Biblical Hebrew word order: The interface of Information structure and formal features

Christo H.J. van der Merwe (Stellenbosch[1]) and Eep Talstra (Amsterdam)

1 Introduction

In recent years different theoretical frames of reference were used in attempts to better understand the language(s) of the Hebrew Bible. While the 19th and first half of the 20th century were dominated by historical-comparative approaches, structuralist and functional approaches started to get the upperhand in many circles during the latter quarter of the previous century.[2] One of the main features of the latter two modern linguistic approaches is the use of distributional criteria. Linguistic categories at various levels of linguistic description are identified on account of the fact that the members of each category enjoy the same paradigmatic and syntagmatic distribution. The formal character and intersubjective verifiability of categories identified on account of distributional criteria are of the major reasons why the use of these criteria has been established as one of the cornerstones of most current linguistic research. However, the question whether distributional criteria can render significant insight to linguistic phenomena beyond the level of the clause is still being debated. Furthermore, the empirical status of functional labels that are attached to categories involved at these higher levels of description also gave rise to a number of questions and uncertainties.

This dilemma is well-illustrated in attempts to describe the function of word order across languages. Biblical Hebrew is no exception if one considers the various options scholars took. Some modified and supplemented traditional linguistic categories with more refined semantic labels, e.g. identificatory, selective exclusive, prominence,[3] some designed their own idiosyncratic logical frame of reference and applied it rigorously without producing any convincing results[4], some failed to understand modern linguistic categories and applied them wrongly[5], some were informed by modern linguistics and chose a clearly defined semantic notion like "focus," applied it rigorously and were content not to account for all the data in terms of a coherent frame of reference[6] and some were informed by a particular

---

[2] Cf. Van der Merwe (2002).
[3] Cf. Muraoka (1999:198-206),
[4] Cf. Niccacci (1999:216-217).
[5] Cf. Revell (1999:306-308).
[6] Cf. Gross (1996).

approach in modern linguistic thinking and produced results that convince[7] or fail to convince.[8] One may argue that the inconclusiveness of the results of these attempts will confuse interpreters and exegetes of the Hebrew Bible more than be of help to them. However, this does not imply that the Biblical Hebrew scholars must not continue to find more conclusive results.

The purpose of this study is to illustrate that a cognitive-oriented notional frame of reference developed for the interpretation of word order across languages holds the key towards more conclusive interpretations of BH word order, as well as attempts to develop models that can be used for the intersubjectively verifiable interpretations of the Hebrew Bible.[9] To justify this claim a model for the interpretation of BH word order will be developed, applied to a specific BH text and compared with the findings of an independant analysis of the formal features of a particular BH text beyond the level of the sentence. The reason for the comparison is to determine the role and value of a text linguistic database developed at the University of Amsterdam. It is hypothesized that such a comparison will illustrate the heuristic value of this instrument.[10]

For these purposes our paper will be organized as follows: In the *first section* we will commence with a motivation why we believe the notion "information structure" as developed by Lambrecht (1994) is warranted for the investigation of BH word order.[11] Then we will explain the basic tenets of Lambrecht's theoretical frame of reference. We will conclude this section by indicating how Lambrecht's insights can be used for explaining BH word order patterns. This application of his insights will be represented in the form of a set of pragmatic and syntactic categories that may be used to explain BH word order patterns. Intersubjectively testable criteria for each category will be provided. In the *second section* the basic features of our formal presentation of Deut 3:1-21 will be discussed. If relevant, the criteria used will be explained. In the *third section*, we will present our analysis of each clause in Deut 3. In this analysis we will illustrate how we used our analysis of the information structure of the text and compared it with the structuring of the text on account of its formal features. In *section four* we will describe the results of the investigation.

---

[7] Cf. Buth (1999:79-108). One of the reasons why Buth's results convince is that he addresses some of the inadequacies of Dik's functional grammar. However, Buth's decision to use the notion "generative-functional" to label his approach is unfortunate. It will lead to unnecessary confusion with the generative grammatical approach. Cf. also Heimerdinger (1999).

[8] Rosenbaum's (1997) application of Dik's functional grammatical approach to describe word order variation in Isa 40-55 reveals some of the intrinsic weaknesses of Dik's approach. It, namely, provides a taxonomy of pragmatic labels to be mapped onto syntactic and semantic ones, without addressing the issue whether these labels are suitable and informative at the pragmatic level. Cf. Bolkenstein's (1998) justifiable criticism of Dik in this regard.

[9] Cf. Floor's (forthcoming) use of the notions focus and topic in order to determine the theme of a text.

[10] Cf. Hardmeier *et al* (2000).

[11] Although he does not always indicate explicitly when he uses Lambrecht's insights, Heimerdinger (1999) presents a worthwhile effort to implement these insights to analyse the notions "topic", "focus" in BH narratives. For a review of Heimerdinger, cf. Van der Merwe (forthcoming).

2 Information structure and BH word order

2.1 Introduction

In a recent review article[12] of Gross (1996)[13], a more top-down approach to the description and explanation of BH word order, complementary to the bottom-up one used by Gross, has been suggested.[14] Such an approach has been prompted, firstly, by the fact that Gross's investigation, though meticulous, rendered a number of instances of fronting that he did not account for in terms of a coherent theoretical frame of reference.[15] A second impetus was given by a monograph, *Information structure and sentence form. Topic, focus and the mental representation of discourse referents*, by Knud Lambrecht (1994). The functional sentence perspective initiated by scholars of the Prague school in the 1920s was further developed by Halliday, Dik and others.[16] Lambrecht, to our opinion, turned insights from this hotly debated initiative into a well-justified coherent frame of reference.[17] This frame of reference does not merely produce taxomic lists of functional and quasi-pragmatic categories. It provides criteria in terms of which an entire discourse situation can be systematically analysed in order to determine the role of sentence forms in the structuring of information in a particular language.[18]

In accordance with the views of Lambrecht, the "top-down" approach proposed in this investigation explains word order patterns as syntactic forms (alongside other linguistic signals) that display the information structure of utterances at particular points during a communication process. There is no one-to-one correspondence between these forms and the information they convey. However, taking full cognisance of the unfolding of information in the course of the communication process, criteria can be identified for determining the pragmatic value of those cases that may have more than one interpretation.[19]

---

12 Van der Merwe (1999a).

13 Michel (1997) and Disse (1998) must be read with Gross (1996). These works are the dissertations of two of Gross's research partners in his investigation of BH word order.

14 Word order refers here to the linear ordering of clause constituents.

15 Gross does assign functional values to these constructions, e.g. "Reliefgebung in der Handlungsdarstellung" and "Der Satz mit dem topikalisierten Element dient der Diskursgliederung." (1996-105-107). However, the theoretical status of these classes Gross does not explain. For a very useful overview of Gross's (1996) findings as far as "clauses with a nominal/pronominal constituent before the finite verb" are concerned, cf. Gross (1999:39-45).

16 Cf. Lambrecht (1994:12-13), Gross (1996:53-73) and Disse (1998:109-136). Disse in particular pays attention to the way some of the functional categories were treated in generative circles.

17 Lambrecht positions his approach in the realms of "categorical grammar" (1994:13 and 25-35).

18 Cf. Bolkenstein's criticism of Dik's treatment of the concepts topic and focus (1998:211). Cf. also Rosenbaum (1997) for an application of Dik's view to Isaiah 40-55.

19 This type of approach is presented as complementary to that of Gross for mainly two reasons: Firstly, it draws on his insights gained from a close investigation of the BH data, e.g. the range of lexical, syntactic and pragmatic considerations that may play a role in the interpretation of particular word order patterns. Secondly, it scrutinizes these explanations and tries to account for them in terms of a coherent pragmatic theory.

In Van der Merwe (1990) the advantages of Jacobs's (1984) formulation of the concept "focus" are described, firstly, to the widely-used but very vague concept "emphasis" and, secondly, to other definitions of the concept.[20] Its value for describing an overt focus inducer like גּם is demonstrated in the same work.[21] In Van der Merwe (1993) and Gross (1996) the notion is used to describe one of the functions of word order in BH verbal clauses.[22] Although Jacobs's view, viz. that the focus of a clause can be identified as that element in a clause that represents a choice of one alternative in a context where more than one alternative is present, cannot be faulted[23], he is mainly concerned with the semantics of this concept.[24] For this reason he does not pay much attention to the pivotal role this rather pragmatic notion plays in the structuring and presentation of meaningful utterances in particular communicative situations. Such a broader and more coherent perspective for analysing the information structure of discourse is provided by Lambrecht (1994).[25]

2.2 Lambrecht: Information structure and sentence form

According to Lambrecht (1994:xiii) the sequential ordering of clause constituents is one of the means that speakers of many languages use in order to structure the information they want to convey. The formal structure of their sentences (in the sense of the order of their constituents) represents the interface between the world of the formal grammar of those languages and the cognitive environment of their speakers. Trying to explain (and, of course, to understand!) the way in which sentence forms may be used to represent the pragmatic structuring of the cognitive environments of participants during a communication process in a few paragraphs is not easy. We will start by explaining (a) what we understand as the cognitive world of participants in a communication process. Special attention will be paid to the difference between the notions "knowledge" and "discourse activeness of entities and propositions". (b) A clause with the same content will be used to illustrate how speakers may use

---

[20] Bandstra (1982 and 1992), though not referring to Jacobs, also prefers the notion "focus" to "emphasis."

[21] The identification of a word class "focus particles" has gained wide acceptance in linguistic circles (cf. König 1991). Cf. also Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999) for the treatment of other BH focus particles. However, Disse (1998:276) correctly points out the ambiguity that may arise concerning the domain of the focus particles that occur at the beginning of clauses.

[22] Although Buth does not use Jacob's definition, his functional explication of the concept implies a similar understanding of the notion focus (1999:81). He uses it to describe successfully the way in which focus is expressed in utterances referred to by nominal clauses. Less successful is a similar attempt by Revell (1999:297-319). The fact that Revell prefers to use the term "highlight" instead of focus merely "to avoid confusion" suggests that his understanding of focus is not in line with that of Buth and Gross.

[23] Comparing the results of Van der Merwe (1993) with that of this investigation will demonstrate that Lambrecht's theoretical framework is in many regards merely more comprehensive.

[24] Cf. Molnár's (1997) scrutinization of Jacobs.

[25] Some of the limitations of using the concepts, focus-background, topic-comment, and theme-rheme, but working without a coherent framework for analysing the information structure of a written text, have been identified by Disse. Cf. his observations on the basis of his analysis of Deut 12 (1998:290-291).

different accentuation patterns to reflect differences in their pragmatic structuring of the "same" clause in communication situations with different information structures (i.e. different states of the discourse activeness of entities and propositions). From the discussion of these examples the necessity of distinguishing pragmatic categories to capture the different structures will be evident. For this reason the concepts "focus" and "topic" will be defined (c). The pivotal role these concepts may play in understanding word order patterns in many languages will also be illustrated in this section. In some languages the formal syntactic features of constructions signalling argument focus of an utterance and those signalling the introduction or establishing an entity as the topic of an utterance may be similar at the surface level. Fronting in BH is a good example in this regard. Therefore (d) the pragmatic differences between cases where argument focus and those where a newly established (or re-established) topic is involved, will be pointed out.

a) Participants in a communicative situation, i.e. the interlocutors, each have a cognitive world of their own. This world, among other things, consists of mental representations of *persons, things, places (i.e. entities)* and *states of affairs and events (i.e. propositions)*. These mental representations, which are identifiable in the case of entities, or presupposed in the case of propositions, make up their *knowledge of the world*. When two parties communicate they are normally not conscious of their entire knowledge of the world. At a particular point in a conversation, only a part of it is, or can be, activated. This is because the shortterm memory of humans has a limited capacity. In the case of a narrative, characters, things, places, states of affairs and events may be introduced or activated in the course of the narrative. However, only those in the shortterm memory of the interlocutors are active at a particular point of a narrative. These entities and propositions are referred to as being *discourse active*. This implies that some entities may be identifiable for interlocutors, i.e. part of their knowledge, but not discourse active.[26]

b) Speakers present the information they want to communicate in the form of clauses that are pragmatically structured. This means that they structure their clauses in such a way that the sentences reflect their assumptions concerning the cognitive environment of their addressees at the moment a particular clause is uttered.[27] Each utterance will reflect a speaker's assumption of the discourse activeness of (i) the entities and/or propositions involved and (ii) the role that these entities play in these propositions. Compare the following utterances that represent different pragmatic structurings of the same clause (The use of the capital letters is an attempt to reflect more or less the prosodic pattern of each utterance).

---

[26] A distinction is made between active, accessible, unused, brand new anchored and brand new unanchored items (Lambrecht 1994:77-114). There is also evidence that, in contrast to entities that are normally referred to by means of nominal constituents, predicates "are not stored in the form of mental representations which can be activated and maintained over stretches of discourse of indefinite length" (1994:269).

[27] To structure their clauses speakers normally have various means at their disposal, e.g. prosodic, lexical and morphosyntactic (including word order) constructions. These means may be used alone or in combination. The rules according to which these means can be utilized form part of the grammatical conventions or system of a particular language.

(1)   PETER wrote an essay.[28]

(2)   Peter wrote AN ESSAY.

(3)   Peter WROTE an essay.

Example (1) reflects the assumption that the proposition "*Somebody* wrote an essay" is discourse active, while the identity of the author of the book is unknown to his/her audience. This assumption is, among other things, signalled in the spoken form of this English utterance by means of the absence of accents on "wrote an essay" and by accenting "PETER".[29] This would, of course, typically be the case if (1) is the answer to the question: "Who wrote an essay?" In some contexts the accentuation pattern in (1) may also reflect an assumption of the speaker that his/her audience thinks somebody else wrote an essay, too (PETER, and not John, wrote an essay.) It may even convey the assumption that the audience suspects, but is uncertain whether Peter indeed wrote an essay. This assumption is typically conveyed by a clause like "Yes, PETER wrote an essay."

Example (2) reflects the assumption of a speaker that his/her audience knows "Peter wrote *something*." In other words, this proposition is then discourse active. By accenting AN ESSAY the nature of what Peter wrote is provided (identified), viz. an essay. Also (2) may be the answer to a question. In this case the question would be "What did Peter write?" In some other contexts, example (2) may also be used to confirm that Peter wrote an essay, and not a poem.

