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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.
I am particularly grateful for the contributions of the faculty of the Semitic and Egyptian Languages and Literatures Department at The Catholic University of America to the present research, including Dr. Monica J. Blanchard and Dr. Sidney H. Griffith, S.T., who introduced me to the extensive corpus of Aramaic literature. I cannot overstate the significance of the work of the late Dr. Michael P. O’Connor in the area of Biblical Hebrew verse. I had the privilege of sitting under him as a pupil during my doctoral studies, and those who are familiar with his work will sense his influence on every page of this dissertation. Similarly, my teacher and friend Dr. Douglas M. Gropp carefully and closely guided my research, helping me refine my topic and method over numerous phone calls and gallons of coffee at the annual conferences. The line of inquiry pursued in this dissertation is founded upon many of those conversations as well as Dr. Gropp’s unpublished work on the topic, and it would not have been completed without him. I owe a profound debt of gratitude to Dr. Edward M. Cook, who directed and commented extensively on my work, providing significant guidance in the areas of comparative Semitics, linguistic theory, and research method. He saw this project through to completion, and I cannot imagine it reaching its final form without him. I am thankful for the linguistic and technical insight provided by Dr. Andrew D. Gross and Dr. David A. Bosworth. Both were gracious and generous with their time, and their responses have improved this document considerably. Of course, any errors found herein are mine.

The Board of Trustees, my colleagues, and the administration at Reformed Theological Seminary have been nothing short of encouraging during my writing process, and for that I am most grateful. I also want to thank Michael Farrell and Laura Armstrong of the library staff for their tireless efforts to acquire the resources I needed while in Orlando. I am likewise grateful for my gifted teaching assistants: Alex Kirk, for his editorial work, and Ryan Fraser, for his help with the sample of BH verse.
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
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.


\(^3\) 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 (אשר) 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

---


5. Sappan, Typical Features, xxxi-xxxv.

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).  

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, 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
Dialekt des Akkadischen,” ZA 40 (1931): 163–65; Wolfram von Soden, “Der hymnisch-

JSOTS Sup (Sheffield, England: T. & T. Clark, 1984), 49, 51–52; Wilfred G. E. Watson,
Traditional Techniques in Classical Hebrew Verse, JSOTS Sup (Sheffield: Sheffield
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.

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 \textit{wh}-word of the sentence is fronted alone leaving the “off” in place. This results in the following sentence:

\begin{equation}
\text{(2) The call, Naomi put off.}
\end{equation}

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.

\textbf{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.\textsuperscript{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 (\textit{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

\begin{quote}
\end{quote}
from that of Daniel. 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.” 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).

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.” 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.

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).


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 (though this claim is not without critics). 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 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, they suggest that Middle English poetry was more likely to preserve older syntactic structure than prose.


These few illustrations support what O’Connor calls his “linguistic axiom” which calls for the study of verse as a “subsystem of language.” O’Connor is committed to the notion that verse is unique and susceptible to manipulation, a notion he develops from Lotz. 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.

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.


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.” O’Connor notes that it is repeated phenomena that must occur in order for poetic function to occur. 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.

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. 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


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.


supports Kugel’s argument against generic distinction), 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” 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).

Formalist school of literary criticism. In answer to the symbolist movement in general\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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;\textsuperscript{32}

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Iz Zapisok Po Teorii Slovesnosti} [Notes on the Theory of Language] [Kharkov, 1905], 83.)


ultimately even the essence of what it was is forgotten.\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{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”\textsuperscript{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-

\textsuperscript{32} Shklovsky, “Art as Technique,” 11.

\textsuperscript{33} Shklovsky, “Art as Technique,” 13.

\textsuperscript{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.*

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,” 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. Shklovsky cites the way Tolstoy defamiliarizes an object by refusing to name it. 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.\textsuperscript{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 “\textquoteleft [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.”\textsuperscript{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:

\begin{quote}
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.\textsuperscript{41}
\end{quote}

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.


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”\footnote{Shklovsky, “Art as Technique,” 22.} or as Shklovsky later clarifies,

> In the light of these developments we can define poetry as \textit{attenuated, tortuous} speech. Poetic speech is \textit{formed speech}. Prose is ordinary speech --- economical, easy, proper, the goddess of prose [\textit{dea prosae}] is a goddess of the accurate, facile type, of the “direct” expression of the child.\footnote{Shklovsky, “Art as Technique,” 23.}

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.”\footnote{Milman Parry, “Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making. I: Homer and Homeric Style,” \textit{Harvard Studies in Classical Philology} 41 (1930): 80.} 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.\footnote{Albert Bates Lord, \textit{The Singer of Tales} (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1960), 30.}

While the Parry-Lord hypothesis of mutual exclusivity of orality and textuality has been
considerably revised, their descriptions (particularly that of Lord) of the memory techniques are still accepted today. 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. 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. 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. Shklovsky likens literary tropes to the architecture of a


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.  

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. 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


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


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.
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.) and a linguistic standard for texts developed during and after the exile. 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.

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, 


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. In his *Introduction*, Driver views the “age of Nehemiah” as the turning-point in BH; 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” 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.


Esther, and Ecclesiastes (which exhibit “palpable” changes in vocabulary and syntax). 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. 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”.

