THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

Constituent Postponement in Biblical Hebrew Verse

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of the

Department of Semitic and Egyptian Languages and Literatures

School of Arts and Sciences

Of The Catholic University of America

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

By

John Scott Redd, Jr.

Washington, D.C.

2012

Constituent Postponement in Biblical Hebrew Verse

John Scott Redd, Jr., Ph.D.

Director: Edward M. Cook, Ph.D.

The structure of Biblical Hebrew (BH) verse remains an open question today despite the extensive amount of investigation that the question has inspired.   Much headway has been made in terms of describing the features and devices that find expression in BH verse, but little has been done to make a compelling and consistent distinction between BH verse and BH prose. The question remains: what differentiates BH verse from prose? One distinguishing feature of BH verse can be found in its "relaxed" syntactic structure, wherein certain syntactic constructions that would be unviable in prose are acceptable in verse. One such construction is the occurrence of syntactic constituent postponements that are viable in the environment of verse but not in prose. In the verbal clause, such postponement would include (1) irregular subject- and (2) object-placement in a clause after constituents that they would normally precede in prose, and (3) placement of the verb in the third constituent position of a clause, a position that excludes the verb according to the syntactic rules of prose. A close analysis and evaluation of the constituent postponements found only in BH verse are required to develop a more precise description of that corpus. This study gathers all of the cases of verb-, subject- and object-postponement found in a broad sample of BH verse, categorizes the occurrences, and evaluates their relationship to poetic devices such as syntactic, semantic, and phonological parallelism and gapping, and syntactic dependency. This project begins with an assessment of constituent order rules for verbal clauses in BH prose, or more particularly Classical Biblical Hebrew (CBH) prose, which provides a "control" against which postponement in BH verse could be viewed in relief. The sample of BH verse included Genesis 49, Exodus 15, Numbers 23-24, Deuteronomy 32 and 33,

Judges 5, 2 Samuel 1, Psalms 1-25, 78, 106, and 107, Isaiah 40-48, Habakkuk 3, Zephaniah 1-3, Zechariah 9. This corpus is designed to reflect a variety of biblical texts which represent diverse periods, genres, and subjects. Occurrences of constituent postponement were culled from this sample corpus, analyzed, categorized, and evaluated.

This dissertation by John Scott Redd, Jr. fulfills the dissertation requirement for the doctoral degree in Semitic and Egyptian Languages and Literatures approved by Edward M. Cook, Ph.D., as Director, and by Andrew D. Gross, Ph.D., and by David A. Bosworth, Ph.D., as Readers.

_____
Edward M. Cook, Ph.D., Director

_____
Andrew D. Gross, Ph.D., Reader

_____
David A. Bosworth, Ph.D., Reader

For Jennifer Lee Redd

אֵשֶׁת־חַיִל מִי יִמְצָא
וְרָחֹק מִפְּנִינִים מִכְרָהּ

Proverbs 31:10

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AOAT	*Alter Orient und altes Testament*
BBR	*Bulletin for Biblical Research*
BHK	*Biblia Hebraica.* Edited by R. Kittel. Stuttgart, 1905-1906
BHRG	Christo H. J. van der Merwe*, A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*
BHS	*Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart, 1983
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CAD	*The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*
DNWSI	*Dictionary of North-West Semitic Inscriptions*
GKC	Gesenius, Wilhelm; E. Kautzch ed.; translated by A. E. Cowley. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*
HALOT	*The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*
HAR	*Hebrew Annual Review*
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*
JANES	*Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society*
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JBLMon	Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
JL	*Journal of Linguistics*
JNSL	*Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
Joüon	Joüon, Paul. *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique*

Joüon-Muraoka	Joüon, Paul and Takamitsu Muraoka. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*
JQR	*Jewish Quarterly Review*
JSOT	*Journal of the Study of the Old Testament*
JSOTSup	Journal of the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTT	*Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics*
RB	*Revue biblique*
SAJL	*South African Journal of Linguistics*
SemeiaSt	Semeia Studies
UG	Tropper, Josef. *Ugaritische Grammatik*
VT	*Vetus Testamentem*
VTSup	Vetus Testamentem Supplements
Waltke-O'Connor	Waltke, Bruce K. and Michael P. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*
ZA	*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*

Linguistic Abbreviations

ABH	Archaic Biblical Hebrew
XPa	adjunct phrase (e.g. PPa = prepositional phrase adjunct)
ADVP	adverbial phrase
BH	Biblical Hebrew
XPc	complement phrase (e.g. PPc = prepositional phrase complement)
CBH	Classical Biblical Hebrew
I	instrumental

L	locative
LBH	Late Biblical Hebrew
MT	Masoretic Text
MatchGap	syntactic matching with gapping
MatchNoGap	syntactic matching without gapping
NP	noun phrase
O	object
PP	prepositional phrase
pron.	pronoun/pronominalized constituent
REL	relativizer אֲשֶׁר
S	subject
SynDep	syntactic dependency
TBH	Transitional Biblical Hebrew
V	verb

PREFACE

During the summer of 1996 I devoted myself to the study of English poetry in the modern mode and became aware, perhaps for the first time, of the idea of poetic structure as a category of study. It was not until my seminary years, however, that I was able to apply that idea to the corpus of Biblical Hebrew (BH) verse attested in the Hebrew Bible. The interest that has resulted in this current study gestated and found expression in two seminar papers given during my coursework in Washington, D.C., both concerned with ancient Semitic verse, one dealing with Psalm 32 and another the Aramaic Apocalypse (4Q246) discovered outside the settlement at Qumran.

The question of what differentiates verse from prose continues to draw me as does the related question of whether verse is, on the one hand, a discrete literary form or, on the other, a point on a spectrum that includes prose in its numerous expressions. I am not persuaded that a description of BH verse that generates only and all lines of BH verse has been offered, but I am confident that such a description is a legitimate and worthwhile pursuit. I hope that this present study advances the discussion toward that goal.

I am grateful to all of those who have contributed directly and indirectly to the work found in these pages. I would like to thank first the Department of English at The College of William and Mary, particularly Dr. Christopher MacGowan, Dr. Henry Hart, Nancy Schoenberger, and Dr. James Savage, whose love of the workings of verse provoked that summer of reading in 1996; and second, the Old Testament faculty of Reformed Theological Seminary in Orlando, including Dr. Mark D. Futato, Dr. Richard L. Pratt, and Dr. Bruce K. Waltke whose exuberance over the aesthetic properties of the Scriptures and their importance to the worshiping community showed me how scholarship could affect and even enrich spiritual experience.

Lastly, I am grateful for my family and their caring support, especially my parents for their help along the way. I owe my sincere thanks to my wife Jennifer and our four daughters Naomi, Mary, Charlotte, and Catherine for their patience and love during this long road. Jennifer has been my loving companion, a generous voice of encouragement and support, as well as my primary copy editor. I am grateful that the Lord was pleased to place us on this journey together. This work is dedicated to her.

Maundy Thursday, 2012

Orlando, Florida

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The Present Interest

The interest of this study is to investigate the peculiar varieties of word order

commonly exhibited in the verbal clauses[1] of Biblical Hebrew (BH) verse. Verse is that

manifestation of human speech which is both artfully composed and numerically

measured, usually by phonological or syntactical elements. As such, verse is a

subcategory of literature which is the broader category of artful language. Michael

O'Connor, citing Roman Jakobson of the Prague School, writes, "Literature and a fortiori

verse are central manifestations of both language and culture, but in properly Jakobsonian

perspective verse is the central manifestation of language alone."[2] While the numerical

measurement of verse has been described in terms of increased constriction whether

phonological (meter,[3] rhythm, rhyme, etc.) or syntactical (predication, constituent, word,

---

1. The assumption of this study is that a verbal clause is any sequence of words with a conjugated or finite verbal form such as imperfect, perfect, narrative, converted perfect, jussive, or imperative.

2. Michael T. O'Connor, "'Unanswerable Knack of Tongues': The Linguistic Study of Verse," in *Exceptional Language and Linguistics*, eds. L. K. Obler and L. Menn (New York: Academic Press, 1982), 144.

3. The term "meter" can be applied to a variety of prosodic features including syntactic ones, though here it will be used to refer solely to measurement of phonological features. Alter writes, "The term 'meter,' because of its associations with a Greco-Roman system of carefully regulated sequences of vowel quantities, may not be the best one to apply to our text, but the continuously present frame of formal structure . . . is quite conspicuous here." For the same reason I will not speak of "syntactical meter" to avoid confusion. Robert Alter, *The Art Of Biblical Poetry* (New York: Basic Books, 1987), 6.

etc.), this numerical constriction is offset and complemented by a syntactical relaxation of constraints imposed on prose compositions in BH. Constructions affected by the relaxation of the syntactic constraints include coordination, asyndesis or other unmarked dependencies, ellipsis (gapping), determination (or lack thereof), agreement (or lack thereof), and the order of constituents in the clause. In each of these areas, the syntactical constraints present in BH prose are noticeably diminished or absent altogether in BH verse, a situation which indicates syntactic relaxation.[4] For instance, coordination does not occur where it would be expected in prose (asyndesis).[5] Elsewhere, syntactic dependency is not marked in verse where in prose a conjunction or relativizer (אֲשֶׁר) would be overt. Similarly, structurally necessary constituents are gapped in certain poetic contexts where in prose such gapping would be fairly rare.[6] It should be clarified that the notion of "relaxation" does not presuppose that the language of BH verse is historically derived from the language of BH prose. While it is not central to this paper to define the relationship between prose and poetry both to each other and to what we call "standard" spoken varieties of ancient Hebrew, it can be argued that BH prose is probably closer to a particular dialect of ancient Hebrew that was enshrined as a literary prose language. On

---

4. Sappan overstates this point in his description of poetic syntax as a distinct dialect of BH labelled "Dialectus Poetica" (Raphael. Sappan, הייחוד התחבירי של לשון השירה המקראית [Eng. *The Typical Features of the Syntax of Biblical Poetry in Its Classical Period*] [Jerusalem: Kiryat-Sefer [Heb.], 1981], iv).

5. Sappan, *Typical Features*, xxxi-xxxv.

6. For more on recent work with gapping in BH verse, see Cynthia Miller, "A Linguistic Approach to Ellipsis in Biblical Poetry (Or, What to Do When Exegesis of What Is There Depends on What Isn't)," *BBR* 13, no. 2 (2003): 251–70; Cynthia Miller, "The Relation of Coordination to Verb Gapping in Biblical Poetry," *JSOT* 32 (2007): 41–60; Cynthia L. Miller, "Constraints on Ellipsis in Biblical Hebrew," in *Studies in Semitic and Afroasiatic Linguistics Presented to Gene. B. Gragg*, vol. 60, ed. Cynthia L Miller, Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization (Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago, 2007), 165–77.

the other hand, BH verse seems to draw lexical and syntactical elements from a variety of dialects (Transjordanian dialects, Northern Israelite) and languages (Aramaic, Phoenician).[7]

The difference between the word order of BH prose and verse has been recognized in scholarly analyses of BH verse, but word order in verse has not been studied with any sort of rigor until past 15 years. As will be discussed below, there have been multiple attempts to explain peculiar word order in BH verse,[8] attempts which employ the tools made available through structural poetic approaches as well as advances in the field of pragmatic analysis. Our investigation will be largely limited to patterns of word order, presupposing the sort of relaxed syntactic constraints in BH verse described above, while at the same time it will maintain an interest in the extent to which such constraints are actually relaxed. It seems apparent that BH verse can do some things that prose narrative cannot do. The question to be explored here has to do with what patterns of word order are considered grammatical in BH verse, and what configurations are not. In her study of ellipses in BH, Miller argues that while syntactic constraints are relaxed in BH verse, "the otherness of biblical poetry is often incorrectly understood to imply that

---

7. Von Soden has analyzed the archaizing tendency of the hymnic-epic register in Akkadian literature including Enuma Elish, Gilgamesh Epic, and the prologue and epilogue of the Code of Ḥammurapi. Wolfram von Soden, "Der hymnisch-epische Dialekt des Akkadischen," *ZA* 40 (1931): 163–65; Wolfram von Soden, "Der hymnisch-epische Dialekt des Akkadischen," *ZA* 41 (1933): 160–81.

8. Wilfred G.E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*, JSOTSup (Sheffield, England: T. & T. Clark, 1984), 49, 51–52; Wilfred G. E. Watson, *Traditional Techniques in Classical Hebrew Verse*, JSOTSup (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 248–49; Luis Alonso Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*, Subsidia Biblica (Roma: Editrice pontificio Istituto biblico, 1988), 53–55; Nicholas P. Lunn, *Word-Order Variation in Biblical Hebrew Poetry: Differentiating Pragmatics and Poetics* (Bletchley, U.K.: Paternoster, 2006); Sappan, *Typical Features*, xxiv-xxv.

no syntactic constraints operate in biblical poetry at all."[9] If this is an incorrect

understanding, then to what extent are syntactic constraints relaxed? To put it positively,

what syntactic constraints still apply?

While pragmatics are not the main focus of this investigation, one cannot say that

the pragmatic approach to BH word order, particularly the recent field of information

structure, has not returned significant dividends. Quite the opposite, the pragmatic

approach has opened up new avenues for understanding and interpreting BH word order

in both prose and verse texts. Our concern, rather, is the investigation of particular

constructions of word order which are peculiar or unique to BH verse, and more

precisely unique to the syntax of BH verse. There is no longer a question of whether

peculiar word order patterns occur in BH verse, and there is little doubt that, assuming

BH verse is well-crafted, these configurations do perform pragmatic functions, e.g.

topicalization, contrast, and so on, as has been urged in recent applications of the field of

pragmatics to BH. Pragmatic functions themselves, however, must operate within certain

syntactic constraints, as is evident in English by the fact that not just any constituent may

be fronted for pragmatic effect. The following sentence is ungrammatical:

(1) *Off the call, Naomi put.

The prepositional phrase (PP) "off the call" cannot be fronted, and doing so results in an

ungrammatical sounding sentence, even though it is not easy for an English speaker to

explain why. Logically the sentence answers a question, something like, "What did

Naomi put off?" An answer like (1) that involves fronting the whole PP is not an

acceptable due to the fact that the verb (V) "put off" is a phrasal verb, and therefore

fronting the PP "off the call" mis-analyzes the constituent structure of the clause. The

---

9. Cynthia L. Miller, "Constraints on Ellipsis in Biblical Hebrew," 165.

structure of the question, however, does give us a hint. Perhaps the NP "the call" embedded in what on the surface structure appears to be a PP might be fronted, just as the *wh*-word of the sentence is fronted alone leaving the "off" in place. This results in the following sentence:

(2) The call, Naomi put off.

Though awkward sounding in abstraction, this sentence seems grammatical, and the fronted NP would likely be marked with the prosodic feature of accent. The explanation of this distinction between (1) and (2) has to do with how fronting is constrained within the syntactical system of the English language.

The interest of this paper is the way in which word order variations, particularly constituent postponement, are constrained by syntactic parameters in the environment of BH verse. Pragmatic consideration of features which might (or might not) trigger peculiar word order configurations will be of secondary importance to this investigation.

Poetry and Prose

That there is a difference between literary speech and other types of speech has long been recognized, though this difference has been described both in ways that maximize as well as minimize the actual linguistic distinction between the two types of speech. Paul Kiparsky contends,

> There is an enormous body of work in several traditions (philology, Russian formalism, the Prague school, recent stylistics) devoted to exploring the linguistic characteristics of literary language. Certain facts are well established. We know that the relationship between standard language and literary language varies from one literary tradition to another, and from one style to another within each tradition. We know also that literary language may (though it perhaps need not) differ from ordinary language both by extending the system of standard language, and by imposing special restrictions over and above those that hold in standard language. This means that the thesis of the identity of literary and standard

language, on at least one literal construal, is false.[10]

This idea of standard speech perhaps makes more sense in an English speaking context where standard spoken speech is favored for its relative clarity and literal quality. However, those knowledgeable of non-English languages will note that many such languages involve a higher frequency of figurative speech in their standard forms than are commonly used in English.   Furthermore, it should also be acknowledged that some types of language such as technical jargons (e.g. philosophical language) can be derived from standard languages, but put a premium on precision instead of figurative features. So standard language may be thought of as a base from which a variety of other forms of language derive with varying qualities (artful language increases figurative nature while philosophical language increases clarity).

So it can be said that the distinction between literary speech and standard speech can be extended to the distinction between verse and prose. Both verse and prose exhibit features of poetic, or artful, language. It follows that interpreters can talk about the use of structural devices (*chiasmus, inclusio*, tail linkage, etc.), phonological patterning (including alliteration, assonance, etc.), and prosodic features (such as meter, stress), and other poetic devices that contribute to the communicative strategies of both verse and prose.

Likewise the relationship between verse and prose varies from one tradition to another. This is evident in the traditions of the Hebrew Bible, so that the style, syntax, and vocabulary of the BH verse in Job is demonstrably different from that of Lamentations or Isaiah 40–48, and the prose of Deuteronomy is demonstrably different

---

10. Paul Kiparsky, "Commentary," *New Literary History* 5 (1973): 180.

from that of Daniel.[11] The same false thesis (the identity of natural and literary language) to which Kiparsky refers is similarly false in the matter of BH verse and prose. Niccacci puts it succinctly saying, "Poetry has its own rules . . . and, unfortunately, they are still mysterious; they can not be derived from prose and vice versa."[12] Following Kiparsky, we can see how BH verse does differ from BH prose in the sense that it is both extends the system of prose language (e.g. word order, asyndesis) and imposes restrictions on it (clause length).[13]

Perhaps, we should not be surprised that a linguist of the generative school like Kiparsky would not be satisfied with the kind of loose descriptions of literary and standard language that would be necessary in defining an identity between verse and prose. In terms of verse and prose, James Kugel has argued that BH texts can be plotted on a spectrum depending on whether they are more or less involved with "heightening effects."[14] While Kugel is hopeful that his depiction of prose and poetry as two poles connected across a spectrum of literary stylization will aid study of both genres, Adele Berlin is probably correct that such an analysis is "nihilistic" and destructive to Kugel's own project, which sets out to define and distinguish generic features.[15]

---

11. For a recent challenge to the demonstrability of the historic phases of BH, see Ian Young, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensvärd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, BibleWorld (Oakville, Conn.: Equinox, 2008).

12. Alviero Niccacci, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, trans. Wilfred W. G. Watson (JSOTSup; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990), 10.

13. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure,* 67–78.

14. James L. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins Press, 1981), 59–95, particularly 94-95.

15. Adele Berlin, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University, 1985; repr., 1992), 5.

The apparent distinction between verse and prose has emerged from literary studies from other corpora. For instance, in her treatment of syntactic and morphological case in Old English, Ans van Kemenade has argued that the syntax of Old English poetry can be clearly contrasted with the syntax of Old English prose[16] (though this claim is not without critics[17]). Pintzuk, for one, qualifies van Kemenade's claim, arguing that *Beowulf* in particular exhibits a narrative poetry that "was intended for oral recitation, and it seems reasonable to assume that the language of the poem was easily understood by its audience." This qualification misses the point, however, since an Old English audience, just like a Modern English audience, could understand poetic syntax as just that, a syntax of a different register (we are careful to avoid the term "dialect") than the register used in narrative. Furthermore, Pintzuk's assumption that narrative syntax was the same register as conversational syntax is a flawed assumption. Foster and van der Wurff[18] have shown that syntax of Middle English poetry differs from that of prose, favoring O-V word order more than prose does. Citing the fact that surface O-V word order is more common in Old English but attested at a "reasonable frequency" in late Middle English,[19] they suggest that Middle English poetry was more likely to preserve older syntactic structure than prose.

_____

16. Ans van Kemenade, *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English* (Dordrecht, Holland ; Providence, RI, USA: Foris, 1987; repr. 2002).

17. Susan Pintzuk, *Phrase Structures in Competition: Variation and Change in Old English Word Order*, Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics (New York: Garland Pub., 1999), 129.

18. T. Foster and W. van der Wurff, "The Survival of Object-Verb Word Order in Middle English: Some Data," *Neophilologus* 79 (1995): 309–27.

19. Wim van der Wurff, "Object-Verb Order in Late Middle English," *JL* 33 (1997): 487.

These few illustrations support what O'Connor calls his "linguistic axiom" which calls for the study of verse as a "subsystem of language."[20] O'Connor is committed to the notion that verse is unique and susceptible to manipulation, a notion he develops from Lotz.[21] It is germane to our study that he uses the issue of word order in verse to illustrate his point:

> A tension between grammatical studies and treatments of verse often arises because it is claimed that grammar cannot deal with the ungrammaticality of poets. In fact, the argument is reversible: only if, for example, the grammar of English sentence structures is described, can the word order deviation called poetic inversions be treated. No one would hesitate to agree that not all possible types of inversion occur in Miltonic blank verse. This use of grammaticality is even more important in "ungrammatical" phenomena like metaphor, and here, too, the continuity with ordinary language grammar is strong because metaphors are deeply involved in everyday speech.[22]

In this view, verse is a legitimate linguistic form unto itself, one that incorporates features which are both optional (ornamental) and structural (constitutive) to what O'Connor calls fine structure (pertaining to individual lines of poetry) and gross structure (pertaining to stanza and overall poem structure). Following Jakobson's influential description of poetic function as that which "projects the principle of equivalence from the axis of

---

20. O'Connor is quick to point out that the reader may enjoy artful language without being aware of the linguistic axiom when dealing with a poetry in his native language or in a language system familiar to him. In fact, the innate ability of most language users to traffic in native forms of verse corroborates O'Connor's thesis that verse is a subsystem of language. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 13–14.

21. Lotz writes, "verse is the most idiosyncratic use of language and is subject to extreme individual manipulation." John Lotz, "Uralic," in *Versification: Major Language Types; Sixteen Essays*, ed. William K. Wimsatt (New York: Modern Language Association, 1972), 100–21.

22. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 16. It is interesting that the distinction between prose and verse that O'Connor seems to affirm here is absent in his analysis of BH syntax (Waltke-O'Connor).

selection into the axis of combination,"[23] O'Connor notes that it is repeated phenomena that must occur in order for poetic function to occur.[24] On the one hand, some instantiations of such phenomena may occur relatively infrequently, and these phenomena are the ornaments of poetic language, what Kiparsky calls "free" elements. On the other hand, some phenomena reoccur so frequently that they are recognized as structural to the verse system, or what Kiparsky calls "fixed" elements.[25]

In the case of BH verse, it has generally been recognized that BH verse exhibits an observable structure. Though that structure has been the subject of much debate, several theories have moved into prominence, the most popular of which (in English-language scholarship) centers on the notion of two contiguous terse lines of verse which exhibit parallelism in either meaning or in form.[26] While O'Connor is correct to say that parallelism as such is so vaguely described that it has become all but bleached of interpretive meaning and significance (reduced down to the notion of "seconding" that

---

23. Roman Jakobson, "Linguistics and Poetics," in *Style in Language*, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1960), 358.

24. For Jakobson, it is poetic function is to "focus on the message for its own sake" (Jakobson, "Linguistics and Poetics," 356), though Jakobson uses the phrase "poetic function" in a very particular way as it relates to his categories of code and message, and these categories come to bear on "defamiliarization" as it is presented by Shklovsky. For Jakobson, poetic function is necessary to poetry but not solely present in poetry. Poetic function operates in poetry by bringing attention to the message (i.e. language), and not the reference. Of course, as we move into the area of our current endeavor of poetic criticism, we likewise finds ourselves in the metalingual function, focusing on the code involved in drawing attention to the message. See the helpful discussion in Paul Werth, "Roman Jakobson's Verbal Analysis of Poetry," *JL* 12 (March 1976): 21–73.

25. Paul Kiparsky, "The Role of Linguistics in a Theory of Poetry," *Daedalus* 102 (1973): 231–44.

26. Kugel, *The Idea of Biblical Poetry*; Wilfred G.E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*; Berlin, *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*; Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*.

supports Kugel's argument against generic distinction),[27] it is still important to note that this description of BH verse structure in its current form is based on linguistic patterning described by Jakobson. Likewise, theories of phonological meter (based on morae, syllable, or stress accent) seek to map out patterns of prosodic features which are understood to be constitutive of BH verse structure. All verse works within the confines of the language in which it is communicated, with all of the features of that language at its disposal. These features, however, are instantiated through the matrix of relaxation and constraint that is present in all verse. O'Connor has shown that, in relation to BH prose, BH verse is structured around a frame of constraints that limit the *number* of syntactic elements in a line (clause predicator, constituent, and unit). Such constraint is balanced, however, by a syntactical relaxation of, among other things, word order patterning.

Formal Defamiliarization

So how do we account for this demonstrable linguistic distinction between verse and prose? The question presupposes a categorical distinction, or group of distinctions, that is all encompassing and appropriate to the variety of differences between verse and prose. In his seminal 1917 article "Art as Technique"[28] Victor Shklovsky articulated a partial answer to this question, a theory that would become the basis for the Russian

---

27. O'Connor prefers the term "matching" (and dyading for the matter) which refers to repetition of syntactic constituents, what might be called syntactic parallelism. He eschews the term "parallelism" in an attempt to avoid confusion. Geller makes this point in his review of O'Connor (Stephen A. Geller, "Theory and Method in the Study of Biblical Poetry," *JQR* 73 [1982]: 70–73).

28. Victor Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," in *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*, trans. Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Ries (Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska, 1965), 3–24.

Formalist school of literary criticism. In answer to the symbolist movement in general[29] Shklovsky set forth a new dictum for the production and appreciation of literature. This new dictum drew attention away from the object, event, emotion, etc. to which literary art referred (Jakobson's referential function[30]), and instead pointed critical attention to the artfulness of literature itself, to the act and technique of artistic expression and the interaction between the reader and the devices of a particular literary expression.[31]

For Shklovsky, this is what distinguishes literature from other writing. Non-literary writing seeks to remove any obstacles between the reader and the referent, the object which the writing is about, so that the referent can be observed, experienced as immediately as possible. In other words, one might say that in the non-literary project, the goal is to produce an expression which is transparent and unobstructed so that the writing finally recedes from consciousness, merely an economic means to an end. The unintended and perhaps counterintuitive end result is a lack of true experience of the particular object that is being described. Shklovsky argues,

> We see the object as though it were enveloped in a sack. We know what it is by its configuration, but we see only its silhouette. The object, perceived thus in the manner of prose perception, fades and does not leave even a first impression;

---

29. Shklovsky's response particularly targeted symbolist critic Alexander Potebnya who had popularized such anthems as "art is thinking in images," "without imagery there is no art, and in particular not poetry," and "poetry, as well as prose, is first and foremost a special way of thinking and knowing." These translations of Potebnya are based on the translations of the quotations in Shklovsky (Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," 5) citing Potebnya's work (Alexander Potebnya, *Iz Zapisok Po Teorii Slovesnosti [Notes on the Theory of Language]* [Kharkov, 1905], 83.)

30. Jakobson, "Linguistics and Poetics," 353.

31. Such a shift in perspective became commonplace in the 20th century, see for instance, the American movement of New Criticism (e.g. Cleanth Brooks and Robert Penn Warren, *Understanding Poetry*, 3 [New York: Holt, 1960]), Roman Jakobson's emphasis on message (Jakobson, "Linguistics and Poetics"), as well as German analytical philosopher Gotlobb Frege. Andrew Bowie, *From Romanticism to Critical Theory: The Philosophy of German Literary Theory* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 5.

ultimately even the essence of what it was is forgotten.[32]

Therefore, non-literary writing (called "prose" in the above quotation), though it attempts to remove all obstacles to perception, in truth slows down the perceptive process. The particular details of the object are lost in what Shklovsky calls the process of "algebrization" wherein variables, generalities, and clichés replace a meaningful experience of situations in life. The sense of preconceived familiarity with the object renders the object meaningless. This familiarity makes it possible to select and manage the vast range of perceptions which a person encounters in daily life, though it also hinders true experience since, once "we see an object several times, we begin to recognize it. The object is in front of us and we know nothing about it."[33] For Shklovsky, familiarity breeds ignorance.

Literature, on the other hand, takes the opposite tack. Artistic expression gives rise to an opacity in writing, an interest in form, manner, and technique that focuses on the literature itself in lieu of the external referent. The opacity forces the reader to reject the unconscious "habituation"[34] that has trained him to be concerned only with the external referent of the work (for to apply such a habit to literature is to do violence to the text), and to embrace the experience of something new. The vast majority of human experience is spent seeking efficiency, but literature is distinctly inefficient. It is impractical and contemplative. It forces its reader to slow down, to become aware of the process of perception, and to participate in the creative act.

Shklovsky describes the response of the reader upon an encounter with well-

––––––––––––––––––––––

32. Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," 11.

33. Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," 13.

34. Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," 11.

wrought artistic technique:

> And art exists that one may recover the sensation of life; it exists to make one feel things, to make the stone stony. The purpose of art is to impart the sensation of things as they are perceived and not as they are known. The technique of art is to make objects "unfamiliar," to make forms difficult, to increase the difficulty and length of the perception because the process of perception is an aesthetic end in itself and must be prolonged. *Art is a way of experiencing the artfulness of an object; the object is not important.*[35]

This is the function of artful writing: to create a sense of defamiliarization that forces the reader to experience life anew. The sense of "defamiliarization,"[36] however, is not a particular device of literature, but rather the end to which a variety of diverse devices provide the means. The author might employ both formal and semantic techniques in order to dislodge the object, manipulate it, and present it again as a new thing, a thing in its own right.[37] Shklovsky cites the way Tolstoy defamiliarizes an object by refusing to name it.[38] Elsewhere, Tolstoy employs a horse to narrate a story from the equine perspective. Shklovsky argues that defamiliarization is particularly evident in the genre of

---

35. Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," 12.

36. The term translates the Russian word *ostraneniye* which literally means "making strange" or, as it appears in some writing "estrangement." There is an interesting continuity between Shklovsky's use of this term and BH words derived from the root נכר, both of which have to do with processes of strange-making as well as recognition.

37. Indeed, Alter rightly uses the notion of defamiliarization to justify the category of semantic parallelism in BH verse: "What I should like to suggest in the case of semantic parallelism on which so many lines of biblical verse are constructed is that, with all the evident and at times almost extravagant repetition of elements of meaning from one verset to the next, 'semantic modifications' of the sort Shklovsky has in mind are continually occurring." Alter, *The Art Of Biblical Poetry*, 10.

38. Shklovsky's first example is a description of corporal punishment, which Tolstoy describes in terms of the individual steps of the process, an atomization which evokes a sense of arbitrary activity. He then asks, "why precisely this stupid, savage means of causing pain and not any other—why not prick the shoulders or any part of the body with needles, squeeze the hands or the feet in a vise, or anything like that?" Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," 13–17.

the erotic riddle in which sexual organs and activities are described and discussed by using ciphers usually drawn from commonplace objects and mundane situations.[39]

In literature objects and situations which are otherwise commonplace are dislodged from their expected settings and re-presented in fresh perspective. The reader is not allowed to rely on preconceived notions or a false sense of familiarity which might serve to disrupt the artistic process, but rather she is subjected to a process of disorientation and therefore must come to the issue anew. The automatic response is no longer reliable as a key to the meaning, but rather "[t]he object is in front of us and we know about it, but we do not see it–we cannot say anything significant about it." Therefore the sense of defamiliarization is attained as "[a]rt removes objects from the automatism of perception."[40] Defamiliarization is not simply a result of defamiliarized imagery as seen in the examples above, but rather it is the result of the entire artistic enterprise right down to the use of "poetic language," which includes poetic lexicon, syntax, and phonology. Each of these areas of language provides opportunity for the author to affect the process of perception. Shklovsky describes this process as a means by which artistic satisfaction is secured:

> A work is created "artistically" so that its perception is impeded and the greatest possible effect is produced through this slowness of the perception. As a result of this lingering, the object is perceived not in its extension in space, but, so to speak, in its continuity. Thus "poetic language" gives satisfaction.[41]

---

39. The defamiliarization is not simply the result of such creative euphemism, "it is also the basis and point of all riddles." Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," 19.

40. Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," 13.

41. Shklovsky goes on to hypothesize that the use of loanwords in literature serves the same end. "According to Aristotle, poetic language must appear strange and wonderful; and, in fact, it is often actually foreign: the Sumerian used by the Assyrians, the Latin of Europe during the Middle Ages, the Arabisms of the Persians, the Old Bulgarian of Russian literature, or elevated, almost literary language of folk songs." Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," 22. See n. 7 regarding the hymnic register of Akkadian.

In order to achieve such satisfaction, poetic language is modified to the point that the act

of reading or hearing itself is obstructed by a strangeness that is not encountered in non-

literary composition.   It is made "difficult, roughened, impeded language"[42] or as

Shklovsky later clarifies,

> In the light of these developments we can define poetry as *attenuated, tortuous*
> speech. Poetic speech is *formed speech*. Prose is ordinary speech --- economical,
> easy, proper, the goddess of prose [*dea prosae*] is a goddess of the accurate, facile
> type, of the "direct' expression of the child.[43]

Such a "formed" quality is universally attested in phonological features like rhyme,

alliteration, consonance, assonance, and of course metrical configuration. While these

features are more easily managed in literate cultures, in which the poet composes the

poem on a written page for a reader who consumes the poem through the act of reading,

in oral cultures, similar features were developed by singers whose task it was to rapidly

compose a song before an audience. Albert Lord's classic work on the oral tradition and

the Homeric epic builds on the study of formula begun by his teacher Milman Parry, who

defined the formula as a "group of words which is regularly employed under the same

metrical conditions to express a given essential idea."[44] Lord adds that the formula was

not merely a device employed to engage the audience in artistic expression, though it did

serve the purpose of heightening the audience's sense of the artistry of the composition,

but it also served the singer's need to compose the song in a quasi-spontaneous manner.[45]

While the Parry-Lord hypothesis of mutual exclusivity of orality and textuality has been

---

42. Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," 22.

43. Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," 23.

44. Milman Parry, "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making. I:
Homer and Homeric Style," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 41 (1930): 80.

45. Albert Bates Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard
University Press, 1960), 30.

considerably revised,[46] their descriptions (particularly that of Lord) of the memory

techniques are still accepted today.[47] This need is all the more apparent by the fact that

the singer of oral compositions did not perform the same piece in the same way each

time, a fact that must be taken into consideration when time comes to record the

composition in writing.[48] Likewise it makes little sense to appeal to the "original" of a

work composed orally, even those based on a degree of memorization, since many of the

details change with each performance, and the work matures as the singer matures with

his composition and with his form.[49]   Still, the use of formula, the presence of prosodic

patterning such as meter, stress, and intonation cue the audience in to the artistic nature of

the composition.

In oral as in written composition, artistic opacity is subject to its own need for

dissimilarity. In the oral composition, the pattern cannot be utterly similar if only due to

the limits of the singer working in a quasi-spontaneous manner. The pattern of the

formula is only intelligible by the variation that occurs elsewhere in the composition.

Likewise, the tropes employed in a literary composition are only effective insofar as they

themselves resist convention.[50] Shklovsky likens literary tropes to the architecture of a

---

46. David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 6–7 However, see Niditch for a more favorable view of Lord-Parry (Susan Niditch, *Oral World and Written Word: Ancient Israelite Literature* [Louisville, Ky.: Westminister John Knox Press, 1996])

47. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 99.

48. Lord, *The Singer of Tales*, 125.

49. Lord, *The Singer of Tales*, 100–01.

50. My definition of "trope" follows O'Connor. Tropes are the prerequisite parts of what Lowth called "parallelism," but here we will focus on syntactic matching (repetition of structure of a line) and syntactic dependency (extension of structure over more than one line). Matching may or may not include gapping. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 87–88.

Greek temple:

> There is "order" in art, yet not a single column of a Greek temple stands exactly in its proper order; poetic rhythm is similarly just ordered rhythm. Attempts to systematize the irregularities have been made, and such attempts are part of the current problem in the theory of rhythm. It is obvious that the systematization will not work, for in reality the problem is not one of complicating rhythm but of disordering the rhythm–a disordering which cannot be predicted. Should the disordering of rhythm become a convention, it would be ineffective as a device for roughening of language.[51]

To apply Shklovsky's analogy to the question of BH verse, the analysts of Hebrew verse who study the poetic line in order to provide a comprehensive description of its structure are seeking to analyze the similarity between each column of the Greek temple. What about the Greek column makes it a Greek column? What makes it unique to a particular temple? What is the similarity from one column to the next? What are the features which constitute the structure of the column as one part of the architectural whole?

For BH verse, structure has been defined as operating on fundamentally phonological, semantic, and syntactic levels. Phonological structure describes a line regulated primarily by phonological meter, i.e. the numerical regulation of stress, syllable, or morae.[52] Semantic structure describes a line regulated by semantic patterning, and in the case of BH poetry such semantic patterning is referred to as parallelism. Syntactic description describes a poetic line comprised of syntactic elements such as constituents, words, or clauses, ordered in a patterned way.

The question of word order is a question that belongs in large part to the matter of syntactic structure (though it could be argued that phonology influences the order of

---

51. Shklovsky, "Art as Technique," 24.

52. Vance has pointed out that in the case of phonological meter, meter is a "contract between the poet and the reader. The poet declares what he or she is going to do in the opening lines of the poem and this in turn sets up the reader's expectation." Donald R. Vance, *The Question of Meter in Biblical Hebrew Poetry*, Studies in Bible and Early Christianity 46 (Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 2001), 491.

sounds and, therefore, the order of words). Word order variation, however, does not speak directly to the question of structure; rather it speaks to the disordering of structure.

Surprisingly, Michael Rosenbaum is among the very few Hebrew scholars to refer Shklovsky's work on defamiliarization in his explanation of BH word order in Isaiah 40–50.[53] Though he does not mention Shklovsky but rather the later work of Prague School linguist Jan Mukařovsky, Rosenbaum discusses how defamiliarization is an effect of a variety of poetic features of BH verse, including symmetrical word order arrangements, janus constructions, parallelism, as well as other categories that could be subcategorized under parallelism: chiasm, swapping, pivot, terrace, staircase, and repetition. While Rosenbaum is not interested constituent postponement (e.g., V in the third position, V-O-S patterns, and so on), he does see such poetic defamiliarization as one influence on varying word order patterns.

Nicholas Lunn's more recent work on word order variation in BH verse likewise cites Shklovsky, though his treatment is brief.[54] Like Rosenbaum, Lunn's position will be described more in a later chapter, but a few points should be made at the outset. Lunn

---

53. Michael Rosenbaum, *Word-Order Variation in Isaiah 40–55: A Functional Perspective* (Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1997), 149–208.

54. Lunn writes, ". . . all these indicators [unique to Biblical Hebrew poetry] appearing in the poetic text result in what linguists refer to as "'defamiliarization" of the language, a concept first given expression by Victor Shklovsky of the Russian formalist school. By the defamiliarization of the language is meant the device of 'making it strange and the device of impeded form which augments the difficulty and duration of perception, since the process of perception in art is an end in itself, and is supposed to be prolonged'. It is this distinctiveness that gives poetic literature its particular impact. Its purpose is not simply to communicate information but to impress the reader/listener as an art form. This it does through the departure from those familiar forms and patterns that constitute the normal means of communication. A significant shift, therefore, occurs in poetry from the norms of the regular register of language to its own particular conventions. Some of these poetic conventions may be cross-linguistically universal or commonplace, while others may be language specific." Lunn, *Word-Order Variation*, 2 For Alter's use of Shklovsky, see n. 26 above.

misses the far-reaching implications of Shklovsky's perspective, because he only sees defamiliarization at play when irregular, or what he calls "non-canonical" word order, *cannot* be explained on pragmatic grounds. In other words, he understands poetic defamiliarization and pragmatic fronting as two mutually exclusive constructions. While he notes that clauses with verbs in the third position are rare in prose and relatively frequent in poetry, he does not think that is a particularly relevant fact in regards to defamiliarization. He misses the fact that every clause exhibiting constituent postponement is in fact defamiliarized. Furthermore, one should expect to find that the defamiliarized word order in BH verse is often coincidental with and complemented by pragmatic features. The presence of pragmatic features does not undermine but rather augments the defamiliarization of constituent postponement.[55] Thus all of Lunn's examples of aberrant word order should be considered candidates for defamiliarization, not simply those which can't be explained on other grounds.

The early notion of defamiliarization to which Shklovsky gives expression is actually quite developed. Defamiliarization refers to more than simply the strange-making of semantic, lexical, morphological, and syntactic elements of literature. Defamiliarization represents a modification of the normal and predictable process of numerical regulation of verse, and as such it works with and in contrast to the regulating features exhibited in verse. Therefore, the type of aberrant word order, constituent postponement, discussed in this paper will be understood as a function of defamiliarization common in BH verse that is triggered by and in concert with the other

---

55. To the contrary, Kiparsky writes, "The discourse is reevaluated above all by drawing out the latent contribution of surface structure to its meaning, that is, by superimposing a secondary iconic interpretation on it. Examples of this are the foregrounding effects of poetry, and the metrical devices that serve to support and implement them; the iconic significance of word order (chiasmus, parallelism); the restoration of compositional meaning in idioms and fixed compounds." Kiparsky, "Commentary," 181.

tropes that are common to the genre. Defamiliarization is the broad category of poetic

features, and includes, among other features, relaxed syntactic constraints, that is gapping,

asyndeton, and constituent postponement.

CHAPTER 2

CLASSICAL BIBLICAL HEBREW PROSE

Distinct Phases in Biblical Hebrew

To talk about aberrant or peculiar word order in BH verse and the ways in which it

serves as a function of literary defamiliarization, we must assume a linguistic control set.