Example (3) would typically provide the answer to the question, "What did Peter do?" The utterance conveys the proposition that the addressee knew Peter did something, but not what he did. In this case only the proposition, "Peter *did something*" would be discourse active, and what he did, is identified.

c) Similar in (1), (2) and (3) is the fact that in each one or another type of *identification* is established. In terms of Jacob's definition of focus referred to above, each of the items to be identified is the *focus* of the utterance. This is because each represents the choice of a particular item in a context where more than one alternative were possible.[30] Also Lambrecht would regard each identified item as the focus of the respective utterance. He formulates his definition of focus more broadly, viz:

"*The focus of a proposition is that semantic element (or elements) whose presence makes the proposition into an assertion, i.e. into a potential piece of information*" (1994:336).[31] The following three propositions:

---

[28] Explaining and understanding the *use* of language by means of typical sentences is extremely difficult. It is therefore important to read each example only in terms of the contexts envisaged here.

[29] In our discussion below it will become evident that the formal structure of example (1), i.e. here its accentuation pattern, may also signal "sentence focus."

[30] To be more precise, Jacobs would regard each item identified as "the focus of the illocutionary acts" involved.

[31] Crucial in Lambrecht's understanding of the concept focus is that the set of alternatives from which the focus item is "chosen", may or may not, be exhaustive. He (1994:286-291) argues convincingly that the notion "contrastiveness" that implies a limited set of alternatives is merely a "generalized conversational implicature which naturally arises" with argument focus structures "in the absence

(4)   *Somebody* wrote an essay.

(5)   Peter wrote *something*.

(6)   Peter *did something*.

are therefore turned into pieces of information for their addressees by the semantic items PETER in (1), AN ESSAY in (2) and WROTE ESSAY[32] in (3) respectively. Examples (1) and (2) are regarded by Lambrecht as cases of *argument focus*. In each case an argument is the focus of the utterance. Example (3) is considered to be a case of *predicate focus*. The entire predicate is the focus of the utterance. In most languages, in real life communication, particularly in narrations, most utterances have predicate focus. This is because narrations typically tell what characters in a particular story did (or what happened to them).

A significant feature of examples (1), (2) and (3) is that they involve an entity, PETER, that is identifiable for the interlocutors in the communication situations we are envisaging. In (2) and (3) he is discourse active and *his role* in each of the two propositions involved is established. Both the utterances are *about him*.[33] The entity or entities about which a proposition conveys information are called the *topic*(s) of that proposition.[34]

---

[32] of a contextual trigger or block" (1994:291). Gross (1996) is a good example of an approach in which the implicit or explicit availability of an exhaustive list of alternatives is regarded as the distinctive criterium for identifying focused items. For some of the shortcomings of such an approach, and by implication Jacobs' definition of focus, cf. Van der Merwe (1999a).

[32] Although intonation is often used in English to signal the focus of an utterance, as the examples that we have used above illustrate, there is not necessarily a one-to-one relationship between clause accents and focused items. In example (3) either the verb alone, WROTE, or the entire predicate, WROTE AN ESSAY, may be signalled by the intonation pattern indicated in (3). Cf. also Lambrecht (1994:238-257).

[33] "A proposition is interpreted as being about an entity if it is understood as conveying relevant information with respect to this entity, i.e. as increasing the hearer's knowledge of it" (Lambrecht 1994:335).

[34] A proposition may contain a primary and secondary topic, e.g. answering the question of his teacher: "Who wrote this?", the school boy may respond (pointing to his friend standing next to him), "He wrote it." In such a case the proposition contains a primary topic, he, and a secondary topic, it.

However, the theoretical validity of the notion topic has recently been seriously challenged. Floor (forthcoming), drawing on Jacobs (2001), remarks as follows: "There is no proper or rigorous definition of 'topic', he (*i.e. Jacobs, our italics*) argues, quoting Reinhart (1982) and Polinsky (1999). The 'aboutness'-definition is not enough. He (*i.e. Jacobs, our italics*) proposes four salient semantic attributes of topic-comment: 1) informational separation (where there is a clear separation in the information structure role of constituents X and Y. X is topical and Y is focal), 2) Predication (where X is the semantic subject and Y the semantic predicate), 3) Addressation (where the comment Y is 'about' topic X. Y is relevant to X, regardless of the grammatical or semantic relationship) and 4) Frame-setting (where the X sets the frame for the interpretation of Y). (For an in-depth discussion of these categories, see Jacobs, 2001: 645-655)."

Floor (forthcoming) proposes the following distinctions: "1) Link topic – Subject topics will be redefined as topics that have informational separation, predication as subjects, and addressation

Strictly speaking, if (2) and (3) would have been used in real life situations, both these utterances would have sounded unnatural. The following formulations would have been more probable in the above-mentioned envisaged contexts, viz.

(7)   He wrote AN ESSAY.

(8)   He WROTE an essay.[35]

Across languages a *discourse active* topic of which the topic role has already been established in an utterance is most preferably referred to by means of *an unaccented pronoun* that is the subject of the clause involved (Lambrecht 1994:172-176). Furthermore, utterances in which the discourse active topic is already established, and in which something is predicated to this topic, i.e. cases like (3) and (8) where *predicate focus* is involved, tend to display the so-called normal word order pattern of that language (Lambrecht 1994:228, 235-238). Compare the following short narration:

(9)   Last Friday, he *went to this exhibition in the town-hall*. When he
        came there, he *found that John, Mary and Peter decided to go too*.

In each clause the topic is *he*, each has *predicate focus* (indicated by means of the italics) and each displays the so-called normal SVX (subject-verb-x) word order of English. Compare also the following examples from BH that is regarded by many as a VSX language:[36]

(10)   וַיִּתֶּן לָהֶם *He* gave [some (i.e. honey)] to them, ...
         וְלֹא־הִגִּיד לָהֶם כִּי But *he* did not tell them that ... (Jdg 14:9).

d) In example (2) the item that is the focus of the utterance, AN ESSAY, would not be identifiable in the contexts we envisage (2) can be used in. However, if we change example (2) to (11), the definiteness of the focus item (THE ESSAY) implies that the essay is at least identifiable for both the interlocutors.

(11)   Peter wrote THE ESSAY.

---

status, but NOT frame-setting, and will be called *link topics*. 2) Secondary topic – *Secondary topics* are topics that have a component of addressation but not one of predication and informational separation. Secondary topics are topics that appear in the predicate of the clause. The secondary topic is part of the predicate focus construction. 3) Topic frame – The need to create separate categories like 'setting' and 'contextualizing constituent' will be accounted for by the notion of *topic frame*. Fronted or left-dislocated elements (which have the component of frame-setting) will be defined as a case of the separate topic category called *topic frame*. Frame-setting topics 'seem to restrict the application of the proposition by the rest of the sentence to a certain domain' (Jacobs, 2001:656). 4) Tail topic – A tail topic is a presupposed constituent in the form of a word or a phrase that appears at the end of a sentence, and is a right-dislocated extra-clausal contituent."

[35] Although intonation is often used in English to signal the focus of an utterance, as the examples that we have used above illustrate, there is not necessarily a one-to-one relationship between clause accents and focused items. Cf. also Lambrecht (1994:238-257).

[36] It is more conventional to use the notion VSO instead of VSX. Since not all clauses in our examples have objects, We use the notion X instead of O.

A distinctive feature of focus items is indeed that they may either be brand new (example 2), identifiable or discourse active (example 1). What is always "new" about them, however, is the relationship they enter into with a discourse active proposition.[37]

In contrast, for an item to function as topic of an utterance at a particular point in a communication situation, that item has at least to be identifiable.[38] It would be very hard to envisage a context in which (12) could be used[39]:

(12)   An old woman wrote THE ESSAY.

As mentioned earlier, entities that are identifiable and accessible to interlocutors in a specific communication event, are not necessarily discourse active. Languages may have special "topic promoting constructions" to reactivate and establish an accessible entity as the topic of an utterance. In English, the phrase 'as far as TOPIC is concerned...' may be used. Left-dislocation may also be used, e.g. 'That TOPIC, I love it'. Apart from these two constructions, an accent on an accessible item, or even the fronting of a non-subject constituent[40], may be used to establish or re-establish an entity as the topic of a specific proposition, e.g.

(13)   He said to his wife: "...." TO HIS CHILDREN he said: "..."[41]

(14)   I saw Mary and John yesterday. SHE says HELLO, but HE'S still ANGRY at you.

Any item that is *brand new* (i.e. unidentifiable) as far as a current communicaton situation is concerned, needs to be introduced before it can be used as the topic of a subsequent utterance. For this purpose languages also have different means. In English a new entity (an essay) may be introduced by being part of the predicate focus of an utterance, e.g.

(15)   Peter WROTE *an essay. The essay* was very good.

In English, so-called *presentational* constructions like "there was x..." are also often used, e.g.

---

[37] However, the role of a discourse active item in a discourse active proposition may sometimes already be established, but in that case the focus of the utterance is **to confirm that role**, e.g. "Did YOU make this dish? Yes, *I myself* did it."

[38] According to Lambrecht (1994:165) if one has to arrange potential topics on a scale from "most acceptable to least acceptable", the scale would range from active items, accessible items, unused items, brand new anchored items to brand new unanchored items.

[39] It is as difficult as to assign a possible context to the question: What did an old woman write?

[40] This construction is referred to as topicalization. Cf. Lambrecht (1994:31). According to Lambrecht (1994:195) "Topicalization generally seems to require a higher degree of accessibility than left detachment" if it is used to establish or re-establish an entity as the topic of a particular utterance.

[41] This example is from Lambrecht (1994:291). According to him the accentuation of the two discourse active participants, HE and SHE is often mistakenly interpreted as instances of contrastive focus. He provides convincing arguments why they are rather *contrastive topics* (1994:291-295).

(16)   Once upon a time, there was a king, ...[42]

In addition to these presentational constructions *event reporting* constructions may be used, e.g.

(17)   A WOMAN, Mrs Jones from Park Town, was killed in a car crash last night.

(18)   (We were all sitting on the terrace, and then,) A STRANGE MAN appeared from behind the trees.

(19)   (We were all sitting on the terrace, and then,) It STARTED to rain.

The latter type of constructions may typically be used to introduce news reports (example 17) or to convey "what happened next" in a narration (examples 18 and 19). In both event-reporting and presentation constructions, the entire propositions are pieces of information.[43] Hence, Lambrecht regards them as instances of *sentence focus*. According to Lambrecht (1994:307), a distinctive feature of *event reports in the form of clauses with sentence focus* across languages is the fact that they often have *the same surface level features as those with argument focus*, e.g. in English the accentuation patterns of examples (1), (17) and (18) are similar.

(1)   PETER wrote an essay.

Although we do not have access to the accentuation patterns of BH, I will hypothesize below that also in BH one and the same construction is used in instances of argument and sentence focus, viz. the fronting of non-verbal constituents in verbal clauses. [44]

To summarize the most salient aspects of Lambrecht's theoretical framework:

1.   The information structure of a communication process is structured by means of the forms of the clauses that are used.

2.   As far as the cognitive environments of interlocutors are concerned, a distinction must be made between, on the one hand, presupposed propositions and identifiable entities that constitute their knowledge, and, on the other hand, the discourse activeness of those propositions and entities at a particular point of the communication process.

---

[42]   Lambrecht (1994:39) remarks "English, like other languages, has a special 'presentational' construction, involving a small number of transitive verbs like *be* and *come*, the subject of these verbs, and the deictic adverbs *here* or *there*."

[43]   Presentation and event reporting sentences may be subsumed under the heading "thetic sentences." These are sentences that express thetic propositions, in contrast to categorical propositions. For the difference between thetic and categorical propositions, cf. Lambrecht (1994:144).

[44]   When an item is established as the topic of an utterance, according to Jacobs "focus of topicalization" is involved. Cf. Van der Merwe (1990 and 1993) for a more detailed description and application of Jacobs' views.

3. Topic and focus are pragmatic categories that are established on the basis of the information structure of the communicative process and the form of the clauses used.

4. The focus of an uttered clause is that semantic item that turns a (presupposed) proposition into a potential piece of information. Three focus types are distinguished: argument focus, predicate focus and sentence focus.

5. The topic of an utterance is that entity (or entities) about which an utterance advances the audience's knowledge.[45] In order to act as the topic of an utterance, an entity needs to be identifiable. Languages have various means to (a) introduce a brand new entity, (b) establish an identifiable entity as the topic of an utterance and (c) re-establish discourse active entities as topics (e.g. in cases where two topics are compared or contrasted).

6. In contexts where (a) the topic of the clause has been established, (b) the topic is referred to by means of an unaccented pronominal subject, and (c) the clause has predicate focus, the form of the clause used displays across languages the most unmarked form of a clause in that language.

7. Although Lambrecht does not indicate it explicitly, the above-mentioned "most unmarked form of a clause" will also be displayed in clauses that display presupposed propositions, e.g. descriptive relative clauses.

2.3 Explaining BH word order[46]

In the light of the above-mentioned interpretation of Lambrecht's, Gross's and Disse's work, insights gained from a number of other studies of Biblical Hebrew[47], and, of course, our own reading of a substantial corpus of BH narrative texts, we would like to propose the following frame of reference for the explanation of BH word order:

---

[45] It may provide some new information about that entity. It may also confirm or contradict some existing knowledge about the entity.

[46] We will not treat postverbal word order here. We assume that argument focus (see § 3 below) is involved in those instances in the main field that Gross (1996) indentifies as being marked for focus. Cf. Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze §46 for a summary of many of Gross's observations. However, the reasons why, and under what conditions BH resorts to focus marking in the main field need still to be determined. Rosenbaum's (1997:137-148) observations on the role of so-called "language independent preferred order of constituent" (LIPOC) need some closer investigation. Of particular relevance is his remark "LIPOC does not affect the *special positions*. Those constituents which qualify for these special positions can be placed in those positions regardless of their complexity." Special positions for Rosenbaum correlate more or less with Gross's marked constructions.