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,” a premise which remains valid today (despite arguments to the contrary). Therefore it is the debate between two of Driver’s contemporaries C. V. Ryssel and F. Giesebrecht regarding the relative dating of


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.), 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.

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.” 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?

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. In other words, raw concordance data will confuse


rather than settle such a question.

Similarly, late-seeming features such as the use of the shorter first person independent personal pronoun רָאָשׁ against the longer form רַעַשׁ 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.  

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. 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. 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 ראֹ (cf. 1 Kings 12:16) following the Syriac, Targum, and several medieval Hebrew manuscripts. Dillard (following Williamson?) argues that ראֹ 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 - קִומָה לְרָבָּא שָׁפְכָּת

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 קִומָה לְרָבָּא as a noun phrase headed by קִומָה with לְרָבָּא as a nominal complement exhibiting a relationship that might be best described as genitive. However, it is more likely that לְרָבָּא is adverbial describing the extent of the action denoted by the verb שָׁפְכָּת. 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

textual segments, including his main subject the P document, could be verified. 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. Working from this framework, Polzin rejects the conclusions of C.V. Ryssel, and later S.R. Driver, 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.” 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. 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 בָּא with a pronominal suffix


and its increased use before nouns in the nominative case (“emphatic
יָד”), 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 בְּ and כּ, 33

5. repetition of a singular word (e.g., Est 9:28 יִשְׂפָחָה יִשְׂפָחָה, 1 Chron 28:15
יַנְתָה יַנְתָה), 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, יִשְׂפָחָה הָזֶה (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.”

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).” 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.


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. 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. 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.” 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.” For Hurvitz, the significance of CBH as a linguistic model for later compositions possibly explains the anachronistically early features in late poems such as11QPs$^9$ (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,
- tendency to put substantives before the cardinal number modifying it (in


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.


appositional construction),\(^{43}\)

- a similar tendency to put a title after the proper name (וֹדְרָיֶוׁש ַהֶּּמֶלְך 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


\(^{46}\) See n. 43.
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. 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 and Holmstedt who argue for a


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

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. 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. 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), so that preverbal word order variations such as S-O-V or, more rarely,

---


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.

CHAPTER 3
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 יַשַׁע); 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; 26:12a; 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


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: syntaktische, pragmatische, und übersetzungs-technische Studien zum althebräischen Verbalsatz (Berlin: de Gruter, 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.


\(^7\) Moshavi, \textit{Word Order}, 85.
Previous Analysis: Word Order Studies

As opposed to recent scholarly treatments of word order 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,” 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” 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 maq̄eṣ 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.


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.  

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), 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. 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:

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

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.


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 . . .

Ewald understands variations to this “simplest” word order to be a function of either a) clause-type 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.

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. While Joüon’s grammar is


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.

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.”

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.”

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. 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, comes to the same conclusion as Gesenius: “Die Normalstellung Verbum-


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. Müller24 and Davidson25 closely link circumstantiality and emphasis while Driver26 and Muraoka27 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


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 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


linguistic systems. 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. 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, Dik’s functional grammar, Givón’s discourse pragmatic approach, and Lambrecht’s


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.

information structure.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{39}

In the Saussurean terminology, information structure, therefore, analyzes the linguistic sign comprised of a formal \textit{signans} (“lexicogrammatical structure”) and functional or semantic \textit{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:

\ldots 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.\textsuperscript{40}

While information structure enjoys this wide application in the broader linguistic


\textsuperscript{39} Lambrecht, \textit{Information Structure}, 5.

\textsuperscript{40} Lambrecht, \textit{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; thus many prosodic aspects of language are lost to the modern researcher. 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 and Holmstedt through whom it has seen a considerable increase in visibility. To understand the distinctive features of the generative approach, a case study


42. Laver defines suprasegmental description of speech as concerned with “all factors which can potentially be prolonged beyond the domain of segment . . . examples 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.


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.\(^\text{45}\)

Holmstedt’s first point depends on Downing’s opinion favoring nonnarrative (though it should be noted that Downing is not settled on the matter),\(^\text{46}\) qualified by Longacre’s concern about dialogue and the “exigencies of repartee.”\(^\text{47}\) 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.\(^\text{48}\) 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,


\(^{48}\) 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.” 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.” He prefers, however, terminology of the Chomskyan school (e.g. “complement,” “adjunct,” and “specifier”) 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” 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.” 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


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.

“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

\[54.\text{Robert D. Holmstedt, “Word Order in the Book of Proverbs,” 139.}\]

\[55.\text{I thank Edward Cook for bringing this last point to my attention.}\]
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

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

outside the predication"57 (= casus pendens, preposed topic/extraposition, left
dislocation, etc.). Discourse particles refer to words like אֵכן, אָך, אֵיה, אָאְך, אֶף, and ו. 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

57. The extra-predication positioning of the Theme is marked in the formula by

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


60. Jan Mukařovsky, “Standard Language and Poetic Language (1932),” in A
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

V-PP-S // S V

Can the prey be taken from the mighty // or captives of the tyrant62 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 construction63 in which an


62. This translation reflects the emendation, following the reading of a few medieval Hebrew manuscripts, IQIs”Pesh, and the Vulgate.