Terms like "aberrant," "peculiar," or even "postponement" presuppose a standard for

what is "normal" and "familiar," a foil against which poetic aberration or postponement

comes into relief.   For the purposes of this study, a particular phase of BH will serve as

that linguistic control set, namely Classical Biblical Hebrew (CBH). This approach relies

on the general scholarly consensus that CBH is the linguistic norm for most biblical texts

composed before the exile (sixth century B.C.)[1] and a linguistic standard for texts

developed during and after the exile.[2] This division is more complex than such a binary

distinction indicates, and so the priority-status of the CBH and its relation to the other

phases of BH must first be discussed in detail. The goal of the following discussion is to

establish the propriety of CBH verbal clauses as a control set and to address issues that

arise regarding the special linguistic profile and chronological date of certain texts.

---

1. It is understood that this comment ignores Archaic Biblical Hebrew (ABH) which is exhibited in several early songs embedded in a later text. ABH is undoubtedly a product of a linguistic phase earlier than the sixth century, but since it is limited to BH verse, it is not considered a part of the control. Rather it is incorporated into the sample of verse under investigation.

2. The sixth century B.C. is what Hurvitz has referred to as the "linguistic 'Greenwich Meridian' . . . which is the dividing line between pre-exilic (= early) and post-exilic (= late) Biblical Hebrew." Avi Hurvitz, "Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code: A Linguistic Study in Technical Idioms and Terminology," *RB 81 (1974): 26.*

Research in the modern era has shown that the phenomenon of BH is not a unified whole. Philological study over the past three centuries (study which picked up momentum in the nineteenth century and developed technical detail in the twentieth century) has developed a relative history of the phases of BH present in the Hebrew Bible by mapping out the various linguistic features of each phase. While the interest of this study is the *syntactic features* of CBH, in particular word order features, corroborating distinctions can be made on lexical and morphological grounds as well. A good starting point for a discussion of CBH is E.Y. Kutscher's work on the history of the Hebrew language.[3] Kutscher argues for a tripartite division of BH which includes Archaic Biblical Hebrew (ABH), Standard Biblical Hebrew (SBH), and Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH).[4] ABH is the rubric under which Kutscher categorizes the language of early biblical poetry, including that of Genesis 49 and Exodus 15 and the "Early Prophets", though he does not precisely delineate this last segment[5]. SBH (which corresponds to what has been and will hereafter be called CBH) refers to the language of all biblical prose excluding Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, Esther, and the Hebrew portions of Daniel, though again Kutscher's division is not explicit and only comes to light by the examples he gives. The texts excluded from CBH form the corpus of LBH which he argues is shaped largely, though not exclusively, by Aramaic influence.[6] This tripartite division,

_____

3. Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, ed. Raphael Kutscher (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1982).

4. Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, 12.

5. This is most likely a reference to the poetry found in the canonical division of the HB which includes Joshua, Judges, Samuel and Kings.

6. Kutscher makes this caveat, "LBH was shaped to a very great extent by Aramaic influence . . . But it is not easy to distinguish those characteristics that might

though general and imprecise, nevertheless will serve as a helpful framework for the following discussion of the phases of BH.

The rationale for such a division of BH and the interest in distinguishing one phase from another finds its roots in the work of the late nineteenth century philologist S. R. Driver. Driver's description of LBH provides the English-language groundwork for the linguistic dating of BH.[7] In his *Introduction*, Driver views the "age of *Nehemiah*" as the turning-point in BH;[8] in other words, the restoration not the exile, as Hurvitz later argues, is the point at which LBH emerges in the canon of the Hebrew Bible. He sets apart Jeremiah, "the *latter* part of Kings, Ezekiel, Second Isaiah, [and] Haggai"[9] as a transitional phase between, on one hand, the classical phase of what he understands to be the JE texts of the Pentateuch and the earliest narrative material of Judges, Samuel, much of Kings, and Deuteronomy and, on the other hand, the late phase of Ezra and Nehemiah memoirs and Malachi (which make up the beginning of the late phase) and Chronicles,

---

have been the product of inner Hebrew development rather than of Aramaic influence." Kutscher, *A History of the Hebrew Language*, 81, cf. 71–77. For a recent critique of the value of "Aramaisms" to linguistic dating of BH is found in Young and Rezetko, who point out how difficult it is to determine the source and timing of apparent Aramaic influence in BH: whether Old Aramaic and therefore early or Persian Aramaic and therefore late. They maintain that "a very large proportion of the forms considered 'Aramaisms' by scholars are very likely to be, rather, native Aramaic-like features of Hebrew dialects." Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*, 221 Cf. S. R. Driver, "On Some Alleged Linguistic Affinities of the Elohist," *Journal of Philology* 11 (1882): 204–13, 232.

7. S.R. Driver, *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1891; rev. and ed. 1913, 1916), 504–06, 535–40.

8. S.R. Driver, *Introduction*, 505.

9. S.R. Driver, *Introduction*, 505.

Esther, and Ecclesiastes (which exhibit "palpable" changes in vocabulary and syntax).[10]
The assertion of a "transitional" phase in BH (hereafter TBH) that includes Jeremiah and
Ezekiel among other books introduces a helpful distinction that accounts for the
intermediate development that is exhibited between CBH and LBH.[11] For Driver, the
CBH of the classical phase is the "purest and best Hebrew prose style" so it is not
surprising that he describes LBH as at once, "laboured and inelegant" and "uncouth".[12]

Driver later investigated some of the elements of LBH as part of his critique of the
late dating of the P(riestly) source that was ascendant in his day. His treatment is among
the first competent linguistic arguments on the topic, in stark contrast to his predecessors
whose work had rested primarily on religious and literary features of the text to establish
date and for whom the linguistic argument was secondary. Driver's premise was that "it
was of importance to know whether the evidence of language and style agreed or not with
the argument drawn (rightly or wrongly) from history,"[13] a premise which remains valid
today (despite arguments to the contrary[14]). Therefore it is the debate between two of
Driver's contemporaries C. V. Ryssel and F. Giesebrecht regarding the relative dating of

---

10. S.R. Driver, *Introduction*, 505.

11. Elsewhere, Driver argues that P predates Ezekiel but postdates CBH. S. R.
Driver, "Linguistic Affinities". Gropp includes texts traditionally assigned to the P
source in what he considers the CBH corpus. Douglas M. Gropp, "The Function of the
Finite Verb in Classical Biblical Hebrew," *HAR* 13 (1991): 46

12. S.R. Driver, *Introduction*, 505.

13. S. R. Driver, "Linguistic Affinities," 202.

14. For a recent and impassioned debate over the propriety of the linguistic
dating project, see the symposium papers conducted by the National Association of
Professors of Hebrew ("Can Biblical Texts Be Dated Linguistically?" *Hebrew Studies*,
47 [2006]: 83-201), and Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical
Texts*.

the "Elohist" (Wellhausen's Q and Dillman's A) that he uses as a starting point. Ryssel

had returned, for the most part, to the older view that the Elohist belonged to the earliest

stage of Israelite literature (he took exception with some texts dating them to 700-540

B.C.E.),[15] while Giesebrecht argued primarily by comparative lexicon for the common

view of the day that the Elohist was a product of the exilic or post-exilic period.[16]

Among the most significant contributions to arise from his critique of Giesebrecht, Driver

develops a methodological rigor which places the burden on the scholar to show that, in

the case of late-seeming technical terms, "unless the idea could not have arisen till the

period of the exile, no objection can be made to the use of the term denoting it."[17] He

concludes,

> Is it not clear from the character of the civilization already attested by the early
> historians and prophets themselves, that many ideas and objects must have been
> familiar to the Hebrew people, to which, nevertheless, those historians, from the
> nature of their work, never allude? May we not be unnaturally restricting the
> Hebrew language if we limit its lexicon for 10-9 cent. B.C. to the words actually
> found in their writings, and view with suspicion a multitude of others, except in Q
> [P] itself, do not happen to be attested till subsequently?[18]

For this reason, Driver can date P earlier than the exile regardless of that source's

propensity for certain technical terms that only seem to occur elsewhere in

unambiguously late biblical books.[19] In other words, raw concordance data will confuse

---

15. Carolus Victor Ryssel, *De Elohistae Pentateuchici Sermone: Commentatio Historico-Critica* (Leipzig: L. Fernau, 1878).

16. F. Giesebrecht, "Zur Hexateuchkritik: Der Sprachgebrauch des hexateuchischen Elohisten," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 1 (1881): 177–276.

17. S. R. Driver, "Linguistic Affinities," 216.

18. S. R. Driver, "Linguistic Affinities," 233.

19. S.R. Driver, *Introduction*, 155–57.

rather than settle such a question.

Similarly, late-seeming features such as the use of the shorter first person independent personal pronoun אני against the longer form אנכי does not necessitate a late date, because the use of the shorter form, though more common in LBH, is present in CBH and can be explained as reflecting certain authorial concerns such as prosody.[20]

A. Kropat's dissertation published in 1909 sets out to catalog only the syntactical features of LBH present in the books of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah.[21] His work is unique in its exclusive concern for syntactical features, ignoring many of the lexical and morphological features that lay the groundwork for previous studies of the history of BH. Kropat points out the Chronicler's tendency toward subject-first constructions, as is exhibited in certain parallel passages:[22]

(1)   2 Sam 24:4 - וַיֶּחֱזַק דְּבַר־הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶל־יוֹאָב

       1 Chron 21:4 - וּדְבַר־הַמֶּלֶךְ חָזַק עַל־יוֹאָב

(2)   1 Kings 12:16 - וַיַּרְא כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל

       2 Chron 10:16 - כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל רָאוּ [23]

_____

20. S. R. Driver, "Linguistic Affinities," 222–23.

21. Arno Kropat, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik verglichen mit der seiner Quellen: ein Beitrag zur historischen Syntax des Hebräischen*, BZAW (Giessen:: Töpelmann, 1909).

22. Kropat rightly distinguishes these sorts of fronting of the subject from pragmatically or poetically influenced fronting. Kropat, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik*, 25.

23. Here the text is emended to include רָאוּ (cf. 1 Kings 12:16) following the Syriac, Targum, and several medieval Hebrew manuscripts. Dillard (following Williamson?) argues that כָּל־יִשְׂרָאֵל should be read with the coordinated series in the previous verse, though this reading does not seem to take the parallel text into account.

Kropat also observes that objects can be positioned preverbally for the purpose of accentuation. For instance:

(3)   1 Chron 22:8 - דָּם לָרֹב שָׁפַכְתָּ

This example is interesting and effective because it presents several of the elements that need to be taken into consideration when dealing with issues of constituent postponement. The surface structure of the clause exhibits two constituents that are positioned preverbally, which would not be common in CBH and so might be categorized as a late feature. Kropat might be analyzing the entire phrase דָּם לָרֹב as a noun phrase headed by דָּם with לָרֹב as a nominal complement exhibiting a relationship that might be best described as genitive. However, it is more likely that לָרֹב is adverbial describing the extent of the action denoted by the verb שָׁפַכְתָּ. If this is the case, and the PP is understood to be an adjunct of the verb, it is likely that this is a grammaticalized word (Gen 48:16; 1 Kings 1:19; 2 Chron 27:3) which should be understood as an adverb and therefore does not "fill a slot" in the word order configuration of the clause (see discussion in ch. 4).

R. Polzin developed Kropat's framework in his survey on the typology of BH prose. He was primarily concerned with the distinction between CBH and LBH, and he found the language of the book of Chronicles, by which he meant the non-synoptic passages in the Chronicler's history, Ezra, and the non-memoir passages of Nehemiah to be exemplary of LBH, which he equates with post-exilic Hebrew. In his research, Chronicles becomes a "control" against which the relative linguistic dating of other

---

Dillard, Raymond B. *Word Biblical Commentary: 2 Chronicles* (Dallas, Tex.: Word, Inc. 2002), 87.

textual segments, including his main subject the P document, could be verified.[24] While

the "Chronicler's language" offers a pristine form of LBH, Polzin recognizes other

examples of LBH as well. Esther and Nehemiah's memoirs exhibit LBH, though they are

characterized by a strong tendency to archaize. The LBH of Ben Sira and Daniel is

unquestioned as it is marked by a large number of late Hebrew developments and

Aramaisms.[25] Working from this framework, Polzin rejects the conclusions of C.V.

Ryssel,[26] and later S.R. Driver,[27] that the language of P belongs to the earliest stage of

Israelite literature. He argues instead that a linguistic comparison of the language of P

with the language of the Chronicler reveals that, against the early dating, the language of

P was "typologically later than classical BH but quite conclusively before the

Chronicler's language."[28] For him, P falls into a medial stage, though Driver would

probably have accepted such a broad statement as well.

Many of the features which suggest a distinction between CBH and LBH are

lexical or orthographical in kind, and Polzin sees Aramaic influence as minimal in this

distinction.[29] Of the strictly syntactical distinctions between CBH and LBH, Polzin offers

many already proposed by Kropat as well as some additional ones:

1.   the reduced use of the direct object marker אֶת with a pronominal suffix

---

24. Robert Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*, HSM (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976), 1–2.

25. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 4.

26. Ryssel, *De Elohistae Pentateuchici Sermone: Commentatio Historico-Critica*.

27. S. R. Driver, "Linguistic Affinities."

28. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 159.

and its increased use before nouns in the nominative case ("emphatic

אֶת"),[30]

2. the use of the prospective pronominal suffix and the following noun to

communicate possession,[31]

3. the lack of use of the infinitive absolute with the cognate finite form or the

infinitive absolute as a command,[32]

4. the less frequent or different use of the infinitive construct and the

prepositions בְ and כְ,[33]

5. repetition of a singular word (e.g., Est 9:28 מִשְׁפָּחָה וּמִשְׁפָּחָה, 1 Chron 28:15

מְנוֹרָה וּמְנוֹרָה),[34]

In light of his understanding of the linguistic typology of CBH and LBH, Polzin argues

that P exhibits features of the transitional phase, TBH.[35]

----

29. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 2.

30. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 28,32.

31. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 38.

32. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 43.

33. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 45 See also M.H. Segal, *דקדוק לשׁון המשׁנה* (Tel
Aviv, 1936), 135–36.

34. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 47–48 See also S.R. Driver,
Introduction, 538; Angel Sáenz-Badillos, *The History of the Hebrew Language*, John
Elwolde (New York: Cambridge, 1993), 118.

35. The notion of a medial stage of BH between CBH and LBH as proposed for
P by Polzin and Ezekiel by Hurvitz is picked up by, among others, D. Gropp who
asserts that features of TBH is found in the books of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and possibly in
the P document (Gropp, "The Function of the Finite Verb," 46). For a tally of recent
proposals for TBH, see Young, Rezetko, and Ehrensvärd, *Linguistic Dating of Biblical*

Alongside Kropat and Polzin, Hurvitz has contributed much to the historical

linguistic dating of BH, particularly in the relative dating of P in relation to late texts such

as Ezekiel, Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah. His analysis of the putative similarities

between P and the late features of the Book of Ezekiel brought him to the conclusion that

no such similarities exist and that P emerged from a relatively early stage in BH in

relation to the language of Ezekiel. He summarizes his conclusions regarding the

language of P and Ezekiel this way:

> (1) The texts belonging to P make intensive use of only early linguistic elements--
> and never of those identifiable as late.
> (2) The texts belonging to Ez. use *both* early linguistic elements as well as those
> identifiable as late."[36]

Hurvitz resists addressing literary similarities between the two texts, but he does posit

that linguistically, they "exhibit two distinct profiles" so that "any apparent similarities of

P and Ez. are superficial and even misleading (in so far as we take them to indicate a

common historical age)."[37] For Hurvitz, the question is not whether Ezekiel and P are a

part of a common tradition involving cultic personnel, practice, and paraphernalia, but the

relative placement of each within the chronology of that tradition. He argued that P was

clearly the more conservative and likely the earlier of the two voices in that tradition. If P

and Ezekiel shared a common historical ancestor, P seemed to copy the language of that

source faithfully, whereas Ezekiel made "drastic alterations and revisions" to the source's

---

Texts, 51–54.

36. Avi Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship Between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel: A New Approach to an Old Problem*, Cahiers de la Revue Biblique (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1982), 150.

37. Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study*, 154 See also Polzin on P's linguistic profile as distinct amongst late texts. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 86.

language.[38] Here, Hurvitz also resists drawing distinct conclusions about Israelite religious history from his linguistic profiles of P and Ezekiel, though he does make the point that '"Old School" descriptions of Ezekiel as the "father of Judaism" are refuted by the relative chronology he proposes.[39] Contrary to the image of Ezekiel as an innovative and creative force, Hurvitz understands Ezekiel to be a product of an "age of compilation not edition and revision, let alone innovation."[40] Even in an age of innovation, certain late texts exhibited what was perhaps a "possible archaizing or conservative style" due to the fact that "biblical compositions constantly served as classical models for later writers."[41] For Hurvitz ,the significance of CBH as a linguistic model for later compositions possibly explains the anachronistically early features in late poems such as11QPs[a] (11Q5).

In terms of word order, the transition from CBH to LBH seems to have been reflected in certain constructions. Word order in LBH phrases and clauses as they appear in a particular LBH texts exhibits the following differences from word order in CBH:

- increased use of subject-first verbal clauses,[42]

- tendency to put substantives before the cardinal number modifying it (in

---

38. Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study*, 151.

39. Instead, he describes P as a"link in a chain; but it is the first--not the last--in historical order." Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study*, 154–55.

40. Hurvitz, *A Linguistic Study*, 155.

41. Hurvitz, "Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code: A Linguistic Study in Technical Idioms and Terminology," 4–5. See also Avi Hurvitz, "Observations on the Language of the Third Apocryphal Psalm from Qumran," *Revue de Qumran* 18 (1965): 231; Avi Hurvitz, "Date of the Prose-Tale of Job Linguistically Reconsidered," *HTR* 67 (1974): 17–34.

42. Kropat, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik*, 25.

appositional construction),[43]

- a similar tendency to put a title after the proper name (דָּרְיָוֶשׁ הַמֶּלֶךְ Zech 7:1),[44]

- tendency to put the subject of passive infinitive clauses before the infinitive (Hag 1:2; Zech 8:9)[45]

Engaging each of these features individually would go beyond the scope of the current study, but the possibility that a shift in word order between CBH and LBH took place raises the concern about the propriety of a control set that includes mixed corpus of CBH and LBH texts. In other words, our control set of BH prose is more stable and reliable if it is limited to CBH clauses. Not only does CBH seem to provide a reliably stable collection of finite verbal clauses, it also has been shown to play a role as the standard literary language (and a source for archaization) for much or all of the LBH corpus.[46] In using CBH in this way, we are following in the current trend in linguistic studies of BH

_____

43. Polzin, *Late Biblical Hebrew*, 58–60; S.R. Driver, *Introduction*, 537.

44. Kropat, *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik*, 48, 74. See also Talmy Givón, "The Drift from VSO to SVO in Biblical Hebrew: The Pragmatics of Tense-Aspect," in *Syntax: An Introduction*, vol. 2 of *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change*, ed. Charles N. Li [Austin, Tx.: University of Texas, 1977], 181–254). For a critique of Givón, see Randall Buth, "Functional Grammar, Hebrew and Aramaic: An Integrated, Textlinguistic Approach to Syntax," in *Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature: What It is and What It Offers*, ed. W. R. Bodine, SemeiaSt (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 91; for a further critique of the usefulness of this feature (and linguistic dating in general), see Martin Ehrensvärd, "Why Biblical Texts Cannot Be Dated Linguistically," *Hebrew Studies* 47 (2006): 185, 187.

45. Frank H. Polak, "Sociolinguistics: A Key to the Typology and the Social Background of Biblical Hebrew," *Hebrew Studies* 47 (2006): 127.

46. See n. 43.

word order including Gropp,[47] Lunn,[48] and Moshavi.[49]

Word Order in Classical Biblical Hebrew

Given the apparent though ill-defined difference between the word order features of CBH and LBH, this study will use only CBH as a standard against which to analyze clauses with peculiar word order in BH poetry. It would be uncontroversial to say that basic word order in CBH requires the verb to be in the first or second position, in which case clauses that exhibit the verb in the third or fourth position would be considered anomalous.[50]   A proper study of word order, however, would require more precision, and such precision touches upon a current debate among scholars. The debate surrounding the order of constituents in the verbal clause and has been primarily concerned with the typological classification of CBH as a V-S-O or S-V-O language. The traditional V-S-O position still enjoys majority support, though the S-V-O position is not without its advocates. The traditional view that CBH exhibits a V-S-O word order has been questioned rigorously over the two decades by DeCaen[51] and Holmstedt[52] who argue for a

---

47. Gropp helpfully delimits the CBH corpus to "Genesis-Numbers (including the P stratum), Deuteronomy-Kings (minus secondary additions), and possibly the book of Ruth." Gropp, "The Function of the Finite Verb"Gropp, "The Function of the Finite Verb in Classical Biblical Hebrew."

48. Lunn, *Word-Order Variation*.

49. Adina Moshavi, *Word Order in the Biblical Hebrew Finite Clause: A Syntactic and Pragmatic Analysis of Preposing* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010).

50. This statement seems to reflect the situation in Ugaritic (Josef Tropper, *Ugaritische Grammatik*, AOAT 273 [Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000], 160).

51. Vincent DeCaen, "On the Placement and Interpretation of the Verb in Standard Biblical Hebrew" (University of Toronto, 1995); Vincent DeCaen, "A Unified Analysis of Verbal and Verbless Clauses Within Government-Binding Theory," in *The

basic S-V-O word order. While their work has proven to be insightful and at points intriguing, their arguments for the basic S-V-O order in BH ultimately fail. Buth argues that a basic S-V-O word order in BH, were it true, should allow for O movement that should result in numerous clauses with an O-S-V order. That such clauses are almost nonexistent in CBH prose is perhaps the most elegant rebuttal to the S-V-O hypothesis.[53] From a methodological perspective, Moshavi has called into question the usefulness of Anna Siewerska's basic-sentence criterion which both DeCaen and Holmstedt use to define their samples. She has shown how the criterion is so reductionistic that, in the case of BH, it renders the sample statistically unusable.[54] While the questions remains open, those making the case for S-V-O have not been able to account for these contradictions.

Following current consensus, this essay will assume that basic word order of CBH is V-S-O-(PP),[55] so that preverbal word order variations such as S-O-V or, more rarely,

---

Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Approaches, vol. 1, ed. Cythia L. Miller and et. al, Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1999), 109–31.

52. Robert D. Holmstedt, "Word Order in the Book of Proverbs," in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, eds. K. G. Friebel, R. T. Troxel, and D. R. Magary (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 135–54; Robert D. Holmstedt, "Word Order and Information Structure in Ruth and Jonah: A Generative-Typological Analysis," *JSS* 54 (2009): 111–39.

53. Buth, "Functional Grammar, Hebrew and Aramaic," 80–81.

54. Moshavi, *Word Order*, 15.

55. When PP is not pronominalized. See Joüon-Muraoka §155. As mentioned in ch. 2 (n. 20-21), Muraoka's revision differs from Joüon's original view that BH basic word order is *normalement* S-V. For affirmations of the V-S-O hypothesis, see GKC §142f; Givón, "The Drift from VSO to SVO"; Takamitsu Muraoka, *Emphatic Words*

O-S-V represent two movement operations, not one. Likewise, postverbal word order variations, such as V-O-S or V-PP-S (when PP is not pronominalized) likewise represent a different but related movement operation. These clause types as they appear in BH verse will be the subject of this study.

---

and Structures in Biblical Hebrew (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University ; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985), 30; Waltke-O'Connor, 635 n.13; K. Jongeling, "On the VSO Character of Hebrew," in *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax: Presented to Professsor J. Hoftijzer on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, vol. 17 of *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax: Presented to Professsor J. Hoftijzer on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, eds K. Jongeling, H.L. Murre-Van ven Berg, and L. van Rompay, Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 103–11; Bill T. Arnold and John H. Choi, *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* (New York: Cambridge University, 2003), 169; Moshavi, *Word Order*, 11–17.

For a affirmations of V-S-O order in cognate Semitic languages: for Peripheral Akkadian, see T. J. Finley, "Word Order in Clause Stucture of Syrian Akkadian" (Los Angeles, Ca.: University of California, 1979), 64–69; Agustinus Gianto, *Word Order Variation in the Akkadian of Byblos* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto biblico, 1990), 4; for Old Aramaic, see Stephen A. Kaufman, "Aramaic," in *Semitic Languages*, ed. Robert Hetzron (New York: Routledge, 1997), 127; but not necessarily in Biblical Aramaic (Edward M. Cook, *Word Order in the Aramaic of Daniel*, Monographic Journals of the Near East. Afroasiatic Linguistics, vol. 9 [Malibu, Calif.: Undena Publications ; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1986], 3–4); for Ge'ez, see Gene Gragg, "Ge'ez (Ethiopic)," in *Semitic Languages*, ed. Robert Hetzron (New York: Routledge, 1997), 255; for Epigraphic South Arabian (Sayhadic), see Leonid E. Kogan and Andrey V. Korotayev, "Sayhadic (Epigraphic South Arabian)," in *Semitic Languages*, ed. Robert Hetzron (New York: Routledge, 1997), 238;   for Ugaritic, Faber argues that S-V-O is "statistically most frequent" (Alice Faber, "Genetic Subgroupings of Semitic Languages" [Austin, Tx.: University of Texas, 1980], 44–55). Tropper notes that V-S-O and S-V-O are most common but poetry shows relaxation (Tropper, *UG*, 870), but Dijkstra argues that "preferred" word order in prose is VS with qualifications in the case of letters (Meindert Dijkstra, "Ugaritic Stylistics: Ugaritic Prose," in *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*, vol. 39, Wilfred G. E. Watson and Nicolas Wyatt, Handbook of Oriental Studies [Boston, Mass.: Brill, 1999], 39:160). Sivan disagrees, however, given the limited prose corpus Daniel Sivan, *A Grammar of the Ugaritic Language*, Handbuch der Orientalistik (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997), 210. Bordreuil and Pardee are hesitant about general word order, though they are certain that V-S-O is primary in subordinate clauses (Pierre Bordreuil and Dennis Pardee, *A Manual of Ugaritic*, Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic [Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2009], 66).

PREVERBAL CONSTITUENTS IN BH PROSE

Introduction

Given the basic V-S-O-(PP) word order of CBH, we can expand our description to allow for the raising of one constituent to the preverbal position in the movement called fronting:

(1)   X-V-S-O-(PP)

In the above formulation (1), X is an open syntactic slot which may be occupied in BH by either the S, any argument of the verb, or any adjunct. It has been shown, however, that in CBH only one constituent X may occupy that preverbal position, so that the following description is not normally allowed in CBH:

(2)   X-Y-V-S-O-(PP)

Scholars of BH verse have shown that just such word order patterns (as well as patterns of three preverbal constituents, e.g. X-Y-Z-V-S-O-[PP]) are relatively frequent in the context of verse. This chapter will briefly trace exactly how this phenomenon has been observed and described in BH studies.

Two Preverbal Constituents in BH Prose

In his 1999 study of clauses with two preverbal constituents, Gross showed that such constituent order patterns were rare in all phases of BH prose though relatively common in poetry. He remarks that "although this type [two or three] of clause occurs

37

very rarely in prose. It is frequent in poetry."[1]   In his 2001 study, he lists the following

cases of clauses in prose with two or three preverbal constituents (the division into the

phases of BH are mine)**:**[2]

> Classical Biblical Hebrew (CBH): Gen 5:1b; 7:8-9; 8:19; 14:10d; 17:6c;
> 23:6d:31:29b, 42b; 35:11f; 41:11b; Exod 12:4c, 10b; 16:18d; 18:23d; Lev 17:11d;
> 19:3a; Num 22:33d; 30:9a; 36:7b, 9b; Deut 2:10; 2:28a, 28c; 12:22c; 18:14a;
> 24:16c; Judg 17:6b; 21:25b; 2 Kings 5:13d; 8:12g; 14:6d; 16:15c; 25:10a, 30
>
> Transitional Biblical Hebrew (TBH): Jer 18:12d (with אִישׁ); 19:8b, 9b; 26:18d;
> 31:30a; 32:4d, 44a; 33:24b; 34:3d; 34:3e; 37:10c; 42:16b; 42:16c; Ezek 1:9b, 12a,
> 17a; 3:18e, 19c, 19d, 20g, 21e; 4:11a, 16d; 5:2a, 4a, 12a, 12c, 12d; 6:6a, 10b, 12a,
> 12b, 12c; 9:10c; 10:11a, 22b; 11:21b; 12:6, 18a, 18b, 19c, 19d; 14:14b, 20d;
> 16:43c, 51a; 17:21b; 18:7d; 11a, 16d, 19c, 30a; 20:7b, 8c, 39a, 22:11a, 11b, 11c;
> 31c; 23:10c; 25c; 25d; 23:38a; 23:47d; 24:21d; 25:13e; 26:6a; 26:11b; 26:11c;
> 26:12e; 27:14; 27:19a; 30:17a; 30:17b; 30:18d; 31:17a; 32:29b; 33:6f; 33:6f;
> 33:6g; 33:8e; 33:20c; 33:26c; 34:18c; 34:19a; 36:7c; 36:37b; 38:8c; 38:20d;
> 39:3b; 44:26; 45:21b; 45:24a; 46:8a;
>
> Late Biblical Hebrew: Zech 1:12c; Ezra 4:3c; Neh 2:3b; 1Chron 17:18b; 19:13c;
> 2 Chron 25:4e; 31:6a; 35:8b.

That clauses showing V-postponement are so infrequent in BH prose is immediately

apparent to the reader of the Hebrew Bible. One should also note that Gross's list does

not show a tendency in LBH for V-postponement.

Moshavi has provided a service in analyzing constituent order of the finite verbal

clause in what is primarily the prose literature of the Classical Biblical Hebrew (CBH)

phase of BH development, and her study provides something of a model for the current

---

1. Walter Gross, "Is There Really a Compound Nominal Clause in Biblical
Hebrew?" in *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Approaches*, ed.
Cynthia L. Miller (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1999), 45.

2. Many of Gross's examples would not count as true postponement since they
include two constituents in apposition (e.g. Gen 7:8-9) or a prepositional phrase in the
second position that is actually a complement of the subject (e.g. Gen 5:1b). Walter
Gross, *Doppelt besetztes Vorfeld: syntaktishe, pragmatische, und übersetzungs-
technische Studien zum althebräischen Verbalsatz* (Berlin: de Grutyer, 2001), 23–24
Several of these clauses are culled from a footnote of his 1999 study. Gross,
"Compound Nominal Clause," 45, n. 95.

work on BH verse. Following the example of van der Merwe[3] and Miller,[4] Moshavi based

her study on a corpus that is largely CBH (Genesis-2 Kings) though she discounts the

heterogeneity of the corpus due to the presence of the P source.[5]   She does, however,

distinguish between "two registers," one comprised of narrative material and another

comprised of direct-speech quotations.[6] Moshavi reports that the clauses with "double

preposing" constructions occur in 0.6% of the finite nonsubordinate clauses found in her

sample of the prose of Genesis.[7] She comments that the construction is so rare that they

do not "allow for a reliable analysis."

So the question that arises and the answer provided in the studies below have to

do with the reason for the relatively high number of clauses in BH verse that show word

order patterns that are rare in BH prose (e.g. "double preposing"). While the question of

word order pattern in prose has been subjected to vibrant and rigorous study, the studies

chosen for discussion below address the issue of word order in verse for the purposes of

this inquiry.

----

3. Christo H. J. van der Merwe, "Marked Word Order in the Book of Joel," *JNSL* 36 (2010): 109–30.

4. Cynthia L. Miller, *Representation of Speech in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: A Linguistic Analysis* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003).

5. Moshavi, *Word Order*, 3.

6. Moshavi, *Word Order*, 5 Her distinction is based on Polak's work on direct speech varieties. Frank Polak, "The Oral and the Written: Syntax, Stylistics and the Development of Biblical Prose Narrative," *JANES* 26 (1999): 59–105; Frank Polak, "The Style of the Dialogue in Biblical Prose Narrative," *JANES* 28 (2001): 53–95.

7. Moshavi, *Word Order*, 85.

Previous Analysis: Word Order Studies

As opposed to recent scholarly treatments of word order[8] in BH literature, the

interests of the present study are quite narrow. There is something of a cottage industry

established around the study of the order of words in BH in recent years. In 1985, it

would be quite reasonable for a scholar of BH to say that "a careful study of word-order

in Biblical Hebrew" was "an urgent desideratum,"[9] but such a situation today would not

be so obvious. Rather, the increased scrutiny leveled on BH word order has produced a

large body of diverse observations and opinions pertaining both to the rudimentary

elements of word order and their implications on interpretative framework.

The result of this increased interest is a glut of information and a dearth of

scholarly consensus.   Considering this state of affairs, M. P. O'Conner refers to the

"uncertainty that reigns"[10] in the study of BH word order patterns. The uncertainty

derives from a variety of approaches and opinions concerning the nature and significance

of word order as a universal feature of human language and how these can be applied to

the case of BH. The variety can be helpfully reduced to three approaches broadly defined

---

8. For the sake of general clarity and continuity with past studies, the phrase "word order" will be used in contradistinction to the more precise phrase "constituent order." In the purview of this study, which is primarily concerned with verbal clauses, the order of clause immediate constituents is most significant, even when those constituents are comprised of more than one word. In other words, a noun phrase might include several nouns or noun phrases in construct with the head noun (whether linked by the Masoretic mark *maqqēp* or not). Though studies of general word order, including the order of words in such phrases are valuable for the overall comprehension of BH, they are of little interest here.

9. Muraoka, *Emphatic*, 1.

10. Michael P. O'Connor, "Clausal Word Order in Biblical Hebrew: Comments on Recent Studies," paper presented at the annual international meeting of the SBL, Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Section (Washington, D.C., 2006), 1 In light of such uncertainty, perhaps Muroaka's desideratum is still valid. Not much of a consensus has emerge despite the intense scrutiny on the topic so that the "fundamental disagreement" which Muraoka reported twenty years ago (Muraoka, *Emphatic*, 4) still exists today.

as the traditional Hebraist approach, the typological-functionalist approach, and the generative approach.[11]

The approach of traditional Hebraists is marked by usually general and brief observations about prevailing word order patterns organized by traditional categories of grammar. Such cursory observations typically (1) depend on statistics describing usage frequency, not distribution across generic boundaries (e.g. poetry and prose),[12] and (2) employ broad interpretative categories, usually "emphasis," to describe word order patterns. For this approach, the constituent that occurs first in a clause is thought to be the one being emphasized.[13] This approach is perhaps best represented in the traditional grammars of Biblical Hebrew. For instance, Gesenius' treatment is both typical and formative of the traditional approach:

> . . . the natural *order of words* within the verbal sentence is: *Verb—Subject* or *Verb—Subject—Object*. But as in the noun-clause . . . so also in the verbal-clause, a variation of the usual order of words frequently occurs when any member of the sentence is to be specially emphasized by priority of position.[14]

---

11. For a more thorough summary of previous studies of these approaches, see Moshavi (Moshavi, *Word Order*, 19–47). She uses functional categories like "emphasis-centered model" in lieu of the categories based on linguistic schools like "traditional Hebraist approach" as I use above.

12. Siewierska's distinction between basic and dominate word orders would provide a corrective to the ambiguities of traditional approaches. Anna Siewierska, *Word Order Rules*, Croom Helm Linguistic Series (London: Croom Helm, 1988), 8–14.

13. E. J. Revell, "The Conditioning of Word Order in Verbless Clauses in Biblical Hebrew," *JSS* 24 (1989): 1–24; Heinrich Ewald, *Syntax of the Hebrew Language of the Old Testament*, 8th ed., trans. James Kennedy (Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2004; repr., Edinburgh: T &T Clark, 1891), §306b; Friedrich Eduard König, *Historisch-Comparative Syntax der Hebräischen Sprache*, vol. 3 of *Historisch-kritischen Lehrgebaudes des hebräischen* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1897), §339a-e; Wilhelm Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch, trans. A.E. Cowley, Dover Books on Language (Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications, 2006), §142a

14. Gesenius, *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, 456–57.

Of all of Gesenius's exceptions to the V-S-O order that also include two preverbal

constituents, all but one are poetic—2 Kings 5:13, a verse which will be discussed below.

Ewald came to the same conclusion that BH is basically a V-first language,

though his explanation of variations of this "simplest" order introduced sentence type as a

contributing factor.

> That the predicate, according to the simplest mode of arrangement, precedes the
> subject, because, in most cases, it contains the new and more important element
> which the speaker wishes to bring forward . . .[15]

Ewald understands variations to this "simplest" word order to be a function of either a)

clause-type[16] or b) emphasis, remarking, "[w]hen slight emphasis is to be indicated, it is

sufficient to put the subject or the object first, contrary to the order usually followed in

calm discourse." Moshavi is right to describe Ewald's approach as an "emphasis-

centered model," but it is interesting to note that his primary understanding of word-order

variation is "circumstantiality" as related to "foregrounding" of the subject not the

action.[17]

Driver sees circumstantiality as a major feature of S-fronting (the movement of

the subject to the preverbal position), he clarifies that "emphasis or love of variety" might

be the triggering factor for this or any sort of fronting.[18]   While Joüon's grammar is

---

15. Ewald, *Syntax of the Hebrew Language of the Old Testament*, 152.

16. He writes, "here, the mere order assigned to the words must also be at once made to serve in forming a new idea. From the arrangement just described, which is the simplest of all, is distinguished, in unimpassioned discourse, the mode in which a *descriptive* or *circumstantial clause* is formed, by assigning a significant order to the words" (Ewald, *Syntax of the Hebrew Language of the Old Testament*, 152).

17. Moshavi includes Müller (1888) and Davidson (1901) alongside Ewald in a category of grammarians who connect circumstantiality to "emphasis." Moshavi, *Word Order*, 21.

18. S. R. Driver, *Treatise on the Use of Tenses in Hebrew: And Some Other Syntactical Questions* (1882; repr.; Eugene, Or.: Wipf & Stock, 2004), 200.

significantly later than the previous three, and it follows a distinctly structural framework, he speaks in similar terms as Gesenius (though with a different understand regarding "normal" word order):

> L'ordre des mots dans la proposition verbale . . . est normalement: Sujet — Verbe. Mais s'il y a quelque emphases sur le prédicat on a l'ordre V.-Suj. Or, avec une particule il y a généralement emphase sur le prédicat, d'où l'ordre V.-S."[19]

Joüon's assertion that the "normal" word order for BH is S-V does not reflect the consensus at his time, nor has it found widespread acceptance since, though support for the position has increased somewhat. It is significant to note that as Joüon's reviser and translator, Takamitsu Muraoka, renders the opposite word order pattern in his translation of the same section in Joüon's grammar: "The statistically dominant and unmarked [Joüon's "normalement"] word order in the verbal clause is: Verb — Subject."[20] Though the verb-first paradigm is common to the traditional Hebraist approach, it is notable that Muraoka does not comment on the discrepancy in his translation, though he refers to it in his own separate and expanded treatment of emphasis structures in BH.[21] While Muraoka's approach is best categorized as a typological-functional approach (he employs the language of "emphasis" though he does so with a linguistic sophistication not common to the traditional approach), the prevailing interest of his subject Joüon was that of a traditional Hebraist. For his part, Brockelmann, building on the work of Schlesinger,[22] comes to the same conclusion as Gesenius: "Die Normalstellung Verbum-

---

19. Joüon, 474. Joüon does make a general distinction for poetry: "En poésie l'ordre V.-S. est assez fréquent, mais généralement motiv par quelque case particulière . . ."

20. Joüon-Muraoka, 579.

21. Muraoka, *Emphatic*, 4–5, 28–41.

22. K. Schlesinger, "Zur Wortfolge Im Hebräischen Verbalsatz," *VT* 3 (October 1953): 381–90.

Subjeckt wird nur aufgegeben, um das Subjekt hervorzuheben."[23]

While the traditional Hebraist views word order movements primarily in terms of emphasis, clause type has also been considered a related category. As mentioned above, Ewald notes that word order can be used to indicate circumstantiality, referring to an event or state of affairs that occur simultaneously with the action or state of affairs expressed in the previous clause. Müller[24] and Davidson[25] closely link circumstantiality and emphasis while Driver[26] and Muraoka[27] see circumstantiality as separate from emphasis (both prefer to link emphasis to contrast). Moshavi makes a credible case that many if not most cases of circumstantial clauses are in fact clauses that are constructed for the pragmatic reason of providing justification of the previous utterance.[28] Blau avoids a confident stance on the matter, simply noting V-S and S-V tendencies respective to "*waw-consecutive*" tenses and those not marked for sequence.[29]

As the new typological and functional methods became available to students of BH, so did new paradigms for explaining the phenomena of word order patterns. The traditional Hebraist model, as it stood, was considered by the functionalist school to be too simplistic and vague to adequately explain the varieties of word order pattern that

---

23. Carl Brockelmann, *Hebräische Syntax* (Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1956), 49.

24. August Müller, *Outlines of Hebrew Syntax*, translated from Part 3 of *Hebräische Schulgrammatik*, ed. and trans. James Robertson (Glasgow: Maclehose, 1888), ss130–31.