[47] For example, Joüon-Muraoka (1991), Bandstra (1991), Hatav (1997), Rosenbaum (1997), Zevit (1998), Goldfajn (1998), De Regt (1999), Buth (1999:79-109) and Muraoka (1999:187-213).

2.3.1 Verbal clauses

2.3.1.1 Unmarked order

The VSO (VSX[48]) order[49] of constituents represents for BH its most unmarked order as far as verbal clauses are concerned. With unmarked order[50] the order is meant one

could expect in clauses which

§1   contain only presupposed information[51], e.g. relative clauses with אֲשֶׁר and כַּאֲשֶׁר-clauses[52], or

§2   have predicate focus.[53]

The view that clauses with predicate focus display the unmarked word order in BH is based on an observation of Lambrecht (1994) referred to in 1.2. However, the following criteria must be met: The clause must have an established topic that functions as the subject of the clause. The topic-subject may be an enclitic pronoun or a noun phrase. When it is a (lexicalized[54]) noun phrase, the noun phrase follows the

---

48   There is indeed justified criticism to be brought in against aspects of current word order typologies of languages, e.g. the use of O=object as the third element while the object constituent occurs in only some clauses of a language, many languages have no formal means of identifying objects, etc. Cf. also Gross (1996:69). We maintain the notation here for its heuristic value.

49   DeCaen (1999:117-118 footnote 22) is correct when he points out that it is important to distinguish clearly between a VSO or SVO pattern as an abstract underlying representation and that as a pattern displayed at the surface level and that is used to classify languages cross-linguistically. The cross-linguistic typological classification is mainly used in functional circles. According to J A Naudé (personal communication), convincing arguments from the point of view of generative linguistics can be provided that the underlying pattern of BH is VSO. This is in contrast to DeCaen (1995 and 1999) who maintains that BH's underlying pattern is SVO. Creason (1993) as cited in Rosenbaum (1997:223-224) provides arguments in terms of the surface level features of BH relative clauses that the unmarked word order of BH is VSO.

50   It should be evident that this typology of BH word order is primarily not based on statistics, but on *the information structure* signalled by the sequence of clause constituents at the surface level (of verbal clauses with finite verbs).

51   In contrast to Gross's dichotomy (1996:73-74) unmark does not refer to unmark in the sense of neutral as far as his concept of focus is concerned.

52   כַּאֲשֶׁר occurs 495 times in the Tenach. 93% (465 of 495) of these are clauses with finite verbs (qatal- or yiqtol-forms) and 2.5% (12 of 495) active participles. Except for two cases, viz. 1 Sam 2:35 and Job 29:25 all those with finite verbs display a VSX order. In the majority of the cases the topic-subjects are discourse active (e.g. Gen 7:9,16) or identifiable entities (e.g. Deut 32:50, Josh 8:31, 23:5, 1 Sam 12:6, 1 Kgs 3:15, 9:4). All the apparent brand new topic-subjects are אִישׁ used as the indefinite personal pronoun (e.g. Exod 33:11, Deut 1:31, 8:5, 22:26, 2 Sam 16:23, 2 Kgs 5:26, Mal 3:17) or a generic entity (e.g. Deut 28:29, 28:49, Jdg 7:5, 16:9, 1 Sam 26:20, 2 Sam 17:12, 19:4, 1 Kgs 14:15, Isa 25:11, 29:8, 31:4, 55:10, 65:8, Jer 13:11, 43:12, Eze 1:16, 10:10, Am 2:13, 3:12, 5:19, Mal 3:17).

53   We assume that *verb focus* display the same formal features as *predicate focus*. With verb focus we refer to instances where only the verb itself is the focus item in a clause. For example, I BOILED the eggs, I did not BAKE them.

54   When an established topic that is also the subject of a clause is relexicalized, the relexicalization may serve specific pragmatic functions, cf. De Regt (1999). However, this relexicalization does not

verbal construction.[55] The clauses convey what an established topic or topics did (or not did), what happened to them, or in what state the topic-subjects find themselves.

(20)　　　　　　　　וַיַּשְׁכִּמוּ בַבֹּקֶר　They rose early in the morning and
וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲווּ לִפְנֵי יְהוָה　(they) worshipped before the Lord
(1 Sam 1:19).

(21)　　　　　וַיְשַׁלַּח אֶת־הַיּוֹנָה מֵאִתּוֹ　Then he sent out the dove from
וְלֹא־מָצְאָה הַיּוֹנָה מָנוֹחַ לְכַף־רַגְלָהּ　him, ...; but *the dove* found no
place to set its foot, (Gen 8:8-9).

Word order is only one of the means of structuring the information structure of BH. We do not have access to the accentuation patterns of the language and these patterns were most probably the other major device used for these purposes. For this reason, and on the basis of our understanding of "unmarked word order, we have to assume the following: Clauses with an unmarked word order may have focus structures that were signalled prosodically only, e.g. in instances where *wayyiqtol*- and *weqatal*-constructions disallow fronting of any sort.

The *wayyiqtol*- and *weqatal*-constructions indeed complicate matters.[56] Although they may often be interpreted as expressing predicate focus (like in example 20), the expressions themselves (in contrast to x-qatal-constructions like in example 11) signal the notion "progress."[57] In contexts where "progress" has to be signalled, they therefore eliminate the possibility of fronting constituents that refer to brand new entities (example 22 in contrast to example 23) or an argument that is the focus of an utterance (example 24 in contrast to example 25).[58]

(22)　　　　　　　　וַיִּוָּתֵר יַעֲקֹב לְבַדּוֹ　(Jacob was left alone;) and then *a*
וַיֵּאָבֵק אִישׁ עִמּוֹ עַד עֲלוֹת הַשָּׁחַר　*man* wrestled with him until day-
break (Gen 32:25).[59]

(23)　　　　　　　　וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֵלָיו　They answered him, "*A man* came
אִישׁ עָלָה לִקְרָאתֵנוּ　to meet us ..." (2 Kgs 1:6).[60]

---

serve to reactivate the discourse active entity.

[55] With the verbal construction is meant finite verb + inf. abs., negation word + finite verb and focus particle + verb. The verbal construction may be syndetic or asyndetic. Cf. also Gross (1996:24).

[56] Cf. Gross (1996:17-19 and 52).

[57] In Van der Merwe (1997a and 1999b) is suggested that the notion "progress" may also be described in more technical terms as "advancing the reference time." Cf. also Hatav (1997:56) and Goldfajin (1998) in this regards. Furthermore, it is common knowledge that these constructions are sometimes used in contexts where no "progress" is involved. Cf. also Cook (2002:293-298)

[58] There are also other constructions that do not allow the fronting of a non-verbal constituent, e.g. in none of its 128 occurrances in the Tenach a non-verbal constituent is fronted פֶּן. In 2 Sam 12:28 the subject, referred to by means of an independent personal pronoun, is the focus constituent in the clause, but directly follows the verb.

[59] Cf. also Gen 37:15, Exod 2:1, 1 Sam 4:12, 10;12, 14:28, 2 Sam 18:10, 1 Kgs 20:28.

[60] Cf. also 1 Sam 20:21, 1 Kgs 20:39. In Jdg 13:6, 1 Sam 1:2 and 1 Kgs 13:1 the verbal forms may also be interpreted as participles. On semantic grounds, however, we interpret them rather as *qatal*-forms.

(24) לֹא־בָחַרְתִּי בְעִיר מִכֹּל שִׁבְטֵי   I have not chosen a city from any
יִשְׂרָאֵל לִבְנוֹת בַּיִת לִהְיוֹת שְׁמִי שָׁם   of the tribes of Israel in which to
וָאֶבְחַר בְּדָוִד לִהְיוֹת עַל־עַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל: build a house, that my name might
be there; but I chose *David* to be
over my people Israel (1 Kgs
8:16).[61]

(25) כִּי לֹא אֹתְךָ מָאָסוּ   For they have not rejected *you*, but
כִּי־אֹתִי מָאֲסוּ מִמְּלֹךְ עֲלֵיהֶם   *me* they have rejected from being
king over them (1 Sam 8:7).

2.3.1.2 Fronted constituents

When an argument is fronted in a BH verbal clause, the construction may be inter-
preted in different ways. The "vagueness" of the constructions is resolved by either
the information structure of the communicative situation (§3-6) or specific syntactic
and semantic considerations (§7). The following interpretations are possible:

§3 The *argument is the focus* of the clause uttered.[62]

This happens when the argument, or some aspect of it,[63] represents that semantic
element that turns the "*presupposed proposition*" conveyed in the clause into a piece
of information. This means the "new" proposition (i.e. focus entity plus presupposed
proposition) is intended to have some effect on the cognitive world of the addressee.
This effect may be the *adding* of some information to the cognitive world of the
addressee, viz. establishing a relationship between a specific semantic item and the
presupposed proposition (example 26). The cognitive effect may also be that the
relation between a proposition and an entity is *contradicted* (example 25 above).[64] A
third cognitive effect may be that the already established role of a particular entity in
a presupposed proposition is *confirmed* (example 27). In some cases an attribute of
such an entity is confirmed (example 28).

(26) מִי יַעֲלֶה־לָּנוּ אֶל־הַכְּנַעֲנִי   Who shall go up first for us against
וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה יְהוּדָה יַעֲלֶה   the Canaanites, to fight against
them? The Lord said, *Judah* shall
go up (Jdg 1:1-2).

---

[61] Also Ps 78:67.

[62] According to Lambrecht (2001:463) the "cleft formation is one of several devices languages can use
to express deviations from the unmarked predicate-focus type."

[63] For example, "SIX days you must work, but on the SEVENTH day, you must rest." When word
order is used to signal focus, the syntactic domain of a focus constituent is therefore not necessarily
the same as its semantic domain. Cf. also example 29.

[64] Such cases are sometimes associated with the notion "contrastive focus." Cf. Lambrecht's critical
remarks in this regard (1994:286-291).

(27) אֱלֹהֵי הָעִבְרִים נִקְרָא עָלֵינוּ *The God of the Hebrews* has re-
vealed *himself* to us; (Exod 5:3).[65]

(28) כָּל־הָעָם הַיֹּצֵא מִמִּצְרַיִם *All the people who came out of
הַזְּכָרִים כֹּל אַנְשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה Egypt, the males, all the men of
מֵתוּ בַמִּדְבָּר war*, had died on the way in the
wilderness (Josh 5:4).

The "presupposed propositions" are often discourse active, i.e. explicitly referred to
(e.g., example 26).[66] However, presupposed propositions are not necessarily dis-
course active. They may only be identifiable. In such instances they are reactivated
by means of the uttered propositions themselves. Compare example 28[67] and 29[68].

(29) שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲבֹד *Six days* you must work (Exod
20:9).[69]

§4 *Sentence focus* is involved.

This happens when the fronted argument refers to a *brand new entity* and the predi-
cate refers to a proposition that is neither discourse active nor can be inferred from
the co-text or context. In other words, sentence focus entails predicate focus.

---

65 In this context Moses and Aaron already had told Pharao: "Thus says the LORD, the God of Israel,
    Let my people go... " (Exod 5:1). This utterance in 5:3 is a response to Pharao's reaction in Exod
    5:2, viz. "Who is the LORD, that I should heed him and let Israel go? I do not know the LORD, and I
    will not let Israel go." Aaron and Moses confirm by means of this utterance with argument focus
    the identity and role of God in the revelation they got. The fact that God himself revealed himself to
    them is the reason why Pharao should heed their request.

66 Cf. Deut 5:24. When the clause with the fronted deictic temporal constituents is uttered, the notion
    that the Israelites experienced that it is possible that God speaks to man and he does not die is
    already discourse active. The "added" information is the fact that the Israelites had experienced it
    that very same day. Cf. also Deut 10:1, 27:9.

67 What happened in Numbers 14:29-35, 26:64-65 and Deut 2:14 was part of the knowledge of the
    implied (and real world) addressees in Josh 5:4. The focus of the utterrance in Josh 5:4 is the extent
    of the people that died, viz. *All* the people who came out of Egypt, *all* the men of war. The
    confirmation of this fact motivates why Joshua had to circumcize all the Israelites that are about to
    enter Canaan.

68 It was most probably common knowledge to the addressees that they need to work. What is
    confirmed or specified here is exactly how long they need to work. The same principle applies in
    Deut 24:14. Labourers get paid. With the fronted temporal argument the point in time the payment
    should take place is specified. Cf. also Deut 10:8. The addressees knew the role of the Levites in
    their society.

69 Cf. in contrast Deut 16:8. The notion that only unleavened bread may be eaten is discourse active.
    The fronted temporal argument specifies the exact duration that unleaven bread must be eaten, viz.
    six days. Cf. also Deut 1:3, 16:3 and 16:15. In Deut 31:10 one may argue that the events in 31:9
    implies that the law will be read. The fronted temporal argument specifies the exact time when it
    must be read.

(30)　　　　　וּבֶן־הֲדַד מֶלֶךְ־אֲרָם קָבַץ אֶת־כָּל־חֵילוֹ　*And Benhadad the king of Syria gathered all his army together* (1 Kgs 20:1).

Sentence focus may also be involved if an event is reported "out of the blue". In such cases a discourse active topic may or may not be involved. Crucial is the fact that the utterance reports primarily something what happened, not what the discourse active entity did next.[70] The fact of the matter is that an event, happening or state of affairs is referred to that does not follow in time on that referred to in the immediately preceding context. In a narration this clause normally refers to background information.[71]

(37)　　　　　וַיהוָה אָמַר אֵלַי לֹא תַעֲבֹר אֶת־הַיַּרְדֵּן הַזֶּה:　(And besides) *the Lord* had told me: You shall not cross this Jordan (Deut 31:1).[72]

§5　The fronting *establishes* entities as the *topics to be compared* (example 31) *or contrasted*[73] (examples 32 and 33). In cases like these *a topic frame* for the subsequent clause is established.[74] The function of these constructions is similar to that of pendens constructions. Cf. 2.3.4.[75]

The entities must be identifiable or discourse active. Sometimes the comparisons [take on] the form of a list (examples 34 and 35).

70　This category cannot be motivated in terms of Lambrechts' insights. It needs further investigation. Cf. also the next footnote.