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

(3) Isa 46:7

They lift it on their shoulders they carry it.

The PP 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. Such pause can be caused by defamiliarized word order such as the OV word order pattern. 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.

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, 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. 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. 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

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


68. This view of the clause is also found in Disse’s analysis of word order. Andreas Disse, *Informationssstruktur 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”)\textsuperscript{70} and used by Rosenbaum.\textsuperscript{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 heightened 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,\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{70} Dik, \textit{Functional Grammar}, 21.


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

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) even though the vast majority of his examples of two constituents in the preverbal field come from verse. 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.


74. van Hecke, “From Linguistics to Hermeneutics,” 77.


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, Gross’s 1996 monograph is the closest thing to a complement to Andersen’s seminal monograph on word order patterns in verbless clauses. 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.


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 (also translated estrangement) 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


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.”

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, Watson84 and Sappan85 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.


85. Sappan, _Typical Features_, iv.

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.

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

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.”

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.” 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

\[(5) \quad \text{We ate.}\]

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. The S or O are arguments of the verb, though only O is considered a complement of the verb. In BH, a simple distinction between the S and


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.

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.\textsuperscript{95}

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

\begin{equation}
(6) \quad \text{I gave the flower to Mary.}
\end{equation}

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:

\begin{equation}
(7) \quad \text{I gave Mary the flower.}
\end{equation}

When a complement is a PP in BH, it can be called an “oblique complement.”\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.

\begin{equation}
(8) \quad \text{I spoke to Kate in the evening.}
\end{equation}

\textsuperscript{95} Moshavi, \textit{Word Order}, 62.


\textsuperscript{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, \textit{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

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

The V שָׁבַה takes an overt or covert complement PP (locative - origin, path, goal), which is overt in the PP לָמֹרֹום. The pronominal suffix of the PP וָעֶליָה refers back to the לֻאִּמים “assemblies of the people” in the previous line, so that the first PP describes the place where the event of the VP לָמֹרֹום שָׁבַה 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.

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, XSyntax: 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:


(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.”  

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

distinguish complements from adjuncts in a given language.\textsuperscript{104} Because there have not been many studies of BH syntax that focus on the distinction between complements and adjuncts,\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Syntax}, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics (Cambridge: Cambridge, 1981), 124.


106. While “thematic role” is the preferred terminology by Radford in 2004, the more algebraic “θ-role” is his preferred term in 2009. Radford, \textit{Minimalist Syntax}, 251–54; Radford, \textit{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 את, and with other prepositions. The following examples are illustrative:

(19) Gen 18:7

חיה בㆍברכה רכ ושוב
He took a tender and good calf.

(20) Gen 2:15

שם יהוה אלהים ואת את
The Lord God took Adam.

(21) Gen 7:9

אסחר יצאה אלהים אתנה
. . . just as God commanded Noah.

(22) Gen 2:16

�או יהוה אלהים עלאתנה
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 את (20-21), and as a PP (22). In this study, את 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, את constructions are not common. When the

108. Waltke-O’Connor, 163.
complement object is a PP, it will be categorized as an “oblique complement.”

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). 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

---


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 Satzteilstellung 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 into 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.

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.

² Lunn, Word-Order Variation, 6–8.
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.

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)

הָאֱלֹהִים עַל־הָרְכָּה וַיִּשְׁמַע יִהוֵּה עַל נְעֹרֵי יֹשְׁבֵי

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.”

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) קָאָרָן אָשֶׁר שָמֶה שָלָה בִּלְבּוֹת לָךְ אֱנוֹנָנָהוּ לְזֶרֶךְ׃

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) לָךְ אֵּ ATK permissible שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִם שָׁמַיִ 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
(7) Hab 1:10

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

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. ’atm bšm w ʾān šnt = ʾātumā bāšātumā wa ʾānā šanītu “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 רָאָה was added to a verbless clause (וַיַּעַשֶּׁה) resulting in a periphrastic construction that is more common to Late Biblical Hebrew. The O of the clause is a relative clause (כֹּלָּאֶשֶר עִׂישָׁם יָשַּׁם) 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 (עִׂישָׁם and עֶׂשְׂתָּם) in the relative clause and in the periphrastic construction of the main clause. The plural participle עִׂישָׁם can be explained either as referring to the antecedant כֹּלָּאֶשֶר in the previous clause, or as a plural form used for unspecified 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. Buth has shown how when another constituent is moved before the participle then the subject must necessarily precede the participle. 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. In this case, the object is moved to the front, requiring the subject to precede the participle, resulting in a regular


word order pattern. Of course, this requires understanding הָנַה 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 נַה]; 4:16b [with נַה]; 6:5; Lev 26:16a [preceded by נָה]; Num 3:12 [followed by נַה]; 14:35a; 17:6b; 23:19b [interrogative particle נ]; 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)\textsuperscript{15} or adverb (A),\textsuperscript{16} since these adverb NP seem to move more freely than typical adjunct PP in prose contexts. In BH such adverbs include יְחָדוּ (and לְהָדוּ “together,”) יָאוּ “very” (almost always modifies an adjective or stative verb [tensed adjective] or a piel verb that is causative of stative), ולְפִינָן “formerly,” אשָׁשׁ “last night,” and יְהִי רְפָאִים “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 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.\textsuperscript{17}
9. I speedily swam to shore.
10. I swam speedily to shore.
11. I swam to shore speedily.