25. A.B. Davidson, *Hebrew Syntax*, 3 (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1901), s105.

26. S. R. Driver, *Treatise*, s160; Muraoka, *Emphatic*, 33.

27. Muraoka, *Emphatic*, 33.

28. Moshavi, *Word Order*, 21, 116–18.

29. Joshua Blau, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, reprint, 2nd ed. (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1993), 90–92.

were evident in BH. Although the traditional model was not jettisoned, it was wholly

absorbed into the new paradigm. As a result, the typological-functionalist approach has

dominated the study of BH word order for the last forty years, whether the genre of

analysis is prose narrative material [30] or verse.[31]

In the broader field of general linguistics, there are two tendencies of the

typological-functional approach which distinguish it. First, its analysis is concerned with

the statistical study of surface structure, taking into account frequency, distributional, and

pragmatic criteria, and with how these structures compare and contrast to other known

---

30. For the typological-functionalist approach as applied to BH prose, see
Francis I. Andersen, *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew* (The Hague: Mouton, 1974);
Muraoka, *Emphatic*; Revell, "The Conditioning of Word Order in Verbless Clauses in
Biblical Hebrew"; Christo H. J. van der Merwe, "Towards a Better Understanding of
Biblical Hebrew Word Order," *JNSL* 25 (1999): 277–300; Christo H. J. van der Merwe,
"Explaining Fronting in Biblical Hebrew," *JNSL* 25 (1999): 173–86; van der Merwe,
"Marked Word Order in the Book of Joel"; Jongeling, "On the VSO Character of
Hebrew"; Nicholas A. Bailey and Stephen H. Levinsohn, "The Function of Preverbal
Elements in Independent Clauses in the Hebrew Narrative of Genesis," *JTT* 5
(1992): 170–207; Barry Bandstra, "Word Order and Emphasis in Biblical Hebrew
Narrative: Syntactic Observations on Genesis 22 from a Discourse Perspective," in
Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew, ed. Walter R. Bodine (Winona Lake, Ind.:
Eisenbrauns, 1992), 109–23; Jean-Marc Heimerdinger, *Topic, Focus and Foreground in
Ancient Hebrew Narratives*, JSOTSup (Sheffield, Eng.: Sheffield Academic Press,
1999); Katsuomi Shimasaki, *Focus Structure in Biblical Hebrew: A Study of Word
Order and Information Structure* (Bethesda, Md.: CDL, 2002); Nicholas A. Bailey, "A
Second Look at Double Preverbal Constituents," *Hebrew Studies* 45 (2004): 253–76;
Adina Moshavi, "The Discourse Functions of Object/Adverbial Fronting in Biblical
Hebrew," in *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting: Typological and
Historical Perspectives*, eds. Steven E. Fassberg and Avi Hurvitz (Jerusalem and
Winona Lake, Ind.: The Hebrew University Magnes Press and Eisenbrauns, 2006), 231–
45.

31. Buth, Rosenbaum, and Gross have made significant contributions by
applying the typological-functionalist approach to BH verse. Randall Buth, "Word
Order Differences Between Narrative and Non-Narrative Material in Biblical Hebrew,"
in *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division D*, vol. 1
(Jerusalem, 1990), 9–16; Buth, "Topic and Focus"; Rosenbaum, *Word-Order Variation
in Isaiah 40–55*; Gross, *Doppelt besetztes Vorfeld*; Lunn, *Word-Order Variation.* For
Ugaritic, Sivan notes that word order is more "flexible" in verse than prose (Sivan,
Grammar, 211).

linguistic systems.[32] A second tendency of the typological-functionalist approach is the

priority it gives to the pragmatic level of language over the semantic and syntactic

levels.[33]   These tendencies lead to what is perhaps its most significant contribution to the

study of word order, the theory of *information structure*. The study of information

structure seeks to map linguistic expressions in such a way as to analyze the salient

elements of the expression.   Of the many iterations of the pragmatic theory that would

ultimately result in information structure proper, four have heavily influenced the study

of BH word order over the past two decades: Firbas's *functional sentence perspective*,[34]

Dik's *functional grammar*,[35] Givón's *discourse pragmatic* approach,[36] and Lambrecht's

---

32. Joseph H. Greenberg, "Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements," in *Universals of Language*, ed. J. H. Greenberg (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1963), 73–113; Siewierska, *Word Order Rules*, 8–14; Matthew S. Dryer, "Word Order," in *Volume 1: Clause Structure*, vol. 1 of *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, 2nd., ed, Timothy Shopen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 73–78.

33. ". . . the functional approach to language regards pragmatics as the all-encompassing framework within which semantics and syntax must be studied. It regards semantics as subservient to pragmatics, and syntax as subservient to semantics." Simon C. Dik, *Studies in Functional Grammar* (New York: Academic Press, 1980), 2. Here Dik reiterates the "three components of grammar" articulated by the Prague School as the grammatical and semantic structure of the sentence and the organization of the utterance. The final category includes prosodic features and word order. Frantisek Daneš, "A Three-Level Approach to Syntax," *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 1 (1964): 225–40.

34. Jan Firbas, *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*, reprint, 1992, Studies in English Language (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004). In his introduction to the Prague School, Vachek (Josef Vachek, *The Linguistic School of Prague* [Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1966], 88) credits Mathesius as the founder of the functional approach to the sentence that Firbas would later present in its most developed form.

35. Dik, *Studies in Functional Grammar*.

36. Talmy Givón, *Syntax: An Introduction* (Amsterdam ; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, 2001).

information structure.[37] Of these four approaches, Lambrecht's has received the most

attention in recent years by biblical scholars as it is generally understood to offer the most

complete picture of information structure dynamics.[38] Lambrecht's definition of

information structure introduces an important distinction from earlier pragmatic theory:

> That component of sentence grammar in which propositions as conceptual representations of states of affairs are paired with lexicogrammatical structures in accordance with the mental states of interlocutors who use and interpret these structures as units of information in given discourse contexts.[39]

In the Saussurean terminology, information structure, therefore, analyzes the linguistic

sign comprised of a formal *signans* ("lexicogrammatical structure") and functional or

semantic *signatum* ("propositions as conceptual representations of states of affairs"). As

such information structure is not merely concerned with syntax and lexicon nor is it

merely a pragmatic endeavor, but rather it takes into consideration both parts of the full

informational sign. Lambrecht further explains what structures he considers to be open to

analysis:

> . . . information structure is formally manifested in aspects of prosody, in special grammatical markers, in the form of syntactic (in particular nominal) constituents, in the position and ordering of such constituents in the sentence, in the form of complex grammatical constructions, and in certain choices between related lexical items.[40]

While information structure enjoys this wide application in the broader linguistic

---

37. Knud Lambrecht, *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic Focus and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994) For a brief but thorough treatment of the purview of information structure and its composite influences, see Lambrecht's introduction. Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, 1–13.

38. E.g. Lunn, *Word-Order Variation*; van der Merwe, "Marked Word Order in the Book of Joel"; cf. Moshavi, *Word Order*, 47.

39. Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, 5.

40. Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, 6.

discipline, in the realm of biblical studies, scholarly energies have been overwhelmingly focused on the particular phenomenon of word order, particularly the fronting construction as the predominant means by which information is pragmatically marked in BH. This narrow focus on word order can be defended as a necessity of dealing with dead languages. Researchers cannot interview native speakers of BH, nor do they have access to recordings of conversations in BH;[41] thus many prosodic aspects of language are lost to the modern researcher.[42] When the only record of a language is textual, word order provides one of the few measurable expressions of pragmatic, or informational, structure. The benefits of the information structure hypothesis in its various stages of development to the study of word order on BH prose are obvious in the work mentioned above (see n. 30), particularly that of Muraoka, van der Merwe, Heimerdinger, and Shimasaki, Lunn, and Moshavi. There is little doubt that efforts of linguistic description and textual interpretation and translation have been well served by the introduction of this new paradigm.

Finally, the generative approach has developed in recent years primarily in the work of DeCaen[43] and Holmstedt[44] through whom it has seen a considerable increase in visibility. To understand the distinctive features of the generative approach, a case study

41. Rosenbaum, *Word-Order Variation in Isaiah 40–55*, 19.

42. Laver defines suprasegmental description of speech as concerned with "all factors which can potentially be prolonged beyond the domain of segment . . . [e]xamples of these are . . . pitch, loudness, rate, continuity, and rhythm." John Laver, *Principles of Phonetics*, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics (Cambridge ; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1994; repr. 1995), 152.

43. Vincent DeCaen, "Theme and Variation in Psalm 111: Phrase and Foot in Generative-Metrical Perspective 1," *JSS* 54, no. 1 (2009): 81–109.

44. Robert D. Holmstedt, "Word Order and Information Structure"; Robert D. Holmstedt, "Verb Movement in Biblical Aramaic," *Hebrew Studies* 47 (2006): 436–39; Robert D. Holmstedt, "Word Order in the Book of Proverbs."

is helpful. In his study of word order in the biblical book of Proverbs, Holmstedt sets out

to develop a picture of "basic" BH word order from a corpus of clauses that is strictly

poetic, a methodology he defends by arguing that the significant generic opposition is not

between prose and poetry but between narrative and nonnarrative material. He further

defends his choice of Proverbs on the grounds that proverbs are 1) a type of dialogic

discourse, since it is between a father and a son, but without the problems that arise due

to conversational repartee, since the son does not respond, 2) discrete sayings unhindered

by the "long, pragmatically complex stretches of discourse found in prose," and 3) lack

the narrative, *wayyiqtol* verb form that requires the V be in clause initial position.[45]

Holmstedt's first point depends on Downing's opinion favoring nonnarrative (though it

should be noted that Downing is not settled on the matter),[46] qualified by Longacre's

concern about dialogue and the "exigencies of repartee."[47] If biblical proverbs are

considered dialogic, however, then so is the vast majority of BH verse, including the

Psalms and the prophetic books, which are addressed to an audience, whether divine or

human, who, like the proverbial son, never or rarely answers.[48] Furthermore, while verse

does not include the complexities involved in the presentation of a narratival main-event

line, the relaxation of syntactic constraints, including the lack of clause-coordinating

conjunctions, does pose new difficulties that Holmstedt does not address. For instance,

---

45. Robert D. Holmstedt, "Word Order in the Book of Proverbs," 137–38.

46. Pamela Downing, "Word Order in Discourse: By Way of Introduction," in *Word Order in Discourse*, ed. Pamela Downing and Michael Noonan, Typological Studies in Language (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1995), 20–21.

47. Robert E. Longacre, "Left Shifts in Strongly VSO Languages," in *Word Order in Discourse*, ed. Pamela Downing and Michael Noonan, Typological Studies in Language (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1995), 333.

48. The large number of vocatives and second person forms in BH verse collaborate this point.

Holmstedt is correct that clause-lines in BH verse are not "bound" like clauses in narrative, but that does not lead to the conclusion that word order in clauses in proverbs are less marked or more basic than prose narrative.

Holmstedt calls his approach "generative-typological" because "there is a strong typological element to [his] analysis of the BH data, but it is predicated on generative principles."[49] By "strong typological element" he means that he "recognizes the value of cross-linguistic analysis, the nuanced discussion of which clause type best approximates the basic clause type, the identification of a variety of discourse types, and the typological obsession with compiling vast sets of data."[50] He prefers, however, terminology of the Chomskyan school (e.g. "complement," "adjunct," and "specifier"[51]) and he also follows the generativist program by understanding the subject of a clause as the specifier (Spec), a head which usually sits to the "left"[52] of its phrasal complement, which is, in this case, V. It is no surprise, therefore, that Holmstedt concludes that the basic word order of BH is S-V. But he sees the generativist school as one that does not limit itself to a "naive acceptance of the final or 'surface' product as the sole object of syntactic study."[53] He explains the overwhelmingly common VS word order of narrative prose to be a surface structure under the influence of its discursive context. As Holmstedt says, there is a

---

49. Robert D. Holmstedt, "Word Order in the Book of Proverbs," 138.

50. Robert D. Holmstedt, "Word Order in the Book of Proverbs," 143.

51. Robert D. Holmstedt, "Word Order in the Book of Proverbs," 139.

52. Such terminology always assumes a left to right writing system, so that fronting constructions are considered "leftward" movements even in the case of BH in which the movement is actually rightward. Likewise, preposed constructions will sometimes be called "left dislocation" even though the actual preposed constituent occurs to the right of the clause in BH.

53. Robert D. Holmstedt, "Word Order in the Book of Proverbs," 143.

"strong typological element" in his work, and that may be his reliance on Greenberg's criteria for determining if a language's head precedes or follows its complements.[54]

Holmstedt's conclusions, however, are more influenced by what he considers a "basic clause type" which precludes dependent, modal, negative, and interrogative clauses as well as any clauses involved in contrast (it is interesting to note that this last filter only affects the number of S-V clauses). The initial sample included 504 clauses, though only 103 of these are what Holmstedt considers a "basic clause type," and of that number, 22 are VS and 81 are S-V. This corroborates his view that basic word order in BH is S-V.

Holmstedt's approach is significant primarily in showing how a generativist might approach this particular aspect of BH syntax, and this aspect alone might qualify his work as somewhat groundbreaking. His presupposition that a poetic text provides better sample for analysis of BH is somewhat problematic both on historical grounds (he does not seem interested in the relative date of the book of Proverbs) and on generic grounds (that the genre of verse allows for a wider variety of word order patterns). On the latter point, the fact that he filters out "contrastive" parallelism only touches on what is a much larger problem to his analysis: its neglect of the fact that because of its a variety of tropes, verse can accommodate word order patterns that would be aberrant in a prose text. There is another problem related to the placement of a large number of his S-V clauses in what might be called paragraph-initial contexts. He does not explore how this placement in that larger discourse might affect special word order patterns.[55]

Still, Holmstedt's discussion of basic word order is ancillary to the discussion of this paper, which will consider some of these aberrant patterns found in verse. Whether

54. Robert D. Holmstedt, "Word Order in the Book of Proverbs," 139.

55. I thank Edward Cook for bringing this last point to my attention.

basic word order is S-V or V-S, the fact remains that the vast majority of clauses in BH prose contain a V in the first or second position. In verse, V can appear in the third position. With that said, the filters used in this discussion have been influenced by Holmstedt's filters above.

Word Order Studies in Verse

Having laid out the three primary schools of word order studies in BH, it would be fruitful to consider three particular studies of BH verse that have addressed the problem of word order studies in BH verse. Two of these works, Rosenbaum and Lunn, set out explicitly to analyze word order in verse, while Gross is looking instead at verbal clauses which have two or more constituents in the preverbal field (his *Vorfeld*). Since the vast majority of such clauses occur in verse, his study is effectively a study of word order in that genre.

Rosenbaum (1997).

Rosenbaum applies the findings of functional grammar, primarily the brand of that approach articulated by Dik, to the verse of Isaiah 40–55. He concludes that basic word order pattern of BH is VSO, and that the constituents that occur immediately before this clausal core have marked pragmatic function, while other extra-clausal constituents serve other either pragmatic (information structural) or discourse functions. The resulting order is as follows:

(1)   Theme, Discourse Particle--Initial pragmatic position–VSO, Tail[56]

Rosenbaum closely follows Dik in defining these terms. Theme is pragmatically similar to topic (which he describes as the old information of the discourse), though it is "appears

---

56. Rosenbaum, *Word-Order Variation in Isaiah 40–55*, 22.

outside the predication"[57] (= *casus pendens*, preposed topic/extraposition, left disclocation, etc.). Discourse particles refer to words like אַף, אַךְ, אָכֵן, הֵן, הִנֵּה, כִּי, and וְ. The initial pragmatic position does not simply mark "emphasis" as the traditional Hebraist approach would argue, but, because functional grammar offers more precise descriptive categories, Rosenbaum can introduce notions of topic, focus and setting to describe movement to the initial pragmatic position. Such movement might also be explained by syntactic complexity so that more syntactically complex constituents follow more simple constituents (e.g. pronominalized PPs may precede S in a clause). Lastly the tail, like the theme, appears in an extra-predication position (what might be called extraposition or postposition), and it expresses what Dik calls an "afterthought"[58] a clarification or modification of what has come before it.

Rosenbaum's greatest contribution to the current study, however, is his explanation of word order patterns as a function of poetic defamiliarization.[59] He relies on Mukařovsky's notion of "foregrounding" to explain this sort of defamiliarization which breaks up the "automatic" process of communication, what he calls deautomization. "In poetic language," Mukařovsky writes, "foregrounding reaches maximum intensity to the extent of pushing communication into the background as the objective of expression and or being used for its own sake."[60] Because of the quite

57. The extra-predication positioning of the Theme is marked in the formula by a comma. Rosenbaum, *Word-Order Variation in Isaiah 40–55*, 45–46.

58. Simon C. Dik, *Functional Grammar*, 3rd (Dordrecht-Holland: Foris, 1981), 130.

59. Rosenbaum, *Word-Order Variation in Isaiah 40–55*, 149–208.

60. Jan Mukařovsky, "Standard Language and Poetic Language (1932)," in *A Prague School Reader*, ed. Paul L. Garvin (Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1964), 19.

common and different use of the term "foregrounding" to refer to pragmatically marked

constructions in contemporary Hebrew studies, the term "defamiliarization" will be used

in the following discussion.   Rosenbaum finds that this sort of defamiliarization is

expressed in "(de)familiar" patterns of inversion, insertion, and parallelism:

> The result is the development of a variety of (de)familiar patterns which serve the (poetic) function of foregrounding the language (parole). Moreover, the deployment of these (de)familiar patterns is itself a kind of communicative signal alerting the receiver that this is "foregrounded language" and special care must be taken in decoding the message.[61]

What Rosenbaum calls inversion is used to explain aberrant postverbal word order such

as V-PP-O when PP is not pronominalized. For instance,

(2)   Isa 49:24

הֲיֻקַּח מִגִּבּוֹר מַלְקוֹחַ \\ וְאִם־שְׁבִי עָרִיץ (> צַדִּיק) יִמָּלֵט: V-PP-S // S V

Can the prey be taken from the mighty // or captives of the tyrant[62] be rescued?

This A line is chiastically related to the following B line. Syntactically speaking, the

constituent order is V PP S // S V which can be described as the chiasm abc//c'a'. The

poetic function of the chiasm exerts influence on the clause in line A resulting in irregular

postverbal word order.

The construction of insertion represents a kind of janus construction[63] in which an

----

61. Rosenbaum, *Word-Order Variation in Isaiah 40–55*, 151.

62. This translation reflects the emendation, following the reading of a few medieval Hebrew manuscripts, 1QIsᵃPesh, and the Vulgate.

63. For the discussion around janus constructions, see Mitchell Dahood, "A New Metrical Pattern in Biblical Poetry," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29 (1967): 574–82; W.G.E Watson, "The Pivot Pattern in Hebrew, Ugaritic and Akkadian Poetry," *ZAW* 88 (1976): 239–53; C.H. Gordon, "New Directions," *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 15 (1978): 59–60; David Toshio Tsumura, "Janus Parallelism in Nah 1:8," *JBL* 102 (1983): 109–11.

element occurs in between constituent A and B and applies equally to both:

(3)   Isa 46:7

יִשָּׂאֻהוּ עַל־כָּתֵף יִסְבְּלֻהוּ

V PP V

They lift it *on their shoulders* they carry it.

The PP עַל־כָּתֵף can be read to apply equally to both Vs in the clause, in such a way that suggests that the word order of the two clauses binds the V in an inextricable way.

Rosenbaum also sees parallelism itself as a function of poetic defamiliarization, and it is the parallel construction that gets most of his attention. Like Kugel, he understands parallelism primarily in terms of the "connection" and "separation" between parallel lines. Connection is the binding together of parallel lines through constituent gapping, repetition, and word pairs. An opposite trajectory is initiated between the parallel lines by separation or cognitive "pause." By "pause," Rosenbaum is not referring to the prosodic pause that occurs between lines and between segments of lines, such as couplets, triplets, and so on, which are marked in the MT by the accentuation system. Rather he is referring to the cognitive pause that occurs in the reader who is confronted with a defamiliarized construction.[64] Such pause can be caused by defamiliarized word order such as the OV word order pattern.[65]Rosenbaum introduces defamiliarization as a guiding principle for a variety of word order patterns that occur in a poetic text like Isaiah 40–55, he considers it to be employed apart from and in exclusion of other pragmatic purposes. Since he is not dealing with highly irregular word order patterns (even the O-V

---

64. Rosenbaum, *Word-Order Variation in Isaiah 40–55*, 176.

65. Rosenbaum, *Word-Order Variation in Isaiah 40–55*, 177.

construction he cites in regards to "pause" is not particularly irregular in prose texts), we

need not press the issue further. The strong distinction between pragmatic and

defamiliarized constructions does not appear, however, until the work of Lunn, who deals

explicitly with irregular word order patterns.

Gross (1996, 2001).

Walter Gross has contributed to the study of word order in two areas: a 1996 study

that looks at the basic clausal word order in prose,[66] and a 2001 study that looks at two

constituents in the preverbal field, what he calls the *Vorfeld* and which corresponds with

the "initial pragmatic position" of Rosenbaum's framework.[67] The constituents which

occur on the other side of the verb, postverbal constituents, are found in the *Hauptfeld*.

This conceptualization of verbal arguments in two fields relative to the position of the

verb (*Stellungsfeldermodel*) is drawn from grammatical studies of modern High

German.[68] In the 1996 he study, he established a pragmatically neutral word order from

clauses found in a prose corpus comprised of Deuteronomy, Judges, and Kings.

(4) Verb - Subject - Direct Object - Indirect Object - Locative Complement -
Adjunct - Locative Adjunct - Temporal Adjunct[69]

These constituents may be affected by non-pragmatic influences, such as what Gross calls

Längeregel ("rule of length") which is synonymous with LIPOC, the acronym articulated

---

66. Walter Gross, *Die Satzteilfolge im Verbalsatz alttestamentlicher Prosa: Untersucht an den Büchern Dtn, Ri und 2 Kön* (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1996).

67. Gross, *Doppelt besetztes Vorfeld*.

68. This view of the clause is also found in Disse's analysis of word order. Andreas Disse, *Informationsstruktur im Biblischen Hebräisch: Sprachwissenschaftliche Grundlagen und exegetische Konsequenzen einer Korpusuntersuchung zu den Büchern Deuteronomium, Richter und 2 Könige*, Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache Im Alten Testament (St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1998).

69. Gross, *Die Satzteilfolge Im Verbalsatz*.

by Dik ("Language Independent Preferred Order of Constituents")[70] and used by Rosenbaum.[71] This rule predicts that constituents with less syntactic complexity will precede constituents with more syntactic complexity. A related rule is that of the pronoun, that pronominalized constituents (particularly prepositions with pronominal suffixes) move closer to the verb in the clause. Gross points out these rules to show that not all word order patterns are pragmatically influenced. Pragmatic influence, however, is the main reason for word order variation, when the above rules do not apply. In short, constituents which are moved away from their neutral position are pragmatically marked. Since the neutral position of verbal complements is near to the verb, these constituents are moved into focus (pragmatically heighted as salient information) by moving away from the verb. The opposite is true of adjuncts (optional constituents that are not arguments of the verb) which are neutrally located away from the verb and move into focus by moving toward the verb in the clause.

Gross's conclusions have the benefit of dealing with focus movement that is multidirectional respective to complements (in focus, move away from V) and adjuncts (in focus, move toward V), a feature which helps him account for unexpected constructions. His analysis is one of the only studies to deal with the questions of postverbal word order patterns, with the possible exception of Lode's two part study,[72] though Lode's study is somewhat idiosyncratic and not nearly as complete as Gross's method and extent. Van der Merwe has already pointed out the terms Gross uses to

70. Dik, *Functional Grammar*, 21.

71. Rosenbaum, *Word-Order Variation in Isaiah 40–55*, 137–38.

72. Lars Lode, "Postverbal Word Order in Biblical Hebrew: Structure and Function," *Semitics* 9 (1984): 113–64; Lars Lode, "Postverbal Word Order in Biblical Hebrew: Structure and Function (Part Two)," *Semitics* 10 (1989): 24–39.

describe the pragmatic values of the main field ("focus" and "background") are not broad enough and ill-defined,[73] but his categories become more precise and descriptive between his 1996 and his 2001 monographs.[74]

Gross's interest is in word order patterns in verbal clauses, particularly those irregular patterns in which there are two constituents in the preverbal field. His work of fronted constructions is augmented by his previous and thorough work on preposed constructions. Unlike Rosenbaum and Lunn, Gross does not make much of the distinction between prose and poetic texts (see Pardee's same complaint about this with preposed constructions[75]) even though the vast majority of his examples of two constituents in the preverbal field come from verse.[76] While the bulk of his examples are found in the context of verse, he does not find much value in accounting for word order patterns as a manifestation of poetic device. He does acknowledge that poetic function does influence some cases in which two constituents in the preverbal field occur, but he does not consider such function to replace or overrule the primary pragmatic function of word order. His gaze, therefore, is almost wholly directed to the pragmatic function of the two constituents in the preverbal field, particularly the interplay of three opposing pairs at work: Topic-Comment, Theme-Rheme, and Focus-Background.[77]

---

73. van der Merwe, "Towards a Better Understanding," 290. See also Pierre van Hecke, "Job 12–14. A Functional-Grammatical and Cognitive-Semantic Approach," DTh dissertation in *From Linguistics to Hermeneutics: A Functional and Cognitive Approach to Job 12–14*, Studia Semitica Neerlandica (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 81.

74. van Hecke, "From Linguistics to Hermeneutics," 77.

75. Dennis Pardee, review of *Die Pendenskonstruktion im Biblischen Hebräisch: Studien zum Althebräischen Satz*, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51 (1989): 326–29.

76. Gross, *Doppelt besetztes Vorfeld*.

77. Also, following Disse (Disse, *Informationsstruktur*).

Gross's two studies together have been lauded as some of the more complete and rigorous analyses of word order in verbal clauses. According to Fassberg,[78] Gross's 1996 monograph is the closest thing to a complement to Andersen's seminal monograph on word order patterns in verbless clauses.[79] Gross's influence will be most keenly felt in the methodology employed to define clause immediate constituents and their place in the clausal structure, and in the study of postverbal constituents (his *Hauptfeld*) since he is one of the few grammarians to complete an exhaustive study of that syntactic field.

Lunn (2006).

As has already been mentioned in the previous chapter, Lunn finds inspiration for his work with word order in the studies in the work of Victor Shklovsky, a figure from the Russian Formalist school, who explored the significance of *defamiliarization*[80] (also translated *estrangement*[81]) in literary production. Lunn applies the notion of defamiliarization to the artful language of BH verse, with the intent of describing the seemingly extensive word order variation found in the verbal clauses of verse. When Lunn speaks of word order variation, he is only concerned with preverbal word order, and, unlike Gross, he rarely distinguishes between the order of the multiple constituents

---

78. Steven E Fassberg, review of W. Gross, *Die Satzteilfolge im Verbalsatz alttestamentlicher Prosa: Untersucht an den Büchern Dtn, Ri und 2 Kön*, *JSS* 45 (2000): 361–63.

79. Francis I. Andersen, *The Hebrew Verbless Clause in the Pentateuch*, JBLMon (New York and Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1970).

80. The Russian term *ostraneniye* which has to do with the process of making something strange or unfamiliar. Shklovsky's best discussion of how the defamiliarization is constitutive of the literary process is in his 1917 essay translated and reprinted in Shklovsky, "Art as Technique."

81. For instance, Svetlana Boym, "Poetics and Politics of Estrangement: Victor Shklovsky and Hannah Arendt," *Poetics Today* 26, no. 4 (2005): 581–611.

that occur before the verb, only that they do in fact occur in a position prior to the verb in a poetic clause. His neglect of postverbal word order is not accidental. Rather, he has concluded that postverbal word order is not susceptible to meaningful patterning and examination.[82]

He correctly notes that word order patterns in prose are somewhat stable, so that "canonical" word order patterns emerge,[83] but he is also convinced that these canonical word order patterns are disregarded in BH poetry relatively frequently. By comparing a sample of poetic texts to a sample of prose texts, Lunn shows that "[a] significant shift, therefore, occurs in poetry from the norms of the regular register of language [i.e. prose] to its own particular conventions," and this shift can be explained, in part, by Shklovsky's notion of defamiliarization. Of course, others have noted the presence of peculiar word order in BH poetry, though few have connected it to this broader notion of defamiliarization. Among those who have noted peculiar word order as a feature, Watson[84] and Sappan[85] are highlighted by Lunn, though he leaves out Hillers,[86] presumably because Lunn is not interested with the sort of postverbal word order variation that Hillers is analyzing.

----

82. Lunn, *Word-Order Variation*, 7–8.

83. Canonical word order refers to the basic V-S-(O)-(M) configuration (in which M=modifier) found in BH prose, which in Lunn's case is most Classical Biblical Hebrew. His understanding of word order canon expands to include fronting, even double fronting, if he can explain the fronting constituents pragmatically. Lunn, *Word-Order Variation*, 7.

84. Wilfred G.E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*, 46.

85. Sappan, *Typical Features*, iv.

86. Hillers, "Observations on Syntax and Meter in Lamentations."

For Lunn, poetic defamiliarization does not describe every case of preverbal word order variation found in BH poetry. While some verbal postponement might be explained by mere artistic device, most cases (75%) can be described by the categories of information structure developed by Lambrecht, on whom Lunn greatly depends.[87]

The criteria for discerning the pragmatic interpretation of the non-canonical line is somewhat impressionistic, a criticism which has been voiced about other applications of information structure theory. Indeed, van der Merwe has shown how all of the non-canonical lines in poetry might be explained by "semantic-pragmatic" (that is, informational) categories.[88] In fact, the operative categories of "topic" and "focus" are fluid and susceptible to broad application like that of van der Merwe's analysis. For his study of Joel, van der Merwe points out that topic can be drawn from any field "relevant" to the discourse including "Joel's historical background, Joel's people, Joel's sociocultural and religious setting, Joel's poetic features, Joel's language, and so forth," that is, anything and everything that can be defined as active in the discourse. Likewise, his definition of focus is expansive. Focus is anything said about a topic that either a) introduces new information (thus creates a new proposition), b) alters a previous proposition, or c) confirms a previous proposition.[89] With such a broadly defined description, it would be hard to falsify any proposed case of topicalization.

When non-canonical word order patterns occur that cannot be explained by information structure, Lunn resorts to poetic defamiliarization in order to explain the cause of the irregular pattern. In the case of parallel lines, if the postponement occurs in

---

87. Lambrecht, *Information Structure*.

88. van der Merwe, "Marked Word Order in the Book of Joel," 111–12.

89. van der Merwe, "Marked Word Order in the Book of Joel," 112–13.

the B-line, it is considered defamiliarization; if the postponement occurs in the A-line, it is considered a marked information structure. Van Hecke has pointed out that this methodology hinges on a particular understanding of parallelism.[90]

Lunn also acknowledges that many of these cases are difficult to explain by either information structure or defamiliarization. Some of these cases he leaves as a question mark and others, he argues, serve a discourse function occurring at discursively significant places in the text (i.e. stanza boundaries and peaks). This description runs the risk of seeming ad hoc and impressionistic, since, given typical stanza length of 6-8 lines, it would be hard for a particular line not to fall near or on a boundary or peak of the stanza.

It will be the position of this paper that all clauses with two preverbal constituents are defamiliarized whether or not there is an explanation to be garnered from the categories of information structure, such as topic and focus. Regardless of such explanations, this study will evaluate the extent to which certain peculiar constructions occur in verse that do not occur in prose and the degree to which they are subject to any syntactic constraints.

Complements and Adjuncts

So what might a study of word order in poetry that is primarily concerned with syntactic relations look like? Previous studies of syntax in BH poetry have adopted relatively simple models of syntactic analysis which are built on the traditional grammatical categories, S for subject, V for verb, O for object, and P or PP for prepositional phrase or perhaps, M for modifiers in general. Such simplicity brings with it several considerable benefits, not the least of which is its accessibility to readers. A

_____

90. van Hecke, "From Linguistics to Hermeneutics," 89–90.

study is only as successful as it is absorbed into the scholarly discussion into which it speaks, and multiplying technical grammatical words does not multiply readership, rather quite the opposite is true. Similarly, the linguistically sophisticated student of BH poetry must resist the temptation to impose on the target language the linguistic structure of his native language. One must only be as precise as the linguistic structure with which one is working allows. Still, the point at which one moves from helpful to unhelpful precision is difficult to perceive in a language in which one is not a native speaker. The danger of unwitting over-analysis is a constant threat.

The best way to test analytical models is, however, simply to apply them to the target language to see if they are useful in explaining and predicting, or perhaps generating, the feature of that language. Such a "trial and error" approach is successful either a) if it proves the value of a certain linguistic feature as an aspect of certain language's structure, or b) if it rules out a certain linguistic feature as an aspect of a certain language's structure. This investigation into peculiar word order in BH poetry will include an analysis of a linguistic feature which has not received much attention in the study of structure of BH. This particular aspect of the analysis deserves special discussion here.

The feature has to do with the distinction between complements and adjuncts at the level of the verbal phrase. The categories of complement and adjunct are used by both the functional and generative schools, with slight differences between the two approaches. The current study will aim at a descriptions of these categories that will be sufficient for both schools.

A description of argument structure would be a helpful starting point. Radford defines the study of argument structure as an attempt "to describe the role played by

particular types of expression in the semantic structure of sentences."[91] If a sentence is described as a proposition, the argument structure describes how the proposition is "comprised of a predicate and a set of arguments."[92] Such arguments include what is called "subject" and "object" in traditional grammar, and they are understood to be necessary to the particular verb of the predication. That is not to say that they are always overt in the clause.   For instance, the clause

(5)   We ate.

is not problematic even though the verb "ate" takes a NP complement as an O (i.e. is transitive) as part of its argument structure, but the NP complement (e.g. "dinner") does not need to be overt in the clause.[93] The S or O are arguments of the verb, though only O is considered a complement of the verb.[94] In BH, a simple distinction between the S and

_____

91. Andrew Radford, *Minimalist Syntax: Exploring the Structure of English*, Cambridge Textbooks of Linguistics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 435.

92. Radford, *Minimalist Syntax*, 248.

93. Complements that have the quality of being either overt or covert in the expression are sometimes referred to as optional (cf. Robert D. Van Valin, *An Introduction to Syntax* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001], 93), but I prefer to use the overt/covert distinction to disambiguate this quality of certain complements from the optional quality of adjuncts.

94. In the generative X-bar theory, objects are referred to as external complements, while subjects are referred to as "internal objects" (Radford, *Minimalist Syntax*, 249; also A. Alsina, "Argument Structure," in *The Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, vol. 1, eds. Keith Brown, Anne H. Anderson [Amsterdam ; Boston: Elsevier, 2006], 461–68). These categories are not to be confused with Chomsky's early distinction between "internal" and "external" postmodifiers (Noam Chomsky, *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax* [Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1965], 101–03), which refer to what are later called complements and adjuncts, respectively. In his linguistic introduction to the book of Ruth, Holmstedt calls NP complements "accusative complements" (Robert D. Holmstedt, *Ruth: A Handbook on the Hebrew Text*, Baylor Handbook on the Hebrew Bible [Waco, Tx.: Baylor University Press, 2010], 5).

the complement can be drawn by the fact that, on the one hand, the finite V agrees with S but not its complements; on the other hand, NP complements (O) can be pronominalized and suffixed to the finite verb.[95]

Other complements include a PP when the verb necessarily takes one, as does the verb "gave" in the following clause:

(6)   I gave the flower to Mary.

The verb "gave" takes an NP complement (O) and a PP complement (in this case the recipient of the verb). It should be noted that the verb "gave" can take two NP to express the same thematic roles, but its argument structure requires a change in word order putting the NP (recipient) before the NP (O), resulting in the following clause:

(7)   I gave Mary the flower.

When a complement is a PP in BH, it can be called an "oblique complement."[96]

Unlike verbal complements, verbal adjuncts are not arguments of the predication, which means that they are not necessary for the completion of the clause.[97] In BH, adjuncts are primarily present in the form of a PP, but adjunct NPs sometimes occur. Adjuncts give further information about the event or state of affairs in the proposition, most typically the time, place, or manner in which the event took place.

(8)   I spoke to Kate in the evening.

---

95. Moshavi, *Word Order*, 62.

96. Robert D. Holmstedt, *Ruth: A Handbook on the Hebrew Text*, Baylor Handbook on the Hebrew Bible (Waco, Tx.: Baylor University Press, 2010), 5.

97. In his discussion of verbal valence ("the number of dependents that a head may take"), Van Valin prefers to use the terms "adjunct" and "argument," instead of "complement." Van Valin, *An Introduction to Syntax*, 92.

The verb "spoke" in (8) takes a complement PP "to Kate"(addressee), but the PP "in the evening" provides optional information that is not required by the verb. It is an adjunct Likewise, in BH, a complement PP and an adjunct PP often occur in the same clause. Example (9) provides an illustration:

(9) Ps 7:8

וַעֲדַת לְאֻמִּים תְּסוֹבְבֶךָּ \\ וְעָלֶיהָ לַמָּרוֹם שׁוּבָה:

May the assembly of the nations surround you // Over it, return to the height.

The V שׁוּבָה takes an overt or covert complement PP (locative - origin, path, goal), which is overt in the PP לַמָּרוֹם. The pronominal suffix of the PP וְעָלֶיהָ refers back to the וַעֲדַת לְאֻמִּים "assemblies of the people" in the previous line, so that the first PP describes the place where the event of the VP לַמָּרוֹם שׁוּבָה occurs.[98]

Verbal complements and adjuncts in English can be distinguished in other ways that also shed light on the distinction in BH. For instance, the complement of a verb can be passivized while the adjunct cannot.

(10) (a) Naomi lectured on word order.

(b) Naomi lectured on Monday.

---

98. In X-bar theory, adjuncts are described as "sisters and daughters of V-bar," while only complements can be a sister of V. For a more detailed description of complements and adjuncts with the phase of generative grammar know as Transformational Grammar, see Andrew Radford, *Transformational Grammar*, Cambridge Textbooks of Linguistics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 230–40; Ray Jackendoff, $\overline{X}$ *Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*, Linguistic Inquiry Monographs (repr. 1977; Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991). This is an earlier form of the generative grammar that Radford currently espouses in his more recent work (Radford, *Minimalist Syntax*; Andrew Radford, *Analysing English Sentences: A Minimalist Approach [Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics]* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1 edition, 2009]).

In sentence (10a), the PP "on word order" is a complement of the verb, whereas in (10b) the PP "on Monday" is a temporal adjunct. Therefore, the complement PP can be passivized while the adjunct PP cannot.

(11)   (a) Word order was lectured on by Naomi.

        (b) **Monday was lectured on by Naomi.

It should be noted that (11b) is not grammatical only if the PP is taken as a temporal adjunct. If the context demanded that it be taken as a complement (e.g., "During the series on the origin of the names of weekdays, Naomi lectured on "Monday.") then (10b) and (11b) are both grammatical sentences.

Another common way in which complements are distinguished from adjuncts in English is the way in which complements can be "pronominalized" by the phrase "do so."[99] The phrase "do so" has been called a pro-verb since it can be used to replace a VP (verb + all verbal complements) or a VP and adjuncts in a verbal clause. The following two sentences are Radford's examples:

(12)   (a) John will buy [NP the book] [PP on Tuesday]

        (b) John will put [NP the book] [PP on the table][100]

Though the sentences seem to have the same structure of V NP PP, upon a closer look the PP in (12b) is a complement PP because the V "put" takes a PP complement locative (goal). The V in (12a) "buy" does not take a PP complement, and it is an adjunct PP

99. Jackendoff calls the "to do so" constituent a "pro-V-bar" (Jackendoff, $\overline{X}$ *Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*, 58).

100. Radford, *Transformational Grammar*, 234.

expressing temporal setting. The replacement phrase "do so" must replace the whole VP (verb + all verbal complements), and it can replace the whole VP and adjuncts (verb + all complements + adjuncts), but it cannot replace part of the VP (verb + fewer than all complements). Radford uses the following sentences to show the contrast:

(13) (a) John will [buy the book on Tuesday], and Paul will *do so* as well.

       (b) John will [buy the book] on Tuesday, and Paul will *do so* on Thursday.

(14) (a) John will [put the book on the table], and Paul will *do so* as well.

       (b) **John will [put the book] on the table, and Paul will *do so* on the chair.[101]

The temporal PP "on Tuesday" in (13a) is an adjunct of the VP "buy the book," and therefore it can either be included or not included in the "do so" replacement as seen in the (13a) and (13b). The locative PP "on the table" is a complement of the V "put" (with the NP "the book"), and therefore it must be included in the replacement "do so," which explains why (14b) is not grammatical.

A similar distinction can be made by use of ellipsis. The V and all verbal complements can be elided with or without the accompanying verbal adjuncts.[102] So that the following pair are grammatical:

(15) (a) Who might buy a book when?

       (b) John might on Tuesday.

but the following pair result in an ellipses that is ungrammatical:

---

101. Radford, *Transformational Grammar*, 234.

102. A. Akmajian, S. Steele, and T. Wasow, "The Category AUX in Universal Grammar," *Linguistic Inquiry* 10 (1979): 20–21.

(16)   (a) Who might put the book where?

        (b) **John might on the table.

The phrase "put the book" cannot be elided in (16b) because it is not itself a complete constituent since it lacks the locative complement PP "on the table."[103]

Complements and adjuncts can also be distinguished in English by ordering rules. Simply put, postverbal complements tend to occur closer to the verb than postverbal adjuncts, so that the following contrast results:

(17)   (a) Naomi bought the book today.

        (b) **Naomi bought today the book.

(17b) is ungrammatical because the verb and complement are separated the adjunct.

Finally, in English it should be noted that the complement is typically obligatory while the adjunct is never obligatory.

(18)   (a) Charlotte put [NP the book] [PP on the table] [ADVP today].

        (b) **Charlotte put [PP on the table] [ADVP today].

        (c) **Charlotte put [NP the book] [ADVP today].

        (d) **Charlotte put [ADVP today].

        (e) Charlotte put [NP the book] [PP on the table].

Only the adjunct adverbial phrase (ADVP) is optional in the sentence, while the complements are obligatory.