71　Zevit (1998) refers to these constructions as "anterior constructions". According to Zevit (1998:33) this construction "was available for backgrounding of a particular type. An author could provide background, either through the words of characters or through his own narrative voice, by significant detail or allusion." Whether these constructions are restricted to anterior constructions is, of course, questionable. There is theoretically speaking no reason why they cannot occur in contexts where reference is made to forthcoming events.

72　Compare the difference between Jdg 14:9 with a fronted subject and Jdg 16:20 without a fronted subject.

73　A contrast implies a comparison.

74　It is obvious that the differences between §4 and §5 are smaller than those between §3 and §4, or §3 and §5 respectively. This is because in both §4 and §5 topics are fronted. In §4 the topics are brand new and in §5 they are identifiable or discourse active. The main reason why §5 cannot be regarded as instances of sentence focus is that the predicates involved cannot be regarded as having predicate focus, e.g. in example 34 the proposition "I gave x" is discourse active. Lambrecht (1994) does not indicate where instances like §5 should fit in as far as his distinctions, predicate-, argument- and sentence focus are concerned. I hypothesize that in BH these instances are similar to pendens constructions. A *topic frame* is involved. For this reason the fronted constituent should not be treated as part of the clause for the purposes of interpreting the focus structure of that clause.

75　We suspect that the difference between this type of fronting and pendens constructions is similar to the following clauses in English: "That girl, I love her" and "That girl, I love".

(31)   וַיַּגֵּד לָכֶם אֶת־בְּרִיתוֹ ...
וְאֹתִי צִוָּה יְהוָה בָּעֵת הַהִוא
לְלַמֵּד אֶתְכֶם

13 He declared <u>to you</u> his covenant,
...14 And *me* the LORD charged at
that time to teach you ... (Deut
4:13-14).[76]

(32)   וַנַּחֲרֵם אוֹתָם ...
וְכָל־הַבְּהֵמָה וּשְׁלַל הֶעָרִים
בַּזּוֹנוּ לָנוּ׃

6 And we utterly destroyed <u>them</u>,
.... 7 *But all the livestock and the
plunder of the towns* we kept as
spoil for ourselves (Deut 3:7-8).

(33)   בַּבֹּקֶר תֹּאמַר מִי־יִתֵּן עֶרֶב
וּבָעֶרֶב תֹּאמַר מִי־יִתֵּן בֹּקֶר

In the morning you shall say, "If
only it were evening!" and *at
evening* you shall say, "If only it
were morning!" (Deut 28:67).[77]

(34)   (34) וּלְמָכִיר נָתַתִּי אֶת־הַגִּלְעָד׃
וְלָרֻאוּבֵנִי וְלַגָּדִי נָתַתִּי מִן־הַגִּלְעָד
וְעַד־נַחַל אַרְנֹן ...

15 *To Machir* I gave Gilead. 16 And
to the Reubenites and the Gadites I
gave the territory from Gilead as
far as the Wadi Arnon ... (Deut
3:15-16).

(35)   (35) מִקְצֵה שָׁלֹשׁ שָׁנִים תּוֹצִיא
אֶת־כָּל־מַעְשַׂר תְּבוּאָתְךָ

Every third year you shall bring
out the full tithe of your produce ...
(Deut 14:28).

מִקֵּץ שֶׁבַע־שָׁנִים תַּעֲשֶׂה שְׁמִטָּה

Every seventh year you shall grant
a remission of debts (Deut 15:1).

§6   A type of temporal construction is involved.[78]

---

76 Compare Gen 19:19, Exod 4:21, 1 Sam 25:25 and 1 Kgs 12:11 with fronted first person subjects in
contrast to Gen 6:18, Exod 33:3, Josh 2:4, 24:10, 1 Kgs 2:26 and 10:7 where the first person subjects
are not fronted. In the case of the former list of examples the predicates of the topic-subjects are
compared to that of another topic. In the second list of examples this is not the case.

77 In Van der Merwe (1997 and 1999b) the notion by Gross (1996) that fronted or temporal
constituents may or may not be marked for focus had been challenged. A reconsidering of fronted
constituents in Deuteronomy has shown that Gross is indeed correct. However this applies
primarily as far as his definition of focus, as well as his notion of "unmarked" is concerned.
According to the database developed by the *Werkgroep vir Informatica* at the Free University in
Amsterdam, there are 21 cases in Deuteronomy where a temporal constituent is fronted. If one
leaves two dubious cases, viz. Deut 3:3 and 32:35 out of consideration, of the 19 left, 13 can be
regarded as instances of argument focus, viz. Deut 1:3, 2:25, 5:13, 5:24, 9;11, 11:12, 16:03, 16:8,
16:15, 24:15, 26:16, 27:9, 31:10. In three cases a temporal constituent is activated in order to serve as
the topic of the subsequent clause, viz. Deut 14:28, 15:1 and 28:67. Problematic is Deut 4:41, 10:1
and 10:8. It is possible that these instances of fronting may be explained in terms of the lexical items
involved, e.g. אָז and בְּעֵת הַהִוא. However, further investigation is needed.

78 Like §6 this category begs a more adequate theoretical grounding.

This normally applies when none of the above-mentioned reasons for the fronting in a verbal clause can be established. The fronting may occur in a single clause or two clauses following each other. Significant, however, is that in each case immediately simultaneous or nearly simultaneous actions are involved.[79]

(38)   הֵמָּה בָּאוּ בְאֶרֶץ צוּף   *When they came to the land of*
       וְשָׁאוּל אָמַר לְנַעֲרוֹ אֲשֶׁר־עִמּוֹ   *Zuph*, Saul said to his servant who
          was with him, ... (1 Sam 9:5).

2.3.2 Participal clauses

§7 The most unmarked order is subject + predicate (example 39).[80]

(39)   הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים אֲשֶׁר   The ordinances that *I* am teaching
       אָנֹכִי מְלַמֵּד אֶתְכֶם לַעֲשׂוֹת   you to observe (Deut 4:1).

§8   If any other constituent is fronted, the fronting signals *argument focus* (example 40).

(40)   מַה־תְּבַקֵּשׁ   What are you looking for?
       אֶת־אַחַי אָנֹכִי מְבַקֵּשׁ   *My brothers* I am seeking (Gen 37:15).

2.3.3 Nominal clauses[81]

§9   In nominal clauses the most unmarked order[82] is subject + predicate.[83]

(41)   וַיַּרְא אֲדֹנָיו כִּי   And his master saw that
       יְהוָה אִתּוֹ   the Lord was with him (Gen 39:3).

When both the predicate and subject is identifiable, and the subject preceeds the predicate, *argument focus* is signalled.

---

79   A limited amount of these constructions had been identified by Kuhr (1929). Cf. also Gross (1996:5).

80   The fact that the sequence subj + verb is maintained in example 40 may be taken as justification for the claim that subject + predicate is the most unmarked order. Cf. also Buth (1999:87-94). In all כַּאֲשֶׁר-clauses of the Tenach where a participle is the verb, the constituent order is: subject + predicate. Cf. Gen 34:22, Num 32:25, 32:27, 2 Kgs 2:19, 17:26, Isa 66:22, Jer 42:2, Eccl 11:5, Neh 5:12, 2 Chron 25:3, 29:8, 30:7.

81   Most of the examples and insights in this paragraph are from Buth (1999:79-108). For a more comprehensive overview of recent studies of verbless clauses in Biblical Hebrew, cf. Miller (1999) and Zewi and Van der Merwe (2001:81-99).

82   Buth (1999:107) remarks: "The underlying order in nominal clauses is Subject-Predicate. This is clear from the pattern of fronted Participles, from the patterns with participles, from patterns with 'neutralized' order, from subordinate clauses that have one fronted constituent, from 'circumstantial' clauses, and from descriptive clauses that have one fronted constituent."

83   Uncertain at this stage is whether the subject in these cases needs to be discourse active or not, what influence the verbal form היה has in these cases (e.g. 1 Sam 1:1 and Job 1:1) and what influence שׁ and אין have on the order of elements in nominal clauses.

(42) יְהוָה הוּא נַחֲלָתוֹ The Lord, *he* is our inheritance (Deut 10:9)

§10 When the predicate preceeds the subject, *predicate focus* is signalled.

(43) רַב הָעָם אֲשֶׁר אִתָּךְ The people who are with you are [too] *many* ... (Jdg 7:2).

Only one part of a two-part predicate may precede the subject.

(44) כִּי עַם קָדוֹשׁ אַתָּה For you are *a holy peope* to the לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ Lord (Deut 14:2).

§11 When an adjunct preceeds a nominal clause, *argument focus* is involved.

(45) עוֹד הָעָם רָב The people are *still* too many (Jdg 7:4).

2.3.4 Pendens constructions

§12 In verbal and nominal clauses pendens constructions[84] *establish (promote)* identifiable, but non-active entities to a state of discourse activeness (*topic frame*) as far as a subsequent utterance is concerned.

(46) וְלָאֲתֹנוֹת הָאֹבְדוֹת לְךָ *As for your donkeys that were lost* אַל־תָּשֶׂם אֶת־לִבְּךָ לָהֶם ..., give no further thought to them, כִּי נִמְצָאוּ for they have been found (1 Sam 9:21).

(47) (46) וְיֶתֶר דִּבְרֵי יוֹתָם אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה *Now the rest of the acts of Jotham,* הֲלֹא־הֵם כְּתוּבִים עַל־סֵפֶר *and all that he did*, are they not דִּבְרֵי הַיָּמִים לְמַלְכֵי יְהוּדָה written in the Book of the Annals of the Kings of Judah? (2 Kgs 15:36).

(48) הָאֲנָשִׁים הָאֵלֶּה *These men*, they are friendly with שְׁלֵמִים הֵם אִתָּנוּ us (Gen 34:21).

3 Formal Features of Deuteronomy 3

Computer-assisted research in the syntax of BH performs experiments with linguistic markers of textual structure and with assumptions about their functionality (Talstra 1997:85-156). Experiments leading into a preliminary hypothesis about grammatical and lexical markers and their possible text-level functions result in a proposal for textual hierarchy. The basic hypothesis is that the order and the function

---

84 Muraoka (1999:188-198) provides an exhaustive list of possible syntactic configurations of so-called "tripartite nominal clauses." However, he does not regard most of them as pendens constructions.

of clause elements not only display the information structure of the clause in its specific context, such as which items are the topic and which are the focus of an utterance, but also determine the relationship between clauses. If it is correct that textual organisation to a certain level can be calculated on the basis of the linguistic markers and patterns detected, this textual organisation in its turn will be helpful to determine the balance of actors in a text, topics and the focus of its statements or propositions.

The goal of this section, therefore, is to argue what grammatical and lexical markers in the text of Deuteronomy 3 are effective in guiding the reader in establishing the structure of the text. First we will present some experiment-based assumptions about the functionality of the patterns in which the textual elements are being presented to the reader. Second a proposal for a text linguistic structure of the text will be argued.

3.1 Linguistic markers of clause connections and paragraphs. For a full report of experiments see Talstra (1997a:85-118.)

I. Phrase-level connections:

1. אֲשֶׁר-clauses connect to the immediate preceding clause (Deut 3:2dQCR, 4bR, etc.);
2. Infinitive clauses connect to the immediate preceding clause (Deut 3:1c, 24a, 26e).

II. Clause-level connections:

1. Sets of frequently connected clause types, e.g.:
   - Connections at the same level are marked by:
     wayyiqtol + subj -> wayyiqtol + subj (Deut 3:2a and 3a; 3:26a and 26c)
     wayyiqtol - subj[85] -> wayyiqtol - subj (Deut 3:4a, 3:6a and 3:8a)
   - Connections at unequal level are marked by:
     wayyiqtol + subj -> wayyiqtol - subj (Deut 3:3a and 3b)
     wayyiqtol - subj -> wayyiqtol + subj (Deut 3:1a and 2b)
     wayyiqtol - subj -> we-x-qatal (Deut 3:18a and 3:21a)
2. Start of direct speech sections are marked by:
   - e.g., wayyiqtol - אֶל (Deut 3:2bQ)
3. Connecting parts of clauses that are separated due to embedding marked by, e.g. infinitive or אֲשֶׁר in the first following line and one or more constituents without a preceding conjunction and without a verb in the next following line, e.g. Deut 3:1c.

III. Word-level and phrase-level markers, verifying or falsifying proposals of II:

1. Morphological correspondences:
   Identical person-number-gender of the verb; identical person-number-gender of suffix and verb or of suffix and noun phrase (that Deut 3:26a is following 3:26a is confirmed in this way).

---

[85] Wayyiqtol - subj refers to cases where the subj is not lexicalized. Wayyiqtol + subj refers to cases where the subj is lexicalized.

2. Identical verbal forms (Deut 3:3b is followed by 4a. The latter is followed by 6a.) This is confirmed by means of a *wayyiqtol* form of the verb with the same number and person.

IV. Lexical patterns:

1. Syntactic constructions based on lexical patterns:
   יָדַעְתִּי + כִּי־מִקְנֶה רַב לָכֶם (Deut 3:19)

2. Lexical parallels contribute to or confirm the clause connections established with the help of syntactic data in II and III (בָּעֵת הַהִוא) (Deut 4a, 8, 11, 12a)

V. Paragraph marking by special clause types:

1. Wayyiqtol-x x= Subject (Deut 3:2a, 3a)

2. Markers of paragraphs of equal text level:
   The set of actants (Subject + Object or Complement) equals the set of actants in the preceding paragraph. The roles may change, e.g.: Subject, Complement and the reverse (Deut 3:23a and 26a).

3. Markers of paragraph embedding:
   Wayyiqtol: the subject or object is new or is identical to a constituent in the clause(s) of the preceding paragraph (Object or Complement) (Deut 3:18 and 21)

It is important to understand that the hierarchical organisation of a text is not a static picture, as it is usually presented in rhetorical types of analysis. Rather the text linguistic hierarchy emerges when in the process of reading one moves through the text; that process is being imitated by the process of computer-assisted analysis.