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

\[(12) \text{I will speedily swim to shore.}\]

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 הָּטֵמא can occur at just about any position in the BH clause:

\[(14) X = הָּטֵמא\]

\[(14a) S X V: \text{Deut 12:22}\]


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”\(^{19}\) (Radford, *Minimalist Syntax*, 342–43).
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

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, 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

The God of your fathers spoke to me last night.

This is a normal BH clause in prose, because the adverb אֲשֶׁר 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.  

**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 רַשּׁע, יִבְשֹׁר, and רַשּׁוֹן illustrate the ways in which different particles operate on different and sometimes overlapping levels. It seems that רַשּׁע 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 רַשּׁע) if the clause is verbal. In (17) רַשּׁע 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.

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

(17)  Gen 2:19

וֹכֶל אֶשֶר يְקָרָא לוֹ הָאָדָם נֶפֶשׁ

and whatever the man named every living thing

When the particle כי 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

כי בֹּו שָׁבַת מְכָל־מַּלאֲכּתֹו אָלֹהִים לָעׂשֹות

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

Unlike אשר, the conjunction כי is not an argument of the verb. Because כי 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 כי particle and main clause. For example, in the following line (19) כי occurs before the preposed independent pronoun אתה:

(19)  Psalm 18:28

פִּירָאתָה יָמְעָעֶרְךָ

But you will save an afflicted people.

- a Linguistic Analysis” [Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin - Madison, 2002], 252–57), though he reads אשר 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 אשר 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 כֵּאֶּשְׁר 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
וְהָבִאים ָזָכר ּוְנֵקָבה ִמָּכל־ָּבָׂשר ָּבאּו ַּכֲאֶׁשְׁר ִצָּוה ֹאתֹו ֱאֹלִים

In cases that include כֵּאֶּשְׁר or כֵּאֶּשְׁר, the particle will be analyzed as occupying the first position. In cases that begin with כֵּי, 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 אֵּשֶׁר 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 התיה

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

---

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 from 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Constituent Structure</th>
<th>Trope</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen 49:13 a</td>
<td>יְזָבֻלָּן יִשְׂכֶנּוּ שָׁם Zebulum will dwell on the shore of the seas</td>
<td>NPs PPc V</td>
<td>MatchGap</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num 23:9c</td>
<td>בִּלְתָּא אִם לָבָדַד לְשִׁכֵּנּוּ Behold, a people live alone</td>
<td>De NPs PPa V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num 23:24a</td>
<td>כָּרִים כָּלִיבֵי יִקְּמוּ Behold, a people rise up like a lion</td>
<td>De NPs PPa V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num 24:9b</td>
<td>כָּלִיבֵי אָם מַשּׁה Like a lion, who will rouse him</td>
<td>PPa NPs V</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 32:12a</td>
<td>יְהֹוָה בָּדָד נַעֲנוּ The Lord alone guides him.</td>
<td>NPs NPa V</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 33:2a</td>
<td>יְהֹוָה מִסָּטִים אָם The Lord came from Sinai.</td>
<td>NPs PPc V</td>
<td>MatchNoGap</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 33:3b</td>
<td>כָּלִלְּשֶׁי בָּרְעֹן &gt;חֹּמְטֶה All his saints bow themselves in your hand.</td>
<td>NPs PPla V</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. It is possible that NPa here is not an adjunct of V but of NPs, however, the preposition ל 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 (ְוָזַרח ִמֵּׂשִעיר ָלמֹו) 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 (תָּאָכְלָה) to the 2 c. pl. pft. form of the Gt stem from the root בָּדָך 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  נְשַׁנָּאיו ִמן־ְיקּומּון׃
Of those who hate him, who will rise up?

Deut 33:17c  בֵּן סֵמִים יִנְגָּח
With them he gores the nations.

Deut 33:19a  יַמְּסִים הָרָּאָר
They call peoples to the mountain.

Deut 32:38  אֶשֶׁר מַּחֲלָה אֱלֹהִים
who ate the fat of their sacrifices.

Judg 5:17a  גַּלֶּעְד ְּבֵעֶבר ַהַּיְרֵּדן ָׁשֵכן
Gilead stayed in the Trans-Jordan.

Judg 5:26a  נֵּּבַעְתָּה מָלַלְתָּה
She reached out her hand to the tent peg.

27. This case deserves some discussion. I am taking נְשַׁנָּאיו to be a G ptc. with a partitive min- prefix, translated “of those who hate him, who will rise up.” The preposition מ- must be repointed as the interrogative pronoun מ- for this reading as well. O’Connor takes the mem- as an enclitic, though he also repoints מ- to מ- (Michael P. O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 212). The MT has נְשַׁנָּאיו the D ptc., which in turn is the object of the impv. in the preceding line (משמ), and the preposition מ- 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 נְשַׁנָּאיו and מ- 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 יָקְרָא. The former reading is preferable because it is entirely plausible and does not require repointing the MT.
2 Sam 1:25c Jonathan is slain in your high places.