There are particular challenges that arise when a non-native speaker attempts to

_____

103. Radford, *Transformational Grammar*, 236–37

distinguish complements from adjuncts in a given language.[104]   Because there have not

been many studies of BH syntax that focus on the distinction between complements and

adjuncts,[105] this line of inquiry is relatively open. The distinction between complements

and adjuncts can be developed from observations of the BH lexicon, such as distribution

and frequency of verbal complements based on the mean of the verb and the thematic

roles it seems to require.   Certain verbs assign certain thematic roles[106] that are necessary

to the verbal action. Waltke and O'Connor use similarly semantic terms to describe the

complement as the "obligatory constituent" of a given clause, as opposed to the adjunct

which is an "optional constituent."[107] They begin their discussion by treating these

categories as matters of transitivity and intransitivity, so that a direct object is by nature

complementary and an adverbial accusative is by nature adjunctive. This is an important

distinction to make, one that will be followed in current study. However, admitting that

"proper categorization of Hebrew verbs is a more complex task than hinted here," they

---

104. Sometimes the distinction between complement and adjunct can only be sensed by the native speaker. For instance,

> I will give help.
> *I will give rescue.

This difference is one of collocational restrictions, but would be difficult to explain to a non-native speaker. Peter H. Matthews, *Syntax*, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics (Cambridge: Cambridge, 1981), 124.

105. For a few exceptions, see Takamitsu Muraoka, "Verb Complementation in Biblical Hebrew," *VT* 29 (1979): 425–35; Takamitsu Muraoka, "Verb Complementation in Qumran Hebrew," in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leiden University, 11–14 December 1995*, vol. 26, ed. T. Muraoka and J.F. Elwolde, Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 222; Gross, *Die Satzteilfolge Im Verbalsatz*; Moshavi, *Word Order*, 61–63.

106. While "thematic role" is the preferred terminology by Radford in 2004, the more algebraic "θ-role" is his preferred term in 2009. Radford, *Minimalist Syntax*, 251–54; Radford, *Analysing English Sentences*, 243–49.

107. Waltke-O'Connor, 163.

acknowledge that "direct and prepositional objects may be similarly used in different clause types."[108] In BH, discrete object complements (not including pronominal suffixes) can occur alone, with the direct object marker אֶת, and with other prepositions. The following examples are illustrative:

(19)   Gen 18:7

וַיִּקַּח בֶּן־בָּקָר רַךְ וָטוֹב

He took a tender and good *calf*.

(20)   Gen 2:15

וַיִּקַּח יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם

The Lord God took *Adam*.

(21)   Gen 7:9

כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה אֱלֹהִים אֶת־נֹחַ

. . . just as God commanded *Noah*.

(22)   Gen 2:16

וַיְצַו יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים עַל־הָאָדָם

The Lord God commanded *Adam*.

In each of the cases above, the word in italics is the complement object of the verb, though those complements are communicated through a variety of constructions: as a NP alone (19), an NP with אֶת (20-21), and as a PP (22). In this study, אֶת will not be treated as a preposition but rather in the same way as an unmarked NP direct object. Because the constraints common to BH verse, אֶת constructions are not common. When the

_____

108. Waltke-O'Connor, 163.

complement object is a PP, it will be categorized as an "oblique complement."[109]

Several observations can be made about the structural features of the complement and the adjunct. For instance, in BH complements tend to be attracted to the verb in the standard V-S-O-(PP) word order as long as all constituents are lexical words. Likewise, non-subject pronominalized constituents also tend to be attracted to the verbs in such a way that they will occur in the first post-verbal position (V-X-S).[110] Adversely, adjuncts and lengthy constituents, such as those in which relative clauses are embedded, tend to be drawn toward the end of a clause.

The current analysis will consider the distribution of three main categories related to argument structure: subjects, complements, and adjuncts. Each clause exhibits a postponement construction, so special attention will be paid to how these constructions may or may not be constrained by the placement of the subject, complements, and adjuncts.

Corpus

The corpus of BH verse which will make up the sample set for the current study will include to Genesis 49, Exodus 15, Numbers 23-24, Deuteronomy 32 and 33, Judges 5, 2 Samuel 1, Isaiah 40-48, Habakkuk 3, Zephaniah 1-3, Zechariah 9, Psalms 1-25, 78, 106, and 107. This corpus provides a body of verse that includes all or a large part of the

---

109. Robert D. Holmstedt, *Ruth*, 5.

110. In other words, there is a well-known tendency in BH for pronominalized constituents to move closer to the verb in a sentence. Pronominalized PP will often occur between the verb and the subject in an otherwise standard BH clause. *BHRG*, 341. This tendency is variously articulated as Gross's *Längeregel* (Gross, *Die Satzteilfolge Im Verbalsatz*, 270–71) and Dik's LIPOC (Rosenbaum, *Word-Order Variation in Isaiah 40–55*, 137–43).

corpora used in the three recent and significant analyses of BH verse: O'Connor,[111] Rosenbaum,[112] and Lunn.[113]

This study is interested in the whole of BH verse not the merely practice as it is limited to a particular era or function. To address this interest, the corpus is designed to reflect a variety of biblical texts which represent diverse periods, genres, and subjects. Occurrences of constituent postponement will be culled from this sample corpus, analyzed, categorized, and evaluated. When postponement appears to be correlative with a particular chronological context (whether early [Yahwistic Poetry of Genesis 49, Exodus 15, and so on] or late [Isaiah 40-48, Zechariah 9]) or function (redemptive historical [Psalm 78], prophetic oracle [Zeph 1-3], and so on), such correlation will be discussed in the observations.

The notes on particular lines do not begin to account for the previous scholarship that informs their final result. Where the MT line division is not followed, a note will usually explain the departure. Verse segments are divided in to sub-segments using the simpler letter divisions ("a," "b," "c," etc.), instead of the common binary sigla ("a1α," "a1β," etc.) that is commonly used to preserve the MT system.

---

111. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 167–69.

112. Rosenbaum, *Word-Order Variation in Isaiah 40–55*, 1–2.

113. Lunn, *Word-Order Variation*, 10.

CHAPTER 4

VERBAL POSTPONEMENT

Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the distribution and type of V-Postponement in BH verse as it is represented by the corpus chosen for this study. The following analysis will show that word order is generally less constrained in BH verse, but that the occurrence of peculiar word order patterns is perhaps not as common as previously thought. Holmstedt has argued that certain generic distinctions should be taken into account, and so he sets out to argue for a theory of basic BH word order built on an analysis of the book of Proverbs.[1] Lunn differentiates between "non-canonical" word order patterns that could be explained by the theory of information structure and other patterns that could only be explained as poetically defamiliarized.[2] The argument below holds that verbal postponement (V-postponement), the word order pattern in which the verb occurs after two or more preverbal (but not preposed) constituents, is allowable only because of the relaxed syntactic constraints evident in BH verse. With that said, however, V-postponement needs to be treated as a discrete word order pattern, carefully distinguished from otherwise common patterns. Many clause-lines that seem to exhibit V-postponement are, in fact, commensurate with the conventional syntactic constraints of CBH prose, and so the criteria of the phenomenon of postponement needs to be carefully defined.

---

1. Robert D. Holmstedt, "Word Order in the Book of Proverbs," 135–36.

2. Lunn, *Word-Order Variation*, 6–8.

74

Finally, this analysis will not appeal so much to information structure or poetic device as it will to basic syntactical constraints and constructions.

Criteria

In the analysis of V-postponement, the decision must be made about what defines the parameters of a clause, which constituents are immediate to the clause, which constituents exist outside of the clause structure (e.g., extraposition), and which constituents do not count as filling a syntactic position in the clause (e.g., certain adverbs). The following discussion accounts for the criteria applied in this analysis to verbal clauses in BH verse from the corpus.

Preposed Constituent.

The common occurrence of a preposed constituent ("left dislocation" or *casus pendens*) in BH verbal and verbless clauses should not be analyzed as a case of verbal postponement since postponement refers solely to immediate constituents of the clause.[3] The preposed topic, by definition, resides outside of the immediate structure of the clause. This superstructural nature of the preposed constituent is perhaps most evident in the requirement of a resumptive, or anaphoric, pronoun marking the position of the preposed constituent in the clausal structure.[4]

-----

3. Gross argues that the fact that the medieval Arab grammarians did not distinguish between *pendens* constructions and constituents topicalized in the preverbal position but not resumed in the main clause has led to residual confusion about the difference between these two constructions. Gross concludes that such ambiguity in description gave rise to problematic notions such as the "compound nominal clause." Gross, "Compound Nominal Clause," 24.

4. Thomas E. Payne, *Describing Morphosyntax: A Guide for Field Linguists* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 274–75; William A. Foley, "A Typology of Information Packaging in the Clause," in *Volume 1: Clause Structure*, vol. 1 of *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, ed. Timothy Shopen. 2nd ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 443.

(1)   X (preposed constituent), V X(pro)

It should be noted that, in verbal clauses, the preposed topic does not need to come from the immediate clause structure but may be even more deeply embedded. For instance:

(2)   Deut 28:54 (cf. 56)

הָאִישׁ הָרַךְ בְּךָ וְהֶעָנֹג מְאֹד תֵּרַע עֵינוֹ בְאָחִיו

The tender and most sensitive among you, *his* eye will begrudge his neighbor.

In this case, the preposed element is resumed in the pronominal suffix of the S of the clause. These cases of deep embedding are common in BH prose.

Driver describes the function of the preposed topic in BH prose as a matter of both pragmatic and prosodic effect:

> This possesses more advantages than one: not only does it give the subject (or object) a prominent place at the beginning, and ease the body of the sentence by permitting a light pronominal suffix to take its place; but it further rounds the sentence off, and gives it an ending upon which the voice may suitably rest."[5]

Both effects are employed in a manner that increases the readability of BH prose, as any reader of the Old Testament can appreciate. Driver puts forward Gen 28:13 as a clear illustration of the clarifying function.

(3)   הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה שֹׁכֵב עָלֶיהָ לְךָ אֶתְּנֶנָּה וּלְזַרְעֶךָ׃

The land upon which you are lying, I will give *it* to you and to your offspring.

In this case, the object of the verb ("it") refers to the preposed topic ("the land upon which you are lying"), the first constituent of the main clause is also the first coordinated PP, benefactive, indirect complement ("to you"), followed by the verb (including the

------

5. S. R. Driver, *Treatise*, 265.

resumptive object suffix, "I will give it") and the second coordinated PP, also

benefactive, indirect complement ("and to your offspring"). This clause could be

rendered,

(4)   Preposed Object, PP #1–Verb (+ O [pron.])–PP #2

Since the preposed constituent is situated outside of the clause structure, the word order

fits the expected constraints of CBH prose, primarily that of the verb occurring in the

second position, preceded by only one constituent (in this case PP #1). Driver's

explanation that this is an instance of the clarifying function of the preposed topic seems

highly plausible. Without the extraposition of the object, the clause would result in a

clumsy read:

(5)   לְךָ אֶתֵּן הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה שֹׁכֵב עָלֶיהָ וּלְזַרְעֶךָ:

As with a similar example in Gen 35:12 (וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נָתַתִּי לְאַבְרָהָם וּלְיִצְחָק לְךָ אֶתְּנֶנָּה), the

preposed topic is employed to clarify the main clause, and allow for another constituent,

in this case the PP, to be fronted, presumably on pragmatic grounds.

Generally speaking, the preposed topic structure is indexed by the presence of a

resumptive pronoun in the main clause.[6] In the vast majority of cases, this indexing is

overt, but it should be pointed out that not all preposed topics are so indexed. For

instance, the resumptive pronouns are not necessarily overt in verbal clauses in which the

subject is preposed. Hebrew after all is a language in which S may be dropped, meaning

---

6. Joüon is broad in his proclamation, "A noun or pronoun is often placed at the
head of a clause in such a way as to stand aloof from what follows, and then *resumed* by
means of a retrospective pronoun." [italics his] Joüon-Muraoka, 586. Muraoka:
"Another characteristic feature of the phenomenon is that the extraposed or fronted
sentence part is usually resumed later by means of a pronominal element pointing back
to it." Muraoka, *Emphatic*, 93.

that the pronominalized subject can be encoded in verbal inflection and therefore not be

overt. Driver acknowledges this feature of BH,[7] and more recently Naudé has examined

this feature of BH in depth.[8] For this reason, all clauses whose surface structure seems to

reflect V-postponement and the first constituent is an independent personal pronoun were

ruled out as clear cases of V-postponement. This is not to say that these are not cases of

V-postponement, just that they are not necessarily V-postponement Among such cases

are the following:

(6)   Deut 33:29 וְאַתָּה עַל־בָּמוֹתֵימוֹ תִדְרֹךְ (see also Isa 45:2)

(7)   Hab 1:10 וְהוּא בַּמְּלָכִים יִתְקַלָּס (see also Ps 17:15)

In both (6) and (7), the pronoun in the first position could be construed as resumed in the

inflectional structure of the verb, allowing the pronoun to be read as preposed. On the

other hand, in the following case of (8), the pattern is O-S-V with the S pronominalized.

Since the S is not in the first position, it should not be analyzed as preposed, but rather as

a case of V-postponement. The S is preverbal and pronominalized, but, because it occurs

in the second position, following the O of the clause, it must be analyzed as occurring

within the immediate clause structure:

(8)   Gen 39:22

כָּל־אֲשֶׁר עֹשִׂים שָׁם הוּא הָיָה עֹשֶׂה

---

7. S. R. Driver, *Treatise*, 266.

8. Jacobus A. Naudé, "Qumran Hebrew as a Null Subject Language," *SAJL* 9 (1991): 119–25; Jacobus A. Naudé, "On Subject Pronoun and Subject Noun Asymmetry: A Preliminary Survey of Northwest Semitic," *SAJL* 11 (1993): 17–28 It should also be noted that Bordreuil and Pardee classify clauses with SV order in which the S is an independent personal pronoun (e.g. ʾatm bštm w ȧn šnt = ȧttuma bāšātumā wa ʾanā šanîtu "as for you, you may tarry, but as for me, I'm off.") as *casus pendens* (Bordreuil and Pardee, *A Manual of Ugaritic*, 66).

Everything that was done there, he was doing.

This case is interesting in several ways, most of all because it is found in a prose context. First, it is possible that הָיָה was added to a verbless clause (הוּא עֹשֶׂה) resulting in a periphrastic construction that is more common to Late Biblical Hebrew. The O of the clause is a relative clause (כָּל־אֲשֶׁר עֹשִׂים שָׁם) that seems to be fronted for pragmatic purposes. One might expect, however, that the preposed construction would be preferable here, but there is no resumptive pronoun. This may be because of the use of similar participles (עֹשִׂים and עֹשֶׂה) in the relative clause and in the periphrastic construction of the main clause. The plural participle עֹשִׂים can be explained either as referring to the antecedant כָּל־הָאֲסִירִם in the previous clause, or as a plural form used for unspecifed subject (also a common feature of LBH). The singular participle in the main clause refers to Joseph as the subject. As the Hebrew text stands, this seems to be a somewhat rare O-S-V pattern in a prose context, though without the periphrastic הָיָה the order would be regular.[9] Buth has shown how when another constituent is moved before the participle then the subject must necessarily precede the participle.[10] In participial clauses of this type, the subject and the participle seem to make up the nexus of the predication, though Buth seems to disagree with this assertion.[11] In this case, the object is moved to the front, requiring the subject to precede the participle, resulting in a regular

---

9. Randall Buth, "Word Order in the Verbless Clause: A Generative-Functional Approach," in The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Approaches, vol. 1, ed. Cynthia L. Miller, Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1999), 1:87–90.

10. Buth, "Word Order in the Verbless Clause: A Generative-Functional Approach," 87.

11. Buth, "Word Order in the Verbless Clause: A Generative-Functional Approach," 87 n.18.

word order pattern. Of course, this requires understanding הָיָה to be a secondary addition.

In prose contexts, other examples of possible preposed S pronouns resumed only in inflection of the verb include Gen 17:9 [possibly vocative]; 41:15; 42:8b, 37b; 43:9, 14; 45:; 46:4; 47:30; 48:22; Exod 2:9; 3:19; 4:12 [with הָיָה]; 4:16b [with הָיָה]; 6:5; Lev 26:16a [preceded by אַף]; Num 3:12 [followed by הִנֵּה]; 14:35a; 17:6b; 23:19b [interrogative particle הֲ]; Deut 1:41a; 3:24a; 9:3a; 29:15a; 31:18a; 32:21a, 21b, 39b.[12]

To insure that a clause truly exhibits two or more preverbal clause-immediate constituents, cases with a pronoun in the first position (like those above) will not be included in the following analysis. It is recognized that this decision is perhaps the most controversial and has a significant reductive effect on the number of clauses under analysis due to the large number of putative V-postponement patterns in which the first constituent is an independent personal pronoun. The decisions seems necessary, nevertheless, in the interest if insuring that the analysis considers only clear and bona fide cases of V-postponement.[13]

Adverbs.

There is a class of words that are usually categorized as adverbs though they appear to occur in what might otherwise be considered an "accusative" case.[14] Such

------

12. Cases in which a 2nd person form of the pronominalized S precedes an imperative are ruled out as a preposed construction on the assumption that such a pronoun should be understood in the vocative (see Gen 6:21, 9:7; 42:16).

13. Clauses with independent personal pronouns will be included in the analysis of S- and O-postponement.

14. In this way, the accusative in BH really is the predicate case, not necessarily the object case. Any immediate constituent of the predicate would be in the accusative

adverbs often concern time, place, or manner and are always adjunctive, so they should be

distinguished from NP complements. It does not help to analyze these adverbs as the

same as other PPs under one large category such as "modifier" (M)[15] or adverb (A),[16]

since these adverb NP seem to move more freely than typical adjunct PP in prose

contexts. In BH such adverbs include יַחְדָּו (and יַחַד) "together," מְאֹד "very" (almost

always modifies an adjective or stative verb [tensed adjective] or a piel verb that is

causative of stative), לְפָנִים "formerly," אֶמֶשׁ "last night,"and תָּמִיד "again, regularly."

The nearly universal linguistic tendency to allow some adverbs to occupy almost

any position within a sentence seems to hold true for several classes of adverb in BH

prose. Another way to say this would to be that some adverbs do not take a clause-

immediate position in the clause, but rather they seem to float free of the typical syntactic

slots that make up the structure of the clause. For instance, in English, there is little

difference between the following four statements:

(8)   Speedily I swam to shore.[17]

(9)   I speedily swam to shore.

(10)   I swam speedily to shore.

(11)   I swam to shore speedily.

case.

15. See Lunn's use of this category in a very general way.

16. Joüon-Muraoka, 548.

17. This example could be interpreted to mean that the action was undertaken in a quick or immediate fashion, not that the action itself was done "speedily" (as in the other examples). My point still stands but (9) is indeterminate as it stands. Likewise, in (8) and (11) the adverb could be taken to modify the entire verb phrase "swam to shore," whereas in (9) and (10) the adverb modifies only the verb "swam."

The predicate adverb "speedily"[18] can even come between an auxiliary verb and the main verb:

    (12)   I will speedily swim to shore.

Though it should be noted that the adverb cannot occur anywhere within a clause. In the case of the clause above, the adverb is not allowed to break up the PP:

    (13)   **I swam to speedily shore.

While the adverb does not fill a position as a constituent, it is still limited as to where it can occur; it cannot break up another constituent phrase, as it does in the ungrammatical clause (13).[19] The adverb is a constituent, but it does not occupy a position of its own as such. In the case of BH, the corpus of BH prose shows that the common adverb יַחְדָּו can occur at just about any position in the BH clause:

    (14)   X = יַחְדָּו

    (14a)   S X V: Deut 12:22

        הַטָּמֵא וְהַטָּהוֹר יַחְדָּו יֹאכְלֶנּוּ

---

18. Following the classification of Haser and Kortmann (V. Haser and B. Kortmann, "Adverbs," in *The Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, vol. 1, eds. Keith Brown and Anne H. Anderson [Amsterdam ; Boston: Elsevier, 2006], 1:67).

19. Radford makes a further distinction in the case of English, that adverb placement in a clause determined by aspects of meaning and the verb and it is modifying, so that they following contrast can be shown:

    (a) He had deliberately rolled the ball gently down the hill.
    (b) *He had gently rolled the ball deliberately down the hill.

The contrast can be accounted for by observing that the meaning of "deliberately" requires that it only be an adjunct of an agentive verb. "The verb *roll* is a non-agentive agentive predicate because its subject has the θ-role [i.e. thematic role] THEME, not AGENT" (Radford, *Minimalist Syntax*, 342–43).

(14b)   V X PP: Gen 22:19

וַיָּקֻמוּ וַיֵּלְכוּ **יַחְדָּו** אֶל־בְּאֵר שָׁבַע

(14c)   V PP X (where P ≠ pron.): Deut 22:10

לֹא־תַחֲרֹשׁ בְּשׁוֹר־וּבַחֲמֹר **יַחְדָּו**

Clauses (14a), (14b), and (14c) occur in prose environments, but the adverb does seem to enjoy the same freedom in verse.

(15)   Ps 4:9

בְּשָׁלוֹם יַחְדָּו אֶשְׁכְּבָה וְאִישָׁן

In peace I both lie down and sleep

Distinguishing adverbs from objects and from other "modifiers" provides a rationale for analyzing (15) as PP-V-V,[20] due to the fact that the adverb does not occupy its position in the clause. Likewise, Gen 31:29 presents a similar case:

(16)   Gen 31:29

וֵאלֹהֵי אֲבִיכֶם אֶמֶשׁ אָמַר אֵלַי

The God of your fathers spoke to me last night.

This is a normal BH clause in prose, because the adverb אֶמֶשׁ does not act as a second preverbal constituent. This clause is correctly analyzed by its verbal arguments: S-V-PP.

_____

20. PP = prepositional phrase; V = verb.

Because these adverbs do not seem to occupy a syntactic slot in the BH clause, they will not be counted in the following analysis.[21]

Discourse Markers.

A class of particles in BH can be categorized as discourse markers, some of which can affect the way in which word order in a clause is analyzed. In some cases, these particles seem to occupy a position at a higher level than the clause structure, and in other cases, the particles seem to occupy a position that extends from the higher syntactic level to the immediate level. To use some basic labels from generative grammar, the clause level or Tense Phrase (TP) deals with the predication, while the supra-clause level or Complementizer Phrase (CP) deals with the predication as it is oriented in the discourse, or what we could describe as the contextualized predication level. Using this multilevel understanding of the clause, we can begin to categorize certain particles as members of TP in which case they would occupy a syntactic slot in our analysis and those particles which orient the clause, as heads of CP, and therefore do not occupy a syntactic slot in our analysis.

The three particles אֲשֶׁר, כִי, and כַּאֲשֶׁר illustrate the ways in which different particles operate on different and sometimes overlapping levels. It seems that אֲשֶׁר operates as the head of a TP and therefore occupies a slot, always the first slot, in a clause (so that, in prose, the V must follow אֲשֶׁר) if the clause is verbal.[22] In (17) אֲשֶׁר should be

---

21. Moshavi talks about clausal adverbs that are immovably in the first position of the verbal clause. The word category that she is addressing is complex and probably includes some element of predication (e.g. הנה) which she does not discuss. Even so, her category of clausal adverb fits perhaps more closely what I am describing as discourse particles in the section below. Moshavi, *Word Order*, 68–75.

22. See Holmstedt (Robert Holmstedt, "The Relative Clause in Biblical Hebrew

analyzed as occupying the first position of the subordinate clause it heads:

(17)   Gen 2:19

וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר יִקְרָא־לֹו הָאָדָם נֶפֶשׁ חַיָּה

and whatever the man named every living thing

When the particle כִּי occurs at the head of a clause, on the other hand, it operates as a conjunction at the CP level and therefore does not occupy a slot in the syntax of the TP. The following clause shows how the two discourse particles contrast:

(18)   Gen 2:3

כִּי בֹו שָׁבַת מִכָּל־מְלַאכְתֹּו אֲשֶׁר־בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים לַעֲשֹׂות

. . . Because in it he ceased from all of his work that God created to do.

Unlike אֲשֶׁר, the conjunction כִּי is not an argument of the verb. Because כִּי occurs in CP or in the level that orients the predication of the clause, it does not occupy a slot in the clause and so can be followed by another constituent than V.   This means that a preposed constituent can occur between the the כִּי particle and main clause. For example, in the following line (19) כִּי occurs before the preposed independent pronoun אַתָּה:

(19)   Psalm 18:28

כִּי־אַתָּה עַם־עָנִי תֹושִׁיעַ

But you will save an afflicted people.

- a Linguistic Analysis" [Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin - Madison, 2002], 252–57), though he reads אֲשֶׁר to be part of CP. The example he gives of an exception to the V in the first position order (Isa 62:2) is poetic.
     If the clause headed by a אֲשֶׁר has a predicative ptc. with an overt subject, then the subject always comes before the ptc. indicating that both subject and verb might be considered part of the verbal field in the case of predicative participial construction (e.g. Deut 28:49).

This case would not be analyzed as V-postponement, because the pronoun is preposed, putting V in the second position.

The particle כַּאֲשֶׁר appears to span CP and TP so that it orients the predication but also occurs directly before the V because it occupies a slot in the predication itself.

(20)   Gen 7:16

וְהַבָּאִים זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה מִכָּל־בָּשָׂר בָּאוּ כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה אֹתוֹ אֱלֹהִים

And those that entered, male and female from all flesh, entered just as God had commanded.

In cases that include אֲשֶׁר or כַּאֲשֶׁר , the particle will be analyzed as occupying the first position. In cases that begin with כִּי , the particle will not be analyzed as occupying a slot in the predication.

Constituents of the Clause

As has already been seen, postponing the verb to the third, fourth, or fifth position in a clause-line is, in itself, a defamiliarizing technique of BH verse. While such postponement rarely occurs in BH prose, its frequent occurrence in BH verse exhibits a defamiliarization whether or not it can be explained in terms of information structure or otherwise. It is in itself a poetic technique unique to the sphere of verse, though good verse will collaborate such a defamiliarizing technique with notions of topic and focus to a heightened communicative effect.

In the area of syntax, in could be asserted that the sense of defamiliarization is achieved through the relaxation of syntactic constraints on constituent pattern (as opposed to constituent number, which reflects a tightening of syntactic constraints [see

O'Connor[23]]), including verbal gapping, asyndesis, and word order. In particular, V-postponement reflects relaxed syntactic constraints, not only in the fact of the V-postponement but in the varieties of preverbal word order patterns. In the following description, these varieties are organized primarily by the categorial labels (NP, PP, V) and labels related to basic argument structure (subject, complement, adjunct).

This analysis will use the following labels:

- verb (V) when that V is finite and the main clause predicator of the clause-line
- noun phrase (NP)
- Relativizer אֲשֶׁר will be marked REL when it is an argument of the verb
- prepositional phrase (PP)
- subject (s) is marked as NPs which is the NP that agrees with V in person, number, and gender
- complement (c) is marked like subject (e.g. NPc is a NP that is a complement of V)
- adjunct (a) is marked like subject and complement (e.g. PPa is a PP that is an adjunct of the clause)
- predicate nominative (pred) is marked NPpred when the NP is the predicate nominative of the verb הָיָה

To be sure, notions of complementation and adjunction present a problem due to the ambiguity that comes with them especially in a language in which a person is not a native speaker. It is that much more difficult to feel the necessity of a complement and the optionality of an adjunct. That does not mean, however, that such notions completely

---

23. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 67–78.

elude the reader of BH. Therefore, judgments concerning complementation and adjunction will be made based on the semantic content of the verb and assumptions about what complements the verb selects (see above discussion in ch. 3).

The column labeled trope below refers to the type of poetic device that links the line (whether as a whole or by it's individual elements) to one or more other lines. The most common trope type in this sample, and indeed in all of BH verse, is the trope of matching. Matching can occur with or without constituent (usually verbal) gapping. The phenomenon, which will be explained in depth below will be labelled:

- MatchGap when gapping occurs
- MatchNoGap when gapping does not occur

Likewise, the trope of syntactic dependency will be labelled "SynDep". This label refers to what has traditionally been called enjambment, the spanning of a clause across two lines, so that the clause can not be understood completely with reading both lines.

Cases of V-Postponement in the Sample

Using the criteria above, a query of the sample, returned 94 clauses in which V occurs in the third or fourth position. These cases were drawn form a sample of 514 eligible clauses and they account for 18.3% of the sample. Table 1 shows each case:

Table 1. Cases of V-Postponement

Citation	Text	Constituent Structure	Trope	Line
Gen 49:13 a	זְבוּלֻן לְחוֹף יַמִּים יִשְׁכֹּן Zebulum will dwell on the shore of the seas	NPs PPc V	MatchGap	A
Num 23:9c	הֶן־עָם לְבָדָד יִשְׁכֹּן Behold, a people live alone	De NPs PPa V		A
Num 23:24a	הֶן־עָם כְּלָבִיא יָקוּם Behold, a people rise up like a lion	De NPs PPa V		A
Num 24:9b	וּכְלָבִיא מִי יְקִימֶנּוּ Like a lion, who will rouse him	PPa NPs V		B
Deut 32:12a	יהוה בָּדָד יַנְחֶנּוּ [24] The Lord alone guides him.	NPs NPa V		A
Deut 33:2a[25]	יהוה מִסִּינַי בָּא The Lord came from Sinai.	NPs PPc V	MatchNoGap	A
Deut 33:3b[26]	כָּל־קְדֹשָׁיו בְּיָדֶךָ <וְהֵמְתַכּוּ> All his saints bow themselves in your hand.	NPs PPla V		B

---

24. It is possible that NPa here is not an adjunct of V but of NPs, however, the preposition לְ would be expected if that were the case (see Ps 4:9). When the word occurs without the preposition, it tends to be an adjunct of the verb (Lev 13:46; Deut 33:28; Jer 15:17; 49:21).

25. In this case, the locative is a complement of a verb of translocation which does take a locative; furthermore, the verb of this line and the syntactically matching next line (וְזָרַח מִשֵּׂעִיר לָמוֹ) takes locative complements both of origin and source.

26. This is conjectural. Closely following the S-L word order apparent in the poetic line of Deut 33:2 comes another similarly configured line. This reading entails a textual emendation repointing וְהֵם תֻּכּוּ to the 2 c. pl. pft. form of the Gt stem from the root מכך with the meaning "to bow themselves". Hempel (*BHS*, 349) proposes this reading as does O'Connor (Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 209) following Cross and Freedman (Frank Moore Cross, Jr. and David Noel Freedman, *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*, The Biblical Resource Series [Grand Rapids, Mich..: Eerdmans, 1997], 76 n.16).

Deut 33:11d	וּמְשַׂנְאָיו מִן־יְקוּמוּן: [27] Of those who hate him, who will rise up?	PPla NPs V		B
Deut 33:17c	בָּהֶם עַמִּים יְנַגַּח With them he gores the nations.	PPa NPc V	SynDep	A
Deut 33:19a	עַמִּים הַר־יִקְרָאוּ They call peoples to the mountain.	NPc PPa V [28]		A
Deut 32:38	אֲשֶׁר חֵלֶב זְבָחֵימוֹ יֹאכֵלוּ who ate the fat of their sacrifices.	RELc NPc V		C
Judg 5:17a	גִּלְעָד בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן שָׁכֵן Gilead stayed in the Trans-Jordan.	NPs PPc V		A
Judg 5:26a	יָדָהּ לַיָּתֵד תִּשְׁלַחְנָה She reached out her hand to the tent peg.	NPc PPc V	MatchGap	A

---

27. This case deserves some discussion. I am taking וּמְשַׂנְאָיו to be a G ptc. with a partitive *min-* prefix, translated "of those who hate him, who will rise up." The preposition מִן must be repointed as the interrogative pronoun מַ for this reading as well. O'Connor takes the *mem-* as an enclitic, though he also repoints מִן to מַן (Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 212). The MT has וּמְשַׂנְאָיו the D ptc., which in turn is the object of the impv. in the preceding line (מְחַץ), and the preposition מִן governs the impf. verb. The resulting line "Break the backs, those who rise up against him // and those who hate him so that they cannot rise up." My reading does raise the question of whether there is a syntactic break between the וּמְשַׂנְאָיו and מִן since the interrogative pronoun might require that it occurs at a clause boundary, perhaps due to its quality of being a complementizer. This raises a complex question that will not be answered here, but it should be noted that this might be a sort of preposing construction and not a case of verbal postponement at all.

28. In this case, the V is taken to be plural with an indefinite subject and thus a passive meaning, or it should be repointed to the N stem יִקָּרְאוּ. The former reading is preferable because it is entirely plausible and does not require repointing the MT.

2 Sam 1:25c	יְהוֹנָתָן עַל־בָּמוֹתֶיךָ חָלָל[29] Jonathan is slain in your high places.	NPs PPa V	MatchNoGap	B
Isa 40:10a	הִנֵּה אֲדֹנָי יהוה בְּחָזָק יָבוֹא Behold, the Lord God will come with might.	NPs PPa V		A
Isa 40:11a	כְּרֹעֶה עֶדְרוֹ יִרְעֶה He will tend his flock like a shepherd.	PPca NPoc V	MatchNoGap	A
Isa 40:12b	וְשָׁמַיִם בַּזֶּרֶת תִּכֵּן He marked off the heavens with a span.	NPc PPa[30] V	MatchNoGap	B
Isa 40:13b[31]	וְאִישׁ עֲצָתוֹ יוֹדִיעֶנּוּ׃ Or what man teaches him his counsel.	NPs NPc V		B
Isa 40:19b	וְצֹרֵף בַּזָּהָב יְרַקְּעֶנּוּ A refiner overlays it with gold.	NPs PPa V		B
Isa 40:20a	הַמְסֻכָּן תְּרוּמָה עֵץ לֹא־יִרְקַב יִבְחָר The poor chooses wood that will not rot for an offering.	NPs NPc [R. cl.] V		B

_____

29. The text should be repointed as a pft. form of the G stem, with the meaning "to be slain / pierced" instead of the adj. form in the MT. Several Greek manuscripts, including Theodotion, read εἰς θανατον ἐτραυματίσθης , retroverting the clause למות חללת in which the PP assigns result (you are pierced to death"). McCarter favors this reading, particularly with the Lucianic addition ἐμοί (לי) which, he notes, begins a series of three לי phrases (P. Kyle McCarter, _II Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes, and Commentary_, The Anchor Bible [Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984], 73).   Apart from being somewhat redundant, these Greek variants are not preferable. In the MT reading, the line of v. 25b syntactically matches its preceding line v. 25a, which includes a clear locative (אֵיךְ נָפְלוּ גִבֹּרִים בְּתוֹךְ הַמִּלְחָמָה) and therefore suggests that the role should be extended to this line.

30. It is possible that this verb takes the instrument complement when used to mean "distribute/arrange (See Job 28:25 וּמַיִם תִּכֵּן בְּמִדָּה "he meted out the waters by measure"), though if this is the case, this only seems to happen in Hebrew, and not in the cognate uses of the D stem of the root in Aramaic ("תקן/תכן" [_DNWSI_, 1228]) or in the Akkadian ("_tuqqunu_" [_CAD_ 18, 198–99]).

31. This B-Line continues the question of the A line. It is not possible to read these two lines as syntactically dependant, since וְאִישׁ acts pronominally in the place of the interrogative מִי in the A line.

Isa 40:23b	שֹׁפְטֵי אֶרֶץ כַּתֹּהוּ עָשָׂה: He reduces the judges of the earth to nothing.	NPc PPc V	SynDep	B
Isa 40:24e	וּסְעָרָה כַּקַּשׁ תִּשָּׂאֵם: The wind carries them away like chaff.			
Isa 40:26d	לְכֻלָּם בְּשֵׁם יִקְרָא He summons them from name.	PPc PPc V	MatchNoGap	B
Isa 40:27d	וּמֵאֱלֹהַי מִשְׁפָּטִי יַעֲבוֹר: My judgment is passed over from my God.	PPc NPs V	MatchNoGap	B
Isa 40:29b	וּלְאֵין אוֹנִים עָצְמָה יַרְבֶּה: He increases strength for those who lack might.	PPcPPc	MatchNoGap	B
Isa 41:3b	אֹרַח בְּרַגְלָיו לֹא יָבוֹא: A way he has not gone by his feet.	NPc PPa V		B
Isa 41:6a[32]	אִישׁ אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ יַעְזֹרוּ Each one helps his neighbor.	NPs NPc V		A
Isa 41:15d	וּגְבָעוֹת כַּמֹּץ תָּשִׂים: You make the hills like chaff.	NPc PPc V[33]		B
Isa 41:17b	לְשׁוֹנָם בַּצָּמָא נָשָׁתָּה Their tongues dry out with thirst.	NPs PPa V		B
Isa 41:27b	וְלִירוּשָׁלִַם מְבַשֵּׂר אֶתֵּן: I will give Jerusalem a bearer of good news.	PPc NPc V		B

---

32. This case is different from the reciprocal construction אִישׁ־לְרֵעֵהוּ "each to his friend" (Exod 18:7; Deut 19:11 (discontinuous complement); Judg 7:13 discontinous complement; Ruth 4:7; 1 Kings 8:31; 2 Chron 6:22; 18:7; Est 9:19, 22; Jer 23:27; 34:15,17; Zech 3:10) since the second word in Isa 41:6 has the direct object marker and is therefore clearly an argument of the verb whereas, in the reciprocal construction, לְרֵעֵהוּ is typically taken to be a nominal complement.

33. Note that these arguments are identical to Isa 40:23.

Isa 42:1d	מִשְׁפָּט לַגּוֹיִם יוֹצִיא: He shall bring forth judgment on the nations.	NPc PPc V	MatchNoGap	B
Isa 42:4c	וּלְתוֹרָתוֹ אִיִּים יְיַחֵילוּ: The coastlands wait for his instruction.	PPc NPs V	MatchNoGap	C
Isa 42:8b	וּכְבוֹדִי לְאַחֵר לֹא־אֶתֵּן I will not give my glory to another.[34]	NPc PPc V	MatchGap	A
Isa 42:12b	וּתְהִלָּתוֹ בָּאִיִּים יַגִּידוּ: Let them declare his praises in the coastlands.	NPc PPa V	MatchNoGap	B
Isa 42:13a	יהוה כַּגִּבּוֹר יֵצֵא The Lord goes out like a mighty man.	NPs PPa V		A
Isa 44:16b	עַל־חֶצְיוֹ בָּשָׂר יֹאכֵל Over half of it, he eats meat.	PPa NPc V		B
Isa 44:17a	וּשְׁאֵרִיתוֹ לְאֵל עָשָׂה The remainder he makes into a god.	NPc PPc V	MatchNoGap	A
Isa 44:19f	וְיִתְרוֹ לְתוֹעֵבָה אֶעֱשֶׂה And the remainder he has made an abomination.	NPc PPc V	MatchNoGap	A
Isa 45:12b	וְאָדָם עָלֶיהָ בָרָאתִי I created mankind upon it.	NPc PPa V		B
Isa 45:14c	אַנְשֵׁי מִדָּה עָלַיִךְ יַעֲבֹרוּ Men of stature will come over to you.	NPs PPc V	SynDep	B
Isa 46:2c[35]	וְנַפְשָׁם בַּשְּׁבִי הָלָכָה: They themselves go into captivity.	NPs PPc V		C

---

34. See the same line in Isa 48:11c.

35. The verb of translocation selects NPl as indirect complement here in the second position, though it should be noted that וְנַפְשָׁם has a meaning that is somewhat similar to pronominalization (cf. Baltzer's translation as illustrative ". . .and they themselves went into captivity." Klaus Baltzer, *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40–55*, Hermeneia [Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2001], 253).

Isa 46:4b	וְעַד־שֵׂיבָה אֲנִי אֶסְבֹּל Until your hair is gray, I will support you.	PPa NPs V		B
Isa 46:6b	וְכֶסֶף בַּקָּנֶה יִשְׁקֹלוּ They weigh out silver by the reed's length.	NPc PPa V	SynDep	B
Isa 48:3a	הָרִאשֹׁנוֹת מֵאָז הִגַּדְתִּי I declared the former things long ago.	NPc PPa V		A
Isa 48:8d	וּפֶשַׁע מִבֶּטֶן קֹרָא לָךְ You were called a rebel from the womb.	NPs PPa V PPc		B
Isa 48:11c	וּכְבוֹדִי לְאַחֵר לֹא־אֶתֵּן My glory I will not give to another.[36]	NPc PPi V		C
Isa 48:16b	לֹא מֵרֹאשׁ בַּסֵּתֶר דִּבַּרְתִּי From the beginning I have not spoken in secret.	PPa PPa V		A
Isa 48:21b	מַיִם מִצּוּר הִזִּיל לָמוֹ He made water flow from the rock for us.	NPc PPc V PPc[37]		B
Hab 3:2d	בְּרֹגֶז רַחֵם תִּזְכּוֹר In wrath, you must remember compassion.	PPa NPc V	MatchGap[38]	B

---

36. See the same line in Isa 42:8b.

37. This reading of לָמוֹ as locative complement is the most likely ("he caused water to flow from the rock to them"), but it is possible that it should be read benefactive adjunct ("he caused water to flow from the rock for them [*for their benefit*]").

38. Object is backgapped or what O'Connor called "leftward gapped" (the only other occurrence of this in his corpus is Judg 5:4). Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 504

Hab 3:3a[39]	אֱלוֹהַּ מִתֵּימָן יָבוֹא God came from Teman.	NPs PPc V	MatchGap	A
Hab 3:4a	וְנֹגַהּ כָּאוֹר תִּהְיֶה His splendor was like the sunlight.	NPs PPpred V	MatchGap	A
Hab 3:11b	לְאוֹר חִצֶּיךָ יְהַלֵּכוּ Your arrows go about as light	PPc NPs V[40]	MatchGap	A
Hab 3:16f	לַעֲלוֹת לְעַם יְגוּדֶנּוּ׃ During a rising a people will invade us.	PPa NPs[41] V		B
Zeph 2:4a	כִּי עַזָּה עֲזוּבָה תִהְיֶה For Gaza will be forsaken.	NPs NPpred V	MatchGap	A
Zeph 2:7b	בֵּית יְהוּדָה עֲלֵיהֶם יִרְעוּן The house of Judah will graze on them.	NPs PPc V	MatchNoGap	B

---

39. The verb of translocation selects L as an oblique complement. It is unclear whether the rare divine name אֱלוֹהַּ is attracted to the beginning of the line. The postponed verb is gapped in the B-line, which may explain why it is drawn to the end of the A-line. Such placement places it in a janus position in the line. This explanation is provisional and, by no means, required for other couplets in which the verb of the A-line is gapped in the B-line.