3.2 Proposed hierarchy of the text

Verse	Syntactic and lexical argumentation	Set of Actors (marked; implied)	# Level
1a	wayyiqtol, no subj NP. The clause continues Deut 2 [later on the text will show that Deut 3:1a is continued at the same level only by the last line of 3:29a]	we: (Moses+Israel)	# 1
1c	wayyiqtol + subj introduces a new paragraph (=#), The # level is different from the current # and is therefore indented.	he: (King Og of Bashan)	# 1.1[.1]
2a	wayyiqtol + subj introduces a new #. One could on the basis of similarity, decide to have this # at the same level as the previous one. However, the presence of the first person pronominal suffix creates a relation to the first person predicate in the opening line of 1a. As a result we will see: first, a sub-	he: (Yahweh)	# 1.1

88

	paragraph attached to the first line of verse 1a, starting from verse 2a; and second, the sub-paragraph already made in verse 1c is being presented with additonal indentation.		
2b	The direct speech section has a clear hierarchy: a clause אל + yiqtol 2nd person continued by a clauses weqatal 2nd person, each of them expanded by dependent clauses (2b-2d)		#1.10
3a	wayyiqtol + subj introduces a new #. The new subj is identical to the subject in 3:2a, viz. Yahweh. If the relationship of the pronominal suffix first person plural in בְּיָדֵנוּ to the first person singular in אֵלַי in 2a is accepted, the new # of verse 3 can be located as parallel to the # of verse 2a.	(Yahweh, our God) – him	# 1.2
3b	wayyiqtol: "we struck him." Formally two options for a clause-connection exist; either connecting back to 3:1a (on the basis of verbal tense, person, number), or to 3:3a (on the basis of the verbal tense, pronominal reference "him". Here the morphological argument (option 1) has to be expanded by the text-syntactic argument (option 2): the actors of 3:3b are a subset of the actors of 3:3a. This does not apply to 3:1a.	we – him (suffix)	# 1.2.1

From 3:4 to 3:11 the main clauses follow the same pattern of actors and the same verbal tense form, person and number:

4a	wayyiqtol + בָּעֵת הַהִוא	we – his (suffix)	# 1.2.1
6a	wayyiqtol	we – them (suffix; cities)	
	Due to the strong connection of verse 4a and 6a, 3:5 is a comment in between. The we-x[obj]-qatal of verse 7 is connected with 6c. A connection of unequal level is involved.		1.2.1.1
8	wayyiqtol + בָּעֵת הַהִוא	we	# 1.2.1

From 3:12 to 3:17 the wayyiqtol clauses are interrupted.

3:12a	we-x[obj]-qatal + בָּעֵת הַהִוא + cities. The verbal tense is different from 3:8,	we - cities	# 1.2.1

	but the person and number agree; lexical parallels are strong: 'land', 'time.' 3:12a depends on 3:8a just as 3:7 depends on 3:6a.		
12b	x[obj]-qatal. The verbal tense is continued. A new subj: "I" gave region A to "X".	I (Moses)	# 1.2.1.1
13a	we-x[obj]-qatal is a parallel connection to 12b.	I (Moses)	# 1.2.1.2
15	we-x[comp]-qatal. The construction is chiastic in comparison to 13a and 12b. The clause has an identical verbal tense, person, number; similar obj and comp constituents, but in different order than that of 13a and 12b, viz. to "X" I gave region B.	I (Moses)	# 1.2.1.2
16	we-x[comp]-qatal. The clause is a parallel connection to 15. The parallels are identified on the basis of the strong connections of 12b/13a to 15a/16a. 13b and 14a-14b are comments and a short story put in between.	I (Moses)	# 1.2.1.2
18a	wayyiqtol + subj + בָּעֵת הַהִוא. Here a new pattern of actors emerge, viz. I and you (plur.) This is the first time the audience is directly referred to in this chapter. There is no previous clause with "I" and "you (plural)" starting a paragraph where this line could be connected to for reason of formal identity. The best solution seems to identify the "I" and "you" with the "we" of 3:1a. Since, in spite of the identical verbal tense form, there is no formal identity in terms of number, the rules of the game prescribe that 3:18a is not made parallel, but is analysed as dependent on 3:1a. Thus we are back at paragraph level 1.1.	I - you (pl)	# 1.1
19-20	direct speech section	God - you(pl) - brothers - land	
21	we-x[obj]-qatal + בָּעֵת הַהִוא. The verbal tense is different from 3:18, but person and number agree. The verbal lexeme is repeated (lexical connection) and the time indicator is repeated (lexical con-	I - Joshua	# 1.1.1

	nection). A clause connection of un-equal levels is established.		
21-22	direct speech section	God – you(sing) – kingdoms	
23	wayyiqtol + בָּעֵת הַהִוא. The verbal tense differs, but person and number agree; the time indicator is repeated (lexical connection). The verse is connected parallel to verse 18a.	I – He (Yahweh)	# 1.2
24-25	direct speech section	God - deeds seen – I (Moses) see	
26a-b	wayyiqtol + subj. The verbal tense is different, the person differs, the set of actors is the same; the order has been reversed connected parallel to verse 23.	me – He (Yahweh)	# 1.3
26c	wayyiqtol + subj. The verbal tense and lexeme are identical. The subj is also identical with *with 3:2a, 3a and 26.* Deut 3:26c is therefore a connected parallel with 2a, 3a and 26a.	me – He (Yahweh)	# 1.4
27-28	direct speech section	God – you (Moses) see; Joshua – people	
29	wayyiqtol. No new subj is introduced. The clause refers to no subset of one of the current sets of actors. Deut 3:29 therefore marks a return to starting set of actors in 3:1a..	we (Moses + Israel).	# 1

Computer-assisted research tries by way of experiment to analyse and as far as one can get to imitate the interaction of 'clause type', 'textual hierarchy' and the 'sets of participants' in a text. Its result: a hypothesis of the structure of a text is a proposal to be tested by both syntactic and pragmatic analysis.

4 Analysis of Deuteronomy 3

In paragraph 2.3 we assume that the word order of BH is primarily determined by the information structure of the text. The fact that other factors may also play a role in determining word order patterns of BH is also acknowledged, e.g. the presence of some syntactic constructions (e.g. *wayyiqtol*- and *weqatal*-constructions), and the presence of some semantic constituents and clauses (e.g. temporal constructions). However, any BH scholar will know that it would be naive to expect that each clause of this Tenach reflect the carefully executed information structure of a particular author who wants to convey a specific meaning. On the contrary, it is often the case that many layers of redactional work are obviously present in a text. In such cases one may find that the information structure of a text is either confusing or

impossible to determine.[86] Notwithstanding, we will illustrate in this section that using the final redaction of the text as point of departure for inferring the information structure of the text yields significant results for explaining BH word order patterns. Furthermore, we hypothesize that these insights are often supported by insights provided by the formally determined text linguistic structures of the texts. In some cases these insights might also provide criteria to refine the above-mentioned text linguistic structuring of a text.

As we have indicated, in this section we want to analyse the information structure of Deut 3 and illustrate how it explains the order of constituents in the clauses. In order to do this we need a breakdown of the chapter's verses into clauses. For these purposes we used the hierarchical textual databasis referred to in paragraph 3.2. Since Talstra's database not yet contains any alphabetic numbering of the clauses' particular verses, we used his divisions, compared it to the numbering in *Biblica Hebraica Transcripta* (Richter 1991) and numbered our clause divisions alphabetically (cf. Addendum: clause numbers). Since Talstra's database provides also a suggested textlinguistic structuring of the text on the basis of formal distributional patterns (Talstra 1997a), we notated his proposed paragraph divisions (Addendum: paragraphs). This allows us to determine whether there is any correlation or interplay between formal textlinguistic distinctions and those suggested by the information structure and word order patterns of the chapter.

Before we turn to the analysis of the information structure of the individual clauses, it is important to formulate our understanding of the co-text: of Deut 3. This chapter concludes an overview of God's history with the Israelites from Horeb to the banks of the Jordan as presented by Moses in Deut 1-3. It serves as the ground on account of which Moses argues in Deut 4:1 the Israelites to heed to the Lord's laws and rules that he is about to teach them (וְעַתָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל שְׁמַע אֶל־הַחֻקִּים ... אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי מְלַמֵּד אֶתְכֶם).

The first paragraph opens (3:1a and 1b) with two *wayyiqtol*-clauses in which the topics (we) are already established as discourse active (cf. 2:35). In each clause is conveyed what the discourse active entities did next, hence predicate focus is involved.[87] This accords well with our proposal in §2. In 3:1c a new topic-subject is introduced in a *wayyiqtol* clause. In the light of Deut 1:4, one may assume that this new entity[88], though not discourse active, was identifiable. On the one hand, one may argue that this entity is not revived by means of fronting since the *wayyiqtol*

---

[86] Van der Merwe (1997b:151) concludes the analysis of so-called narrative syntactic approaches as follows: "As a study of the structures and formulae displayed in specific communication processes it (i.e. text linguistics, *the authors*) involves both the conceptual and social world of all the participants in- and outside the text of the Tenach. When you embark upon this approach to Biblical Hebrew you cannot escape the fact that you are in the domain of the study of language *use*." One has to add to this quotation: "the analysis of language use of a religious text with a long and complex history." Cf. Talstra (1995b:189-210) for an illustration of some of the complexities of Tenach exegesis, as well as some proposals how to approach the synchronic and diachronic levels of a Tenach text. Cf. also Talstra (1997b and 1998) on the same topic.

[87] Each *wayyiqtol* clause advances the reference time. This nuance is well represented by the NIV viz. "Next we turned and went up along the road toward Bashan."

[88] Its referent is specified by means of an appositional construction (הוּא וְכָל־עַמּוֹ).

makes it impossible. On the other hand, the predicate of this entity is not compared with that of any previous topic. Most relevant in this context was what happened next to the already discourse active entity, Israel, i.e. when they (we) were on their (our) way to Bashan.[89] Despite the introduction of a new entity, continuity is maintained with the topic in 1b by means of an enclitic personal pronoun in לִקְרָאתֵנוּ. What is significant of the newly introduced entity (Og, the king of Bashan) is that it does not play a very active role as subject (agent) in the rest of the narrative.

Verse 2a commences with a *wayyiqtol* clause with a discourse active entity as subject, יְהוָה (cf. Deut 2:36). Continuity with the topic of 1a-1c is maintained by means of אֵלַי (the first person singular is a subset of the plural). The clause conveys in the first place "what happened next" and not what the discourse active subject in 1a-b or 1c did next. This redirection of events by means of a verb of speaking, but the maintenance of continuity as far as the discourse active topic entity is concerned, warrants the sub-paragraph #1.1 (+#1.10). The verb of speaking and what is said in 2b-d have predicate focus. The connection of 2a with 1a and the assignment of 1c to a lower rank of the text linguistic hierarchy (# 1.1.1. See also the Addendum) are therefore borne out by the information structure.

The clauses 2b-2d are discursive speech. Verse 2b implies a discourse active proposition, the addressee feared Og, the king of Bashan. As overt focus inducer[90], אַל signals that the predicate in its domain is the focus of the clause.[91] Since overt focus inducers do not influence the order of clause constituents, a directive without אַל would also have had the same order of constituents. What a discourse active topic entity must or must not do indeed conveys predicate focus. In the motivation of the directive in 2b, 2c, a complement is fronted. Since the appeal in 2b invokes the notion that God will assist his people, the fronting in 2c may be interpreted as signalling *argument focus* (§3). What is confirmed by the argument focus is the way in which God will assist them. So, not the identity of the referents, i.e. "In your and in nobody else's hand I give them... " is confirmed by the argument focus, but "I give them ... *completely* in your hands (power)." Cf. Deut 2:19. In 2d topic continuity is maintained by means of the enclitic personal pronoun contained in the clause initial *weqatal* form. Since 3a conveys what the established subject-topic (link topic) can, must or shall do next, predicate focus is involved. The clause 2dQC, introduced by כַּאֲשֶׁר, and embedded as part of the predicate of 2dQ, contains presupposed discourse active information that is used as the point of comparison of the predicate in 2dQ. It has the expected unmarked word order (§1).

---

89 The verbal lexeme in 1a refers to an activity of movement. In this context it displays its normal atelic feature. It therefore creates the temporal frame for the subsequent inchoative activity, referred to in 1c. Hence the possibility of a translation like that of the NRSV: "When we headed up the road to Bashan, King Og of Bashan came out against us, he and all his people, for battle at Edrei."

90 An overt focus inducer is a lexical item that signals that a focus item is involved. It stands in contrast to a covert focus inducer like word order. Lambrecht (1994) does not discuss the phenomenon of covert and overt focus inducers. These distinctions are made by Jacobs (1984). While the notion of covert focus inducers fits easily in with Jacobs's semantic sentence-oriented definition of focus, the role of this notion of Lambrecht's frame of reference must still be determined.

91 For more information on overt focus markers, cf. Van der Merwe (1990).

3a conveys what "happened next", i.e. after 2a. The clause is introduced by a *wayyiqtol*-form. Predicate focus is obviously involved. However, part of the predicate also contains an overt focus inducer, viz. גַּ. It signals that the proposition with predicate focus in 3b, contains some presupposed information, viz. "The Lord (already) gave x into the Israelites' hand." By the use of גַּ the author indicates that he and his audience share this knowledge. Significant in 3a is that the discourse active subject of 2a יְהוָה is relexicalized in 3a as יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ, while the topic entity of 1a-1c (we) is pronominalized in בְּיָדֵנוּ. One has good reason to argue that this relexicalisation is a way to signal that clause (3a) conveys what "happened next", not only to the discourse active subject topic (יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ), but to him and the other discourse active topics, viz. Moses and the Israelites. In BH the notion "predicate focus" may therefore be misleading if one assumes wayyiqtol constructions only signal predicate focus and that this predicate focus refers only to cases where it is conveyed what happened to a discourse active entity that is the subject of a clause. Furthermore, the information structure of this clause illustrates the importance to distinguish between different types of topics, e.g. link topics and secondary topics.

The formal text linguistic structure proposed in section 2, viz. that 3a must be connected to 2a (a new paragraph at the same hierarchical level) vividly illustrates the relation of this sub-paragraph with 2a and the relation of 2a+3b as unequal level paragraphs with 1a-b.