Isa 40:10a Behold, the Lord God will come with might.

Isa 40:11a He will tend his flock like a shepherd.

Isa 40:12b He marked off the heavens with a span.

Isa 40:13b Or what man teaches him his counsel.

Isa 40:19b A refiner overlays it with gold.

Isa 40:20a The poor chooses wood that will not rot for an offering.

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 ἐκ θανάτου έπραξαν αὐτόν, retroverting the clause לַחֲלָל in which the PP assigns result (you are pierced to death”). McCarter favors this reading, particularly with the Lucianic addition έξω (לי) which, he notes, begins a series of three lei 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 (וַּהֲנַפֶּל בָּלָם הַמִּלָּחָמָה) 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 "וַיֶּתֶם מִיסְכִּים תִּכְוָן יִשְׁרָעִיב " 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 ("תִּכְוָן/תִּכְוָנָה" [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 איש acts pronominally in the place of the interrogative יִתְנַשֵּׁה in the A line.
He reduces the judges of the earth to nothing.
The wind carries them away like chaff.
He summons them from name.
My judgment is passed over from my God.
He increases strength for those who lack might.
A way he has not gone by his feet.
Each one helps his neighbor.
You make the hills like chaff.
Their tongues dry out with thirst.
I will give Jerusalem a bearer of good news.

32. This case is different from the reciprocal construction “each to his friend” (Exod 18:7; Deut 19:11 (discontinuous complement); Judg 7:13 discontinuous 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, לֵרֵעהו is typically taken to be a nominal complement.

33. Note that these arguments are identical to Isa 40:23.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isa 42:1d</td>
<td>מִשֶּפֶט לָגוֹוִים יֹוִציא׃</td>
<td>He shall bring forth judgment on the nations.</td>
<td>NPc PPc V MatchNoGap B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 42:4c</td>
<td>וַלֹתוָרֹתו ִאִּיים ְיַיֵחילּו׃</td>
<td>The coastlands wait for his instruction.</td>
<td>PPC NPs V MatchNoGap C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 42:8b</td>
<td>יַבֹוִדי ְלַאֵחר ֹלא־ֶאֵּתן</td>
<td>I will not give my glory to another.</td>
<td>NPc PPc V MatchGap A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 42:12b</td>
<td>וְׁתִהָּלתֹו ָּבִאִּיים ַיִּגידּו׃</td>
<td>Let them declare his praises in the coastlands.</td>
<td>NPs PPa V MatchNoGap B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 42:13a</td>
<td>יהוה ַּכִּגּבֹור ֵיֵצא</td>
<td>The Lord goes out like a mighty man.</td>
<td>NPs PPa V A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 44:16b</td>
<td>וָאָדם ָעֶליָה ָבָראִתי</td>
<td>I created mankind upon it.</td>
<td>PPa NPc V B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 44:17a</td>
<td>נְשַׁאְריוֹתָה לָּאֵל ָעָׂשה</td>
<td>The remainder he makes into a god.</td>
<td>NPc PPc V MatchNoGap A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 44:19f</td>
<td>הָוָה ָלַזְּכֵרָה אֶעֶשַׁה</td>
<td>And the remainder he has made an abomination.</td>
<td>NPc PPc V MatchNoGap A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 45:12b</td>
<td>אָנְדָה ָעלָיָה בָּראִתי</td>
<td>I created mankind upon it.</td>
<td>NPc PPa V B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 45:14c</td>
<td>נְפַשְׁיָם בָּהלָּכְבָּר</td>
<td>Men of stature will come over to you.</td>
<td>NPs PPa V SynDep B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 46:2c</td>
<td>הָנָּפֶשֶׁם בְּשַׁבָּהַלָּכָה</td>
<td>They themselves go into captivity.</td>
<td>NPs PPa V C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 נְפַשְׁיָם 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).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isa 46:4b</td>
<td>יָהִיא שְׁבַעְתֶּךָ אַיָּמִים&lt;br&gt;ְַוִּיסָּּהֶל</td>
<td>Until your hair is gray, I will support you.</td>
<td>PPa NPs V B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 46:6b</td>
<td>בָּקָהָּה הָּשַׁלְּחֵּל&lt;br&gt;יָשֹּׁל</td>
<td>They weigh out silver by the reed’s length.</td>
<td>NPc PPa V SynDep B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 48:3a</td>
<td>יִשֹּׁלְלֵּת הָּשָׁנִים&lt;br&gt;הַגְּדֵּד</td>
<td>I declared the former things long ago.</td>
<td>NPc PPa V A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 48:8d</td>
<td>הֶלְכָּשׁ הָּסַּכִּיֵּל&lt;br&gt;קַר</td>
<td>You were called a rebel from the womb.</td>
<td>NPs PPa V B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 48:11c</td>
<td>הָּשָׁנִים יִנְּשֹּׁלְלֵּת&lt;br&gt;לָא־אָחָר</td>
<td>My glory I will not give to another.</td>
<td>NPc PPI V C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 48:16b</td>
<td>לָא מֵאַשָּׁהְת הַמְּדָרֶה</td>
<td>From the beginning I have not spoken in secret.</td>
<td>PPa PPa V A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 48:21b</td>
<td>קָזָּה הַמַּלְּאָה הַיָּוָּד</td>
<td>He made water flow from the rock for us.</td>
<td>NPc PPCc V B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hab 3:2d</td>
<td>הָּשָׁנִים כְּרֶם הַנַּוְּפֵּד</td>
<td>In wrath, you must remember compassion.</td>
<td>PPa NPc V MatchGap B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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

37. This reading of לָא מֵאַשָּׁהְת הַמְּדָרֶה 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 ֱאֹלוַּה ִמֵּתיָמן ָיֹבוא  
God came from Teman.