40. In this reading, the arrows and the spear replace the sun and moon respectively as luminaries, (cf. Isa 60:19), reading "the arrows will go about as light, the spear as glow " (J. J. M. Roberts, *Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah: A Commentary*, Old Testament Library [Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1991], 141–42 n.57–

58); cf. LXX εἰς φῶς βολίδες σου πορεύσονται εἰς φέγγος ἀστραπῆς ὅπλων σου (though the second line seems to read a construct relationship between לְנֹגַהּ בְּרַק).

41. I follow O'Connor in reading the second לְ as emphatic here (Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 239), though it would be possible to read this as a PP head of an asyndetic relative clause "to come upon the people who invade us" (Roberts, *Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah*, 147).

Zeph 2:7c[42]	בְּבָתֵּי אַשְׁקְלוֹן בָּעֶרֶב יִרְבָּצוּן In the estates of Ashkelon they will lie down in the evening.[43]	PPa PPa V		C
Zeph 2:9c	כִּי־מוֹאָב כִּסְדֹם תִּהְיֶה Moab will become like Sodom.	NPs PPpredc V	MatchGap	A
Zeph 2:14c[44]	גַּם־קָאַת גַּם־קִפֹּד בְּכַפְתֹּרֶיהָ יָלִינוּ The desert owl and the screech owl will lodge in her columns.	NPs PPc V	MatchNoGap	A
Zeph 3:5c	בַּבֹּקֶר בַּבֹּקֶר מִשְׁפָּטוֹ יִתֵּן Every morning he gives his judgment.	PPa[45] NPc V		A
Zeph 3:10a-b	מֵעֵבֶר לְנַהֲרֵי־כוּשׁ עֲתָרַי \\ בַּת־פּוּצַי יוֹבִלוּן מִנְחָתִי׃ From beyond the rivers of Cush my worshipers, // the daughter of my dispersed ones, will bring my offering.	PPc NPs V NPc	SynDep	A-B

---

42. This is surely the B-line in completion, and בֵּית יְהוּדָה cannot be construed with the previous line (as in the ESV, KJV, NAS, NIV, NRS translation). This reading is based on a misreading of שְׁאֵרִית as a construct form, but the construct form which is identical to the absolute form. Furthermore, if read as a construct chain, the resulting A-line would be too long, and the resulting B-line will be much too short.

43. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 250.

44. The line need not be divided, since the line configuration is not irregular from a syntactical view. (Following O'Connor's analysis, the line configuration 134 (1 clause predicator [=verb], 3 constituents, 4 units [=words]) falls into what O'Connor calls "Class II" line types, a category that includes the second most common line types (along with 013 and 233 types), occurring in 19% (236) of his corpus. The 134 type itself occurs 79 times or in 6% of the corpus [Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 317–19]). The two NPs constituents are in apposition to one another, so that this line matches the following line: S-P-V // S-V-P or what O'Connor classifies as a simple back-flip chiasm (Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 395).

45. The idiom בַּבֹּקֶר בַּבֹּקֶר is taken as one PP.

Zech 9:14a[46]	וַיהוה עֲלֵיהֶם יֵרָאֶה The Lord will appear over them.	NPs PPa V	MatchNoGap	A
Zech 9:14c[47]	וַאדֹנָי יהוה בַּשּׁוֹפָר יִתְקָע The Lord God will sound the trumpet.	NPs PPc V		A
Ps 3:5a	קוֹלִי אֶל־יהוה אֶקְרָא My voice I will cry out to the Lord.	NPc[48] PPc V		A
Ps 5:13b	כַּצִּנָּה רָצוֹן תַּעְטְרֶנּוּ: You surround them with favor like a shield.	PPa NPc V		B

---

46. Though נִרְאָה does select an experiencer complement, that complement is not always overt (Gen 1:9; 8:5; 9:14; Exod 13:17; Judg 5:8; 19:30; 1 Kings 6:18; 10:12; Prov 27:25; Song 2:12). When the complement is overt, the verb takes the preposition אֶל (Gen 46:29; Lev 13:19; Judg 13:10; 1 Kings 18:1). Here the עֲלֵיהֶם does not refer to the experiencers but rather to the location where the occurrence will take place, marking the superiority of the Lord. This line matches the following line with no gapping, and a mirror chiasm S-PP-V - V-PP-S (Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 393).

47. If read with 9:14a (see above), the entire verse is comprised of two bound couplets each with the chiastic order NPs PPa V: V PPc NPs, though because S is not present in the last line, that couplet exhibits syntactic dependency:

וַיהוה עֲלֵיהֶם יֵרָאֶה
וְיָצָא כַבָּרָק חִצּוֹ
וַאדֹנָי יְהוִה בַּשּׁוֹפָר יִתְקָע
וְהָלַךְ בְּסַעֲרוֹת תֵּימָן

The Lord will appear over them	NPs PPa V
His arrows like lightning will fly	V PPc NPs
The Lord Yhwh will blow the horn	NPs PPc V
and he will go in the storms of the south	V PPc

The chiastic form of the surface structure of each couplet corroborates the defamiliarized word order found in each B-line. The V in v. 14c does take an NPc when the object is the thing being "projected" whether as a sword or a tent peg, but the horn in this case is the device by which the signal is emitted (see תְּרוּעָה as NPc in Num 10:5).

48. It is possible though unlikely that this NP should be analyzed as a preposed constituent that is resumed in the first person form of the verb.

Ps 6:7c	בְּדִמְעָתִי עַרְשִׂי אַמְסֶה׃ I drench my couch with tears.	PPa NPc V	MatchNoGap	B
Ps 6:10b[49]	יהוה תְּפִלָּתִי יִקָּח׃ The Lord will receive my prayer.	NPs NPc V	MatchNoGap	B
Ps 7:6c	וּכְבוֹדִי לֶעָפָר יַשְׁכֵּן Let him lay my glory in the dust.	NPc PPc V	MatchNoGap	B
Ps 7:8b	וְעָלֶיהָ לַמָּרוֹם שׁוּבָה׃ Over it return on high.	PPa PPc V		B
Ps 7:14b	חִצָּיו לְדֹלְקִים יִפְעָל He makes his arrows into fiery bolts.	NPc PPc V	MatchNoGap	B
Ps 7:17b	וְעַל קָדְקֳדוֹ חֲמָסוֹ יֵרֵד׃ Violence will come down on his head.	PPc NPs V		B
Ps 9:8a	וַיהוָה לְעוֹלָם יֵשֵׁב The Lord sits enthroned forever.	NPs PPa V	MatchNoGap	A

---

49. The NPs NPc V order is clear in this example, which is the second member of two syntactically matching lines with the word order V NPs NPc // NPs NPc V:

שָׁמַע יהוה תְּחִנָּתִי
יהוה תְּפִלָּתִי יִקָּח׃

Both lines include the divine name though this does not seem to affect word order, and both lines contain different verb forms, pft. and impf., most likely to convey the continuing accessibility of the Lord to the psalmist's prayers. The NPs NPoc V structure of the B line seems to be simply a function of what O'Connor calls a "back flip chiastic order" a b c // b' c' a', and pragmatic concerns do not seem to come into play. O'Connor lists eight word orders available to second lines of two matching lines, "if both lines have three constituents in their surface structure forms . . . [and] if account is taken of the chiastic arrangement after verb gapping." The "back-flip chiastic order" of Psa 6:10 falls into the category of "intermediate chiasm" meaning that it is more complex than a "simple chiasm" (e.g., a b c // b' a' c') and less complex than the "most complex chiasm (e.g. a b c // c' b' a') (Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 393–94).

Ps 9:13a[50]	כִּי־דֹרֵשׁ דָּמִים אוֹתָם זָכָר For he who avenges blood remmebers them.	NPs NPc V		A
Ps 10:2a	בְּגַאֲוַת רָשָׁע יִדְלַק עָנִי In his pride, the wicked pursued the afflicted.	PPa NPs V NPc		A
Ps 10:7a[51]	אָלָה פִּיהוּ מָלֵא His mouth is filled with curse.	NPc NPs V[52]	SynDep	A
Ps 10:8c[53]	עֵינָיו לְחֵלְכָה יִצְפֹּנוּ׃ His eyes secretly set against the poor.	NPs PPc V	MatchNoGap	C

---

50. This A line is not syntactically matched to the B line, though there is a clear semantic parallel. The A line is headed by כִּי, but while the complementizer does influence in word order in BH prose, the NPs NPc V word order is still peculiar here in a causal clause. The A line does not syntactically match the B line, though it is dubious to argue, as Lunn does, that a defamiliar line in one of two members of a non-parallelism serves some sort of discourse function, particularly in a poem where one in two paired lines occurs at a point of closure. Lunn, *Word-Order Variation*, 190Lunn, *Word-Order Variation*, 190.

51. If the MT is reliable: The text string should be parsed as the first of two short lines that are syntactically dependant with the second line being a two constituent phrase line; see O'Connor's parse of Psa 106:22a-b (Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 358). Bardtke emends אָלָה to אֵלֶךְ and reads it with the previous line (*BHS*, 1093).

53. The emendation proposed by Bardtke (*BHS*, 1093) based on the LXX and Peshitta readings fits with the semantics of S עֵינָיו (Cf. Psa 37:2). In this case, חֵלְכָה is semantically O though it is mediated by the preposition לְ, qualifying it was what I am calling an oblique complement of the verb. This is the third line of a three-line string of matching lines with no gapping. Given the apparent acrostic format of the Psalms 9-10, Psa 10:8c is the first line of the ע stanza though there is no poetic reason apart from this to connect it to v.9a. Ps 10:9a, on the other hand, exhibits verbal repetition with v. 9b (יֶאֱרֹב), Thus it could be argued that 10:8c and 10:9a form a janus pair between lines 10:8a, 8b, on the one side, and lines 10:9b, 9c on the other. The former are linked by syntactic matching, while the latter are linked by lexical repetition.

Ps 10:14d	יָתוֹם אַתָּה הָיִיתָ עוֹזֵר Of the orphan, you are a helper.	NPnc NPs V NPpred[54]		B
Ps 11:5a[55]	יהוה צַדִּיק יִבְחָן וְרָשָׁע The Lord tests the righteous and the wicked.	NPs NPc V NPc	MatchNoGap?	A
Ps 12:3b	שְׂפַת חֲלָקוֹת בְּלֵב וָלֵב יְדַבֵּרוּ׃ With flattering lips and a duplicitous heart they speak.	NPa PPa V		B
Ps 12:9a	סָבִיב רְשָׁעִים יִתְהַלָּכוּן All around the wicked walk.	NPa NPs V		A
Ps 14:2a[56]	יְהוָה מִשָּׁמַיִם הִשְׁקִיף The Lord from heaven looks down.	NPs NPa V	SynDep	A
Ps 17:2a	מִלְּפָנֶיךָ מִשְׁפָּטִי יֵצֵא Let my vindication come out from your presence.	PPc NPs V	MatchNoGap	A

---

54. It is possible that יָתוֹם is the complement of עוֹזֵר, though there might be a syntactic pause between the former and the pronoun that follows it. Bardtke seems to read it this way emending the text to read לְיָתוֹם. Oesterley (144) and Kraus (189-190) reads יָתוֹם in the previous line as does Oesterley. In this case PRN does is not left dislocated because it follows יָתוֹם, the first constituent of the clause. This line is a questionable as a case of verbal postponement.

55. This scansion differs from the MT reading which reads וְרָשָׁע with the B line (*BHS*, 1094). That division however would result in an B line with a rare five word configuration. In terms of the most simple reading, the proposed scansion makes clearer sense. The Lord tests both types of person, but his disdain is distributed according to the results of that testing. To be sure, this reading does result in a discontinuous coordinated pair, which Kraus transposes (Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 1–59: A Continental Commentary*, translated from *Psalmen*, 1. Teilband, *Psalmen 1–59*, Hilton C. Oswald [Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg, 1993], 200–01).

56. The divine name occupies the first position in this line. The locative is a verbal adjunct in this line, the verbal complement of the verb in this line occurs in the second line עַל־בְּנֵי־אָדָם with which it is syntactically dependent as it is with the remaining lines of v. 2.

Ps 17:4b[57]	בִּדְבַר שְׂפָתֶיךָ אֲנִי שָׁמַרְתִּי I have kept the word of your lips.	PPc[58] NPs V	MatchNoGap*	B
Ps 17:10a	חֶלֶב לִבָּמוֹ סָגְרוּ [59] They enclose their hearts with fat.	NPa NPc V	MatchNoGap	A
Ps 18:7d[60]	וְשַׁוְעָתִי לְפָנָיו תָּבוֹא בְאָזְנָיו My petition came before him to his ears.	NPs PPc V PPc		B
Ps 18:13a	מִנֹּגַהּ נֶגְדּוֹ עָבָיו עָבְרוּ [61] From the brightness before him thick clouds passed.	PPc NPs V	SynDep	A

---

57. This emendation follows a suggestion by Gropp that emends this and the following three lines in a way that results in three matching lines that exhibit now gapping.

$$\begin{array}{r}\text{בִּדְבַר שְׂפָתֶיךָ אֲנִי שָׁמַרְתִּי} \\ \text{אָרְחוֹתֶךָ תָּמְכוּ אֲשֻׁרָי} \\ \text{יִמָּעֵף וְטוֹמֵנָֽ־לֵב דְּיְתֵולֹגֻּעֵם}\end{array}$$

The word of your lips I have kept.
Your ways have supported my steps.
In your tracks, my foot never stumbles.

58. The verb שָׁמַר does take a complement headed by the preposition בְּ, however irregularly (2 Sam 18:12; 2 Kings 9:14).

59. This is based on Bardke's emendation (*BHS*, 1098), following Kittel (*BHK*, 986); see also Oesterley (W.O.E. Oesterley, *The Psalms: Translated with Text-Critical and Exegetical Notes* [London: SPCK, 1959], 158) and Kraus (Kraus, *Psalms 1–59*, 244).

60. In this case the verb of translocation takes locative as an indirect complement, which in this case is interesting because of the occurrence of two appositional locative constituents, one occurring in the preverbal field, the other after. It is hard to describe how one constituent might receive certain marking *vis à vis* information structure while its appositive does not receive the same pragmatic marking. Another reading, in which לְפָנָיו is a complement of the NPs, would render this a case of V in the second position and therefore outside the scope of this study.

61. In this case, the second word נֶגְדּוֹ is clearly a complement of PPc.

Ps 21:10c[62]	יְהוָה בְּאַפּוֹ יְבַלְּעֵם The Lord will swallow them in his anger.	NPs PPc V		A
Ps 21:11a	פִּרְיָמוֹ מֵאֶרֶץ תְּאַבֵּד You will destroy their descendants from the earth.	NPc PPc V	MatchGap	A
Ps 25:1a	אֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה נַפְשִׁי אֶשָּׂא׃ To you Lord, I lift up my soul.	PPc NPc V		A[63]
Ps 25:13a	נַפְשׁוֹ בְּטוֹב תָּלִין He himself will dwell in prosperity.	NPs PPa V		A
Ps 78:50c	וְחַיָּתָם לַדֶּבֶר הִסְגִּיר He delivered their lives over to the plague.	NPc PPc V	MatchNoGap	C
Ps 78:64a	כֹּהֲנָיו בַּחֶרֶב נָפָלוּ His priests fell by the sword.	NPs PPa V		A[64]

---

62. This division of this line follows the MT accentuation against Bardtke who divides the line after יהוה so that the divine name goes with the previous line as a presumably as a vocative. Bardtke's scansion results in two couplets 10a1//10a2 and 10b1//10b2 with the word stress 3:3 and 2:2, respectively, while the MT reads the same two couplets with a word stress count 3:2 and 3:2 respectively. In the MT reading, v. 10b does show a partial chiastic structure, with NPs PPc V // V NPs with the PP absent from the second line.

63. Note that the B colon is similar in structure though not technically matching.

64. This line forms a partial parallel structure with it's B-line וְאַלְמְנֹתָיו לֹא תִבְכֶּינָה resulting in NPs PPa V/NPs V.

Ps 106:7[65]	אֲבוֹתֵינוּ בְמִצְרַיִם לֹא־הִשְׂכִּילוּ נִפְלְאוֹתֶיךָ Our fathers did not remember in Egypt your wonders.	NPs PPa V NPc		A
Ps 107:5b[66]	נַפְשָׁם בָּהֶם תִּתְעַטָּף׃ Their soul fainted within them.	NPs PPa V	SynDep	B
Ps 107:26c[67]	נַפְשָׁם בְּרָעָה תִתְמוֹגָג׃ Their soul melted away in their distress.	NPs PPa V		C

Divine Name

The divine name may occupy the first position in a clause, perhaps, as a result of

the deferential tendency in BH for the divine name that moves it toward the beginning of

---

65. It is possible to take this as two lines, the first of which being merely a phrase line (אֲבוֹתֵינוּ בְמִצְרַיִם) that is syntactically dependent on the following line as the S of the multi-line clause (following others, e.g. Oesterley (Oesterley, *The Psalms*, 449), Bardtke (*BHS*, 1187), and Kraus (Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 60–150: A Continental Commentary*, translated from *Psalmen*, 2. Teilband, *Psalmen 60–150*, Hilton C. Oswald [Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg, 1993], 313). Lunn cites this line as one that is commonly misanalyzed, suggesting, however tentatively, that אֲבוֹתֵינוּ בְמִצְרַיִם could be taken to be a verbless clause which provides temporal setting for the main clause which follows: "When our fathers were in Egypt . . ." (Lunn, *Word-Order Variation*, 332–33). One would expect the particle כי prior to the verbless clause to justify this reading. Lunn is right to be uncertain on this point. In his appendix he analyzes the line as two clauses, though he marks the proposed verbless clause with a question mark (Lunn, *Word-Order Variation*, 325).

66. Here L is a verbal adjunct, since the Dt verb הִתְעַטֵּף is stative in meaning (or an experience verb which bears many similarites to a stative verb in BH) and does not necessary assign L. The A-line is a phrase line of two adjectives רְעֵבִים גַּם־צְמֵאִים which are syntactically dependant on the B line. Lunn reads this line as pragmatically marked (Lunn, *Word-Order Variation*, 326).

67. Reading this as the third line follows O'Connor's division of the first two lines as having one V and one NPc (Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 293).

a syntactic construction.[68] Of the fourteen clauses with the divine name, eleven of those

clauses contain the divine name in the first position (Deut 32:12a; 33:2a; Pss 11:5a;

6:10b; 9:8a; 14:2a; 21:10c; Isa 40:10a; 42:13a; Heb 3:3a (אֱלֹוהַ); Zech 9:14a) and three do

not (Pss 3:5a; 25:1a; Zech 9:14c).

A- and B-line

It is probably correct that the two line unit or couplet[69] is, as Geller puts it, "the

indispensable and necessary unit of composition for parallel verse."[70] O'Connor does

not accept the indispensability of the couplet, contending that "the reality of the bicolon is

indisputable but it has resisted characterization because it is a secondary reality and as

such is not uniform."[71] He does introduce the notion of the couplet as a "target

structure," which is dependent upon syntactic and lexical phenomena which are part of a

system of "poetic grammar,"[72] though he does not expand on that notion. The broad

distribution of two-line structures is rather a result of poetic patterning that expands

---

68. "In some cases religious sentiment may account for the initial position of the word for God or an agent of his." Joüon-Muraoka, 582. See also ch. 5 below and Muraoka's discussion of constructions in which S=God (Muraoka, *Emphatic*, 35).

69. Following Geller, O'Connor, and, two a lesser extent, Petersen and Richards (David L. Petersen and Kent H. Richards, *Interpreting Biblical Hebrew Poetry* [Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1992], 23) the term line will be used in place of "colon" or "stich."

70. Stephen A. Geller, *Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979), 6.

71. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 134

72. O'Connor draws an analogy between the poetic couplet and the construct phrase (which is comprised of many underlying structures) since both are target structures in their respective systems of grammar (Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 134–35). By target structure, he means something similar to Andersen's "deep relations" in Andersen, *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*.

beyond the base unit of the line (three-line structures, for that matter, are likewise frequent because they are patterns which expand beyond two lines). In O'Connor's analysis, multiple-line structures, such as couplets, triplets, quatrains, are considered similar structures which are either projections of either a single line (which is usually the case) or another multiple line structure.

Both notions of the couplet, Geller's indispensable unit and O'Connor's target structure, anticipate different markedness between the A- and non-A-line.   Such a conclusion matches Kugel's belief that parallel lines are a function of "seconding". He writes, "B is always a further statement (even if only mere restatement) but one that is not wholly independent of A."[73]   It follows that one would expect that the non-A-line exhibits attributes of a marked line. In fact, Muraoka notes that there is a prevalence of preposing constructions in the second line of a parallel couplets,[74] which would be expected if the second line of two-line parallel construction is be believed to be the marked line. While this holds true for preposing constructions, it does not for cases of two preverbal constituents which seem to be evenly distributed across A- and B-lines.

Of the 100 clauses that exhibit V-postponement, 50 occur in what are traditionally understood to be A-lines of a couplet, while 50 occur in what are traditionally understood to be non-A-lines.

Syntactic Tropes: Matching and Syntactic Dependency.

Holmstedt has raised the point that word order analysis in BH verse should rule out clauses in which certain poetic devices, particularly structural parallelism and its

---

73. James L. Kugel, "The Feeling of Déja Lu," Review of Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Poetry*, *Journal of Religion* 67 (1987): 74.

subcategories chiasm, tail linkage, etc., exert influence over the word order pattern of the line.[75] The position of the current study holds that all such poetic constructions should be understood as a function of poetic defamiliarization that provides the grounds upon which the syntactical constraints of verse are relaxed. Constituent postponement and chiasm are not two discrete poetic devices, but rather the former can be manipulated (with the increased liberty of verse) for the sake of the latter, all of which serve the broader goal of defamiliarization, of making the text more opaque. For that matter, chiasm for instance, should not be viewed as a goal different from, say, a linguistic goal like topicalization or predicate focus as has been argued by Lunn. Rather, successfully communicative verse draws these constructions together in symphony.

Parallelism as commonly understood in BH scholarship is a broad and somewhat fuzzy category. The same can be said for information structure, despite its generally positive contribution to the study of word order.[76] While parallelism is often discussed as a hard and fast poetic category, as Kugel points out, it is rarely clearly defined beyond the level of personal impression. Many descriptions of parallelism in BH poetry revolve around ill-defined semantic categories (for instance, "A and what's more B"), which may very well result from the murkiness of the phenomenon of semantic parallelism itself. In order to avoid the controversy surrounding the definition of semantic parallelism, this

74. Muraoka, *Emphatic*, 96.

75. Holmstedt rules out cases which occur as part of antithetical or contrastive parallelism. Robert D. Holmstedt, "Word Order in the Book of Proverbs," 148–49.

76. Note Lunn's explanation of unusual cases as discourse marking, a general categories that includes boundaries and peaks of poetic units. Lunn, *Word-Order Variation* Van Hecke's critique is helpful. van Hecke, "From Linguistics to Hermeneutics," 85–91.

analysis will maintain a strictly syntactical focus by only recognizing a narrowly construed notion of syntactic parallelism. This sort of syntactic parallelism is the same phenomenon that O'Connor wisely labels "matching" in order to carefully distinguish it from the broader category of parallelism that is so common in discussions of BH verse. O'Connor defines matching most generally as "the identity of constituent or unit [word] structure," though he notes that the identity does not include an identity of order. For instance, he acknowledges that some lines will exhibit chiastic order, but "[c]hiasm is constrained in a profound way by the word order demands of the language, but within the granted boundaries, it flourishes."[77] The extent to which those boundaries apply is, of course, the interest of the current study. Take the following couplet:

(20)   Isa 40:27c-d

נִסְתְּרָה דַרְכִּי מֵיְהוָה \\ וּמֵאֱלֹהַי מִשְׁפָּטִי יַעֲבוֹר

My path is hidden from the Lord //

and from my God, my justice is departed

The form of the couplet V NP PP // PP NP V is construed in a chiastic pattern which includes a peculiar postponement of V in the second line. While it is true that V-postponement is triggered by the chiasm, the relaxed syntactic constraints of BH verse allow such a word order pattern to occur. Though this would not be allowed under the constraints of prose syntax, constraints in BH verse are relaxed to make such a construction possible.

A related issue is that of gapping. For O'Connor, gapping is "[t]he phenomenon of matching adjacent clauses against one another and deleting from all but either the first

_____

77. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 391.

or the last some or all of the common elements."[78] As has already been mentioned,

gapping is rare in BH prose but relatively common in BH verse, which is somewhat

analogous to the paucity of gapping in English written prose and its frequency in English

speech. Gapping, however, is easily confused with what O'Connor calls syntactic

dependency, what was in earlier scholarship called enjambment.[79] The confusion

between enjambment and gapping meant that many cases of true "enjambment" were

being reckoned as gapping, a mistake which led to the consensus view that enjambment

was a rarity in BH verse.[80] Gapping requires that a necessary element be deleted from a

clause in a way that works against the structure of the clause; it creates, in other words, a

syntactic structural instability (which, as an aside, makes it a function of defamiliarization

in BH verse). Syntactic dependency on the other hand, may appear at first as a case of

matching, until one looks closer at the structural continuity between the adjacent lines.

Very often, V gapping is actually syntactic dependency in which the second line contains

a verbal argument that is in apposition to another verbal argument of the first line. Note

the following case of matching with gapping:

(21) Ps 21:11a-b

פִּרְיָמוֹ מֵאֶרֶץ תְּאַבֵּד \\ וְזַרְעָם מִבְּנֵי אָדָם

you will destroy his fruit from the earth //

and their seed from the sons of men

---

78. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 401.

79. To be fair, equating enjambment with syntactic dependency may commit categorical error, since the former does presume a native perspective of verse that allows access to its phonological realities, particularly that of pause. We have access to the graphical representation of pause in the MT and some earlier poetic manuscripts, but we can't be sure how this was manifested in the performance of BH verse. I am grateful to David Bosworth for bringing this point to my attention.

80. Karl Budde, "Poetry (Hebrew)," *Dictionary of the Bible* 4:2–13.

For the B-line to be structurally whole, it requires the V תְּאַבֵּד in the A-line to be reckoned as part of its structure. This is not a chiastic ordering of constituents, though the V does serve a pivot function[81] in the third position, resulting in the structure abc//a'b'. Now note the following case of syntactic dependency:

(22) Ps 14:2

יְהוָה מִשָּׁמַיִם הִשְׁקִיף

עַל־בְּנֵי־אָדָם

לִרְאוֹת הֲיֵשׁ מַשְׂכִּיל

דֹּרֵשׁ אֶת־אֱלֹהִים

The Lord looks down from heaven //

upon the sons of men //

to see whether there are any who understand, //

any who look for God.

The entire quatrain is built off of syntactic dependency between the A-line and the three following non-A-lines. Apart from the peculiar word order of the A-line (NPs PPc V), there is nothing especially peculiar about the syntax of this quatrain. The O of the infinitive in the C-line is in apposition to the O in the D-line, a construction that might be rare (we might expect coordinate ojbects instead of appositive ones), but the construction is not problematic.

─────────────────────

81. A pivot function is when an element of a poetic structure serves a syntactic function in the segment (in poetry, usually a line) that precedes and in the segment that follows it. Dahood, "A New Metrical Pattern in Biblical Poetry"; W.G.E Watson, "The Pivot Pattern in Hebrew". Pivot is not to be confused with janus function in which one word takes on two different meanings and syntactic functions depending on the segment before and after it. Gordon, "New Directions".

Of the 94 lines that exhibit V-postponement, 37 (39.4%) occur in lines that exhibit the trope of matching (11 [29.7%] also show gapping; 26 [70.3%] show no gapping). Twenty (54.1%) of the matched lines exhibit V-postponement in the A-line, while 17 (47.4%) exhibit V-postponement in the non-A-line (14 [82.4%] in the B-line; 3 [17.6%]in the C-line). In 11 lines in which there was matching and gapping, all but one occurred in the A-line, and of the 26 lines in which there is matching and no gapping, 17 are in A-lines (65.4%).

In the case of syntactic dependency, 9 (9.6%) lines show a clause that extend across more than one line.

- 5 of the syntactically dependent couplets have the V in the B-line, while

- 4 of the syntactically dependent couplets have the V in the A-line. In these cases, other arguments of the V occur in the B-line in such a way that the B-line does not lack structure that is compensated by a constituent in the A-line (i.e, matching with gapping). For instance, in the case of (22), the B-line contains NPc (objects) that are coordinated, though discontinuous, with the NPc of the A-line:

(22)   Ps 10:7a-b

אָלָה פִּיהוּ מָלֵא \\ וּמִרְמוֹת וָתֹךְ

His mouth is filled with curse // and treachery and oppression.

It is not obvious from any of the instances of syntactic dependency that V-postponement was triggered by the syntactic trope. Using the example of (22), the V could have placed in the first or second position with no change in meaning, and the problem of the discontinuous NPc could have been resolved. As it stand, however, the word order pattern seems to reflect a clear case of defamiliarization for its own sake.

Coordination

Clause coordination is not as common in BH verse as it is in BH prose, particularly the prose of historical narrative. This difference can be explained in part by the different communicative function of these genres: where BH narrative prose typically communicates events on a main event line by means of sequentially marked clauses (*wayyiqtol* and *wəqatal* forms), BH verse does not have the same interest in sequence. In BH verse the "story" is typically told through non-sequential lines.

Even in BH prose, however, not all clause coordination has to do with sequence, so another feature of BH verse has been cited to explain the paucity of overt coordination: the feature of terseness. One of the first features of BH verse to become apparent is its verbal frugality when compared to the much more verbose BH prose. This frugality is strictly a matter of number of words used to communicate a message, not the variety of words used.[82] In terms of lexical variety, BH verse is exceptional, no doubt, because of the rich use of synonymous terms in adjacent poetic lines.[83] However there is a clear frugality or terseness not only in the number of lexical words in a clause, but also, and perhaps primarily, in functional elements like the relativizer אֲשֶׁר, the definite article הַ, and the coordinating conjunction וְ . Therefore, whether by communicative demands or stylistic terseness, one would not expect a high frequency of the coordinating conjunction in a sample of lines of BH verse.

---

82. See O'Connor's description of the constraints on the number of "units" in a typical clause line. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 314–15.

83. See Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 144–46; Schökel, *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*, 64–75; Wilfred G.E. Watson, *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*, 36–39.

Coordinated Lines. Clause–lines with V in the third or fourth position and are coordinated with a previous line by means of the coordinating conjunction ן occur 30 times (31.9%) in the sample of 94 (Deut 33:11; Num 24:9; Isa 40:12, 13, 19, 24, 27, 29; 41:15, 27; 42:4, 8, 12; 44:17, 19; 45:12; 46:2, 4, 6; 48:8, 11; Hab 3:4; Zech 9:14[2x]; Pss 7:6, 8, 17; 9:8; 18:7; 78:50).

Of the 30 coordinated lines, 23 (76.7%) occur in non-A-lines, which would be expected since it is the non-A-line that extends from the A-line and therefore would be the likely candidate for coordination. Furthermore, the circumstantial clause construction (ן + S) which is common in BH prose occurs 9 times (30%). Of those 9 clause lines which are both coordinated and have S in the first position (Isa 40:13, 19, 24; 46:2; Hab 3:4; Zech 9:14 [2x]; Ps 9:8 18:7), 5 occur in the A-line (Hab 3:4; Zech 9:14 [2x]; Ps 9:8 18:7), and none are circumstantial in force.

Uncoordinated Lines.   Of the 94 clause lines that exhibit V in the third or fourth position, 60 (63.8%) are not coordinated with a previous line by means of the coordinating conjunction ן (Gen 49:13; Deut 32:12; 38; 33:2, 3, 17, 19; Num 23:9; Judg 5:17, 26; 2 Sam 1:25; Isa 40:10; 11, 20, 23, 26; 41:3, 6, 17; 42:1, 13; 44:16; 45:14; 48:3, 16, 21; Hab 3:2, 3, 11, 16; Zeph 2:7, 9, 14; 3:5, 10; Pss 3:5; 5:13; 6:7, 10; 7:14; 10:2, 7, 8, 14; 11:5; 12:3, 9; 14:2; 17:2, 4 [emend], 10; 18:13; 21:10, 11; 25:1, 13; 78:64; 106:7; 107:5, 26).

Of these 60 uncoordinated clause lines, 37 (61.7%) occur in A-lines, which again would be expected, though the low ratio to uncoordinated non-A-lines, again highlights the infrequence of the coordinating conjunction in BH verse.

Somewhat related to the issue of coordination is that of hypotaxis, particularly the use of *kî*-clauses in the sample. Three clause lines (included in the uncoordinated category) are headed by *kî* (Ps 9:13; Zeph 2:4, 9). Two are causally related to the

previous line (Ps 9:13; Zeph 2:4) and one as a quotative introducing direct speech (Zep 2:9).

V-Postponement Overview - Categorial Patterns

Variety 1: NP PP V. This word order pattern was the most common by far with 54 of the 94 (57.4%) occurrences of V-postponement in the sample.

Variety 2: PP NP V. This word order pattern was the second most common with 22 of the 94 (23.4%) occurrences of V-postponement in the sample.

Variety 3: NP NP V. This word order pattern was the third most common with 12 of the 94 (12.8%) occurrences of V-postponement in the sample (15 if Zeph 2:4 is counted with this group NPs NP[pred] V).

Variety 4: PP PP V. This word order pattern was the least common with 5 of the 94 (5.3%) occurrences of V-postponement in the sample.

V-Postponement Overview - Grammatical Role Patterns

"Subject" (NPs)-first patterns. NPs-first patterns. There are several reasons to expect a prevalence of NPs-first patterns in our sample of clauses showing V-postponement. Only syntactical reasoning will be considered here.[84] Assuming a basic

---

84. This tendency toward S-first constructions does not necessarily prove a link between S and the pragmatic category of topic. Lambrecht notes that correlation does not mean identity: "The examples . . . show that, in English at least, it is not possible to equate topic with a single grammatical category like subject. If this were possible, no separate category "topic" would be needed. . . .Nevertheless the correlation between topic and subject is extremely strong on the level of discourse and has grammatical consequences, in English as well as in other languages." Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, 131.

V-S-O-(PP) word order for CBH prose, it is perhaps not surprising to find that S-(O/PP)-V patterns which preserve the basic postverbal order in the preverbal field represent the most common pattern (40 clauses; 42.6%) of poetic clauses in which the V is postponed. Of those NPs-first clauses,

- 19 (47.5%) have PPa in the following position,

- 11 (27.5% of S-postponement) have PPc in the following position,

- 6 (15%) have NPc in the following position,

- 3 (7.5%) have NPs followed by NPpred in clauses in which הָיָה is the V, and

- 1 (2.5%) NPa in the second position.

"Object" (NPc)-first patterns. Lines with NPc in the initial position make up the second most frequent type of patterns, occurring 23 times in the corpus (24.5%).

- 14 (60.9%) are followed by PPc

- 8 (34.8%) are followed by PPa

- 1 (4.3%) is followed by NPs

"Adjunct" (PPa)-first patterns. Lines with PPa in the initial position make up the third most frequent type of patterns, occurring 15 times in the corpus (16%).

- 7 (46.7%) are followed by NPc

- 5 (33.3%) are followed by NPs

- 2 (13.3%) are followed by another PPa

- 1 (6.7%) is followed by a PPc.

"Indirect Object" (PPc)-first patterns. Lines with PPc in the initial position make up the least frequent type of patterns, occurring 12 times in the corpus (12.8%).

- 8 (66.7%) are followed by NPs (compare with only 1 with the order NPc NPs C)

- 2 (16.7%) followed by NPc[85]

- 2 (16.7%) followed by PPc

Complementation/Adjunction.

Complementation/Adjunction in First Position (XPc/XPa-first). Since S does not count as a complement or adjunct in any line, it was not categorized as such in this analysis. Of the 54 lines (57.4%) with a non-S constituent in the first position,

- 36 lines (66.7% of non-S-first lines; 38.3% of all V-postponed lines) have a complement in the first position (23 NPc/12 PPc/1 RELc)

- 17 lines (31.5%; 18.1%) have and adjunct in the first position.

- The 1 (1.9%) remaining line has NPpred that is a part of a discontinous predicate in a clause where V is הָיָה

XPc-first constructions outnumber XPa-first clauses over 2 to 1, though this needs further explanation. More telling would be to see which construction is more common in clauses which have both XPc and XPa as constituents in the preverbal position.

- There are 17 lines (18.1%) in which there are discrete XPc and XPa constituents. Of those 17 lines, 8 lines are XPc-first (47.1%) and the rest are XPa-first.

- When there is an XPc and NPs in the line (27 lines; 28.7%), 9 are NPs-second lines (33.3%), while 18 are NPs-first (67.7%).

When NPs is present in the line (56 lines; 59.6% of 94 V-postponement lines),

---

85. Though Ps 25:1 has a vocative between PPc and NPc.

- 40 of those lines have NPs-first constructions (71.4%)

  - 20 (50%) are NPs - XPa - V

  - 17 (42.5%) are NPs - XPc - V

  - 3 (7.5%) are NPs - SPpred - V (when V is הָיָה)

- 16 of those lines have NPs-second constructions (25.4%)

  - 9 (56.3%) are XPc - NPs - V

  - 6 (37.5%) are XPa - NPs - V

  - 1 (6.3%) of those lines has NPpred - S - V - NPpred (when V is הָיָה), though this line (Ps 10:14) is an interesting case because the predicate is discontinuous.

Complementation/Adjunction in Second Position (XPc/XPa- second).

Sixteen lines (16.3%) have NPs in the second position, which leaves 78 lines (83%) that have either a complement or adjunct in the second position.

- 45 lines (57.7%) exhibited a word order with a complement in the second position (PPc–28 lines [62.2%]; NPc–17 lines [37.8%]).

- 30 lines (38.5%) exhibited a word order with an adjunct in the second position.

- 3 lines (3.8%) exhibited a word order with an a pred of the V הָיָה in the second position.

Canonical Context

Of the over 2800 lines analyzed in this study, there are 514 clauses with finite verbs that are eligible for V-postponement. This means that they include a finite V, and two discrete constituents of the following type: NPs (that is not an independent personal

pronoun), an NPc, or a PP (a or c) according to the criteria above. Coordinated

constituents count as one argument. If the V takes two NPc that are discrete

complements (not in apposition), then they count as two constituents. The same goes for

the PP. Of these 514 clauses, 94 (18.3%) exhibit V-postponement. These clauses with

V-postponement word order patterns are somewhat evenly distributed throughout the

texts in the sample. A comparison between early and late verse does show a noticeable

but inconsistent increase in the tendency for V-postponement For instance, the body of

verse presented as early Yahwistic poetry[86] (Genesis 49, Exodus 15; Numbers 23-24;

Deuteronomy 32[87] and 33; Judges 5; 2 Samuel 1:19-27, Psalm 18) exhibits a tendency

toward V-postponement (16:130 eligible lines, 12.3%][88]) that is less than the whole

sample, and considerably less than Isaiah 40-48 (34:118 eligible lines, 28.8%).

Individual upticks occur in diverse texts. For instance,

- Isaiah 40 includes 11 examples of V-postponement (42.3% of the chapter's 26 eligible lines [9.9% 111 total lines] and 32.4% of all cases of V-postponement in chs. 40-48).
- Zephaniah 2 includes 5 lines showing V-postponement out of 8 eligible (63.5%), while
- Zephaniah 1 and 3 show 0% and 14.3% of eligible lines with V-

---

86. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*.

87. Cross and Freedman are not confident in the inclusion of this poem in the corpus of early Yahwistic poetry, though they do consider it "on the fringe of the corpus," and containing material that is "undeniably early." Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 4.

88. It should be pointed out that Exodus 15 shows no V-postponement, while Deuteronomy 32-33 contains 7 lines exhibiting V-postponement.

postponement respectively.

- Shorter psalms like Psalm 3 have 100% postponement rate, since the one eligible line in the poem is postponed, and

- Psalm 10 (40 lines total) show 4 out of 8 eligible lines with V-postponement (50%) though that number is increased to 75% if it is taken together with Psalm 9 as is traditionally proposed, because both of the eligible lines in Psalm 9 show postponement.

- Lastly, there does seem to be certain generic considerations that might account for V-postponement. Redemptive historical psalms like 78, 106, and 107 do exhibit a decreased tendency for V-postponement (4.7%, 5.6%, and 1.3% respectively), though it is not clear why this is, and the reason cannot be lack of eligible clauses. The more prosaic syntax may be due to the shared communicative goals historical verse has with historical narrative (the large number of narrative verb forms in Psalm 78 corroborates this hypothesis).

The entire list of canonical segments and their respective tendencies toward lines that exhibit V-postponement is as follows:

Genesis 49 (1:18 eligible lines, 5.5%; 80 lines,[89]1.3%; 70 lines [possibly 79],[90] 1.4%)

---

89. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 169.

90. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 49–53.