God's giving Og into the hands of the Israelites entails an event.[92] This event is explicated in 3b-5a. On account of the change of subject in 3b one should on account of the criterion V in section 2, distinguish a new paragraph or sub-paragraph. This embedded paragraph with its own embedded paragraphs, e.g. 12b and 13a-17 runs from 3b to 17. In terms of the semantic structure, these clauses convey propositions that refer to accomplishments entailed by the event referred to in 3a. Clauses on the same level in an embedded paragraph is an appropriate representation in this regard. Though four clauses with *wayyiqtol*-forms are used in 3b, 4a, 6a and 8, each with the same established link-topic and each with predicate focus (they told what the link-topic ("we") did), all of them do not necessarily convey events that happened one after the other on the time-line. One may interpret the author's use of בָּעֵת הַהִוא in 4a and 8 as a means of indicating that he is aware that the narrative time (i.e. a sequence of events) suggested by the verbal forms in these two clauses, does not correlate with events on the time-line in the real world.

As far as the other clauses in the above-mentioned paragraph are concerned, the following are relevant to our purposes. 3c represents a finite clause at the formal level. It is, however, governed by the proposition in 3b. 3c serves as a temporal adjunct to 3b. Therefore, it cannot be regarded as a clause with a fronted temporal constituent. In 4b the possibility that there was one of the cities left that the Israelites did not capture (referred to in 4a), is denied by an overt focus inducing negative word. In 4b the entire clause implying such a notion is the domain of the negative word. This clause displays the (unmarked order) of a clause containing presupposed information as asserted in §1. 6bC is an adjunct of 6a and part of the predicate of the

---

92 For the distinction between an event and an activity, cf. Hatav (1997:43).

latter clause. 6bC contains a discourse active proposition and displays the unmarked word order. Cf. also 2dQC.

In vs.7 the object of the clause is fronted. Since the semantic information provided by the fronted item does not turn any (explicit or implicit) presupposed proposition into a piece of information, in terms of our definition, this fronting cannot be interpreted as argument focus.[93] Identifiable entities (or more specific, entities inferable from the world projected by the discourse), i.e. וְכָל־הַבְּהֵמָה וּשְׁלַל, are established as topics to be compared (§4). In this context the predicate of כָּל־עִיר מְתִם הַנָּשִׁים וְהַטָּף in 3:6c is contrasted ("destroyed" in constrast to "took as booty") with הַבְּהֵמָה וּשְׁלַל וְכָל in 7. In Lambrecht's terminology this is a case of "contrastive topics" that need to be distinguished from "contrastive focus" (1994:291). The former is merely a subset of §4 and need not be confused with argument focus, of which "contrastive focus" is a subset. Fronting in this context is used to mark a topic frame וּשְׁלַל וְכָל־הַבְּהֵמָה. This frame holds only for the clause in verse 7. This is confirmed by the status assigned to verse 7 by our formal text linguistic analysis, viz. #1.2.1.1 that is connected to 6c (#1.2.1) as an unequal clause connection.

The two clauses 9a and 9b are narrative comment. Both the subjects, which refer to identifiable entities, are fronted. Like in vs. 7, fronting establishes non-discourse active, but identifiable entities, as the topics of clauses in order to compare them (§4). In these clauses they are contrasted.[94]

Vs. 10 is an appositional specification of 8. By elaborating the extent of the land they conquered, the implied speaker (Moses) indicates the significance of the Israelite victory (and by implication God's assistance) in vss. 8 and 10. He further motivates its signifance by referring to some background information concerning Og, the King of Bashan, viz. he was the only of the giants (הָרְפָאִים) left.[95] In other words, the promised land was now clear of all those who could threaten the Israelites. The focus particle רַק in 11a is an overt focus inducer. It lexically signals that Og, the King of Bashan alone, he and nobody else remained of the Refaim. The question may arise: why is constituent lexically marked for focus also fronted? This is not as Disse (1998:285) suggests, to signal a stronger focus. In this context one may explain the fronting of the subject as follows: 11a presupposes "The other Refaim were not left over." In contrast, "(Only) Og, the king of Bashan was left over." The subject is according to §4 fronted to establish a discourse active entity as the topic of a clause in a context where different topics are compared (or more specifically, contrasted), hence marking a topic frame. In Lambrecht's terminology this is a case of "contrastive topics." The focus signalled by רַק is that what is described by Kuno (as

---

93 According to Gross (1996:188) it is a "focused constituent." He obviously did not make the distinction pointed out by Lambrecht (1994).

94 According to Gross (1996:177 and 193), in both 9a and 9b, "Der ganze Satz mit dem topikalisierten Syl ist hervorgehoben." It is not clear what Gross means with the notion "hervorgehoben." Furthermore, in terms of our theoretical frame of reference, mentioning the name of the city, Hermon, in this context invokes the notion that somebody gave it a name. Hence the reason for not regarding it as an instance of sentence focus. Moreover, Vs. 9b implies the notion that x called Hermon y. It, therefore cannot be regarded as having *sentence focus*.

95 For this interpretation of כִּי, cf. Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999).

cited by Lambrecht 1994:292) as "exhaustive listing." Others refer to this sub-set of focus as "contrastive focus."[96] In other words, when רַק preceeds a non-verbal constituent and that constituent is fronted, two pragmatic functions are involved and not an intensified (whatever it may imply) form of one.[97]

11b-11e are four nominal clauses that are governed by כִּי. They provide additional information about Og, the king of Bashan. The availability of this evidence is presented as a further proof that God indeed had assisted Israel to destroy all the fierce enemies in the promised land, before they took possession of it. 11b is introduced by הִנֵּה. The sequence of the nominal clause is unmarked, viz. subject-predicate. The "new" subject-topic עֶרֶשׂ is anchored in the communication situation by means of the enclitic personal pronoun that refers to Og. In terms of the information structure, 11b may be regarded as a proposition that contains no presupposed information, only a new, but anchored topic-subject. If one considers the fact that the semantic function of הִנֵּה is described as "focusing attention on events that are surprising or unexpected for the person addressed or the characters in a story" (Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze §44.3.4(i)), in terms of our definition of focus, the claim of Follingstad (1995:1-24) that הִנֵּה is a focus particle has merit. It turns an unmarked nominal clause into a piece of "newsworthy" information about a long-dead king's bed. 11c is also a nominal clause with an unmarked word order, subject-topic + predicate. It too is lexically marked as newsworthy. This time by means of הֲלֹה. The yes-no question particle marks the nominal clause as a question. It is, however, clearly an instance of a question that is used retorically and confirms a state of affairs, viz. the location of the iron bed is indeed in Rabbah of the Ammonites.[98] Both 11d and 11e are nominal clauses with the "marked" constituent pattern: predicate + subject. Each of these syndetically connected clauses has predicate focus since they convey information about an established topic – such as the iron bed, viz. its length and width. This accords with §11.

In 12a a discourse active entity is fronted in a clause which contains discourse active information, cf. the content of 4a-5a. In terms of our proposal this instance of fronting cannot be explained. Gross (1996:186) suggests that the object is fronted on account of the deictic demonstrative pronoun it contains. Semantically, however, it is not clear how this clause as it stands must be interpreted. Major English translations like the KJ, NIV and NRSV interpret יְרַשְׁנוּ בָּעֵת הַהוּא as a relative clause. This

---

96   Cf. Lambrecht (1994:286-295).

97   Cf. also Gen 19:8, 24:8, 41:4, 47:22, 47:26, 50:8, Exod 8:5, 8:7, 9:26, 10:24, 21:19, Deut 2:35, 2:37, 12:16, 12:26, 15:23, 20:14, 20:16 and 20:20. When no entity needs to be established as the topic to be contrasted, רַק is followed by the verbal construction. Its domain is then the entire clause or predicate (e.g. Deut 2:28, 4:9, 12:23, 15:5 and 17:16). These clauses all have predicate or verb focus. When the domain of רַק is neither an entity that needs to be established as a "contrasted topic" nor a predicate, it occurs "inside" a clause, e.g. Gen 26:29, Deut 28:13 and 28:33. On the basis of this observation it may be concluded that רַק does not influence the position of the constituent it preceeds. The position of that constituent is governed by the information structure of the communication situation. One may speculate that this applies also as far as the other focus particles are concerned. This view challenges the assumption of Gross (1996:106) that focus particles explain the fronting of a constituent.

98   Cf. Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (1999).

indeed seems the most probable solution. 12a then functions as a heading of 12b-15 ("As for the land that we took possession of at that time", NRSV). This construction has an analogy in the pendens constructions in Num 35:8 and 20:16. However, the pendensed item הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת is not pronominally repeated in 12c since this clause concerns only a part of הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת. In 12b and 13a two identifiable entities are established as topics of the respective clauses in a context where different topics are compared. The fronting of the complements in these two clauses can therefore be explained in terms of §4. The discourse active complement of 13b is fronted. The clause contains presupposed information, cf. 3:11a. Although the fronted complement in 13b is discourse active, an aspect of it is specified, viz. "this *entire* (כָּל) Bashan..." Hence the fronted constituent may be interpreted as an instance of argument focus (cf. §3). It is significant that according to our formal hierarchical structure, 12b and 13a-17 are two embedded paragraphs of 12a (# 1.2.1) at the same level (i.e. #1.2.1.1 and #1.2.1.2). In other words we have a connection of a clause and a cluster of clauses at an unevel level. Cf. 6c and 7.

Vs. 14a is an asyndetic sentence following another asyndetic sentence in 13b. It is followed by a *wayyiqtol*-clause in 14b. 13b-14b is presented as narrative comment, apparently explaining the name of a place in the author's days. The entire 13b-14b may also be interpreted as a specification of 13a. However, it is clear that this text had undergone various redactional processes. It is in particular difficult to determine the role of יָאִיר in this context. Does he represent a contemporary or later version of the halftribe of Menassah? Acknowledging these difficulties, it is possible to interpret 13a as a clause in which an identifiable entity is established to be discourse active in a context where different topics are compared (§4), in other words, topic frames.[99] In this way the information structure may explain the fronting of the subject in 14a. In 14b the established link-topic is then pronominalized in a *wayyiqtol*-clause with predicate focus. In 15 and 16-17, both clauses with fronted complements that refer to discourse active entities, the information provided in 3:12-13 is apparently repeated. Many scholars regard the "repetition" rather as correction by later redactors. Nevertheless, in 15 and 16-17 two identifiable entities are established as the topic frames of the respective clauses in a context where different entities are compared. The fronting of the complements in these two clauses can therefore also be explained in terms of §4. Furthermore, their syndetic connection with each other and 13a creates the impression that they form part of a list.[100] In this context it is not necessarily the case. Deut 3:12-17 is a good example of how the formal text linguistic structure, information structure and history of the text may be used towards interpreting a difficult text.

In 18a(+18b-20c) is conveyed what an established linked-topic (i.e. I, Moses) did *next*, i.e. after 12a-17, to the secondary-topic (you). The author employs a *wayyiqtol*-form to signal this progress. However, he also uses the temporal expression הַהוּא בָּעֵת to modify the notion "and then" associated with the *wayyiqtol*-form. The temporal frame referred to by בָּעֵת הַהוּא is broader than the "and then" signalled by the *wayyiqtol*-form. Furthermore, the embedded clauses in 18b-20c has a thematic con-

---

99 Also Gross (1996:177) regards this a problematic case.
100 Cf. Gross (1996:185) in this regard.

tent that differs from that in 12a-17. The use of בְּעֵת הַהוּא in collaboration with the thematic content represent a shift in the narration that warrants a paragraph break in 18a. Our formal analysis points to a paragraph on the same level as 2a (#1.1) and that must be connected to 1a-b (#1).

18bQ conveys a presupposed proposition, i.e. the Israelites knew that God is giving them the promised land. The already established role of a particular entity in a pre-supposed proposition is *confirmed,* viz. "*God himself* is giving you this land to occupy." So the fronting can be interpreted as signalling argument focus (§3). This confirmation, i.e. God's personal involvement in giving the land to the Israelites, in18bQ provides the ground for the directive in 18cQ. The notion that the Israelites were ready to advance into the promised land can also be inferred from the projected discourse world. The way in which they should go about is specified in 18cQ. The fronting of the adjunct may therefore be interpreted as an instance of argument focus (§3). The directive in 18c is qualified, i.e. restricted, in 19aQ by means of רַק. The entire clause is in the domain of רַק. The entities in 19aQ, נְשֵׁיכֶם וְטַפְּכֶם וּמִקְנֵכֶם, are identifiable. They are juxtaposed to entities in 18cQ, the soldiers. They must go. However, *the women,* etc. must stay. This fronting of the subjects may therefore be explained in terms of §4. 19bQ+19cQO conveys a state of affairs concerning the pronominalized discourse active linked-topic. The clause therefore has predicate focus. This information structure may be interpreted as an explanation of the "un-marked" form of the word order. The embedded object clause, 19cQO, predicates something about a discourse active entity. It therefore has predicate focus. This explains the predicate+subject pattern of the nominal clause. The relative clause 19aQR refers to a presupposed proposition, and displays accordingly the unmarked word order. 20aQ-20bQ are two temporal clauses that are the adjunct of 19aQ. It contains presupposed information (i.e. God is giving in due course to all the Israel-ites their portion of the promised land) that is used to specify the duration of the activity prescribed in 19a. Hence the unmarked word order. 20cQ is a clause that refers to an event that will be allowed for the discourse active linked-topics in a future world. The event in 20cQ will follow in time the one referred to in 19aQ(+20aQ-bQ). Hence the use of the *weqatal*-forms. 20cQ has predicative focus, since they tell what the topic-subject is allowed to do next. Both relative clauses in 20bQR and 20cQR convey presupposed propositions. The word order of each, is as expected, unmarked.

In 21a an identifiable entity is established as the topic of the clause in a context where different topics are compared in the sense that semantically non-equivalent but related predicates are ascribed to them. In 18a the *Israelites* were charged x, in 21a Joshua is charged y. The fronting may thus be interpreted as an instance of §4. In terms of our formal structure 21a must be connected to 18a. A clause connection between levels of unequal status is established (#1.1.1 connected to #1.1). Cf. also 6c and 7, 12a and 13a-17.