Hab 3:4a ְוֹנַגּה ָּכאֹור ִּתְהֶיה  
His splendor was like the sunlight.

Hab 3:11b ְלֹאור ִחֶּּציָך ְיַהֵּלכּו  
Your arrows go about as light

Hab 3:16f ַלֲעלֹות ְלַעם ְיגּוֶדּנּו׃  
During a rising a people will invade us.

Zeph 2:4a ִּכי ַעָּזה ֲעזּוָבה ִתְהֶיה  
For Gaza will be forsaken.

Zeph 2:7b ֵּבית ְיהּוָדה ֲעֵליֶהם ִיְרעּון  
The house of Judah will graze on them.

39. The verb of translocation selects L as an oblique complement. It is unclear whether the rare divine name ֱאֹלוַּה 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 εις φως βολίδες σου πορεύσονται εις φέγγος ἀστραπῆς ὀψεων σου (though the second line seems to read a construct relationship between םּרְפָּיָנְאָנ). 

41. I follow O’Connor in reading the second ָּ 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).
42. This is surely the B-line in completion, and שֵאֵרִית cannot be construed with the previous line (as in the ESV, KJV, NAS, NIV, NRS translation). This reading is based on a misreading of the 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.


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 בֲּבָבֵּתי is taken as one PP.
Zech 9:14a  
The Lord will appear over them.

Zech 9:14c  
The Lord God will sound the trumpet.

Ps 3:5a  
My voice I will cry out to the Lord.

Ps 5:13b  
You surround them with favor like a shield.

46. Though נרָאה 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 אל (Gen 46:29; Lev 13:19; Judg 13:10; 1 Kings 18:1). Here the赉לכם 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:

The Lord will appear over them  
His arrows like lightning will fly  
The Lord Yhwh will blow the horn  
and he will go in the storms of the south

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 כֶּתֶר 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: בִּדְמָעִתי ַעְרִׂשי ַאְמֶסה׃ I drench my couch with tears.

Ps 6:10b: יְהוָה ְּתִפָּלִתי ִיָּקח׃ The Lord will receive my prayer.

Ps 7:6c: כְּבֹדְיִי ֶלָעָפר ַיְׁשֵּכן Let him lay my glory in the dust.

Ps 7:8b: לָלָּם ְּתִפָּלִתי ָׁשַמע׃ Over it return on high.

Ps 7:14b: חָציו ְּלֹדְלִקים ִיְפָעל He makes his arrows into fiery bolts.

Ps 7:17b: עָלָּה ְּלֹדְלִקים ִיְפָעל Violence will come down on his head.

Ps 9:8a: יְהוָה ְּלעֹוָלם ֵיֵׁשב The Lord sits enthroned forever.

---

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:

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 NPc 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

וְיָדְרָבֶךָ דָּמֵים אֲחָמָם זֶכֶר
For he who avenges blood remembers them.

Ps 10:2a

בְּעַיְמִית, רֹשֵׁע יִדֶם שְׁמַעָם
In his pride, the wicked pursued the afflicted.

Ps 10:7a

אֵלְךָ פִּיהּוּ מָלַא
His mouth is filled with curse.

Ps 10:8c

עִנֵיָנוּ לְחָלָכהּ יָצַפֵּי
His eyes secretly set against the poor.

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 כי, 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*, 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 עָלָה to עָלֵךְ 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 יֵעִין (Cf. Psa 37:2). In this case, עָלֵךְ is semantically O though it is mediated by the preposition ל, 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 א 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 (בְּעַיְמִית), 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

Of the orphan, you are a helper.

Ps 11:5a

The Lord tests the righteous and the wicked.

Ps 12:3b

With flattering lips and a duplicitous heart they speak.

Ps 12:9a

All around the wicked walk.

Ps 14:2a

The Lord from heaven looks down.

Ps 17:2a

Let my vindication come out from your presence.

54. It is possible that יתום is the complement of עזר, 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 ליתום. Oesterley (144) and Kraus (189-190) reads יתום in the previous line as does Oesterley. In this case PRN does not left dislocated because it follows יתום, 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 ורשע 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 על‑בני‑אדם with which it is syntactically dependent as it is with the remaining lines of v. 2.
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.

The word of your lips I have kept.
Your ways have supported my steps.
In your tracks, my foot never stumbles.

58. The verb שמר does take a complement headed by the preposition ב, 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 לפני 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 עבוי is clearly a complement of PPC.
Ps 21:10c
The Lord will swallow them in his anger.

Ps 21:11a
You will destroy their descendants from the earth.

Ps 25:1a
To you Lord, I lift up my soul.