Exodus 15 (0:20 eligible lines, 0%; 56 lines;[91] 66 lines,[92] 0%)

Numbers 23-24 (3:22 eligible lines, 13.6%; 80 lines,[93] 3.8%])

Deuteronomy 32 (2:19 eligible lines, 10.5%; 140 lines,[94] 1.4%)

Deuteronomy 33 (5:12 eligible lines, 41.7%; 97 lines,[95] 6.2%; 78 lines[96] 6.4%)

Judges 5 (2:15 eligible lines, 13.3%; 106 lines,[97] 2.8%; 3:60 lines,[98] 5%)

2 Samuel 1 (1:4 eligible lines, 25%; 30 lines,[99] 3.3%)

Isaiah 40-48 (34:118 eligible lines, 28.8%; 785 lines, 4.3%)

     40 (11:26 eligible lines, 42.3%; 111 lines, 9.9%)

     41 (5:17 eligible lines, 29.4%; 119 lines, 4.2%)

     42 (5:15 eligible lines, 33.3%; 91 lines, 5.5%)

     43 (0:13 eligible lines, 0%; 66 lines, 0%)

     44 (3:15 eligible lines, 20%; 81 lines, 3.7%)

     45 (2:8 eligible lines, 25%; 115 lines, 1.7%)

     46 (3:4 eligible lines, 75%; 44 lines, 6.8%)

---

91. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 179.

92. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 35–38.

93. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 185.

94. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 194.

95. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 208.

96. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 66–70.

97. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 218.

98. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 9–11.

99. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 230.

47 (0:9 eligible lines, 0%; 75 lines, 0%)

48 (5:11 eligible lines, 45.5%; 84 lines, 5.6%)

Habakkuk 3 (5:23 eligible lines, 21.7%; 65 lines,[100] 7.7%)

Zephaniah 1 (0:9 eligible lines, 0%; 69 lines,[101] 0%)

Zephaniah 2 (5:8 eligible lines, 62.5%; 65 lines,[102] 7.6%)

Zephaniah 3 (2:14 eligible lines, 14.3%; 79 lines,[103] 2.5%)

Zechariah 9 (2:16 eligible lines, 12.5%; 66 lines, 3%)

Psalms 1-25 (27:140 eligible lines, 19.3%; 761 lines, 3.5%)

Psalm 1 (0:2 eligible lines, 0%; 19 lines, 0%)

Psalm 2 (0:7 eligible lines, 0%; 29 lines, 0%)

Psalm 3 (1:1 eligible lines, 100%; 18 lines, 5.6%)

Psalm 4 (0:4 eligible lines, 0%; 21 lines, 0%)

Psalm 5 (1:3 eligible lines, 33.3%; 40 lines, 2.5%)

Psalm 6 (2:6 eligible lines, 33.3%; 22 lines, 9.1%)

Psalm 7 (4:9 eligible lines, 44.4%; 40 lines, 10%)

Psalm 8 (0:2 eligible lines, 0%; 25 lines, 0%)

Psalm 9 (2:2 eligible lines, 100%; 40 lines, 5%)

Psalm 10 (4:8 eligible lines, 50%; 40 lines, 10%)

Psalm 11 (1:6 eligible lines, 16.7%; 20 lines, 5%)

Psalm 12 (2:3 eligible lines, 66.7%; 18 lines, 11.1%)

---

100. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 233–34.

101. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 241.

102. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 248.

103. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 255.

Psalm 13 (0:3 eligible lines, 0%; 12 lines, 0%)

Psalm 14 (1:2 eligible lines, 50%; 22 lines, 4.5%)

Psalm 15 (0:4 eligible lines, 0%; 14 lines, 0%)

Psalm 16 (0:8 eligible lines, 0%; 23 lines, 0%)

Psalm 17 (3:4 eligible lines, 75%; 37 lines, 8.1%)

Psalm 18 (2:20 eligible lines, 10%; 111 lines, 1.8%)

Psalm 19 (0:4 eligible lines, 0%; 41 lines, 0%)

Psalm 20 (0:5 eligible lines, 0%; 21 lines, 0%)

Psalm 21 (2:9 eligible lines, 22.2%; 27 lines, 7.4%)

Psalm 22 (0:15 eligible lines, 0%; 75 lines, 0%)

Psalm 23 (0:2 eligible lines, 0%; 20 lines, 0%)

Psalm 24 (0:2 eligible lines, 0%; 18 lines, 5.6%)

Psalm 25 (2:9 eligible lines, 22.2%; 18 lines, 11.1%)

Psalm 78 (2:43 eligible lines, 4.7%; 163 lines,[104] 1.2%)

Psalm 106 (1:18 eligible lines, 5.6; 106 lines,[105]0.9%)

Psalm 107 (2:16 eligible lines, 1.3%; 89 lines,[106] 2.2%)

Canonical Context Breakdown

Genesis 49 (1:18 eligible lines, 5.5%; 80 lines,[107]1.3%; 70 lines [possibly

---

104. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 263.

105. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 278.

106. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 288.

107. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 169.

49:13	זְבוּלֻן לְחוֹף יַמִּים יִשְׁכֹּן	NPs PPc V

Exodus 15 (0:20 eligible lines, 0%; 56 lines;[108] 66 lines,[109] 0%)

Numbers 23-24 (3:22 eligible lines, 13.6%; 80 lines,[110] 3.8%])

Numbers 23-24 (3:22 eligible lines, 13.6%; 80 lines,[111] 3.8%])

23:9	הֶן־עָם לְבָדָד יִשְׁכֹּן	NPs PPa V
23:24	הֶן־עָם כְּלָבִיא יָקוּם	NPs PPa V
24:9	וּכְלָבִיא מִי יְקִימֶנּוּ	PPa NPs V

Deuteronomy 32 (2:19 eligible lines, 10.5%; 140 lines,[112] 1.4%)

32:12	יהוה בָּדָד יַנְחֶנּוּ	NPs PPa V
32:38	אֲשֶׁר חֵלֶב זְבָחֵימוֹ יֹאכֵלוּ	NPs NPc V

Deuteronomy 33 (5:12 eligible lines, 41.7%; 97 lines,[113] 6.2%; 78 lines[114] 6.4%)

33:2	יהוה מִסִּינַי בָּא	NPs PPc V
33:3	כָּל־קְדֹשָׁיו בְּיָדֶךָ וְהִמְתַכּוּ	NPs PPa V

---

108. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 179.

109. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 35–38.

110. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 185.

111. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 185.

112. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 194.

113. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 208.

114. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 66–70.

33:11	וּמְשַׂנְאָיו מִן־יְקוּמוּן׃	PPa NPs V
33:17	בָּהֶם עַמִּים יְנַגַּח	PPa NPc V
33:19	עַמִּים הַר־יִקְרָאוּ	NPc PPa V

Judges 5 (2:15 eligible lines, 13.3%; 106 lines,[115] 2.8%; 3:60 lines,[116] 5%)

| 5:17 | גִּלְעָד בְּעֵבֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן שָׁכֵן | NPs PPc V |
| 5:26 | יָדָהּ לַיָּתֵד תִּשְׁלַחְנָה | NPc PPc V |

2 Samuel 1 (1:4 eligible lines, 25%; 30 lines,[117] 3.3%)

| 1:25 | יְהוֹנָתָן עַל־בָּמוֹתֶיךָ חָלָל | NPs PPla V |

Isaiah 40-48 (34:118 eligible lines, 28.8%; 785 lines, 4.3%)

40 (11:26 eligible lines, 42.3%; 111 lines, 9.9%)

40:10	הִנֵּה אֲדֹנָי יהוה בְּחָזָק יָבוֹא	NPs PPa V
40:11	כִּרְעֶה עֶדְרוֹ יִרְעֶה	PPa NPc V
40:12	וְשָׁמַיִם בַּזֶּרֶת תִּכֵּן	NPc PPa V
40:13	וְאִישׁ עֲצָתוֹ יוֹדִיעֶנּוּ׃	NPs NPc V
40:19	וְצֹרֵף בַּזָּהָב יְרַקְּעֶנּוּ	NPs PPa V
40:20	הַמְסֻכָּן תְּרוּמָה עֵץ לֹא־יִרְקַב יִבְחָר	NPs NPc [R. cl.] V
40:23	שֹׁפְטֵי אֶרֶץ כַּתֹּהוּ עָשָׂה׃	NPc PPc V
40:24	וּסְעָרָה כַּקַּשׁ תִּשָּׂאֵם׃	NPs PPa V

---

115. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 218.

116. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 9–11.

117. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 230.

40:26	לְכֻלָּם בְּשֵׁם יִקְרָא	PPc PPc V
40:27	וּמֵאֱלֹהַי מִשְׁפָּטִי יַעֲבוֹר:	PPc NPs V
40:29	וּלְאֵין אוֹנִים עָצְמָה יַרְבֶּה:	PPc PPc V

41 (5:17 eligible lines, 29.4%;119 lines, 4.2%)

41:3	אֹרַח בְּרַגְלָיו לֹא יָבוֹא:	NPc PPa V
41:6	אִישׁ אֶת־רֵעֵהוּ יַעְזֹרוּ	NPs NPc V
41:15	וּגְבָעוֹת כַּמֹּץ תָּשִׂים:	NPc PPc V
41:17	לְשׁוֹנָם בַּצָּמָא נָשָׁתָּה	NPs PPa V
41:27	וְלִירוּשָׁלַם מְבַשֵּׂר אֶתֵּן:	PPc NPc V

42 (5:15 eligible lines, 33.3%;91 lines, 5.5%)

42:1	מִשְׁפָּט לַגּוֹיִם יוֹצִיא:	NPc PPc V
42:4	וּלְתוֹרָתוֹ אִיִּים יְיַחֵילוּ:	PPc NPs V
42:8	וּכְבוֹדִי לְאַחֵר לֹא־אֶתֵּן	NPc PPc v
42:12	וּתְהִלָּתוֹ בָּאִיִּים יַגִּידוּ:	NPc PPa V
42:13	יהוה כַּגִּבּוֹר יֵצֵא	NPs PPa V

43 (0:13 eligible lines, 0%;66 lines, 0%)

44 (3:15 eligible lines, 20%;81 lines, 3.7%)

44:16	עַל־חֶצְיוֹ בָּשָׂר יֹאכֵל	PPa NPc V
44:17	וּשְׁאֵרִיתוֹ לְאֵל עָשָׂה	NPc PPc V
44:19	וְיִתְרוֹ לְתוֹעֵבָה אֶעֱשֶׂה	NPc PPc V

45 (2:8 eligible lines, 25%;115 lines, 1.7%)

45:12	וְאָדָם עָלֶיהָ בָרָאתִי	NPc PPa V
45:14	יְגִיעַ מִצְרַיִם וּסְחַר־כּוּשׁ וּסְבָאִים אַנְשֵׁי מִדָּה עָלַיִךְ יַעֲבֹרוּ וְלָךְ	NPs PPc V PPc

46 (3:4 eligible lines, 75%;44 lines, 6.8%)

46:2	וְנַפְשָׁם בַּשְּׁבִי הָלָכָה:	NPs PPc V
46:4	וְעַד־שֵׂיבָה אֲנִי אֶסְבֹּל	PPa NPs V
46:6	וְכֶסֶף בַּקָּנֶה יִשְׁקֹלוּ	NPc PPa V

47 (0:9 eligible lines, 0%; lines, 0%)

48 (5:11 eligible lines, 45.5%;84 lines, 5.6%)

48:3	הָרִאשֹׁנוֹת מֵאָז הִגַּדְתִּי	NPc PPa V
48:8	וּפֶשַׁע מִבֶּטֶן קֹרָא לָךְ:	NPc PPa V PPc
48:11	וּכְבוֹדִי לְאַחֵר לֹא־אֶתֵּן:	NPc PPc V
48:16	לֹא מֵרֹאשׁ בַּסֵּתֶר דִּבַּרְתִּי	PPa PPa V
48:21	מַיִם מִצּוּר הִזִּיל לָמוֹ	NPc PPc V PPa

Habakkuk 3 (5:23 eligible lines, 21.7%;65 lines,[118] 7.7%)

3:2	בְּרֹגֶז רַחֵם תִּזְכּוֹר:	PPa NPc V
3:3	אֱלוֹהַּ מִתֵּימָן יָבוֹא	NPs PPa V
3:4	וְנֹגַהּ כָּאוֹר תִּהְיֶה	NPs PPpred V
3:11	לְאוֹר חִצֶּיךָ יְהַלֵּכוּ	PPc NPs V

---

118. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 233–34.

| 3:16 | לַעֲלוֹת לְעַם יְגוּדֶנּוּ: | PPa NPs V |

Zephaniah 1 (0:9 eligible lines, 0%;69 lines,[119] 0%)

Zephaniah 2 (5:8 eligible lines, 62.5%; 5 lines,[120] 9.2%)

2:4	כִּי עַזָּה עֲזוּבָה תִהְיֶה	NPs NPpred V
2:7	בֵּית יְהוּדָה עֲלֵיהֶם יִרְעוּן	NPs PPc V
2:7	בְּבָתֵּי אַשְׁקְלוֹן בָּעֶרֶב יִרְבָּצוּן	PPa PPa V
2:9	כִּי־מוֹאָב כִּסְדֹם תִּהְיֶה	NPs PPpred V
2:14	גַּם־קָאַת גַּם־קִפֹּד בְּכַפְתֹּרֶיהָ יָלִינוּ	NPS PPli V

Zephaniah 3 (2:14 eligible lines, 14.3%; 79 lines,[121] 2.5%)

| 3:5 | בַּבֹּקֶר מִשְׁפָּטוֹ יִתֵּן | PPa NPc V |
| 3:10 | מֵעֵבֶר לְנַהֲרֵי־כוּשׁ עֲתָרַי בַּת־פוּצַי יוֹבִלוּן מִנְחָתִי: | PPc NPs V NPc |

Zechariah 9 (2:16 eligible lines, 12.5%; 66 lines, 3%)

| 9:14 | וַאדֹנָי יהוה בַּשּׁוֹפָר יִתְקָע | NPs PPc V |
| 9:14 | יהוה עֲלֵיהֶם יֵרָאֶה | NPs PPa V |

Psalms 1-25 (27:140 eligible lines, 19.3%; 761 lines, 3.5%)

---

119. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 241.

120. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 248.

121. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 255.

Psalm 1 (0:2 eligible lines, 0%; 19 lines, 0%)

Psalm 2 (0:7 eligible lines, 0%; 29 lines, 0%)

Psalm 3 (1:1 eligible lines, 100%; 18 lines, 5.6%)

3:5   קוֹלִי אֶל־יְהוָה אֶקְרָא   NPs PPc V

Psalm 4 (0:4 eligible lines, 0%; 21 lines, 0%)

Psalm 5 (1:3 eligible lines, 33.3%; 40 lines, 2.5%)

5:13   כַּצִּנָּה רָצוֹן תַּעְטְרֶנּוּ׃   PPa NPc V

Psalm 6 (2:6 eligible lines, 33.3%; 22 lines, 9.1%)

6:7   בְּדִמְעָתִי עַרְשִׂי אַמְסֶה׃   PPa NPc V

6:10   יְהוָה תְּפִלָּתִי יִקָּח׃   NPs NPc V

Psalm 7 (4:9 eligible lines, 44.4%; 40 lines, 10%)

7:6   וּכְבוֹדִי לֶעָפָר יַשְׁכֵּן   NPc PPc V

7:8   וְעָלֶיהָ לַמָּרוֹם שׁוּבָה׃   PPa PPc V

7:14   חִצָּיו לְדֹלְקִים יִפְעָל   NPc PPc V

7:17   וְעַל קָדְקֳדוֹ חֲמָסוֹ יֵרֵד׃   PPc NPs V

Psalm 8 (0:2 eligible lines, 0%; 25 lines, 0%)

Psalm 9 (2:2 eligible lines, ; 40 lines, 5%)

9:8	וַיהוָה לְעוֹלָם יֵשֵׁב	NPs PPa V
9:13	כִּי־דֹרֵשׁ דָּמִים אוֹתָם זָכָר	NPs NPc V

Psalm 10 (4:8 eligible lines, 50%; 40 lines, 10%)

10:2	בְּגַאֲוַת רָשָׁע יִדְלַק עָנִי	PPa NPs V NPc
10:7	אָלָה פִּיהוּ מָלֵא וּמִרְמוֹת וָתֹךְ	NPc NPs V
10:8	עֵינָיו לְחֵלְכָה יִצְפֹּנוּ׃	NPs PPc V
10:14	יָתוֹם אַתָּה הָיִיתָ עוֹזֵר	Npred NPs V NPpred

Psalm 11 (1:6 eligible lines, 16.7%; 20 lines, 5%)

11:5	יהוה צַדִּיק יִבְחָן וְרָשָׁע	NPs NPc V NPc

Psalm 12 (2:3 eligible lines, ; 18 lines, 11.1%)

12:3	שְׂפַת חֲלָקוֹת בְּלֵב וָלֵב יְדַבֵּרוּ׃	NPc PPa V
12:9	סָבִיב רְשָׁעִים יִתְהַלָּכוּן	NPa NPs V

Psalm 13 (0:3 eligible lines, 0%; 12 lines, 0%)

Psalm 14 (1:2 eligible lines, 50%; 22 lines, 4.5%)

14:2	יְהוָה מִשָּׁמַיִם הִשְׁקִיף	NPs PPc V

Psalm 15 (0:4 eligible lines, 0%; 14 lines, 0%)

Psalm 16 (0:8 eligible lines, 0%; 23 lines, 0%)

Psalm 17 (3:4 eligible lines, 75%; 37 lines, 8.1%)

17:2	מִלְּפָנֶיךָ מִשְׁפָּטִי יֵצֵא	PPlc NPs V
17:4	בִּדְבַר שְׂפָתֶיךָ אֲנִי שָׁמַרְתִּי	PPoi NPs V
17:10	חֶלְבָּמוֹ סָגְרוּ לְבָּמוֹ	NPia NPoc V

Psalm 18 (2:20 eligible lines, 10%; 111 lines, 1.8%)

| 18:7 | וְשַׁוְעָתִי לְפָנָיו תָּבוֹא בְאָזְנָיו׃ | NPs PPc V PPc |
| 18:13 | מִנֹּגַהּ נֶגְדּוֹ עָבָיו עָבְרוּ | PPc NPs V |

Psalm 19 (0:4 eligible lines, 0%; 41 lines, 0%)

Psalm 20 (0:5 eligible lines, 0%; 21 lines, 0%)

Psalm 21 (2:9 eligible lines, 22.2%; 27 lines, 7.4%)

| 21:10 | יהוה בְּאַפּוֹ יְבַלְּעֵם | NPs PPc V |
| 21:11 | פִּרְיָמוֹ מֵאֶרֶץ תְּאַבֵּד | NPc PPc V |

Psalm 22 (0:15 eligible lines, 0%; 75 lines, 0%)

Psalm 23 (0:2 eligible lines, 0%; 20 lines, 0%)

Psalm 24 (0:2 eligible lines, 0%; 18 lines, 5.6%)

Psalm 25 (2:9 eligible lines, 22.2%; 18 lines, 11.1%)

| 25:1 | אֵלֶיךָ יְהוָה נַפְשִׁי אֶשָּׂא׃ | PPc NPc V |
| 25:13 | נַפְשׁוֹ בְּטוֹב תָּלִין | NPs PPa V |

Psalm 78 (2:43 eligible lines, 4.7%; 163 lines,[122] 1.2%)

| 78:50 | וְחַיָּתָם לַדֶּבֶר הִסְגִּיר | NPoc PPli V |
| 78:64 | כֹּהֲנָיו בַּחֶרֶב נָפָלוּ | NPs PPia V |

Psalm 106 (1:18 eligible lines, 5.6; 106 lines,[123]0.9%)

| 106:7 | אֲבוֹתֵינוּ בְמִצְרַיִם לֹא־הִשְׂכִּילוּ נִפְלְאוֹתֶיךָ | NPs PPa V NPc |

Psalm 107 (2:16 eligible lines, 1.3%; 89 lines,[124] 2.2%)

| 107:5 | נַפְשָׁם בָּהֶם תִּתְעַטָּף׃ | NPs PPa V[125] |
| 107:26 | נַפְשָׁם בְּרָעָה תִתְמוֹגָג׃ | NPs PPa V |

Conclusion

V-postponement is relatively common in BH verse. When the proper criteria are taken into consideration, such postponement can be seen to occur in 18.3% of the eligible clauses in lines across the corpus of BH verse. It is not limited to nor is it favored by the A- or non-A-line, though it does seem to occur more commonly in uncoordinated lines. There is a possible correlation between increased cases of V-postponement and the lateness of the composition. In terms of genre, historical psalms exhibit a decreased tendency for V-postponement, perhaps due to their communicative goal..

---

122. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 263.

123. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 278.

124. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 288.

125. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 289.

When V-postponement does occur, NPs is the constituent most likely to occupy the first position (42.6%), followed by NPc (24.4%) and then the other cases. If all lines in which a non-NPs and non-NPc constituent is in the first position were taken as one category (PPa and PPc [28.7%]), then that category would make up the second largest of the sample.

CHAPTER 5

SUBJECT- AND OBJECT-POSTPONEMENT

Introduction

This chapter addresses the phenomenon of subject postponement (S-postponement) in the biblical Hebrew (BH) canon, specifically where such postponement occurs in the context of verse. The occurrence of subject postponement in the post-verbal field (the rare V-O-S and V-PP-S configurations in which the second constituent is not pronominalized) appears to be much more common in the context of BH verse than in the context of BH prose. Recent scholarship on word order variations in BH verse, however, has not adequately addressed why or how the distribution is so heavily weighted on the side of verse.[126] While it has become increasingly clear from recent studies that syntactic constraints of BH verse are somewhat relaxed in the area of preverbal word order, the question of whether the same relaxation occurs in postverbal word order has not been discussed. In this chapter, it will be shown that such variations of postverbal word order do in fact occur and that their relative preponderance in poetic contexts indicate that syntactic defamiliarization is at play alongside pragmatic influences.[127] As a result, one need not choose between either pragmatic or poetic explanations of word order when reading biblical Hebrew verse as has been argued in the past, but rather good verse is

126. The interest of most recent scholarship on the topic has been focussed almost solely on constituent order in the preverbal field of the poetic line. Rosenbaum, *Word-Order Variation in Isaiah 40–55*; Gross, *Doppelt besetztes Vorfeld*; Lunn, *Word-Order Variation*.

127. See discussion in ch. 1.

often marked by these two devices working together to communicate effective and pleasing lines of verse.

In 1974, D. Hillers wrote a brief article on apparent aberrations in postverbal word order patterns evinced in the poetry of the *Book of Lamentations*.[128] Working from the tabulated data describing word order patterns in Genesis found in Andersen's unpublished dissertation,[129] Hillers shows how the verse of Lamentations includes clauses exhibiting postverbal word order of V-PP-S with much more frequency than the prose of Genesis. In Genesis, clauses with the V-PP-S pattern occur 7 of the 122 (5.7%) clauses with these constituents in the book, whereas in Lamentations, 11 out of 32 (34.4%) clauses have the V-PP-S pattern. Furthermore, the verse of Lamentations include clauses which show a disproportionately higher percentage of the V-PP-O word order pattern (42.3%;11 out of 26) than the percentage of V-PP-O patterns in Genesis (10.7%; 11 out of 103). Hillers then compares the clauses with abnormal word order patterns to clauses with the expected word order patterns in order to see if the former can be explained in light of metrical influence, primarily the *qinâ* meter, which Budde has argued is the dominant meter in Lamentations.[130] Hillers's findings, however, convince him that in the majority of cases, metrical influence can not be the trigger for the abnormal word, and that the 3 + 2 "staggered gait" of the *qinâ* would have been preserved if the expected

128. Hillers, "Observations on Syntax and Meter in Lamentations"

129. Francis I. Andersen, "Studies in Hebrew Syntax," in (Johns Hopkins University, 1960).

130. Karl Budde, "Das hebräische Klagelied," *ZAW* 2 (1882): 1–52; Budde, "Poetry (Hebrew)". See also W. Randall Garr, "The Qinah: A Study of Poetic Meter, Syntax and Style," *ZAW* 95 (1983): 54–75.

word order had been used.[131] He concludes that "the author or authors [of Lamentations] were freer in this aspect of syntax than were the writers of Genesis."[132]

The only possible explanation for some of the cases of abnormal word order is the tendency in both Hebrew prose and verse to put the longest constituent at the end.[133] This seems particularly true for clauses with three verbal arguments. Consider the following:

(1)   Lam 2:1cd

הִשְׁלִיךְ מִשָּׁמַיִם אֶרֶץ \\   תִּפְאֶרֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל

V PPc NPc // NPc

He has thrown down from heaven to earth // the beauty of Israel.

The couplet (1) shows a case in which the patient-object יִשְׂרָאֵל (vs. the goal-object אֶרֶץ) comes last, very likely due to its length. Hillers notes that, in some cases, the division seems to heighten the effect of, or draw attention to, the caesura, or secondary pause, in the poetic line.[134] As an example of S-postponement in which the postponement heightens the division of the couplet, the following line is telling:

(2)   Lam 2:10

הוֹרִידוּ לָאָרֶץ רֹאשָׁן \\   בְּתוּלֹת יְרוּשָׁלָ͏ִם

V PPc NPc // NPs

They lower to the ground their head // the virgins of Jerusalem.

_____

131. Hillers, "Observations on Syntax and Meter in Lamentations," 269. See his earlier, brief description of the same phenomena (Delbert R. Hillers, *Lamentations: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, Anchor Bible [Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1972], xxxvi-xxxvii).

132. Hillers, "Observations on Syntax and Meter in Lamentations," 269.

133. Andersen, "Studies," 373–79.

134. Hillers, "Observations on Syntax and Meter in Lamentations," 270.

Couplet (2) shows a case of the V PPc NPc // NPs, where the normal word order, V NPs // NPc PPc would not heighten the pause between the two lines as the aberrant pattern does.[135]

A study of the precise poetic constructions that might be shown to trigger S- and O-postponement in BH verse would provide a stimulating area of further study, but the concern of this analysis will be the extent to which syntax is relaxed in BH verse. In particular, the present analysis will consider the word order patterns that result in a sample of BH verse and suggest possible syntactical descriptions of the movement operations taking place in them.

Postverbal Word Order in CBH

As Andersen has shown, postverbal constituents follow a relatively stable order in CBH prose, though perhaps not as stable as the placement of V in the first or second position of the clause. Gropp has put forward the following underlying clause structure for unmarked word order for clauses with full lexical arguments:[136]

(3)   #_____V_____S_____O_____C_____L_____Inf#

The variables represent the clause's immediate constituents which have a fixed position

---

135. Hillers, "Observations on Syntax and Meter in Lamentations," 270.

136. This hypothetical structure is based on a study of the prose of Genesis and 1 Samuel. In this hypothetical structure, # = clause boundary, V = verb, S = subject, O = (direct) object, C = either subject or object complement, L = locative, Inf = infinitive. It will be presumed that adverbials and discourse particles do not "fill" a slot in CBH clause structure. Douglas M. Gropp, "The Order of Post-Verbal Constituents in Classical Biblical Hebrew Prose," paper presented at the annual international meeting of the SBL, Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Section (Washington, D.C., 1993); in relation to BH verse, see Douglas M. Gropp, "Syntactic Differentia of Biblical Hebrew Poetry," (unpublished paper).

in the clause, and the spaces represent slots that can be held by various other clause-immediate constituents due to normal movement rules. However, there are constraints regarding which constituents can fill these open positions. For instance, any single constituent can occupy the preverbal position, but typically only a pronominalized constituent may fill the pre-S position.[137] In fact, as a general rule of thumb in CBH both a pronominalized PP and a NPc headed by את may precede non-pronominalized ones.[138] Certain temporal phrases are another outlier in this structure since they seem to exhibit adverb-like flexibility regarding which positions they can occupy, and they may at times occupy the pre-S position.[139] While it is irregular for a PP to precede the O position in the clause, when it does occur, the PP is usually the addressee complement of a V of speaking,[140] a benefactive complement of a V of transfer,[141] or a personal destination of a

---

137. For this reason, lines like Gen 49:8c (יִשְׁתַּחֲווּ לְךָ בְּנֵי אָבִיךָ), Exod 16:15a, Deut 32:12b, 28b, Zeph 2:14a; Ps 106:29b, 41b, and others are not considered cases of S-postponement. Zeph 1:14d (צֹרֵחַ שָׁם גִּבּוֹר) should probably be counted among these cases in which the constituent in the second position is pronominalized. It should also be noted that vocatives do count as arguments of the overt verb in this study (Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 80–81), which thereby rules out any clauses in which the verb is in the imperative (e.g. Isa 40:9b 44:21a, 47:8a, 48:1a).

138. Though there are cases in which this constraint is relaxed in CBH: subject-pronominalized prepositional phrase (PP=benefactive, Gen 11:29a; 26:22b; 28:21b; 30:24b; 42:28b; 50:12; Deut 23:6a; 1 Sam 12:13b; 13:14; 14:6a; PP=addressee, Gen 19:18a; 25:23a; 31:16a; 41:8b; 44:27a; 1 Sam 15:16a; 18:24a; PP-source, Gen 44:28a; 1 Sam 13:8b, 11b; PP=goal, Gen 29:34a; 1 Sam 13:12a; PP=instrument, Gen 44:5a), subject-pronominalized direct object with את (Gen 30:30a; 39:20a; 41:39a; 42:22a; 48:12a; 50:25b; Deut 5:32a, 33a). Gropp shared these with me from a database of CBH prose that he is compiling.

139. See the discussion of flexibility of certain adverbial adjuncts in ch. 4.

140. Perhaps the most common. Gropp proposes that this pattern, verb-addressee-object, may be grammaticalized in CBH (Judge 7:13; 1 Sam 10:25; 18:26).

141. Though this may be related to LIPOC, since in many cases, the NPc is long or compound, though there are some exceptions (Gen 26:4; 29:29; 2 Sam 4:8; 2 Kings

V of translocation.[142] It should be understood therefore that some types of postponement are more abnormal than others. For instance, V-NPc-NPs is more irregular in CBH than V-PPc-NPc (if the V communicates transfer and the PPc is the benefactive complement). Gropp explains that, in terms of pragmatic structure, the field between V and the O tends to be more topical while the post-O field (and perhaps the preverbal field as well) tends to be more focal. From this hypothetical structure, the following rules emerge:

(4)   The overt subject usually is the first non-pronominalized constituent after the verb.

(5)   Apart from the overt subject and addressee in verbs of speaking, the object is usually the first non-pronominalized constituent after the verb.

If these two constraints are accepted for CBH prose, it becomes apparent that the same constraints are somewhat relaxed in BH verse. In the case of (6), the PP occurs before S in an otherwise typical line of BH verse.

(6)   Ps 18:14

וַיַּרְעֵם בַּשָּׁמַיִם יְהוָה \\ וְעֶלְיוֹן יִתֵּן קֹלוֹ \\ בָּרָד וְגַחֲלֵי־אֵשׁ

V PPa NPs // NPs V NPc // NPc NPc

The Lord thunders in the heavens // the Most High utters his voice //

hailstones and coals of fire

Since it is not pronominalized, the PP of the A-line appears to contradict the rule stated above that the pre-S position should only be occupied by pronominalized constituents. Functionally speaking, the PP is the locative adjunct, which is therefore peripheral or

13:5; 15:19).

142. Gen 43:11; Num 31:12; 2 Kings 4:42.

optional to the clause structure. It is interesting that this word order V-PP-NPs is the
most common type of word order pattern that occurs in a sample of clauses that exhibit S-
postponement. The PP being an adjunct, however, relegates this word order pattern to the
minority, since it occurs in about one-fifth of the clauses showing V-PP-NPs.

    The rarer word order V-NPc-NPs likewise occurs, as is shown here in (7) from the
same psalm as (6):

(7)   Ps 18:35

מְלַמֵּד יָדַי לַמִּלְחָמָה \\ וְנִחֲתָה קֶשֶׁת־נְחוּשָׁה זְרוֹעֹתָי

V NPc PPc // V NPc NPs

He trains my hands for battle // so that my arms can bend a bronze bow.

While clauses in which the NPs precede non-pronominalized PP are regular in BH prose,
the order of NPs before NPc seems even more stable, making it especially notable that
this inversion takes place in BH verse. The V-NPc -NPs pattern is also exhibited in Ps
22:27 and Ps 78:8, both of which involve a reference to God in O (יהוה in the former and
אֶת־אֵל in the latter) which should be noted since some scholars have argued that references to
God might exert influence over word order patterns.[143]

----

143. "In some cases religious sentiment may account for the initial position of
the word for God or an agent of his." Joüon-Muraoka, 582. See also ch. 4 above and
Muraoka's discussion of constructions in which S=God (Muraoka, *Emphatic*, 35).

S-Postponement

The S-postponement pattern can be expressed by way of the following algebra:

(8)   V XPx NPs (XPx ≠ PRN)

Of the sample of 242 of eligible clauses in the corpus, clauses that contain a verb, a lexical noun phrase or prepositional phrase, and a lexical subject or independent personal pronoun, there are 30 clauses (12.4%) that present the S-postponement pattern. Table 2 provides an account of each of the clauses in which S-postponement takes place.

Table 2. Clauses with S-postponement in Sample

Citation	Text	Constituent Structure	Trope	Line
Gen 49:24a	וַתֵּשֶׁב בְּאֵיתָן קַשְׁתּוֹ His bow remained steady	V PPc NPs		A
Exod 15:8b	נִצְּבוּ כְמוֹ־נֵד נֹזְלִים The waters stood up in a heap	V PPc NPs	Matching	B
Num 24:7c	וְיָרֹם מֵאֲגַג מַלְכּוֹ His king is higher than Agag.	V PPc NPs	MatchGap	A
Num 24:18b	וְהָיָה יְרֵשָׁה שֵׂעִיר אֹיְבָיו Seir, his enemy, shall be a possession	V NPpred NPs	MatchNoGap	B
Deut 32:2a	יַעֲרֹף כַּמָּטָר לִקְחִי Let my teaching drip like rain	V PPc NPs	MatchNoGap	A
Deut 32:2b	תִּזַּל כַּטַּל אִמְרָתִי Let my speech flow out like dew	V PPc NPs	MatchNoGap	B
Deut 32:41b	וְתֹאחֵז בְּמִשְׁפָּט יָדִי My hand takes hold on judgment	V PPc NPs		B

Deut 33:5a	וַיְהִי בִישֻׁרוּן מֶלֶךְ He will be a king in Jeshurun	V PPpred NPs	MatchGap	B
Judg 5:11e	אָז יָרְדוּ לַשְּׁעָרִים עַם־יְהוָה Then the people of the Lord went down to the gates	V PPc NPs		A
Judg 5:24a	תְּבֹרַךְ מִנָּשִׁים יָעֵל May Jael be blessed among women	V PPc NPs	SynDep	A
Isa 40:24b	אַף בַּל־שֹׁרֵשׁ בָּאָרֶץ גִּזְעָם Their stock is hardly rooted in the earth	V PPa NPs	SynDep	B
Isa 41:12b	יִהְיוּ כְאַיִן וּכְאֶפֶס \\ אַנְשֵׁי מִלְחַמְתֶּךָ They will be like nothing at all // those who war with you	V PPpred PPpred // NPs	Syndep	A
Isa 42:17b	יֵבֹשׁוּ בֹשֶׁת \\ הַבֹּטְחִים בַּפָּסֶל They will be put to shame // those who trust in images	V NPc // NPs	SynDep	A-B
Isa 45:16b[144]	יַחְדָּו הָלְכוּ בַכְּלִמָּה \\ חָרָשֵׁי צִירִים: Together, they go into confusion // the engraver of images	V PPc // NPs	SynDep	B
Isa 48:18b	וַיְהִי כַנָּהָר שְׁלוֹמֶךָ Your well-being will be like a river	V PPpred NPs		B
Isa 48:19a	וַיְהִי כַחוֹל זַרְעֶךָ Your seed was like sand	V PPpred NPs		A
Hab 3:3c	כִּסָּה שָׁמַיִם הוֹדוֹ His splendor covered the heavens	V NPc NPs	MatchNoGap	A

---

144. Following the line division in the MT. The adverb יַחְדָּו is not counted in this analysis.

Hab 3:17e	גֹּזַר מִמִּכְלָה צֹאן The flock is separated from the fold	V PPc NPs	MatchNoGap	A
Zeph 3:13b	וְלֹא־יִמָּצֵא בְּפִיהֶם לְשׁוֹן תַּרְמִית a deceitful tongue will not be found in their mouth	V PPc NPs		C
Zeph 3:5e	וְלֹא־יוֹדֵעַ עַוָּל בֹּשֶׁת: The unjust will not know shame	V NPc NPs		C
Ps 2:12c	כִּי־יִבְעַר כִּמְעַט אַפּוֹ because his anger is kindled quickly	V PPa NPs		C
Ps 6:8a	עָשְׁשָׁה מִכַּעַס עֵינִי My eye wastes away from anger	V NPa NPs		A
Ps 18:14a	וַיַּרְעֵם בַּשָּׁמַיִם יהוה The Lord thunders in the heavens.	V PPa NPs		A
Ps 18:35b	וְנִחֲתָה קֶשֶׁת־נְחוּשָׁה זְרוֹעֹתָי: So my arms can bend a bronze bow	V NPc NPs		B
Ps 19:15a	יִהְיוּ לְרָצוֹן אִמְרֵי־פִי Let the words of my mouth be acceptable	V NPc NPs		A
Ps 22:16a	יָבֵשׁ כַּחֶרֶשׂ כֹּחִי My strength is dried up like a potsherd	V NPa NPs		A
Ps 22:27	יְהַלְלוּ יהוה דֹּרְשָׁיו They will seek him, those who praise the Lord	V NPc NPs		B
Ps 22:28a	יִזְכְּרוּ וְיָשֻׁבוּ אֶל־יהוה \\ כָּל־אַפְסֵי־אָרֶץ They will remember and return to the Lord // All the ends of the earth	V+V PPc // NPs		A

| Ps 78:8d | וְלֹא־נֶאֶמְנָה אֶת־אֵל רוּחֽוֹ׃
Whose spirit was not true to God | V PPc NPs | | B |
| Ps 78:65a | וַיִּקַץ כְּיָשֵׁן אֲדֹנָי \\ כְּגִבּוֹר מִתְרוֹנֵן מִיָּֽיִן
The Lord awakes as if from sleep // like a warrior intoxicated with wine | V PPa NPs | SynDep | A-B |

Factors in S-Postponement.

Divine Name. Deference to the name of or reference to God may influence some of these cases. There are 5 clauses that include a divine name (DN),

- 2 clauses in which the DN is the S and thus in the third position (יהוה Ps 18:14; אֲדֹנָי Ps 78:8),

- 2 clauses in which the DN is a NPc that occurs before the NPs (יהוה Ps 22:27; אֶת־אֵל Ps 78:8),

- 1 clause in which the DN is a PPc that occurs before the NPs (אֶל־יהוה Ps 22:28)

Coordination. Nearly one half (13) of the clauses are coordinated, while 16 are uncoordinated. One clause is linked to its preceding to the preceding clause by כִּי (Ps 2:12), so coordination alone does not seem to play a role in such clauses. A phenomenon related to coordination is that of line placement, and so it is noteworthy that, as in coordination, nearly half (56.7%; 17 clauses) of the clauses occur in the A line or begin in the A-line and continue to the B-line by way of syntactic dependency. Given the similar finding in V-postponement (see ch. 4), the putative markedness of the non-A line in BH verse does not exert noticeable influence on whether or not the clause includes a postponed S.

Syntactic Tropes: Matching and Dependency. Another phenomenon related to coordination and line placement are the main syntactic tropes of BH verse: matching (with or without gapping) and syntactic dependency. Of the 30 lines with S-postponement,

- 8 (26.7%) are matching: 6 without gapping (Exod 15:8; Num 24:18; Deut 32:2a-2b; Hab 3:3; 3:17), and 2 with gapping (Num 24:7; Deut 33:5)

- 6 (20%) are syntactically dependent: There are 2 clauses in which the postponement is not in concert with the syntactic dependency (Judg 5:24; Ps 78:65), and 4 in which the postponement is in concert with the syntactic break across the pause (Isa 41:12; 42:17; 45:16; Ps 22:28).[145]   This finding shows that even in cases in which the clause extends across two lines, the syntactic dependency is not necessarily the cause of, or caused by, the postponement. Other influences may be at play, such as the length of the constituent in the B-line or another syntactic trope. In the two cases where postponement is not in concert with dependency, the constituent in the B-line is relatively long and in apposition to a constituent present in the A-line where the postponement occurs.

(9)   Judge 5:24

תְּבֹרַךְ מִנָּשִׁים יָעֵל \\ אֵשֶׁת חֶבֶר הַקֵּינִי \\ מִנָּשִׁים בָּאֹהֶל תְּבֹרָךְ

Jael is most blessed among women // the wife of Heber the Qenite // She is more blessed than tent-dwelling women

(10)   Ps 78:65

וַיִּקַץ כְּיָשֵׁן אֲדֹנָי \\ כְּגִבּוֹר מִתְרוֹנֵן מִיָּיִן

The Lord awakes as if from sleep // as if a warrior intoxicated with wine.

---

145. Hillers, "Observations on Syntax and Meter in Lamentations," 270.

In (9), the A-line is the one that exhibits postponement, the B-line is a phrase line with one constituent[146] which in this case is NPs in apposition to NPs יָעֵל . The NPs of the B-line, however, can also be read as the subject of the C-line, because of its pivotal position in the three line construction. It would appear that this two-way syntactic dependency is the construction that requires the appositive NPs to occur in the B-line. The S-postponement on the A-line contributes to the overall chiastic arrangement of the triplet resulting in the structure a b c // c'// b' a' (with the use of a/a' = תְּבֹרַךְ forming an *inclusio*).