In 21bQ Moses conveys to Joshua, the discourse active topic, a discourse active proposition, viz. he what experiences. The fact that he experiences it with his own eyes is confirmed. A nominal clause is used and the word order is subject + predi-cate. Since the BH has no other means to express this confirmation in a nominal

clause, one has to assume that prosodic means were used in cases like 21bQ. The relative clause, 21bQR contains presupposed information and the word order is as expected unmarked. In 21cQ the notion that God will deal with Israel's enemies may be regarded as a discourse active proposition. The way in which he will deal with them is confirmed. The fronting of the adjunct may therefore be interpreted as argument focus (§3). The relative clause in 21cQR contains a discourse active proposition, hence the unmarked word order.

As far as 22aQ is concerned, cf. the discussion of 2b. In 22bQ the directive in 22aQ is motivated. The proposition "God will assist them in their wars with the nations in the promised land" is presupposed. What is asserted in the motivation is that God in person will be involved. In other words, his already established role in the presupposed proposition is *confirmed* (§9).

In 23a a clause with predicate focus conveys what "I" (Moses) did next. The expression בָּעֵת הַהוּא signals that the temporal frame of 23+24a-28e is not necessarily immediately posterior to the event 18a+18b-22b, but rather part of a broader temporal frame that includes the various eventualities of Israel's history retold in Deut 1-3. On the basis of the fact that 18a is the first aforegoing clause with the same verbal form (wayyiqtol, the same subj. "I") and the repetition of בָּעֵת הַהוּא, but contains different addressees (not the Israelites, but Yahweh), 23a is connected in the formal analysis with 18a. It is a new paragraph at the same level as 18a, viz. #1.2 following #1.1.

In 24aQ, the vocative is followed by a fronted subject. The addressee, Moses, and the addressed, God, shared the proposition in 24a, viz. God began revealing his might to Moses. Moses is confirming God's personal role in this regard. The fronting in this clause can therefore be explained by means of §3 as a case of argument focus. In 25a and 25b the content of Moses's request is the focus of the propositions involved. In both cases the verb form occupies the sentence initial position, hence predicate focus.

In 26a God's reaction, in other words, what "happened next," and not primarily "what did God do next" is reported. The wayyiqtol + lexicalized subject (the Lord), in a semantic role reversed to that in 23, has predicate focus in the sense of that identified in 3a. Since the same set of participants, only in reversed roles, and the same verbal form are involved, 26a is in our formal hierarchical structure connected with 23a. A different paragraph, but at the same level, viz. #1.3 following #1.4. The expectation created by the request in 26a is denied by an overt focus particle in 26b, the negator לֹא.

On account of our formal text linguistic criteria, 26c is a different paragraph at the same level as 26a, viz. #1.4 following #1.3. In terms of its information structure 26c conveyed "what God did next", and not "what happened next". The relexicalization of the subj. is at this stage difficult to explain from this point of view. This is therefore an instance that the new paragraph as suggested by the formal analysis cannot be confirmed in terms of the information structure of the clauses involved.

Deut 3:26d-28e contains a number of directives, one negative (26e), and the rest positive (26d, 27a, 27b, 27c, 28a, 28b, 28c). The directives in 26d-27c are motivated in 27d and those in 28a-c by 28d-e. In both 28d and 28e the subj is fronted. In each

case the propositions are discourse active, viz. somebody will lead the Israelites into the land and "will cause them to inherit the land." The identity of that person, viz. Josua, is confirmed. The fronting can therefore be explained as argument focus (§3). The clause starting with a wayyiqtol clause in 3:29 does not convey what the discourse active subj "we" (i.e. Moses and I) did after 26c+26d-28e but what they did after 1a-b+1c-17 and 18a-28e. In other words, 29 must be connected to 1a-b.

5 Conclusions

This investigation tries to make a contribution towards the application of reliable and useful instruments to analyse and describe BH texts. Two instruments were utilized in this experiment: *Firstly*, a cognitive-oriented weak functional model for explaining fronting in BH. It was hypothesized that this model holds the key towards more conclusive interpretations of BH word order, as well as attempts to develop more comprehensive models that can be used for the intersubjectively verifiable interpretations of the Hebrew Bible. *Secondly*, a computer-assisted hierarchically structured text linguistic analysis of a BH text. The basic tenets of each of the models have been explained.

As far as the "top-down" model is concerned, word order was treated as one of the major devices authors of BH texts could use to structure the information they are conveying in utterances. These utterances are, of course, used in particular contexts. Explicit "pragmatic" criteria were formulated in terms of the information structure of communication situations for the identification of three types of focus, viz. *predicate focus*, *argument focus* and *sentence focus*. Applying these criteria to Deut 3 it was found that predicate focus is indeed involved in all cases of so-called unmarked word order and either argument focus and sentence focus in cases where a constituent has been fronted. Using the "pragmatic" criteria made intersubjectively testable distinctions between instance of argument focus and sentence focus possible.

Up till now fronting in cases where identifiable or discourse active entities are compared, could not be accommodated well in terms of the above-mentioned notions of focus.[101] Two considerations helped us to solve this problem. Firstly, the notion "topic frame" as developed by Floor (forthcoming) drawing on Jacobs (2001). Secondly, the formal analysis of Deut 3 highlighted the fact that the "topic frame" marked by fronting is as a rule indeed restricted to a particular connection between clauses at unequal levels, e.g. Deut 3:6c and 3:7, 3:12a and 3:12b, 3:18a and 3:21a. A feature of a "topic frame" "seems to restrict the application of the proposition by the rest of the sentence to a certain domain" (Jacobs 2001:656). Left-dislocation (in BH it is right-dislocation, the traditionally called pendens construction) and fronting are used across languages for these purpose. Relevant for us is that the topic frame tends to have an addressation feature, which contributes towards clear separation in the information structure role of the addressed entity and the rest of a clause. This implies that the rest of the clause may have its own focus structure, viz. argument or predicate focus.

---

[101] Cf. Van der Merwe (1999) and Heimerdinger (1999).

It cannot be claimed that this investigation confirms the empirical validity of our formal text linguistic analysis. The fact of the matter, we identified in the light of the information structure an instance which calls into question a suggested paragraph division of our formal analysis, viz. Deut 3:26c. However, it provides a valueable point of departure and heuristic device. Most of the clause connections and relationships, and in particular the paragraph connection and relationships are borne out by our analysis of the information structure, e.g. the connection between Deut 3:1a and 2a and its relationship with 1c. See also the relationship between 13a and 13b-14b.

Although our theoretical model for explaining BH word order cannot give theoretical credibility to our computer-aided text linguistic analysis, the notion "information structure" certainly paves the way towards a well-justified analysis of BH texts in which focus markers other than word order, as well as other relevant considerations, could be included and integrated into a more comprehensive model for comprehension of literary texts like the Hebrew Bible. In this process our computer-aided formal analysis will without doubt have a pivotal role to play as heuristic device.

6 Bibliography

Abraham, W. and de Meij, S. (eds.) 1986. *Topic, focus, and configurationality.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Altmann, H. (ed.) 1988. *Intonationsforschungen.* (Linguistischen Arbeiten 200). Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Bandstra, B.R. 1982. *The syntax of the particle KY in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation: Yale University.

— 1992. *Word order and emphasis in Biblical Hebrew narrative: syntactic observations on Genesis 22 from a discourse perspective.* In Bodine (1992:109-123).

Bergen, B. (ed.) 1994. *Biblical Hebrew and discourse linguistics.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Bolkenstein, A.M. 1998. *What to do with topic and focus? Evaluating pragmatic information.* In: Hannay and Bolkenstein (1998:193-214).

Bodine, W.R. (ed.) 1992. *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

— 1995. *Discourse analysis of Biblical Literature. What it is and what it offers.* Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Brown, K. and Miller, J. (eds.) 1996. *Concise encyclopedia of syntactic theories.* Cambridge: Pergomon.

Buth, R. 1999. *Word order in the verbless clause: a generative-functional approach.* In: Miller (1999:79-108).

Cook, J.A. 2002. *The Biblical Hebrew verbal system: a grammaticalization approach.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Madison-Wisconsin.

DeCaen, V. 1995. *On the placement and interpretation of the verb in Standard Biblical Prose. Unpublished doctoral dissertation*: University of Toronto.

— 1999. *Verbal and verbless clauses within government-binding theory.* In: Miller 1999:109-131.

De Moor, J.C. (ed.) 1995. *Papers read at the ninth joint meeting of HET OUDTESTAMENTISCH WERKGEZELSCHAP IN NEDERLAND EN BELGIË and THE SOCIETY FOR OLD TESTAMENT STUDY, held at Kampen, 1994.* Leiden: Brill.

De Regt, L.J. 1999. *Participants in Old Testament texts and the translator. Reference devices and their rhetorical impact.* Assen: Van Gorcum.

Disse, A. 1998. *Informationsstruktur im Biblischen Hebräisch. Sprachwissenschaftliche Grundlagen und exegetische Konsequenzen einer Korpusuntersuchung zu den Büchern Deuteronomium, Richter und 2 Könige.* (ATSAT 56). St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag.

Floor, S. (forthcoming). *From topic, focus, and information structure to theme in Biblical Hebrew narrative and poetry.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation: University of Stellenbosch.

Follingstad, C.M. 1995. *Hinnēh and focus function with application to Tyap.* Journal of translation and textlinguistics 7/3:1-24

Goldfajn, T. 1998. *Word order and time in Biblical Hebrew narrative* (OTM) Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Gross, W. 1987. *Die Pendenskonstruktion im biblischen Hebräisch* (ATSAT 27) St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag.

— 1996. *Die Satzteilfolge im althebräischen Verbalsatz: Untersucht an den Bücher Dtn. Ri und 2Kön.* Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

— 1997. *Ein verdrängter Bibelhebräischer Satztyp: Sätze mit zwei oder mehr unterschiedlichen Konstituenten vor dem Verbum Finitum,* JNWSL 17:5-41.

— 1999. *Is there really a compound nominal clause in Biblical Hebrew?* In: Miller (1999:19-49).

Gross, W., Seidl, T. and Irsigler, H. (eds.) 1991. *Text, Methode und Grammatik. Wolfgang Richter zum 65.Geburtstag.* St. Ottilien. EOS Verlag.

Hannay, M. and Bolkenstein, A.M. 1998. *Functional grammar and verbal interaction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hardmeier, C. et al (ed.) 2000. *Ad fontes! Quellen erfassen – lesen – deuten. Was ist Computerphilologie.* Amsterdam: VU University Press.

Hatav, G. 1997. *The Semantics of aspect and modality: Evidence from English and Biblical Hebrew.* (Studies in Language Companion Series vol. 34). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Heimerdinger, J.-M. 1999. *Topic, focus and foreground in ancient Hebrew narrative.* (JSOTS 295). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Jacobs, J. 1984. *Funktionale Satzperspektive und Illukutionssemantik.* Linguistische Berichte 91:25-58.

— 1986. *The syntax of focus and adverbials in German.* In: Abraham and de Meij (1986:103-127).

— 1988. *Fokus-Hintergrund-Gliederung und Grammatik.* In: Altmann (1988:89-134).

— 2001. *The dimensions of topic-comment. Linguistics* 39/4:641-681.

Joüon, P. and Muraoka, T. 1991. *A grammar of Biblical Hebrew.* 2 vols. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

König, E. 1991. *The meaning of focus particles. A comparative perspective*. London: Routledge.

Kuhr, E. 1929 *Die Ausdruckmittel der konjunktionslosen Hypotaxe in der ältesten hebräischen Prosa. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Syntax des Hebräischen*. Leipzig.

Lambrecht, K. 1994. *Information structure and sentence form: topic, focus and the mental representations of discourse eferents* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 71) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

— 2001. *A framework for the analysis of cleft contructions*. Linguistics 39/2:463-516.

Martínez, F.G. and Noort, E. (eds.) 1998. *Perspectives in the study of the Old Testament and early Judaism. A symposium in honour of Adam. S van der Woude on the occasion of his 70th birthday*. Leiden: Brill.

Michel, A. 1997. *Theologie aus der Peripherie. Die gespaltene Koordination im Biblisch Hebräisch*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Miller, C.L. (ed.) 1999. *The verbless clause in Biblical Hebrew. Linguistic approaches* (Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 1) Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Molnár, V. 1997. *Zu Jabobs' Explication der I-Topikalisierung*. Linguistiche Berichte 169:211-247.

Muraoka, T. 1985. *Emphatic words and structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.

— 1999. *The tripartite nominal clause revisted*. In: Miller (1999:215-213).

Niccacci, A. 1999. *Types and functions of the nominal sentence*. In: Miller 1999:215-248.

Panitz, F. 1998. *Die temporale Elemente des Englischen und deren Zeitbezug in fiktionalen narrativen Texten*. (Linguistische Arbeiten 337) Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Revell, E.J. 1999. *Thematic continuity and the conditioning of word order in verbless clauses*. In Miller 1999:297-319.

Richter, W. 1980. *Grundlagen einer althebräischen Grammatik. B. III. Der Satz* (ATSAT 13) St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag).

— 1991. *Biblica Hebraica Transcripta*. (ATSAT 33). St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag.

Rosenbaum, M. 1997. *Word-order variation in Isaiah 40-55. A functional perspective* (Studia semitica neerlandica) Assen: Van Gorcum.

Talstra, E. 1995a. Clause types and textual structure. An experiment in narrative structure, in Talstra (1995:166-180).

— 1995b. Synchronic or diachronic? A debate on method in Old Testament Exegesis. In De Moor (1995:187-210).

— 1997a. A hierarchy of clauses in Biblical Hebrew narrative. In Van Wolde (1997:85-118).

— 1997b. Deuteronomy 31: Confusion or conclusion? The story of Moses' threefold succession. In Vervenne and Lust (1997:87-110).

— 1998. From the "eclipse" to the "art" of Biblical narrative: reflections on methods of Biblical exegesis. In Martinez and Noort (1998:1-41).

Talstra, E. (ed.) 1995. *Narrative and comment. Contribution presented to Wolfgang Schneider*. Amsterdam.