Ps 25:13a
He himself will dwell in prosperity.

Ps 78:50c
He delivered their lives over to the plague.

Ps 78:64a
His priests fell by the sword.

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 resulting in NPs PPa V/NPs V.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ps 106:7⁶⁵</td>
<td>אַבֹּתֵינוּ בִּמְצַרִים לא־הַשִּׁכֵּילוּ נְפָׁשם</td>
<td>Our fathers did not remember in Egypt your wonders.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 107:5b⁶⁶</td>
<td>נְפָׁשם בָּהֶם תְּתַעֵּטף׃</td>
<td>Their soul fainted within them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 107:26c⁶⁷</td>
<td>נְפָׁשם בְּרָעָה תְּתָמֹוָגג׃</td>
<td>Their soul melted away in their distress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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 a clause.

---

65. It is possible to take this as two lines, the first of which being merely a phrase line (uento הָבֹּתֵינוּ בִּמְצַרִים) 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 unto הָבֹּתֵינוּ בִּמְצַרִים 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 תְּתַעֵּטף is stative in meaning (or an experience verb which bears many similarities to a stative verb in BH) and does not necessarily assign l. The A-line is a phrase line of two adjectives רֶעִיבות צֵמִאים which are syntactically dependent 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. 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 (אלה); 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 is, as Geller puts it, “the indispensable and necessary unit of composition for parallel verse.” 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.” 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,” 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.”


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.”

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, 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

subcategories chiasm, tail linkage, etc., exert influence over the word order pattern of the line. 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. 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


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.” 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

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

ְָוַזְרָעם ִמְּבֵני ָאָדם
ִּפְרָימֹו ֵמֶאֶרץ ְּתַאֵּבד

you will destroy his fruit from the earth //
and their seed from the sons of men


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.

For the B-line to be structurally whole, it requires the V בָּשָׁם 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

אָלֵיךָ יִפְגַּשׁ הָעָנָא
הָעָנָא יַחֲנֹן
הָעָנָא יִתְנַשֵּׁפֶל
הָעָנָא יִשְׁקַר

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 objects 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

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 wqatal 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.\textsuperscript{82} In terms of lexical variety, BH verse is exceptional, no doubt, because of the rich use of synonymous terms in adjacent poetic lines.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{אֶּשֶּר}, the definite article \textit{ה}, and the coordinating conjunction \textit{ו}. 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.


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 ְו 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 ( ְו 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 (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 infrequency of the coordinating conjunction in BH verse.

Somewhat related to the issue of coordination is that of hypotaxis, particularly the use of ְו- clauses in the sample. Three clause lines (included in the uncoordinated category) are headed by ְו (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. 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 NPred in clauses in which נֵבָה 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
• 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 an adjunct in the first position.
• The 1 (1.9%) remaining line has NPpred that is a part of a discontinuous predicate in a clause where V is רָעַי

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 נָקַש)
• 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 נָקַש), 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 נָקַש 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\textsuperscript{86} (Genesis 49, Exodus 15; Numbers 23-24; Deuteronomy 32\textsuperscript{87} and 33; Judges 5; 2 Samuel 1:19-27, Psalm 18) exhibits a tendency toward V-postponement (16:130 eligible lines, 12.3%)\textsuperscript{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-

\textsuperscript{86} Cross and Freedman, \textit{Studies}.  

\textsuperscript{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, \textit{Studies}, 4.

\textsuperscript{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, 1.3%; 70 lines [possibly 79], 1.4%)


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 lines96 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%)

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.
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, 1.2%)
Psalm 106 (1:18 eligible lines, 5.6; 106 lines, 0.9%)
Psalm 107 (2:16 eligible lines, 1.3%; 89 lines, 2.2%)

Canonical Context Breakdown

Genesis 49 (1:18 eligible lines, 5.5%; 80 lines, 1.3%; 70 lines [possibly

Exodus 15 (0:20 eligible lines, 0%; 56 lines;\textsuperscript{108} 66 lines,\textsuperscript{109} 0%)

Numbers 23-24 (3:22 eligible lines, 13.6%; 80 lines,\textsuperscript{110} 3.8%]

Numbers 23-24 (3:22 eligible lines, 13.6%; 80 lines,\textsuperscript{111} 3.8%]

Deuteronomy 32 (2:19 eligible lines, 10.5%; 140 lines,\textsuperscript{112} 1.4%)

Deuteronomy 33 (5:12 eligible lines, 41.7%; 97 lines,\textsuperscript{113} 6.2%; 78 lines\textsuperscript{114} 6.4%)

\textsuperscript{108} Michael P. O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 179.


\textsuperscript{110} Michael P. O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 185.

\textsuperscript{111} Michael P. O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 185.

\textsuperscript{112} Michael P. O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 194.

\textsuperscript{113} Michael P. O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 208.