In the case of (10), however, the syntactic dependency seems to be triggered by the length of the constituent in the B-line, in this case, a PP that is appositive to, but not adjacent to, the PP in the A-line. The result is a truncated chiastic arrangement a b c / b'.

Varieties of S-Postponement.

Variety 1: V PP NPs. Over two-thirds of the clauses (22 clauses) with S-postponement exhibit S-postponement in which the pre-S constituent is a PP. The sub-patterns are:

- V PPc NPs

  12 clauses (54.5%), 1 of which has two verbs in the V V PPc // NPs.

- V PPpred NPs

  4 clauses (18.2%) in which the V is הָיָה and the predicate precedes the NPs (1 of which is V PPpred PPpred NPs).

- V PPa NPs

---

146. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 356–60.

6 clauses (27.3%) in which the PP is an adjunct. Though semantic role is not within the purview of this study, 3 of the clauses have adjuncts of *comparison* (Ps 2:12; 22:16 78:65) and 2 have adjuncts of *location* (Isa 40:24; Ps 18:14), while 1 has an adjunct of *cause* (Ps 6:8).

If the PP is a complement of the verb, it may not be surprising that it might be "bound" more closely to the VP, a hypothesis that is made a little more convincing if one also includes the 4 clauses that have the V הָיָה in which the predicate NPpred is surely a verbal complement. In other words, clauses in which the NPs is preceded by a PP complement outnumber clauses in which the NPs is preceded by a PP adjunct, making up 73% of this type.

Variety 2: V NP NPs. Just under one-third or 8 clauses exhibit S-postponement in which the pre-S constituent is a NP. As might be anticipated by the V PP NPs pattern above, only comlements precede NPs in this pattern. The sub-patterns are:

- V NPc NPs

  7 clauses (23.3%) in which an NPc precedes NPs (Isa 78:8; Hab 3:3; Zeph 3:5; Ps 18:35; 19:15; 22:27; 78:8).

- V NPpred NPs 1 clause in which the V is הָיָה and the predicate precedes the NPs (Num 24:18)

As would be expected, in verbal clauses of three constituents in which the NPs is postponed, the NP in the second position is always a complement. This arrangement is probably more related to the relative paucity of NPa in all of the lines under consideration–only 2 instances arise, both in clauses exhibiting V-postponement (Deut 32:12; Ps 2:7)**.**

Excursus: The Pragmatics of S-Postponement.

The argument of the current study is that postponement patterns occur due to defamiliarization that is constitutive of BH verse. This does not mean that these patterns cannot be triggered by poetic devices such as matching and syntactic dependency or the exigencies of pragmatics or both. Rather, defamiliarization allows for these triggers to work within a system of relaxed syntactic constraints so that more constituent arrangements are available than in BH prose. While pragmatics are not a major part of the current study, there is a possible explanation for certain S-postponement patterns that can be better perceived with the help of the lens of pragmatics.

Heinrich Ewald wrote that Biblical Hebrew (BH) clauses that exhibit the highly unusual V-O-S word order are configured in such a way that "gives greater prominence to the member delayed to the very end."[147]   He gave only two examples of this unusual word order configuration, both of which occur in verse:

(11)   Ps 34:22a

תְּמוֹתֵת רָשָׁע רָעָה \\ וְשֹׂנְאֵי צַדִּיק יֶאְשָׁמוּ

disaster will kill the wicked one //

and the haters of the innocent will be condemned.

(12)   Job 15:5a

כִּי יְאַלֵּף עֲוֺנְךָ פִּיךָ \\ וְתִבְחַר לְשׁוֹן עֲרוּמִים

because your mouth teaches your perversity //

and you choose the language of the crafty.

As mentioned above, the S-postponement occurs in the A-line of both examples which

147. Ewald, *Syntax of the Hebrew Language of the Old Testament*, 158.

indicates that the unusual word order is not due to the influence of an A-line over a B-line. In fact, while both examples reflect a type of semantic parallelism, the syntactic structure of each line is not clearly matching. The first couplet exhibits a V-O-S // S-V pattern (with three words in each line), and the second couplet exhibits a V-O-S // V-O (again with three words each). Likewise, the B-lines do not reflect any sort of gapping that might explain the relationship between the two lines as the reason for the postponement in the A-line. The verb in the B-line of (11) is intransitive, so the object is not gapped in this case, and the verb in the B-line of (12) is in the second person, excluding a gapping of the subject פִּיךָ from line A. In both (11) and (12), the NP in line B includes a construct chain which counter-balances the three constituents of the A-line.

In the case of (11), the context of the postponement reveals a shift in perspective from the prosperity of the righteous to the calamitous fate of the wicked, and it is likely that the postponed S ("disaster") communicates a contrast with the preceding topic of "prosperity." It should be noted that the topic of the wicked is not new to this psalm but is rather resumed from v. 17 and differentiated from the previous material in vv. 18-21. The contrast is heightened by the fact that the righteous experience "disasters" רָעוֹת but are delivered in v. 20, whereas the "disaster" רָעָה is fatal for the wicked in v. 22.

In the case of (12), the ambiguity between the object and subject of the verb in the A-line is not unsolvable. The NP עָוֺן is rarely personified as the subject of a verb of speaking (cf. metaphorical use as S: 2 Kings 7:9; Isa 64:5; Jer 5:35; Ps 65:5; Prov 5:22 "perversity testifies against us" where judgment is in view, Jer 14:7; but see Ps 36:2 נְאֻם־פֶּשַׁע לָרָשָׁע, the LXX reads פֶּשַׁע as a adjective ὁ παράνομος apparently referring to the perpetrator of the transgression), and the presence of the NP פִּיךָ , the organ of speech, the

latter NP that should probably be recognized as the S, as Ewald reads it.[148]   This reading

seems to be confirmed by the wording of v. 6a פִּיךָ יַרְשִׁיעֶךָ . The criticism against Job in

this section targets his manner of speaking, that is, the work of his mouth, and so if we

take Ewald's reading, פִּיךָ as the salient information of v. 5a. By Eliphaz's lights, Job's

apparent sagacity is not a sign of his innocence but rather a cause for his condemnation.

These two poetic passages exemplify the pragmatic rationale Ewald is putting

forward to describe the unusual word order which moves S to the final position of verbal

clause, but his thesis of pragmatically-triggered constituent postponement was not picked

up by Hebraists in the intervening years. In twentieth century scholarship, only two

scholars, Robert Longacre[149] and Lars Lode (in two parts[150]), address the question of

postverbal word order.   Both treatments apply a kind of functional paradigm to the

subject matter, however both are also quite idiosyncratic. It should be noted that Lode

does discern a postverbal word order in the prose of Genesis according to a matrix of

semantic categories: undergoer, involved , locative, manner, time, and non-temporal

categories occurring in four "aspects," source, position, extent, and goal.[151] Clauses with

postverbal constituent word order can be shown to serve a discursive function, such as

episodic transition, or a pragmatic function, what Lode calls "focus" and "emphasis."[152]

----

148. It should be noted that the LXX renders Job 15:5 ἔνοχος εἶ ῥήμασιν στόματός σου // οὐδὲ διέκρινας ῥήματα δυναστῶν· ("You are guilty by the words of your mouth // neither have you discerned the words of the mighty.") Dahood and Andersen read אלף as "to increase (a thousand fold)" which likewise renders פִּיךָ the subject.

149. Robert E. Longacre, "The Representation of Speech in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: A Linguistic Analysis," *JNES* 59 (2000): 229–30.

150. Lode, "Postverbal Word Order"; Lode, "Postverbal Word Order (Part Two)".

151. Lode, "Postverbal Word Order," 124.

152. Lode, "Postverbal Word Order," 140–46.

In a follow-up article he confirms that his theory of word order developed out of his work with Genesis also applies to the books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther though with some exceptions.[153]

In more recent years, the matter of postponement has been revisited. For instance, in S. J. Floor's dissertation, he applies the theory of information structure developed by Lambrecht to explain topic, focus, and theme in BH. He categorizes certain word order configurations as unique in the way that the focused element is moved to the end of a clause. Floor uses the terminology of "focus peaking" to describe this phenomenon,[154] and he notes that a rising effect can occur at the end of the clause though the location of the focus peak is not necessarily at the end of the clause.[155] This sort of focus peaking in BH is only perceptible through word order which is marked for a type of focus activation. In the following poetic couplet, the focused information is postponed to the end of the second line,

----

153. Lode, "Postverbal Word Order (Part Two)," 24–25.

154. Floor defines focus and focus peaking: "Focus refers to the pragmatic domain of the newly-asserted information. Focus peaking, on the other hand, does not refer to a pragmatic domain, but is a catch-all for specific pragmatic operation within the focus domain." (Sebastiaan J. Floor, "From Information Structure, Topic and Focus, to the Theme in Biblical Hebrew Narrative" [Stellenbosch, South Africa: University of Stellenbosh, 2004], 183) Focus-peaking borrows from a similar notion of the Prague School, particularly Jan Firbas, that is the notion of communicative dynamism. Firbas, *Functional Sentence*.

155. Floor, "From Information Structure, Topic and Focus," 181.

(13)   Prov. 7:7

וָאֵ֤רֶא בַפְּתָאיִ֗ם \\ אָבִ֘ינָ֤ה בַבָּנִ֗ים נַ֖עַר חֲסַר־לֵֽב׃

I saw among the simple // I discerned among the youths, *a boy lacking sense*.

In (3), נַ֖עַר חֲסַר־לֵב illustrates the postponement of the constituent in focus (NPc) to the end of a clause as a function of focus peaking. The object of the speaker's perception represents new material, based on the presupposition "I saw x" and marked by placement at the end of the clause. Floor points out, however, that end-weight does not necessarily indicate focus peaking. He distinguishes between contrastiveness and activation[156] as possible features of the "focus peaking overlay in end weight," whether they are both present or one is present alone.[157]   Floor goes on to argue that end weight is employed as a focus peaking device only in the case of predicate focus structures (the entire predicate being in focus) that occur in clauses exhibiting topic-comment articulation.   It is important to point out that, by limiting this construction to predicate focus, this rule excludes instances of S-focus when such focus might be marked by constituent postponement. It is, however, a possible explanation of O-postponement, since O, of course, is a part of the predicate.

A consideration of the examples of S-postponement in BH verse shows that it is likely that the clause-final position can be used as a topic position. The two cases that

---

156. As a term of cognitive linguistics, activation is the means by which a referent that is unrecoverable from the context is introduced to a person's consciousness at a given moment. In the sentences "I just saw Bill. He looks sick." The first sentence activates the referent "Bill" which is, in turn, the topic of the second sentence (Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, 93–95).

157. Floor, "From Information Structure, Topic and Focus," 183 This distinction between activation and contrastiveness is developed from Lambrecht's similar distinction between the marking of activation states and pragmatic presuppositions. Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, 269–86.

Ewald highlights as examples of "prominence," (11) and (12) above, are not cases of

what Lambrecht would call "argument focus,"[158] (though Moshavi is quite right that this

label is problematic, so I will use her preferable label "constituent focus"[159]). In the case

of (11) it would seem that the postponed S is the topic of the clause and the verb phrase

(VP[160]) exhibits contrastive focus (that disaster will be fatal for wicked whereas it is not

for the righteous vv. 20-21).[161] In the case of (12), the postponed S also seems to be the

topic of the clause, since it is the organ of Job's speech, and his speech is the topic of the

preceding lines (see בְּדָבָר לֹא יִסְכּוֹן and מִלִּים in 15:3), the new information being the sort of

teaching that comes from his mouth.

At this point in our discussion, it is unclear whether the operation exhibited in

these clauses is one of postponement or of fronting focused elements, the VP in (11) and

the constituent NPc in (12). In fact , in all other clausal lines with the clause

configuration V-NPc-NPs found in this study, the NPs seems to be the topic as well, as

we might expect. In those cases in which S-postponement occurs, and the configuration

is V-PP-NPs, and NPs is the topic, it would be expected that the entire VP (V + PP)

would be bound together due to two criteria: the first criterion which is related to the

---

158. Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, 228–33 For application of Lambrecht in BH, see Shimasaki, *Focus Structure in Biblical Hebrew*, 134–42; Lunn, *Word-Order Variation*, 44.

159. Moshavi, *Word Order*, 90.

160. The notion of a VP in BH is problematic because of the usual constituent order in which the S interrupts the verb and its complements. In the case of S-postponement, however, that interruption never occurs, and so the notion of VP becomes helpful in these cases. See Moshavi, *Word Order*, 61

161. Lambrecht makes a helpful distinction between contrastive foci and contrastive topics. Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, 286–95.

semantic structure of the VP, the second which is related to the information structure of the VP.

(14)   The PP is a complement of the V, it is necessary (i.e., not optional) to the completing the action of the verb. For instance, a verb of translocation takes a locative complement, a transitive verb takes a direct object as a complement. The complement is usually nuclear to the clause, but it may not always be overt.[162]

(15)   If the VP is in predicate focus, the entire VP (V + PP) may both be in the focus domain, and therefore be fronted, leaving the topic (= S, in these cases) to be clause final.

Take, for instance, the following line:

(16)   Lam 2:9

טָבְעוּ בָאָרֶץ שְׁעָרֶיהָ \\ אִבַּד וְשִׁבַּר בְּרִיחֶיהָ

V PPc NPs // V V NPc

Her gates have sunk into the earth //

He has ruined and shattered her bars

In the case of (16) the V selects a locative PP complement thus providing the conditions for criterion (14) mentioned above. It should also be noted that the entire VP is likely a predicate focus structure. The NPs שְׁעָרֶיהָ is activated by the context: the preceding lines

---

162. Gropp, "The Order of Post-Verbal Constituents," 7–8 For a further discussion of complements and adjuncts in BH, see Moshavi, *Word Order*, 61–63.

which discuss the city and walls of Zion (2:8). The fate of the city gates, their "sinking

into the earth," is therefore focused in (16). Cases in which both criteria (14) and (15) are

true of a clause are common in the cases of S-postponement found in BH verse. For

instance, in (11) the transitive V תְּמוֹתֵת selects the NPc that follows it and it seems that the

entire predicate is in focus.

There are, however, cases in which both criteria (14) and (15) don't account for

the clause structure. In (6) the V הִרְעִים can select an NPc[163] but not a PP locative as a

complement, so in this case the PP בַּשָּׁמַיִם is an adjunct. It could be argued that the entire

predicate is focused, though this analysis is open to criticism.   One might argue that the

"heavens" was activated four verses prior in Ps 18:10 וַיֵּט שָׁמַיִם וַיֵּרַד "he bowed the heavens

and came down" and in the intervening imagery.[164] If this criticism is accepted, than neither (14)

nor (15) can account for the fronting of the predicate (V + PP), and another explanation should

be considered.

Lambrecht acknowledges a significant but "severely restricted" exception to the topic-

first rule which describes the reality that topicalization usually occurs in the clause initial

position (as in constituent fronting and preposing constructions in BH). This exception has been

referred to as "epexegesis," "extraposition,"[165] and "right dislocation," but Lambrecht uses the

---

163. *HALOT* classifies הִרְעִים as an "internally transitive hif." citing *GKC* §53d;
Bergsträsser 2: §19d. "רעם" (*HALOT*, 1266-7).

164. In 18:11, the Lord comes "on the wings of the wind" עַל־כַּנְפֵי־רוּחַ, in v. 12,
he is covered in "dark clouds" עָבֵי שְׁחָקִים and in v. 13 passing before him are עָבָיו בָּרָד
וְגַחֲלֵי־אֵשׁ"clouds, hailstones and coals of fire."

165. Otto Jespersen, *Essentials of English Grammar*, Alabama Linguistic &
Philological Series (Repr. of 1933; Tuscaloosa, Ala.: University of Alabama Press,
1964), 154.

term "antitopic" following Chafe.[166] Lambrecht illustrates the antitopic construction in the following example (his 4.59):

> (17)   He's a nice GUY, your brother.[167]

In this example, the antitopic construction appears as a pronominalized topic "He" and a lexical topic "your brother," neither of which receive the primary accent, and the lexical topic is moved to a post-focal position, while the focus received prosodic marking of accent. The topicalized pronoun is used as an "implicit request" for the hearer to allow for the topic not to be made explicit until the antitopic is lexically expressed. This construction does have cross-linguistic support, and it seems to be used when the topic is "highly salient" but not accented (and therefore not contrastive) so that it is easily recoverable from the context.[168]

One problem that arises is the lack of a cataphoric pronominalized topic in the instances of S-Postponement in BH. In English, as seen in the (11), a cataphoric pronoun is employed to introduce the topic and put the expectation of propositional information on hold until the antitopic is expressed (though a colloquial example in which the pronoun and copula are dropped is acceptable, e.g. "Nice GUY, your brother.").[169] In BH there is an analogy with the structure of pre-posing or *casus pendens*, in which a resumptive,

---

166. Wallace Chafe, "Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics, and Point of View," in *Subject and Topic*, ed. Charles Li (New York: Academic Press, 1976), 53–54.

167. Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, 203.

168. Lambrecht, *Information Structure*, 203–04.

169. The use and constraint of two sets of pronouns in German in cases of right and left detachment, confirms that there is a difference between the former and the latter, in that the former requires a higher level of pragmatic salience than the latter.

anaphoric pronoun occupies the clausal position of the constituent being preposed.[170] In preposed clauses in BH, an anaphoric pronoun occurs as a clause immediate constituent while the preposed constituent occurs superstructurally in relation to the clause.[171] As was discussed in ch. 4, the requirement of a resumptive pronoun in preposing constructions, however, is not rigid,[172] particularly in the case of a preposed S. Joüon considers cases in which S is preposed and notes that the resumptive pronoun need not be an overt independent personal pronoun, but rather, because BH is a pro-drop language, the resumption is "contained in the verb form."[173] The clause (18) provides an example of such virtual resumption,

(18)   Exod 21:12

מַכֵּה אִישׁ וָמֵת מוֹת יוּמָת

Whoever strikes a man and he dies, he must be put to death.

---

170. Using the Native American languages Seneca and Caddo to illustrate his point, Chafe describes antitopic in the Seneca language as a "mirror-image" to what he calls "premature subject" in Caddo. According to Chafe, the premature subject is introduced before the speaker knows exactly what role it will play in the sentences, and so the premature subject often occurs outside the structure of the final sentence (Chafe, "Givenness," 52–54). This might be likened to the poetic device of anacoluthon, though the construction is not necessarily intentional in the spoken utterances Chafe presents.

171. S. R. Driver, *Treatise*, 265 Gross points out the fact that the medieval Arab grammarians did not distinguish between *pendens* constructions and topicalized constituents in the preverbal position but not resumed in the main clause. This ambiguity has led to residual confusion about the difference between these two constructions, giving rise to problematic notions such as the "compound nominal clause." Gross, "Compound Nominal Clause," 24.

172. Waltke-O'Connor, 76.

173. Joüon-Muraoka, 553 Also, see the discussion above in ch. 4.

In (18) the S is the participial phrase which is not resumed apart from the agreement of the main V of the clause.

It could be argued, therefore, that the antitopic construction, a "postposing" construction, does not require an overt independent personal pronoun when the postposed constituent is the S and the cataphoric pronoun occurs in the verb form. If this is the case, then some instances of S-postponement are actually antitopic constructions in which S is outside of the clause structure, much like "your brother" is in the antitopic position in (17) above.

There is still a question about the instances in which S-postponement seems to occur in an antitopic construction, but S appears to be contrastive, a situation rejected by Lambrecht. The only example of this sort of contrastive antitopic construction is found in an emendation of Amos 6:12 which occurs outside of the corpus of the current study, but which provides an interesting case nonetheless.[174] The resulting couplet is comprised of two lines exhibiting S-postponement:

(19)   Amos 6:12 (emended)

הַיְרֻצוּן בַּסֶּלַע סוּסִים \\ אִם יֵחָרֵשׁ בַּבָּקָר יָם

V PP S // V PP S

Do horses gallop on rocks? // Is the sea plowed with the ox?

The A-line in (19) appears to shift the topic from the judgment of the Lord to the faithless response of the people expressed explicitly in 6:12b. The B-line in (19) likewise does

---

174. The B-line in the MT reads אִם־יַחֲרוֹשׁ בַּבְּקָרִים . Since the questions in the couplet expect a negative answer, the B-line of the MT is unintelligible unless one reads the PP בַּסֶּלַע of the A-line as being gapped in the B-line. The emendation follows Kittel (*BHK*, 994). It is emended to אִם יֵחָרֵשׁ בַּבָּקָר יָם (the verb is vocalized as an N-stem, and the PP is divided into two words: PP NPs), leaving the consonantal text unchanged. The result is a matching couplet with no gapping.

seem to be entirely contrastive with the A-line ("ox": "plowing the sea" vs. "horses": "galloping on the rocks"), and like the A-line it shifts topic from what precedes v. 12. It is possible that due to the propensity of BH verse to traffic freely in diverse imagery, this is simply a rare case of postposing construction being used to perform the duty of a preposing one, that is topic-shift, and as such the postposed topics would bear the accent in this case. The resulting matching pattern a b c // a' b' c' gives a further poetic explanation for the irregular use of the postposing construction.

However one explains it, the S-postponement construction is one that occurs in BH verse but is not at all common in BH prose. This is not explained away by offering a justification of such a construction along the lines of information structure. Instead, a generic feature of verse illustrated by its syntactic relaxation which is both defamiliarizing and pragmatically intelligible to the hearer. Defamiliarization and information structure are not two mutually exclusive explanations of unusual word order configurations in BH verse, but rather they work together to achieve poetically pleasing and understandable lines of poetry. Consider the following parallel lines in which V is gapped in the B-line:

(20)   Isa 48:19

וַיְהִי כַחוֹל זַרְעֶךָ \\ וְצֶאֱצָאֵי מֵעֶיךָ כִּמְעֹתָיו

V PPpred S // S PPpred

Your seed would have been like the sand // your offspring like its grains

NPs is post-posed as the topic, with the focus on PPpred "like the sand," but in the B-line, the constituents are arranged in an unmarked word order NPs PPpred with V gapped. The result is a couplet of parallel lines with V gapping in a partial chiastic construction of a b c // c' b'. The pragmatics of the A-line contribute to the chiasm of the overall couplet

resulting in a poetically felicitous arrangement that would not appear in prose due to the
more rigid syntactic constraints.

O-Postponement

The O-postponement pattern can be expressed by way of the following algebra:

(21)   V XPx NPc (XPx ≠ NPs, XPx ≠ PP[PRN])

Of the sample of 289 of eligible clauses in the corpus, clauses that contain a verb, a
lexical noun phrase or prepositional phrase, and a lexical subject or independent personal
pronoun, there are 52 clauses (18%) that present the pattern of O-postponement.

Table 3. Clauses with O-Postponement in Sample

Citation	Text	Constituent Structure	Trope	Line
Gen 49:11c	כִּבֵּס בַּיַּיִן לְבֻשׁוֹ He washed his garment in wine.	V PPa NPc	MatchGap	A
Exod 15:13a	נָחִיתָ בְחַסְדְּךָ עַם־זוּ גָּאָלְתָּ You have lead in faithfulness the people whom you redeemed.	V PPa NPs		A
Deut 32:26b	אַשְׁבִּיתָה מֵאֱנוֹשׁ זִכְרָם I will remove their memory from humanity.	V PPc NPc		B
Deut 32:40a	כִּי־אֶשָּׂא אֶל־שָׁמַיִם יָדִי I lift up to heaven my hand.	V PPc NPc		A
Isa 40:2c	כִּי לָקְחָה מִיַּד יְהוָה \\ כִּפְלַיִם בְּכָל־חַטֹּאתֶיהָ Because she has received from the hand of the Lord // two-fold for all of her sins.	V PPc // NPc	SynDep	A-B

Isa 40:3c	יַשְּׁרוּ בָּעֲרָבָה מְסִלָּה לֵאלֹהֵינוּ Make straight in the desert a highway for our God.	V PPa NPc	MatchNoGap	B
Isa 40:12a	מִי־מָדַד בְּשָׁעֳלוֹ מַיִם Who has measured the waters with his hand?	V PPc NPc		A
Isa 40:12c	וְכָל בַּשָּׁלִשׁ עֲפַר הָאָרֶץ Who has gauged the dust of the earth with a measure?	V PPc NPc	MatchNoGap	C
Isa 40:12d	וְשָׁקַל בַּפֶּלֶס הָרִים Who weighed the mountains with a scale?	V PPc NPc	MatchGap	D
Isa 41:2c	יִתֵּן כֶּעָפָר חַרְבּוֹ He makes like the dust with his sword.	V PPc NPc	MatchGap	A
Isa 41:19a	אֶתֵּן בַּמִּדְבָּר אֶרֶז שִׁטָּה I will put in the desert, the cedar, the acacia.	V PPc NPc NPc	SynDep	A-B
Isa 41:19c	אָשִׂים בָּעֲרָבָה בְּרוֹשׁ I will set in the desert the juniper.	V PPc NPc	SynDep	A-B
Isa 42:2b	וְלֹא־יַשְׁמִיעַ בַּחוּץ קוֹלוֹ Nor will he make his voice heard on the street.	V PPa NPc		B
Isa 42:4b	עַד־יָשִׂים בָּאָרֶץ מִשְׁפָּט Until he sets judgment in the land.	V PPc NPc		B
Isa 43:19c	אַף אָשִׂים בַּמִּדְבָּר דֶּרֶךְ Yes, I will set in the desert a road.	V PPc NPc	SynDep	A-B
Isa 43:20c	כִּי־נָתַתִּי בַמִּדְבָּר מַיִם Because I have set in the wilderness water.	V PPc NPc	MatchGap	A
Isa 43:28b	וְאֶתְּנָה לַחֵרֶם יַעֲקֹב I have given Jacob to the ban.	V PPc NPc	MatchGap	A

Isa 44:19c	וְאַף אָפִיתִי עַל־גֶּחָלָיו לֶחֶם Furthermore, I baked bread on coals.	V PPa NPc	MatchNoGap	B
Isa 44:22a	מָחִיתִי כָעָב פְּשָׁעֶיךָ I have blotted out your transgressions like a cloud.	V PPa NPc	MatchGap	A
Hab 3:14a	נָקַבְתָּ בְמַטָּיו רֹאשׁ פְּרָזָיו You pierced with your arrows the chief of the warriors.	V PPa NPc		A
Hab 3:15a	דָּרַכְתָּ בַיָּם סוּסֶיךָ You tread the sea with your horses.	V PPc NPa	SynDep	A
Zeph 1:4c	וְהִכְרַתִּי מִן־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה אֶת־שְׁאָר הַבַּעַל And I will cut off from this place the remnant of Baal.	V PPc NPc	MatchGap	A
Zeph 3:9a	כִּי־אָז אֶהְפֹּךְ אֶל־עַמִּים שָׂפָה בְרוּרָה For then I will turn to the people a pure language.	V PPc NPc	SynDep	A-B
Zeph 3:11c	כִּי־אָז אָסִיר מִקִּרְבֵּךְ עַלִּיזֵי גַּאֲוָתֵךְ For then I will remove from your midst your proudly exultant ones.	V PPc NPc		A
Zeph 3:12a	וְהִשְׁאַרְתִּי בְקִרְבֵּךְ \\ עַם עָנִי וָדָל I will leave in your midst // a humble and lowly people.	V PPc // NPc	SynDep	A-B
Zech 9:4b	וְהִכָּה בַיָּם חֵילָהּ He will strike her power in the sea.	V PPa NPc		B
Ps 6:7b	אַשְׂחֶה בְכָל־לַיְלָה מִטָּתִי I flood my bed with tears every night.	V PPa NPc	MatchNoGap	A
Ps 7:6b	וְיִרְמֹס לָאָרֶץ חַיָּי And may he trample my life to the ground.	V PPc NPc	MatchNoGap	A

Ps 9:8b	כּוֹנֵן לַמִּשְׁפָּט כִּסְאוֹ He has established his throne in judgment.	V PPc NPc		B
Ps 15:3b	לֹא־עָשָׂה לְרֵעֵהוּ רָעָה He does not do evil to his neighbor.	V PPc NPc	MatchNoGap	A
Ps 9:12b	הִגִּידוּ בָעַמִּים עֲלִילוֹתָיו Declare to the peoples his deeds.	V PPc NPc		B
Ps 18:7c	יִשְׁמַע מֵהֵיכָלוֹ קוֹלִי He heard from his temple my voice.	V PPa NPc		A
Ps 21:4b	תָּשִׁית לְרֹאשׁוֹ עֲטֶרֶת פָּז You set on his head a crown of pure gold.	V PPc NPc		B
Ps 22:21a	הַצִּילָה מֵחֶרֶב נַפְשִׁי Deliver from the sword my soul.	V PPc NPc	MatchGap	A
Ps 23:5c	דִּשַּׁנְתָּ בַשֶּׁמֶן רֹאשִׁי You anoint my head with oil.	V PPc NPc		A
Ps 24:4c	לֹא־נָשָׂא לַשָּׁוְא נַפְשִׁי He does not lift up his soul to what is false.	V PPc NPc		A
Ps 78:2a	אֶפְתְּחָה בְמָשָׁל פִּי Let me open my mouth in parable.	V PPa NPc	MatchNoGap	A
Ps 78:7a	וְיָשִׂימוּ בֵאלֹהִים כִּסְלָם That they might place their confidence in God.	V NPc PPc		A
Ps 78:16b	וַיּוֹרֶד כַּנְּהָרוֹת מָיִם And he caused waters to flow down like rivers.	V PPa NPc	MatchNoGap	B
Ps 78:26b	יְנַהֵג בְּעֻזּוֹ תֵימָן He caused the south-wind to flow by his power.	V PPc NPc	MatchNoGap	B
Ps 78:33a	וַיְכַל־בַּהֶבֶל יְמֵיהֶם He end their days in a breath.	V PPa NPc	MatchGap	A

Ps 78:44a	וַיַּהֲפֹךְ לְדָם יְאֹרֵיהֶם He turned their rivers to blood.	V PPc NPc	MatchNoGap	C
Ps 78:46a	וַיִּתֵּן לֶחָסִיל יְבוּלָם He gave their produce to the locust.	V PPc NPc	MatchGap	A
Ps 78:50b	לֹא־חָשַׂךְ מִמָּוֶת נַפְשָׁם He did not spare them from death.	V PPc NPc	MatchNoGap	B
Ps 78:52a	וַיַּסַּע כַּצֹּאן עַמּוֹ He led out his people like a flock.	V PPa NPc	MatchGap	F
Ps 78:55b	וַיַּפִּילֵם בְּחֶבֶל נַחֲלָה He distributed them a possession by territory.	V PPa NPc	MatchNoGap	B
Ps 78:55c	וַיַּשְׁכֵּן בְּאָהֳלֵיהֶם שִׁבְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל He settled the tribes of Israel in their tents.	V PPc NPc	MatchNoGap	C
Ps 78:61a	וַיִּתֵּן לַשְּׁבִי עֻזּוֹ He delivered his power to captivity.	V PPc NPc	MatchGap	A
Ps 78:62a	יַסְגֵּר לַחֶרֶב עַמּוֹ He gave his people up to the sword.	V PP NPc	MatchNoGap	C
Ps 78:69a	וַיִּבֶן כְּמוֹ־רָמִים מִקְדָּשׁוֹ He built his sanctuary like the heights.	V PPa NPc		A
Ps 107:12a	וַיַּכְנַע בֶּעָמָל לִבָּם He bowed down their hearts with labor.	V PPa NPc		A
Ps 107:41b	וַיָּשֶׂם כַּצֹּאן מִשְׁפָּחוֹת He makes families like flocks.	V PPc NPc	MatchNoGap	B

Factors in O-Postponement.

Divine Name. Deference of the name of, or reference to, God (DN) may have influenced the order in two cases. 2 clauses in which the DN is in the PPc that appears

before the NPc (Isa 40:2; Ps 78:7).

(22)   Ps 78:7

וְלֹא יִשְׁכְּחוּ מַעַלְלֵי־אֵל \\ וּמִצְוֺתָיו יִנְצֹרוּוְיָשִׂימוּ בֵאלֹהִים כִּסְלָם

V PPc NPc // V PPc // NPc V

That they should set their confidence on God // and not forget God's

works // and keep his commands

Coordination. Twenty-one of the clauses (40.4%) are coordinated, while 26
(50%) are uncoordinated. Five clauses (9.6%) are linked to the preceding clause by כִּי
(Deut 32:40a; Isa 40:2c; Isa 43:20c; Zeph 3:9a; 3:11c), suggesting that, as in the case of
S-postponement, coordination alone does not seem to play a role in clauses with O-
postponement. A phenomenon related to coordination is that of line placement, and so it
is noteworthy that 61.5%% (32 clauses) of the clauses occur in the A line or begin in the
A-line and continue to the B-line by way of syntactic dependency. Given the similar
finding in S-postponement above and in V-postponement (see ch. 4), the putative
markedness of the non-A line in BH verse does not exert noticeable influence on whether
or not the clause includes a postponed O.

Syntactic Tropes: Matching and Dependency. Another phenomenon related to
coordination and line placement are the main syntactic tropes of BH verse: matching
(with or without gapping) and syntactic dependency. Of the 52 lines with O-
postponement,

- 28 clauses (53.8%) occur in matching: 15 without gapping (53.6%), and
  13 with gapping (46.4%)

- 6 clauses (11.5%) are syntactically dependent: in 4 of them postponement is not in concert with the syntactic dependency (Isa 41:19a; 19c; Hab 3:15a; Zeph 3:9a), and in 1 clause, the postponement is in concert with the syntactic dependency (Isa 40:2c; Zeph 3:12a).[175] This finding confirms what was observed in case of S-postponement as well, that even in clauses that extend across two lines, the syntactic extension is not necessarily the cause of or caused by the postponement. Other influences are likely at play, such as the length of the constituent in the B-line. In the case of Isa 40:2c, the NPc is relatively long:

(23)   Isa 40:2c

כִּי לָקְחָה מִיַּד יְהֹוָה \\ כִּפְלַיִם בְּכָל־חַטֹּאתֶיהָ

V PPc // NPc

Because she has received from the Lord //

　　　　　double for all of her sins.

The structure of the clause is quite simple, though the 2 arguments include more than one word. This reading analyzes the final PP בְּכָל־חַטֹּאתֶיהָ as a complement of the NP כִּפְלַיִם so that the entire B-line is understood to be a single constituent phrase line. Due to the length of the NPc, this clause could not be arranged in another word order pattern.

Complements and Adjuncts in O-Postponement. **V-PP-NPc**. By definition, all of the 52 clauses in which O-postponement occurs have a PP in the second (or pre-O)

---

175. Hillers, "Observations on Syntax and Meter in Lamentations," 270.

position, so no further varieties emerge. The only differentiation is between PPc and PPa in the second position. They are as follows:

- V PPc NPc

    35 clauses (67.3%) in which the PP is a complement.

- V PPa NPc

    17 clauses (32.7%) in which the PP is an adjunct.

As with S-postponement, if the PP is a complement of the verb, it should not be surprising that it might be "bound" more closely to the VP. Such an description, however, would have to tested by way of a much more comprehensive examination of clause types.

Canonical Context S- and O-Postponement

Of the over 2800 lines analyzed in this study, 531 clauses are eligible for S- or O-postponement. Of those eligible clauses, 82 (15.4%) show S- or O-postponement. These constituent postponement word order patterns are somewhat evenly distributed throughout the texts in the sample. The body of verse presented as early Yahwistic poetry[176] (Genesis 49, Exodus 15; Numbers 23-24; Deuteronomy 32[177] and 33; Judges 5; 2 Samuel 1:19-27; Psalm 18) exhibits a tendency toward S- and O-postponement (17:131, 13%) that is only a slight decrease from the tendency shown in the whole sample. The same observation is true for later bodies of verse (Isaiah 40-48; [21:132, 15.9%]).

---

176. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*.

177. Cross and Freedman are not confident in the inclusion of this poem in the corpus of early Yahwistic poetry, though they do consider it "on the fringe of the corpus," and containing material that is "undeniably early." Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 4.

Individual upticks occur in diverse texts. For instance:

- Psalm 78 includes 16 clauses that exhibit S- or O-postponement (37.2% of 43 eligible lines),

- Psalm 6 includes 2 clauses that exhibit S- or O-postponement (22.2% of 9 eligible lines),

- Zephaniah 3 includes 5 lines showing S- or O-postponement (50% of 10 eligible lines).

The entire list of canonical segments and their respective tendencies toward lines that exhibit S- or O-postponement is as follows:

Genesis 49 (2:25 eligible clauses, 8%; 80 lines,[178] 2.5%; 70 lines [possibly 79];[179] 2.9%)

Exodus 15 (2:14 eligible clauses, 14.3%; 56 lines,[180] 3.6%; 66 lines,[181] 3%)

Numbers 23-24 (2:27 eligible clauses, 7.4%; 80 lines,[182] 2.5%)

Deuteronomy 32 (5:20 eligible clauses, 20%; 140 lines,[183] 3.6%)

Deuteronomy 33 (1:11 eligible clauses, 9.1%; 97 lines,[184] 2.1%; 2:78 lines,[185] -

---

178. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 169.

179. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 49–53.

180. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 179.

181. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 35–38.

182. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 185.

183. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 194.

184. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 208.

185. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 66–70.

2.6%)

Judges 5 (2:15 eligible clauses, 13.3%; 106 lines,[186] 1%; 1:60 lines,[187] 1.7%)

2 Samuel 1 (0:3 eligible clauses, 0%; 30 lines,[188] 0%)

Isaiah 40-48 (21:132 eligible clauses, 15.9%; 785; 2.7%)

      40 (6:32 eligible clauses, 18.8%; 111 lines, 5.4%)

      41 (4:23 eligible clauses, 17.4%; 119 lines, 3.3%)

      42 (3:14 eligible clauses, 21.4%; 91 lines, 3.3%)

      43 (3:17 eligible clauses, 17.6%; 66 lines, 4.5%)

      44 (2:13 eligible clauses, 15.4%; 81 lines, 2.5%)

      45 (1:12 eligible clauses, 8.3%; 115 lines, 8.7%)

      46 (0:5 eligible clauses, 0%; 44 lines, 0%)

      47 (0:5 eligible clauses, 0%; lines, 0%)

      48 (2:11 eligible clauses, 18.2%; 84 lines, 2.4%)

Habakkuk 3 (4:24 eligible clauses, 16.7%; 65 lines,[189] 6.2%)

Zephaniah 1 (1:6 eligible clauses, 16.7%; 69 lines[190] 1.4%)

Zephaniah 2 (0:6 eligible clauses, 0%; 65 lines,[191] 0%)

Zephaniah 3 (5:10 eligible clauses, 50% ; 79 lines,[192] 6.3%)

---

186. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 218.

187. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 9–11.

188. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 230.

189. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 233–34.

190. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 241.

191. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 248.

192. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 255.

Zechariah 9 (1:16 eligible clauses, 6.3%; 66 lines, 1.5%)

Psalms 1-25 (18:145 eligible clauses, 12.4%; 761 lines, 2.4%)

      Psalm 1 (0:2 eligible clauses, 0%; 19 lines, 0%)

      Psalm 2 (1:4 eligible clauses, 25%; 29 lines, 3.4%)

      Psalm 3 (0:1 eligible clauses, 0%; 18 lines, 0%)

      Psalm 4 (0:4 eligible clauses, 0%; 21 lines, 0%)

      Psalm 5 (0:3 eligible clauses, 0%; 40 lines, 0%)

      Psalm 6 (2:9 eligible clauses, 22.2%; 22 lines, 9.1%)

      Psalm 7 (1:10 eligible clauses, 10%; 40 lines, 2.5%)

      Psalm 8 (0:2 eligible clauses, 0%; 25 lines, 0%)

      Psalm 9 (2:11 eligible clauses, 18.1%; 40 lines, 5%)

      Psalm 10 (0:8 eligible clauses, 0%; 40 lines, 0%)

      Psalm 11 (0:10 eligible clauses, 0%; 20 lines, 0%)

      Psalm 12 (0:5 eligible clauses, 0%; 18 lines, 0%)

      Psalm 13 (0:2 eligible clauses, 0%; 12 lines, 0%)

      Psalm 14 (0:3 eligible clauses, 0%; 22 lines, 0%)

      Psalm 15 (1:4 eligible clauses, 25%; 14 lines, 7.1%)

      Psalm 16 (0:8 eligible clauses, 0%; 23 lines, 0%)

      Psalm 17 (0:5 eligible clauses, 0%; 37 lines, 0%)

      Psalm 18 (3:16 eligible clauses, 18.8%; 111 lines, 2.7%)

      Psalm 19 (1:6 eligible clauses, 16.7%; 41 lines, 2.4%)

      Psalm 20 (0:6 eligible clauses, 0%; 21 lines, 0%)

      Psalm 21 (1:6 eligible clauses, 16.7%; 27 lines, 3.7%)

      Psalm 22 (4:10 eligible clauses, 40%; 75 lines, 5.3%)

      Psalm 23 (1:2 eligible clauses, 50%; 20 lines, 5%)

      Psalm 24 (1:2 eligible clauses, 50%; 18 lines, 5.6%)

Psalm 25 (0:6 eligible clauses, 0%; 18 lines, 0%)

Psalm 78 (16:43 eligible clauses, 37.2%; 163 lines,[193] 9.8%)

Psalm 106 (0:20 eligible clauses, 0%; 106 lines,[194] 0%)

Psalm 107 (2:14 eligible clauses, 14.3%; 89 lines,[195] 2.2%)

Canonical Context Breakdown

Genesis 49 (2:25 eligible clauses, 8%; 80 lines,[196] 2.5%; 70 lines [possibly 79];[197] 2.9%)

| 49:11c | כִּבֵּס בַּיַּיִן לְבֻשׁוֹ |
| 49:24a | וַתֵּשֶׁב בְּאֵיתָן קַשְׁתּוֹ |

Exodus 15 (2:14 eligible clauses, 14.3%; 56 lines,[198] 3.6%; 66 lines,[199] 3%)

| Exod 15:8 | נִצְּבוּ כְמוֹ־נֵד נֹזְלִים |
| Exod 15:13 | נָחִיתָ בְחַסְדְּךָ עַם־זוּ גָּאָלְתָּ |

---

193. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 263.

194. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 278.

195. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 288.

196. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 169.

197. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 49–53.

198. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 179.

199. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 35–38.

Numbers 23-24 (2:27 eligible clauses, 7.4%; 80 lines,[200] 2.5%)

| Num 24:7 | וְיָרֹם מֵאֲגַג מַלְכּוֹ |
| Num 24:18 | וְהָיָה יְרֵשָׁה שֵׂעִיר אֹיְבָיו |

Deuteronomy 32 (5:20 eligible clauses, 20%; 140 lines,[201] 3.6%)

Deut 32:2a	יַעֲרֹף כַּמָּטָר לִקְחִי
Deut 32:2b	תִּזַּל כַּטַּל אִמְרָתִי
Deut 32:26b	אַשְׁבִּיתָה מֵאֱנוֹשׁ זִכְרָם
Deut 32:40a	כִּי־אֶשָּׂא אֶל־שָׁמַיִם יָדִי
Deut 32:41b	וְתֹאחֵז בְּמִשְׁפָּט יָדִי

Deuteronomy 33 (2:11 eligible clauses, 9.1%; 97 lines,[202] 1%; 1:78 lines,[203] -

1.3%)

| Deut 33:5a | וַיְהִי בִישֻׁרוּן מֶלֶךְ |

Judges 5 (2:15 eligible clauses, 13.3%; 106 lines,[204] 1.9%; 2:60 lines,[205] 3.3%)

| Judg 5:11d | אָז יָרְדוּ לַשְּׁעָרִים עַם־יְהוָה |
| Judg 5:24a | תְּבֹרַךְ מִנָּשִׁים יָעֵל |

---

200. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 185.

201. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 194.

202. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 208.

203. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 66–70.

204. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 218.

205. Cross and Freedman, *Studies*, 9–11.

2 Samuel 1 (0:3 eligible clauses, 0%; 30 lines,[206] 0%)

Isaiah 40–48 (21:132 eligible clauses, 15.9%; 785; 2.7%)

40 (6:32 eligible clauses, 18.8%; 111 lines, 5.4%)

Isa 40:2c	כִּי לָקְחָה מִיַּד יְהוָה כִּפְלַיִם בְּכָל־חַטֹּאתֶיהָ
Isa 40:3c	יַשְּׁרוּ בָּעֲרָבָה מְסִלָּה לֵאלֹהֵינוּ
Isa 40:12a	מִי־מָדַד בְּשָׁעֳלוֹ מַיִם
Isa 40:12c	וְכָל בַּשָּׁלִשׁ עֲפַר הָאָרֶץ
Isa 40:12d	וְשָׁקַל בַּפֶּלֶס הָרִים
Isa 40:24a	אַף בַּל־שֹׁרֶשׁ בָּאָרֶץ גִּזְעָם

41 (4:23 eligible clauses, 17.4%; 119 lines, 3.3%)

Isa 41:2c	יִתֵּן כֶּעָפָר חַרְבּוֹ
Isa 41:12c	יִהְיוּ כְאַיִן וּכְאֶפֶס אַנְשֵׁי מִלְחַמְתֶּךָ
Isa 41:19a	אֶתֵּן בַּמִּדְבָּר אֶרֶז שִׁטָּה
Isa 41:19c	אָשִׂים בָּעֲרָבָה בְּרוֹשׁ

42 (3:14 eligible clauses, 21.4%; 91 lines, 3.3%)

Isa 42:2b	וְלֹא־יַשְׁמִיעַ בַּחוּץ קוֹלוֹ
Isa 42:4b	עַד־יָשִׂים בָּאָרֶץ מִשְׁפָּט
Isa 42:17b	יֵבֹשׁוּ בֹשֶׁת הַבֹּטְחִים בַּפָּסֶל

43 (3:17 eligible clauses, 17.6%; 66 lines, 4.5%)

_____

206. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 230.

Isa 43:19c	אַף אָשִׂים בַּמִּדְבָּר דֶּרֶךְ
Isa 43:20c	כִּי־נָתַתִּי בַמִּדְבָּר מַיִ
Isa 43:28b	וְאֶתְּנָה לַחֵרֶם יַעֲקֹב

44 (2:13 eligible clauses, 15.4%; 81 lines, 2.5%)

Isa 44:19c	וְאַף אָפִיתִי עַל־גֶּחָלָיו לֶחֶם
Isa 44:22a	מָחִיתִי כָעָב פְּשָׁעֶיךָ

45 (1:12 eligible clauses, 8.3%; 115 lines, 8.7%)

Isa 45:16	הָלְכוּ בַכְּלִמָּה חָרָשֵׁי צִירִים׃

46 (0:5 eligible clauses, 0%; 44 lines, 0%)

47 (0:5 eligible clauses, 0%; lines, 0%)

48 (2:11 eligible clauses, 18.2%; 84 lines, 2.4%)

Isa 48:18b	וַיְהִי כַנָּהָר שְׁלוֹמֶךָ
Isa 48:19a	וַיְהִי כַחוֹל זַרְעֶךָ

Habakkuk 3 (4:24 eligible clauses, 16.7%; 65 lines,[207] 6.2%)

Hab 3:3c	כִּסָּה שָׁמַיִם הוֹדוֹ
Hab 3:14a	נָקַבְתָּ בְמַטָּיו רֹאשׁ פְּרָזָיו
Hab 3:15a	דָּרַכְתָּ בַיָּם סוּסֶיךָ
Hab 3:17	גָּזַר מִמִּכְלָה צֹאן

---

207. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 233–34.

Zephaniah 1 (1:6 eligible clauses, 16.7%; 69 lines[208] 1.4%)

Zeph 1:4c   וְהִכְרַתִּי מִן־הַמָּקוֹם הַזֶּה

Zephaniah 2 (0:6 eligible clauses, 0%; 65 lines,[209] 0%)

Zephaniah 3 (5:10 eligible clauses, 50% ; 79 lines,[210] 6.3%)

Zeph 3:5   וְלֹא־יוֹדֵעַ עַוָּל בֹּשֶׁת:

Zeph 3:9a   כִּי־אָז אֶהְפֹּךְ אֶל־עַמִּים שָׂפָה בְרוּרָה

Zeph 3:11c   כִּי־אָז אָסִיר מִקִּרְבֵּךְ עַלִּיזֵי גַּאֲוָתֵךְ

Zeph 3:12a   וְהִשְׁאַרְתִּי בְקִרְבֵּךְ עַם עָנִי וָדָל

Zeph 3:13b   וְלֹא־יִמָּצֵא בְּפִיהֶם לְשׁוֹן תַּרְמִית

Zechariah 9 (1:16 eligible clauses, 6.3%; 66 lines, 1.5%)

Zech 9:4b   וְהִכָּה בַיָּם חֵילָהּ

Psalms 1-25 (18:145 eligible clauses, 12.4%; 761 lines, 2.4%)

Psalm 1 (0:2 eligible clauses, 0%; 19 lines, 0%)

Psalm 2 (1:4 eligible clauses, 25%; 29 lines, 3.4%)

Ps 2:12c   כִּי־יִבְעַר כִּמְעַט אַפּוֹ

---

208. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 241.

209. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 248.

210. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 255.

Psalm 3 (0:1 eligible clauses, 0%; 18 lines, 0%)

Psalm 4 (0:4 eligible clauses, 0%; 21 lines, 0%)

Psalm 5 (0:3 eligible clauses, 0%; 40 lines, 0%)

Psalm 6 (2:9 eligible clauses, 22.2%; 22 lines, 9.1%)

Ps 6:7b   אֶשְׂחֶה בְכָל־לַיְלָה מִטָּתִי

Ps 6:8a   עָשְׁשָׁה מִכַּעַס עֵינִי

Psalm 7 (1:10 eligible clauses, 10%; 40 lines, 2.5%)

Ps 7:6b   וְיִרְמֹס לָאָרֶץ חַיָּי

Psalm 9 (2:11 eligible clauses, 18.1%; 40 lines, 5%)

Ps 9:8b   כּוֹנֵן לַמִּשְׁפָּט כִּסְאוֹ

Ps 9:12b   הַגִּידוּ בָעַמִּים עֲלִילוֹתָיו

Psalm 10 (0:8 eligible clauses, 0%; 40 lines, 0%)

Psalm 11 (0:10 eligible clauses, 0%; 20 lines, 0%)

Psalm 12 (0:5 eligible clauses, 0%; 18 lines, 0%)

Psalm 13 (0:2 eligible clauses, 0%; 12 lines, 0%)

Psalm 14 (0:3 eligible clauses, 0%; 22 lines, 0%)

Psalm 15 (1:4 eligible clauses, 25%; 14 lines, 7.1%)

Ps 15:3b   לֹא־עָשָׂה לְרֵעֵהוּ רָעָה

Psalm 16 (0:8 eligible clauses, 0%; 23 lines, 0%)

Psalm 17 (0:5 eligible clauses, 0%; 37 lines, 0%)

Psalm 18 (3:16 eligible clauses, 18.85; 111 lines, 2.7%)

Ps 18:7c   יִשְׁמַע מֵהֵיכָלוֹ קוֹלִי

Ps 18:14a   וַיַּרְעֵם בַּשָּׁמַיִם יהוה

Ps 18:35b   וְנִחֲתָה קֶשֶׁת־נְחוּשָׁה זְרוֹעֹתָי׃

Psalm 19 (1:6 eligible clauses, 16.7%; 41 lines, 2.4%)

Ps 19:15a   יִהְיוּ לְרָצוֹן אִמְרֵי־פִי

Psalm 20 (0:6 eligible clauses, 0%; 21 lines, 0%)

Psalm 21 (1:6 eligible clauses, 16.7%; 27 lines, 3.7%)

Ps 21:4b   תָּשִׁית לְרֹאשׁוֹ עֲטֶרֶת פָּז

Psalm 22 (4:10 eligible clauses, 40%; 75 lines, 5.3%)

Ps 22:16a   יָבֵשׁ כַּחֶרֶשׂ כֹּחִי

Ps 22:21a   הַצִּילָה מֵחֶרֶב נַפְשִׁי

Ps 22:27b   יְהַלְלוּ יהוה דֹּרְשָׁיו

Ps 22:28a-b   יִזְכְּרוּ וְיָשֻׁבוּ אֶל־יהוה כָּל־אַפְסֵי־אָרֶץ

Psalm 23 (1:2 eligible clauses, 50%; 20 lines, 5%)

Ps 23:5c   דִּשַּׁנְתָּ בַשֶּׁמֶן רֹאשִׁי כּוֹסִי רְוָיָה

Psalm 24 (1:2 eligible clauses, 50%; 18 lines, 5.6%)

Ps 24:4c   לֹא־נָשָׂא לַשָּׁוְא נַפְשִׁי

Psalm 25 (0:6 eligible clauses, 0%; 18 lines, 0%)

Psalm 78 (16:43 eligible clauses, 37.2%; 163 lines,[211] 9.8%)

Ps 78:2a   אֶפְתְּחָה בְמָשָׁל פִּי

Ps 78:7a   וְיָשִׂימוּ בֵאלֹהִים כִּסְלָם

Ps 78:8   וְלֹא־נֶאֶמְנָה אֶת־אֵל רוּחוֹ׃

Ps 78:16b   וַיּוֹרֶד כַּנְּהָרוֹת מָיִם

Ps 78:26b   יְנַהֵג בְּעֻזּוֹ תֵימָן

Ps 78:33a   וַיְכַל־בַּהֶבֶל יְמֵיהֶם

Ps 78:44a   וַיַּהֲפֹךְ לְדָם יְאֹרֵיהֶם

Ps 78:46a   וַיִּתֵּן לֶחָסִיל יְבוּלָם

Ps 78:50b   לֹא־חָשַׂךְ מִמָּוֶת נַפְשָׁם

Ps 78:52a   וַיַּסַּע כַּצֹּאן עַמּוֹ

Ps 78:55b   וַיַּפִּילֵם בְּחֶבֶל נַחֲלָה

Ps 78:55c   וַיַּשְׁכֵּן בְּאָהֳלֵיהֶם שִׁבְטֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל

Ps 78:61a   וַיִּתֵּן לַשְּׁבִי עֻזּוֹ

---

211. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 263.

Ps 78:62a	יַסְגֵּר לַחֶרֶב עַמּוֹ
Ps 78:65a	וַיִּקַץ כְּיָשֵׁן אֲדֹנָי
Ps 78:69a	וַיִּבֶן כְּמוֹ־רָמִים מִקְדָּשׁוֹ

Psalm 106 (0:20 eligible clauses, 0%; 106 lines,[212] 0%)

Psalm 107 (2:14 eligible clauses, 14.3%; 89 lines,[213] 2.2%)

| Ps 107:12a | וַיַּכְנַע בֶּעָמָל לִבָּם |
| Ps 107:41b | וַיָּשֶׂם כַּצֹּאן מִשְׁפָּחוֹת |

Conclusions to S- and O-Postponement

Very little work has been done on postverbal word order in BH, much less in BH verse. When postverbal word order is analyzed with an eye toward the comparison of prose and verse, however, a difference becomes apparent. That difference can best be described as a relaxation of syntactic constraints on postverbal word order. While pragmatic or poetic exigencies may be used to explain certain constituent postponement, such explanations must be understood as operable solely in BH verse. This is because the patterns they describe are relatively rare in BH prose but noticeably commonplace in BH verse.

This study has provided a test case of S- and O-postponement which has shown that unusual word order exhibits an overlay of both pragmatic function and poetic features, which are possible because of the defamiliarizing effect that is present

212. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 278.

213. Michael P. O'Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 288.

throughout in BH verse. Of the 82 clauses reviewed, 48 (58.5%) are bound by syntactic tropes (36 are members of matched groups of multiple lines, and 12 are members of syntactically dependent couplets). Similarly, 49 lines (59.8%) occur in A lines or in A-B lines when syntactic dependency is in play. Both of these findings reveal that S- and O-postponement is not necessarily a result of syntactic trope or the or the markedness of the B-line. Like V-postponement, S- and O-postponement alert the reader to the fact that the text is, in fact, verse. As a result, any analysis that ignores clauses in which a poetic device occurs (i.e. gapping, parallelism, chiasm, etc.) or in which obvious pragmatic explanations can be used to describe the postponement artificially limit the sample of unusual word order configurations.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

Having considered the rate and type of postponement word order patterns across a generically and chronologically diverse body of BH verse, one could not argue that postponement is, by and measure, a norm in the poetry of the Bible. Of the 1,046 eligible lines of verse, 176 show postponement of either the verb, subject (NPs), or noun phrase complement (NPc), or 16.8% of the lines. While the presence of postponement is not overwhelming, it does show that 1 in 6 lines of verse exhibit a word order pattern that would be highly irregular in BH prose, and this finding supports the proposal that clauses BH verse evince a relaxed syntactic constriction in the area of word order.

Syntactic tropes might influence some of these postponing patterns, but by no means can tropes explain all or even the majority of them. Of the 176 clauses analyzed, 73 (41.5%) show syntactic matching of some kind with another line, and 21 (11.9%) show syntactic dependency, the minority of which depend on the postponement to achieve the dependency. Neither is postponement more frequent in marked B-lines. Here the breakdown is nearly 1:1 with 85 A-lines, 82 non-A-lines, and 9 clauses that extend across an A- and B-line.

While chronology may play a role in V-postponement, that role is not consistent. Isaiah 40–48 presents 55 postponing clauses out of 250 eligible ones (22%), while early Yahwistic poetry exhibits only 33 of 261 eligible lines (12.6%). Zephaniah 1-3 shows 13 out of 53 lines with postponement (24.5%), though Zephaniah 1 only shows 1 out of 15 lines with postponement (6.7%).

It is possible that genre influences the sort of postponement that is allowed in a poem. The low occurrence of V-postponement in Psalms 78, 106, and 107 was noted as a

179

possible result of the historical genre of these psalms. When all postponement is considered for these psalms, however, the presence of postponing lines (23 out of 154 eligible lines, 14.9%) appears to be close to the sample as a whole (16.8%).

Relaxation of syntactic constraints occurs as a natural part of the defamiliarizing tendency of verse. It plays a complementary role to what O'Connor calls the increased syntactic constriction that is exhibited in the number of syntactic elements allowed in a line of BH verse. While pragmatic or poetic operations may trigger postponement, the fact that postponement is allowable at all is due to the process of defamiliarization. During the composition, the BH poet would have been aware that certain word order patterns were acceptable in verse, patterns that were not acceptable in prose. Likewise these patterns alert the audience to the fact that they are in fact hearing verse. The same can likely be said of other syntactic tropes such as gapping which itself would not be possible in BH prose.

WORKS CITED

Akmajian, A., S. Steele, and T. Wasow. "The Category AUX in Universal Grammar." *Linguistic Inquiry* 10 (1979): 1–64.

Alsina, A. "Argument Structure." Pages 461-28 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*. Edited by Keith Brown, Anne H. Anderson. 14 vols. Amsterdam ; Boston: Elsevier, 2006.

Alter, Robert. *The Art Of Biblical Poetry*. New York: Basic Books, 1987.

Andersen, Francis I. *The Hebrew Verbless Clause in the Pentateuch*. Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series. New York and Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1970.

———. *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*. The Hague: Mouton, 1974.

———. "Studies in Hebrew Syntax." Ph.D. diss., Johns Hopkins University, 1960.

Arnold, Bill T., and John H. Choi. *A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. New York: Cambridge University, 2003.

Bailey, Nicholas A. "A Second Look at Double Preverbal Constituents." *Hebrew Studies* 45 (2004): 253–76.

Bailey, Nicholas A., and Stephen H. Levinsohn. "The Function of Preverbal Elements in Independent Clauses in the Hebrew Narrative of Genesis." *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 5 (1992): 170–207.

Baltzer, Klaus. *Deutero-Isaiah: A Commentary on Isaiah 40–55*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2001.

Bandstra, Barry. "Word Order and Emphasis in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: Syntactic Observations on Genesis 22 from a Discourse Perspective." Pages 109–23 in *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*. Edited by Walter R. Bodine. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1992.

Bergsträsser, Gotthelf. *Hebräische Grammatik*. 2 vols. Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel, 1918, 1929.

Berlin, Adele. *The Dynamics of Biblical Parallelism*. 1992. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University, 1985.

Blau, Joshua. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1993.

Bordreuil, Pierre, and Dennis Pardee. *A Manual of Ugaritic*. Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 3. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2009.

Bowie, Andrew. *From Romanticism to Critical Theory: The Philosophy of German Literary Theory*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Boym, Svetlana. "Poetics and Politics of Estrangement: Victor Shklovsky and Hannah Arendt." *Poetics Today* 26 (2005): 581–611.

Brockelmann, Carl. *Hebräische Syntax*. Neukirchen: Kreis Moers, 1956.

Brooks, Cleanth, and Robert Penn Warren. *Understanding Poetry*. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, 1960.

Budde, Karl. "Das hebräische Klagelied." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 2 (1882): 1–52.

———. "Poetry (Hebrew)." Pages 2-13 in *Dictionary of the Bible*. Edited by J. Hastings. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902.

Buth, Randall. "Functional Grammar, Hebrew and Aramaic: An Integrated, Textlinguistic Approach to Syntax." Pages 77–102 in *Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature: What It is and What It Offers*. Edited by W. R. Bodine. Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.

———. "Topic and Focus in Hebrew Poetry: Psalm 51." Pages 83–9 in *Language in Context: Essays for Robert E. Longacre*. Edited by J. J. Hwang Shin and W. R. Merrifield. Arlington, TX: SIL and the University of Texas, 1992.

———. "Word Order Differences Between Narrative and Non-Narrative Material in Biblical Hebrew." Pages 9–16 in *Proceedings of the Tenth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Division D*. Vol. 1. Jerusalem, 1990.

———. "Word Order in the Verbless Clause: A Generative-Functional Approach." Pages 79–108 in The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Approaches. Vol. 1. Edited Cynthia L. Miller. Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1999.

Carr, David M. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Chafe, Wallace. "Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics, and Point of View." Pages 25–55 in *Subject and Topic*, edited by Charles Li. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Chomsky, Noam. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1965.

Cook, Edward M. *Word Order in the Aramaic of Daniel*. Monographic Journals of the Near East. Afroasiatic Linguistics. Vol. 9. Malibu, Calif.: Undena Publications, 1986.

Cross, Frank Moore, Jr., and David Noel Freedman. *Studies in Ancient Yahwistic Poetry*. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997.

Dahood, Mitchell. "A New Metrical Pattern in Biblical Poetry." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29 (1967): 574–82.

Daneš, Frantisek. "A Three-Level Approach to Syntax." *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 1 (1964): 225–40.

Davidson, A.B. *Hebrew Syntax*. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1901.

DeCaen, Vincent. "On the Placement and Interpretation of the Verb in Standard Biblical Hebrew." Ph.D. diss., University of Toronto, 1995.

———. "Theme and Variation in Psalm 111: Phrase and Foot in Generative-Metrical Perspective 1." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 54 (2009): 81–109.

———. "A Unified Analysis of Verbal and Verbless Clauses Within Government-Binding Theory." Pages 109–31 in *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Approaches*. Vol. 1, edited by Cynthia L. Miller, et. al. Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic . Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1999.

Dijkstra, Meindert. "Ugaritic Stylistics: Ugaritic Prose." Pages 140–64 in *Handbook of Ugaritic Studies*. Vol. 39, edited by Wilfred G. E. Watson and Nicolas Wyatt. Handbook of Oriental Studies. Boston, Mass.: Brill, 1999.

Dik, Simon C. *Functional Grammar*. 3rd ed. Dordrecht-Holland: Foris, 1981.

———. *Studies in Functional Grammar*. New York: Academic Press, 1980.

Dillard, Raymond B. *Word Biblical Commentary: 2 Chronicles*. Dallas, Tex.: Word, Inc. 2002.

Disse, Andreas. *Informationsstruktur im Biblischen Hebräisch: Sprachwissenschaftliche Grundlagen und exegetische Konsequenzen einer Korpusuntersuchung zu den Büchern Deuteronomium, Richter und 2 Könige*. Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache Im Alten Testament. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag, 1998.

Downing, Pamela. "Word Order in Discourse: By Way of Introduction." Pages 1–27 in *Word Order in Discourse*. Edited by Pamela Downing and Michael Noonan. Typological Studies in Language. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1995.

Driver, S. R. "On Some Alleged Linguistic Affinities of the Elohist." *Journal of Philology* 11 (1882): 201–36.

———. *Treatise on the Use of Tenses in Hebrew: And Some Other Syntactical Questions*. 1882; Repr., Eugene, Or.: Wipf & Stock, 2004.

Driver, S.R. *An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. New York: Scribner's, 1891; revised and edited, 1913, 1916.

Dryer, Matthew S. "Word Order." Pages 61–131 in *Clause Structure*. Vol. 1 of *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. 2nd. ed., edited by Timothy Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Ehrensvärd, Martin. "Why Biblical Texts Cannot Be Dated Linguistically." *Hebrew Studies* 47 (2006): 177–89.

Ewald, Heinrich. *Syntax of the Hebrew Language of the Old Testament*. 8th ed. Translated by James Kennedy. Edinburgh: T &T Clark, 1891. Repr., Eugene, Ore.: Wipf & Stock, 2004.

Faber, Alice. "Genetic Subgroupings of Semitic Languages." Ph.D diss., University of Texas, 1980.

Fassberg, Steven E. Review of W. Gross, *Die Satzteilfolge im Verbalsatz alttestamenticher Prosa: Untersucht an den Büchern Dtn, Ri und 2 Kön. Journal of Semitic Studies* 45 (2000): 361–63.

Finley, T. J. "Word Order in Clause Stucture of Syrian Akkadian." Los Angeles, Ca.: University of California, 1979.

Firbas, Jan. *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*. 1992. Studies in English Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Floor, Sebastiaan J. "From Information Structure, Topic and Focus, to the Theme in Biblical Hebrew Narrative." Ph.D. diss., University of Stellenbosh, 2004.

Foley, William A. "A Typology of Information Packaging in the Clause." Pages 362–469 in *Clause Structure*. Vol. 1 of *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. 2nd. ed., edited by Timothy Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Foster, T. and W. van der Wurff. "The Survival of Object-Verb Word Order in Middle English: Some Data." *Neophilologus* 79 (1995): 309–27.

Garr, W. Randall. "The Qinah: A Study of Poetic Meter, Syntax and Style." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 95 (1983): 54–75.

Geller, Stephen A. *Parallelism in Early Biblical Poetry*. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1979.

———. "Theory and Method in the Study of Biblical Poetry." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 73 (1982): 65–77.

Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch. Translated by A.E. Cowley. Dover Books on Language. Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications, 2006.

Gianto, Agustinus. *Word Order Variation in the Akkadian of Byblos*. Rome: Pontificio Istituto biblico, 1990.

Giesebrecht, F. "Zur Hexateuchkritik: Der Sprachgebrauch des hexateuchischen Elohisten." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 1 (1881): 177–276.

Givón, Talmy. "The Drift from VSO to SVO in Biblical Hebrew: The Pragmatics of Tense-Aspect." Pages 181–254 in *Syntax: An Introduction*. Vol. 2 of *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change*. Edited Charles N. Li. Austin, Tex.: University of Texas, 1977.

———. *Syntax: An Introduction*. Amsterdam ; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins, 2001.

Gordon, C.H. "New Directions." *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 15 (1978): 59–60.

Gragg, Gene. "Ge'ez (Ethiopic)." Pages 242–62 in *Semitic Languages*. Edited by Robert Hetzron. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Greenberg, Joseph H. "Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements." Pages 73–113 in *Universals of Language*. Edited by J. H. Greenberg. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1963.

Gropp, Douglas M. "The Function of the Finite Verb in Classical Biblical Hebrew." *Hebrew Annual Review* 13 (1991): 45–62.

———. "The Order of Post-Verbal Constituents in Classical Biblical Hebrew Prose." Paper presented at the annual international meeting of the SBL, Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Section. Washington, D.C., 1993.

———. "Syntactic Differentia of Biblical Hebrew Poetry." (unpublished paper).

Gross, Walter. *Doppelt besetztes Vorfeld: syntaktishe, pragmatische, und übersetzungs-technische Studien zum althebräischen Verbalsatz*. Berlin: de Grutyer, 2001.

———. "Is There Really a Compound Nominal Clause in Biblical Hebrew?" Pages 19–49 in *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Approaches*. Edited by Cynthia L. Miller. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1999.

———. *Die Satzteilfolge im Verbalsatz alttestamentlicher Prosa: Untersucht an den Büchern Dtn, Ri und 2 Kön*. Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1996.

Haser, V., and B. Kortmann. "Adverbs." Pages 66–69 in *The Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*. Vol. 1. Edited by Keith Brown and Anne H. Anderson,. Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2006.

Heimerdinger, Jean-Marc. *Topic, Focus and Foreground in Ancient Hebrew Narratives*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series. Sheffield, Eng.: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.

Hillers, Delbert R. *Lamentations: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Anchor Bible. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1972.

———. "Observations on Syntax and Meter in Lamentations." Pages 265–70 in *A Light Unto My Path: Old Testament Studies in Honor of Jacob M. Myers*. Edited by Ralph D. Heim, Howard N. Bream, and Carey A. Moore. Gettysburg Theological Studies 4. Philadelphia: Temple University, 1974.

Holmstedt, Robert D. *Ruth: A Handbook on the Hebrew Text*. Baylor Handbook on the Hebrew Bible. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2010.

———. "Verb Movement in Biblical Aramaic." *Hebrew Studies* 47 (2006): 436–39.

———. "Word Order and Information Structure in Ruth and Jonah: A Generative-Typological Analysis." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 54 (2009): 111–39.

———. "Word Order in the Book of Proverbs." Pages 135–54 in *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients: Essays to Honor Michael V. Fox on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by K. G. Friebel, R. T. Troxel, and D. R. Magary. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005.

Holmstedt, Robert. "The Relative Clause in Biblical Hebrew - a Linguistic Analysis." Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin - Madison, 2002.

Hurvitz, Avi. "Date of the Prose-Tale of Job Linguistically Reconsidered." *Harvard Theological Review* 67 (1974): 17–34.

———. "Evidence of Language in Dating the Priestly Code: A Linguistic Study in Technical Idioms and Terminology." *Revue Biblique* 81 (1974): 24-57.

———. *A Linguistic Study of the Relationship Between the Priestly Source and the Book of Ezekiel: A New Approach to an Old Problem*. Cahiers de la Revue Biblique. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1982.

———. "Observations on the Language of the Third Apocryphal Psalm from Qumran." *Revue de Qumran* 18 (1965): 225–32.

Jackendoff, Ray. $\overline{X}$ *Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs. repr. 1977; Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1991.

Jakobson, Roman. "Linguistics and Poetics." In *Style in Language*, ed. Thomas A. Sebeok, 350–77. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1960.

Jespersen, Otto. *Essentials of English Grammar*. Alabama Linguistic & Philological Series. Repr. of 1933; Tuscaloosa, Ala.: University of Alabama Press, 1964.

Jongeling, K. "On the VSO Character of Hebrew." In *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax: Presented to Professor J. Hoftijzer on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Vol. 17 of *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax: Presented to Professsor J. Hoftijzer on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, eds K. Jongeling, H.L. Murre-Van ven Berg, and L. van Rompay. Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics, 103–11. Leiden: Brill, 1991.

Jongeling, K., and J. Hoftijzer. *M—T*. Vol. 2 of *Dictionary of North-West Semitic Inscriptions*. Leiden: Brill, 1995.

Joüon, Paul. *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1923.

———. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Translated and edited by T. Muraoka. 1991. Rome: Editrice Pontifico Institutio Biblio, 2000.

———. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2nd ed. Trans. and edited by T. Muraoka.; Rome: Editrice Pontifico Institutio Biblio, 2006; repr., 2011.

Kaufman, Stephen A. "Aramaic." In *Semitic Languages*. Edited by Robert Hetzron, 114–30. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Kemenade, Ans van. *Syntactic Case and Morphological Case in the History of English*. Dordrecht, Holland ; Providence, RI, USA: Foris, 1987 (repr. 2002).

Kiparsky, Paul. "Commentary." *New Literary History* 5 (1973): 177–85.

———. "The Role of Linguistics in a Theory of Poetry." *Daedalus* 102 (1973): 231–44.

Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Study ed. 2 vols. Translated by M. E. J. Richardson. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 2001.

Kogan, Leonid E., and Andrey V. Korotayev. "Sayhadic (Epigraphic South Arabian)." Pages 220–241 in *Semitic Languages*. Edited by Robert Hetzron. New York: Routledge, 1997.

König, Friedrich Eduard. *Historisch-Comparative Syntax der Hebräischen Sprache*. Vol. 3 of *Historisch-kritischen Lehrgebaudes des hebräischen*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1897.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms 1–59: A Continential Commentary*. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg, 1993. Translation of *Psalmen*, 1. Teilband, *Psalmen 1–59*; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1978.

———. *Psalms 60–150: A Continential Commentary*. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg, 1993; Translation of *Psalmen*, 2. Teilband, *Psalmen 60–150;* Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1978.

Kropat, Arno. *Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik verglichen mit der seiner Quellen: ein Beitrag zur historischen Syntax des Hebräischen*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 16. Giessen:: Töpelmann, 1909.

Kugel, James L. "The Feeling of Déja Lu." Review of Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Poetry*. *Journal of Religion* 67 (1987): 66–79.

———. *The Idea of Biblical Poetry: Parallelism and Its History*. Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins Press, 1981.

Kutscher, Eduard Yechezkel. *A History of the Hebrew Language*. Edited by Raphael Kutscher. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1982.

Lambrecht, Knud. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Laver, John. *Principles of Phonetics*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge ; New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1994; Repr. 1995.

Lode, Lars. "Postverbal Word Order in Biblical Hebrew: Structure and Function (Part Two)." *Semitics* 10 (1989): 24–39.

———. "Postverbal Word Order in Biblical Hebrew: Structure and Function." *Semitics* 9 (1984): 113–64.

Longacre, Robert E. "Left Shifts in Strongly VSO Languages." Pages 331–54 in *Word Order in Discourse*. Edited by Pamela Downing and Michael Noonan. Typological Studies in Language. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1995.

———. "The Representation of Speech in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: A Linguistic Analysis." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 59 (2000): 229–30.

Lord, Albert Bates. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Lotz, John. "Uralic." Pages 100–21 in *Versification: Major Language Types; Sixteen Essays*. Edited by William K. Wimsatt. New York: Modern Language Association, 1972.

Lunn, Nicholas P. *Word-Order Variation in Biblical Hebrew Poetry: Differentiating Pragmatics and Poetics*. Bletchley, U.K.: Paternoster, 2006.

Matthews, Peter H. *Syntax*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge, 1981.

McCarter, P. Kyle. *II Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes, and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984.

Miller, Cynthia L. "Constraints on Ellipsis in Biblical Hebrew." Pages 165–77 in *Studies in Semitic and Afroasiatic Linguistics Presented to Gene. B. Gragg*. Vol. 60 Edited by Cynthia L. Miller. Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago, 2007.

———. *Representation of Speech in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: A Linguistic Analysis*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003.

Miller, Cynthia. "A Linguistic Approach to Ellipsis in Biblical Poetry (Or, What to Do When Exegesis of What Is There Depends on What Isn't)." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 13 (2003): 251–70.

———. "The Relation of Coordination to Verb Gapping in Biblical Poetry." *Journal for the Studies of the Old Testament* 32 (2007): 41–60.

Milman Parry. "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making. I: Homer and Homeric Style." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 41 (1930): 73–147.

Moshavi, Adina. "The Discourse Functions of Object/Adverbial Fronting in Biblical Hebrew." Pages 231–45 in *Biblical Hebrew in Its Northwest Semitic Setting: Typological and Historical Perspectives*. Edited by Steven E. Fassberg and Avi Hurvitz. Jerusalem and Winona Lake, Ind.: The Hebrew University Magnes Press and Eisenbrauns, 2006.

———. *Word Order in the Biblical Hebrew Finite Clause: A Syntactic and Pragmatic Analysis of Preposing*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2010.

Mukařovsky, Jan. "Standard Language and Poetic Language (1932)." Pages 17–30 in *A Prague School Reader*. Edited Paul L. Garvin. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1964.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, Hebrew University; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1985.

———. "Verb Complementation in Biblical Hebrew." *Vetus Testamentum* 29 (1979): 425–35.

———. "Verb Complementation in Qumran Hebrew." Pages 92-149 in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leiden University, 11–14 December 1995*. Vol. 26. Edited by T. Muraoka and J.F. Elwolde. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Müller, August. *Outlines of Hebrew Syntax*. Translated from Part 3 of *Hebräische Schulgrammatik*. Edited and translated by James Robertson. Glasgow: Maclehose, 1888.

Naudé, Jacobus A. "On Subject Pronoun and Subject Noun Asymmetry: A Preliminary Survey of Northwest Semitic." *South African Journal of Linguistics* 11 (1993): 17–28.

———. "Qumran Hebrew as a Null Subject Language." *South African Journal of Linguistics* 9 (1991): 119–25.

Niccacci, Alviero. *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*. Trans. Wilfred W. G. Watson. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament–Supplemental Series. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990.

Niditch, Susan. *Oral World and Written Word: Ancient Israelite Literature*. Louisville, Ky.: Westminister John Knox Press, 1996.

O'Connor, Michael P. "Clausal Word Order in Biblical Hebrew: Comments on Recent Studies." Paper presented at the annual international meeting of the SBL, Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Section. Washington, D.C., 2006.

———. *Hebrew Verse Structure*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997.

———. "'Unanswerable Knack of Tongues': The Linguistic Study of Verse." Pages 143–68 in *Exceptional Language and Linguistics*, edited by L. K. Obler and L. Menn. New York: Academic Press, 1982.

Oesterley, W.O.E. *The Psalms: Translated with Text-Critical and Exegetical Notes*. London: SPCK, 1959.

Pardee, Dennis. Review of *Die Pendenskonstruktion im Biblischen Hebräisch: Studien zum Althebräischen Satz*. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51 (1989): 326–29.

Payne, Thomas E. *Describing Morphosyntax: A Guide for Field Linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Petersen, David L., and Kent H. Richards. *Interpreting Biblical Hebrew Poetry*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1992.

Pintzuk, Susan. *Phrase Structures in Competition: Variation and Change in Old English Word Order*. Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics. New York: Garland Pub., 1999.

Polak, Frank H. "Sociolinguistics: A Key to the Typology and the Social Background of Biblical Hebrew." *Hebrew Studies* 47 (2006): 115–62.

Polak, Frank. "The Oral and the Written: Syntax, Stylistics and the Development of Biblical Prose Narrative." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 26 (1999): 59–105.

———. "The Style of the Dialogue in Biblical Prose Narrative." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society* 28 (2001): 53–95.

Polzin, Robert. *Late Biblical Hebrew: Toward an Historical Typology of Biblical Hebrew Prose*. Harvard Semitic Monograph Series. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976.

Potebnya, Alexander. *Iz Zapisok Po Teorii Slovesnosti [Notes on the Theory of Language]*. Kharkov, 1905.

Radford, Andrew. *Analysing English Sentences: A Minimalist Approach (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

———. *Minimalist Syntax: Exploring the Structure of English*. Cambridge Textbooks of Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

———. *Transformational Grammar*. Cambridge Textbooks of Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Revell, E. J. "The Conditioning of Word Order in Verbless Clauses in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 24 (1989): 1–24.

Roberts, J. J. M. *Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox, 1991.

Rosenbaum, Michael. *Word-Order Variation in Isaiah 40–55: A Functional Perspective*. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1997.

Roth, Martha T. et al., ed. *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*. 21 vols. Chicago, Ill.: Oriental Institute, 1956-2010.

Ryssel, Carolus Victor. *De Elohistae Pentateuchici Sermone: Commentatio Historico-Critica*. Leipzig: L. Fernau, 1878.

Sáenz-Badillos, Angel. *The History of the Hebrew Language*. John Elwolde. New York: Cambridge, 1993.

Sappan, Raphael. הייחוד התחבירי של לשון השירה המקראית (Eng. *The Typical Features of the Syntax of Biblical Poetry in Its Classical Period*). Jerusalem: Kiryat-Sefer, 1981.

Schlesinger, K. "Zur Wortfolge im hebräischen Verbalsatz." *Vetus Testamentum* 3 (October 1953): 381–90.

Schökel, Luis Alonso. *A Manual of Hebrew Poetics*. Subsidia Biblica. Roma: Editrice pontificio Istituto biblico, 1988.

Segal, M.H. דקדוק לשון המשׁנה. Tel Aviv, 1936.

Shimasaki, Katsuomi. *Focus Structure in Biblical Hebrew: A Study of Word Order and Information Structure*. Bethesda, Md.: CDL, 2002.

Shklovsky, Victor. "Art as Technique." Pages 3–24 in *Russian Formalist Criticism: Four Essays*. Translated by Lee T. Lemon and Marion J. Ries. Lincoln, Neb.: University of Nebraska, 1965.

Siewierska, Anna. *Word Order Rules*. Croom Helm Linguistic Series. London: Croom Helm, 1988.

Sivan, Daniel. *A Grammar of the Ugaritic Language*. Handbuch der Orientalistik. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.

Tropper, Josef. *Ugaritische Grammatik*. Alter Orient un Altes Testament 273. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000.

Tsumura, David Toshio. "Janus Parallelism in Nah 1:8." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102 (1983): 109–11.

Vachek, Josef. *The Linguistic School of Prague*. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1966.

van der Merwe, Christo H. J. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. Sheffield, Eng.: Sheffield, 1999.

———. "Explaining Fronting in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 25 (1999): 173–86.

———. "Marked Word Order in the Book of Joel." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 36 (2010): 109–30.

———. "Towards a Better Understanding of Biblical Hebrew Word Order." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 25 (1999): 277–300.

van Hecke, Pierre. *From Linguistics to Hermeneutics: A Functional and Cognitive Approach to Job 12–14*. Studia Semitica Neerlandica. Leiden: Brill, 2011.

Van Valin, Robert D. *An Introduction to Syntax*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Vance, Donald R. *The Question of Meter in Biblical Hebrew Poetry*. Studies in Bible and Early Christianity 46. Lewiston, N.Y.: Edwin Mellen, 2001.

von Soden, Wolfram. "Der hymnisch-epische Dialekt des Akkadischen." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 40 (1931): 163–227.

———. "Der hymnisch-epische Dialekt des Akkadischen." *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 41 (1933): 90–183.

Waltke, Bruce K., and Michael P. O'Connor. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Watson, Wilfred G.E. "The Pivot Pattern in Hebrew, Ugaritic and Akkadian Poetry." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 88 (1976): 239–53.

———. *Traditional Techniques in Classical Hebrew Verse*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament–Supplemental Series. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.

———. *Classical Hebrew Poetry: A Guide to Its Techniques*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament–Supplemental Series. Sheffield, England: T. & T. Clark, 1984.

Werth, Paul. "Roman Jakobson's Verbal Analysis of Poetry." *Journal of Linguistics* 12 (March 1976): 21–73.

Wim van der Wurff. "Object-Verb Order in Late Middle English." *Journal of Linguistics* 33 (1997): 485–509.

Young, Ian, Robert Rezetko, and Martin Ehrensvärd. *Linguistic Dating of Biblical Texts*. BibleWorld. Oakville, Conn.: Equinox, 2008.