Van der Merwe, C.H.J. 1987. *A short survey of major contributions to the grammatical description of Old Hebrew since 1800 AD*, JNWSL 13: 161-90.

— 1990. *The Old Hebrew particle gam: A syntactic-semantic description of gam in Gn–2Kg* (ATSAT 34) St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag.

— 1993. *The function of word order in Old Hebrew—with special reference to cases where a syntagmeme precedes a verb in Joshua*. JNWSL 17:129-44.

— 1994. *Discourse linguistics and Biblical Hebrew linguistics*. In Berger (1994:3-49).

— 1997a. *Reconsidering Biblical Hebrew temporal expressions*. ZAH 10: 42-62.

— 1997b *An overview of Hebrew narrative syntax research*. In Van Wolde (1997:1-20).

— 1999a. *The Elusive Biblical Hebrew Term* וַיְהִי. *A perspective in terms of its syntax, semantics, and pragmatics in 1 Samuel*. HebStud 40:83-114.

— 1999b. *A major step towards a better understanding of Biblical Hebrew word order*. JNWSL 25:277-300.

— 2002. *An overview of recent developments in the description of Biblical Hebrew relevant for Bible translation*. Acta Theologica Supplements 2 (in the press).

Van der Merwe, C.H.J., Naudé, J.A. and Kroeze, J. 1999. *A Biblical Hebrew reference grammar*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Van Wolde, E. (ed.) 1997. *Narrative syntax and the Hebrew Bible. Papers from the Tilburg symposium, 18-19 October 1996*. Leiden: E J Brill.

Vervenne, M. and Lust, J. (ed.) 1997. *Deuteronomy and Deuteronomic literature. Festschrift C.H.W. Brekelmans*. (Bibliotheca Ephemeridium Theologicarum Lovaniensium 78) Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Zewi, T. and Van der Merwe, C H J 2001. Biblical Hebrew nominal clauses: definitions of subject and predicate. *JNWSL* 27:81-99.

Zevit, Z. 1998. *The anterior construction in Classical Hebrew*. (SBL.MS 50) Atlanta: Scholars Press.

7 Addendum Deut 3

Numbers	Paragraphs	*Clauses*
1AA	1	וַנֵּפֶן
1b	1	וַנַּעַל דֶּרֶךְ הַבָּשָׁן
1c	1.1.1	וַיֵּצֵא עוֹג מֶלֶךְ־הַבָּשָׁן
1cinf	1.1.1	לִקְרָאתֵנוּ הוּא וְכָל־עַמּוֹ
1c	1.1.1	לַמִּלְחָמָה אֶדְרֶעִי׃
2a	1.1	וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלַי
2bQ	1.10	אַל־תִּירָא אֹתוֹ
2cQ	1.10	כִּי בְיָדְךָ נָתַתִּי אֹתוֹ וְאֶת־כָּל־עַמּוֹ וְאֶת־אַרְצוֹ

2dQ	1.10	וְעָשִׂיתָ לּוֹ
2dQC	1.10	כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ לְסִיחֹן מֶלֶךְ הָאֱמֹרִי
2dQCR	1.10	אֲשֶׁר יוֹשֵׁב בְּחֶשְׁבּוֹן:
3a	1.2	וַיִּתֵּן יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ בְּיָדֵנוּ גַּם אֶת־עוֹג מֶלֶךְ־הַבָּשָׁן וְאֶת־כָּל־עַמּוֹ
3b	1.2.1	וַנַּכֵּהוּ
3c	1.2.1	עַד־בִּלְתִּי הִשְׁאִיר־לוֹ שָׂרִיד:
4a	1.2.1	וַנִּלְכֹּד אֶת־כָּל־עָרָיו בָּעֵת הַהִוא
4b	1.2.1	לֹא הָיְתָה קִרְיָה
4bR	1.2.1	אֲשֶׁר לֹא־לָקַחְנוּ מֵאִתָּם
4a	1.2.1	שִׁשִּׁים עִיר כָּל־חֶבֶל אַרְגֹּב מַמְלֶכֶת עוֹג בַּבָּשָׁן:
5a	1.2.1	כָּל־אֵלֶּה עָרִים בְּצֻרוֹת חוֹמָה גְבֹהָה דְּלָתַיִם וּבְרִיחַ לְבַד מֵעָרֵי הַפְּרָזִי הַרְבֵּה מְאֹד
6a	1.2.1	וַנַּחֲרֵם אוֹתָם
6bC	1.2.1	כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשִׂינוּ לְסִיחֹן מֶלֶךְ חֶשְׁבּוֹן
6c	1.2.1	הַחֲרֵם כָּל־עִיר מְתִם הַנָּשִׁים וְהַטָּף:
7	1.2.1.1	וְכָל־הַבְּהֵמָה וּשְׁלַל הֶעָרִים בַּזּוֹנוּ לָנוּ:
8	1.2.1	וַנִּקַּח בָּעֵת הַהִוא אֶת־הָאָרֶץ מִיַּד שְׁנֵי מַלְכֵי הָאֱמֹרִי
8R	1.2.1	אֲשֶׁר בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן מִנַּחַל אַרְנֹן עַד־הַר חֶרְמוֹן:
9aD	1.2.1	צִידֹנִים יִקְרְאוּ לְחֶרְמוֹן שִׂרְיֹן
9bD	1.2.1	וְהָאֱמֹרִי יִקְרְאוּ־לוֹ שְׂנִיר
10<8	1.2.1	כֹּל עָרֵי הַמִּישֹׁר וְכָל־הַגִּלְעָד וְכָל־הַבָּשָׁן עַד־סַלְכָה וְאֶדְרֶעִי עָרֵי מַמְלֶכֶת עוֹג בַּבָּשָׁן:
11a	1.2.1	כִּי רַק־עוֹג מֶלֶךְ הַבָּשָׁן נִשְׁאַר מִיֶּתֶר הָרְפָאִים
11b	1.2.1	הִנֵּה עַרְשׂוֹ עֶרֶשׂ בַּרְזֶל
11c	1.2.1	הֲלֹה הִוא בְּרַבַּת בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן
11d	1.2.1	תֵּשַׁע אַמּוֹת אָרְכָּהּ
11e	1.2.1	וְאַרְבַּע אַמּוֹת רָחְבָּהּ בְּאַמַּת־אִישׁ:
12a	1.2.1	וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת יָרַשְׁנוּ בָּעֵת הַהִוא
12b	1.2.1.1	מֵעֲרֹעֵר אֲשֶׁר־עַל־נַחַל אַרְנֹן וַחֲצִי הַר־הַגִּלְעָד וְעָרָיו נָתַתִּי לָרֻאוּבֵנִי וְלַגָּדִי:
13a	1.2.1.2	וְיֶתֶר הַגִּלְעָד וְכָל־הַבָּשָׁן מַמְלֶכֶת עוֹג נָתַתִּי לַחֲצִי שֵׁבֶט הַמְנַשֶּׁה כֹּל חֶבֶל הָאַרְגֹּב
13bD	1.2.1.2	לְכָל־הַבָּשָׁן הַהוּא יִקָּרֵא אֶרֶץ רְפָאִים:
14aD	1.2.1.2	יָאִיר בֶּן־מְנַשֶּׁה לָקַח אֶת־כָּל־חֶבֶל אַרְגֹּב עַד־גְּבוּל הַגְּשׁוּרִי וְהַמַּעֲכָתִי
14bD	1.2.1.2	וַיִּקְרָא אֹתָם עַל־שְׁמוֹ אֶת־הַבָּשָׁן חַוֹּת יָאִיר עַד הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה:
15	1.2.1.2	וּלְמָכִיר נָתַתִּי אֶת־הַגִּלְעָד:
16	1.2.1.2	וְלָרֻאוּבֵנִי וְלַגָּדִי נָתַתִּי מִן־הַגִּלְעָד וְעַד־נַחַל אַרְנֹן תּוֹךְ הַנַּחַל וּגְבֻל וְעַד יַבֹּק הַנַּחַל גְּבוּל בְּנֵי עַמּוֹן

17	1.2.1.2	וְהַיַּרְדֵּן וּגְבֻל מִכִּנֶּרֶת יָם הַמֶּלַח תַּחַת אַשְׁדֹּת הַפִּסְגָּה מִזְרָחָה: וְהָעֲרָבָה
18a	1.1	וָאֲצַו אֶתְכֶם בָּעֵת הַהִוא לֵאמֹר
18bQ	1.10	יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם נָתַן לָכֶם אֶת־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת לְרִשְׁתָּהּ
18cQ	1.10	חֲלוּצִים תַּעַבְרוּ לִפְנֵי אֲחֵיכֶם בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל כָּל־בְּנֵי־חָיִל:
19aQ	1.10	רַק נְשֵׁיכֶם וְטַפְּכֶם וּמִקְנֵכֶם
19bQ	1.10	יָדַעְתִּי
19cQO	1.10	כִּי־מִקְנֶה רַב לָכֶם
19aQ	1.10	יֵשְׁבוּ בְּעָרֵיכֶם
19aQR	1.10	אֲשֶׁר נָתַתִּי לָכֶם:
20aQ	1.10	עַד אֲשֶׁר־יָנִיחַ יְהוָה לַאֲחֵיכֶם כָּכֶם
20bQ	1.10	וְיָרְשׁוּ גַם־הֵם אֶת־הָאָרֶץ
20bQR	1.10	אֲשֶׁר יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם נֹתֵן לָהֶם בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן
20cQ	1.10	וְשַׁבְתֶּם אִישׁ לִירֻשָּׁתוֹ אֲשֶׁר נָתַתִּי לָכֶם:
21a	1.1.1	וְאֶת־יְהוֹשׁוּעַ צִוֵּיתִי בָּעֵת הַהִוא לֵאמֹר
21bQ	1.1.10	עֵינֶיךָ הָרֹאֹת אֵת כָּל־
21bQR	1.1.10	אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם לִשְׁנֵי הַמְּלָכִים הָאֵלֶּה
21cQ	1.1.10	כֵּן־יַעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה לְכָל־הַמַּמְלָכוֹת
21cQR	1.1.10	אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה עֹבֵר שָׁמָּה:
22aQ	1.1.10	לֹא תִּירָאוּם
22bPQ	1.1.10	כִּי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם הוּא הַנִּלְחָם לָכֶם: ס
23	1.2	וָאֶתְחַנַּן אֶל־יְהוָה בָּעֵת הַהִוא לֵאמֹר:
24aQ	1.20	אֲדֹנָי יְהוִה אַתָּה הַחִלּוֹתָ
24aQinf	1.20	לְהַרְאוֹת אֶת־עַבְדְּךָ אֶת־גָּדְלְךָ וְאֶת־יָדְךָ הַחֲזָקָה
24bQ	1.20	אֲשֶׁר מִי־אֵל בַּשָּׁמַיִם וּבָאָרֶץ
24bQR	1.20	אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲשֶׂה כְמַעֲשֶׂיךָ וְכִגְבוּרֹתֶךָ:
25aQ	1.20	אֶעְבְּרָה־נָּא
25bQ	1.20	וְאֶרְאֶה אֶת־הָאָרֶץ הַטּוֹבָה
25bQR	1.20	אֲשֶׁר בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן הָהָר הַטּוֹב הַזֶּה וְהַלְּבָנוֹן:
26a	1.3	וַיִּתְעַבֵּר יְהוָה בִּי לְמַעַנְכֶם
26b	1.3	וְלֹא שָׁמַע אֵלָי
26c	1.4	וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֵלַי
26dQ	1.40	רַב־לָךְ
26eQ	1.40	אַל־תּוֹסֶף דַּבֵּר אֵלַי עוֹד בַּדָּבָר הַזֶּה:
27aQ	1.40	עֲלֵה רֹאשׁ הַפִּסְגָּה
27bQ	1.40	וְשָׂא עֵינֶיךָ יָמָּה וְצָפֹנָה וְתֵימָנָה וּמִזְרָחָה
27cQ	1.40	וּרְאֵה בְעֵינֶיךָ

27dQ	1.40	כִּי־לֹא תַעֲבֹר אֶת־הַיַּרְדֵּן הַזֶּה:
28aQ	1.40	וְצַו אֶת־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ
28bQ	1.40	וְחַזְּקֵהוּ
28cQ	1.40	וְאַמְּצֵהוּ
28dQ	1.40	כִּי־הוּא יַעֲבֹר לִפְנֵי הָעָם הַזֶּה
28eQ	1.40	וְהוּא יַנְחִיל אוֹתָם אֶת־הָאָרֶץ
28eQR	1.40	אֲשֶׁר תִּרְאֶה
29	1	וַנֵּשֶׁב בַּגָּיְא מוּל בֵּית פְּעוֹר: פ

Abstract:

This investigation tries to make a contribution towards the identification of reliable and useful in-
struments to analyse and describe BH texts. Two instruments are utilized in this experiment: Firstly, a
cognitive-oriented weak functional model for explaining fronting in BH. Secondly, a computer-
assisted hierarchically structured text linguistic analysis of a BH text. As far as the "top-down" model
is concerned, word order is treated as one of the major devices authors of BH texts could use to
structure the information they are conveying in utterances. Explicit "pragmatic" criteria are formu-
lated in terms of the information structure of communication situations for the identification of three
types of focus, viz. predicate focus, argument focus and sentence focus. Applying these criteria to
Deut 3 it was found that predicate focus is indeed involved in all cases of so-called unmarked word
order and either argument focus and sentence focus in cases where a constituent has been fronted.
Although the theoretical model for explaining BH word order cannot give theoretical credibility to
our computer-aided text linguistic analysis, the notion "information structure" certainly paves the
way towards a more comprehensive model for comprehension of literary texts. In this process our
computer-aided formal analysis will without doubt have a pivotal role to play as heuristic device.

Address of the authors:

Prof. Christo H.J. van der Merwe, Department of Ancient Studies,
University of Stellenbosch, Private Bag X1, 7602 Matieland, South Africa
e-mail: cvdm@sun.ac.za

Prof. Eep Talsra, Faculty of Theology, Vrije Universiteit, De Boelelaannos 1105,
Amsterdam 1018 HV, The Netherlands, e-mail: eep@theol.vu.nl