\textsuperscript{114} Cross and Freedman, \textit{Studies}, 66–70.
33:11 והמשנאיי מקריקומון: PPa NPs V
33:17 בתקע תמימים יגלה: PPa NPc V
33:19 וטימים תרירקאר: NPC PPa V

Judges 5 (2:15 eligible lines, 13.3%; 106 lines, 115 2.8%; 3:60 lines, 116 5%)
5:17 ונשלת השכבה תונזרש שבע: NPC PPc V
5:26 ונדלת השכלתה: NPC PPc V

2 Samuel 1 (1:4 eligible lines, 25%; 30 lines, 117 3.3%)
1:25 והוקמה על עידנמקים על: NPC 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 והנה את עיני יהוה בתוקף יבוא: NPC PPa V
40:11 ומעשם בנהרות הנה: PPa NPC V
40:12 ושמיים בנהרות המים: NPC PPa V
40:13 ולא יעשיהו יזרעיה: NPC NPCs V
40:19 ופי שנים בزهرנים: NPC PPa V
40:20 ומעשם וירשה עין לא-אמרס ב以人民: NPC NPC [R. cl.] V
40:23 ונִפְשׁוּ אֵין גְּלָלָא עָם: NPC PPc V
40:24 והמחיה ממֵשָׁה ומשה: NPC PPa V

40:26 כלבם נשם יראה
40:27 נאכלני משמש יבואר:
40:29 כלאי ארונים שעמדה ירבח:

41 (5:17 eligible lines, 29.4%;119 lines, 4.2%)
41:3 אחר הברוא לא יבוא:
41:6 איש אטריווה יעור:
41:15 נכ毌ת פיך חשמ:
41:17 חשים בעשא ושפת
41:27 מכלרשדוע מסר אמן:

42 (5:15 eligible lines, 33.3%;91 lines, 5.5%)
42:1 משמש לואים דייא:
42:4 נתרנה אנימ גוהלה:
42:8 נכבדי ממזר לא יאך:
42:12 וחיה לאימ זמד:
42:13 יהוד גבורה יבר:

43 (0:13 eligible lines, 0%;66 lines, 0%)

44 (3:15 eligible lines, 20%;81 lines, 3.7%)
44:16 עליה עידא בישה יאכלה
44:17 נאהרייה לא לישה
44:19 יתם לחרבעה ישמה
45 (2:8 eligible lines, 25%;115 lines, 1.7%)
45:12  וָאָדם נִלֶּה בְּרָאִיתָי  NPc PPa V
45:14  נִנֹּשְׂסִים וְקֶשָּׂרִים וְקֹשָׁרִים אַשְׂרֵי מִלָּהּ נְיָבָרָךְ כָּל  NPs PPC V PPC

46 (3:4 eligible lines, 75%;44 lines, 6.8%)
46:2  הָפַּסֵּם בְּשֵׁבַי הָלָכה: NPs PPC V
46:4  וְעָדָּשֵׁיָה אֶנֶּי אֶסֶּפֶל PPa NPc V
46:6  כָּכָּבָּת בְּבַקּוֹ הָקִשָּׁלִי NPc PPa V

47 (0:9 eligible lines, 0%; lines, 0%)

48 (5:11 eligible lines, 45.5%;84 lines, 5.6%)
48:3  נִרְאָתָהוּ קְרֹתִית נֵחָדְתֵּה NPc PPa V
48:8  וְפַשָּׁסְתֵּנָה מִינֶקְךָ כָּל נֵחָדְתֵּה NPc PPa V PPC
48:11  וְכֵבֵדֶךְ לְאָסְתֵּר נָא נֵחָדְתֵּה: NPs PPC V
48:16  לֹא מְעָשָׁה בַּקַּרְשׁוֹ תָּבִרְתֵּה PPa PPa V
48:21  נַעֲמָנוּ מִנְצָרָי הָכִי בָּלֵל NPc PPC V PPC

Habakkuk 3 (5:23 eligible lines, 21.7%;65 lines,118 7.7%)
3:2  בֹּרֶגֶז בְּרֹחֵם נָזְכֹּר: PPa NPc V
3:3  אַלּוֹא מִכְּפָרָה יְבָא NPs PPa V
3:4  וַגְּנָה טָאָרוֹת נָכֹה NPs PPpred V
3:11  לָאָרוֹת נִשָּׁבַּךְ נֵקְלְכִי PPc NPc V

Zephaniah 1 (0:9 eligible lines, 0%;69 lines, 0%)  

Zephaniah 2 (5:8 eligible lines, 62.5%; 5 lines, 9.2%)  
2:4 נַעַם חָוֵס בֶּאֵל V NPs NPpred  
2:7 בֵּית יְהוָה יֵעָשֵׂה נְפָשׁוֹת NPs PPa V  
2:7 בָּבֶּל אֶשֶּׁר יֵשׁ סְגֻּלּוֹת PPa PPa V  
2:9 יָמִם נֹפַלְתוֹת נְפָשׁוֹת NPs PPpred V  
2:14 יָמִים וּמוֹפָטִים בֶּאֱשֶׁר בֶּאֵל NPS PPli V

Zephaniah 3 (2:14 eligible lines, 14.3%; 79 lines, 2.5%)  
3:5 בְּבַיָּרוֹן יֵלִין PPa NPc V  
3:10 מְשַׁפְּטוּ בֵּית הַיְּהוָה בְּיָמִים לֵינוֹ קרְעָא PPc NPs V NPc

Zechariah 9 (2:16 eligible lines, 12.5%; 66 lines, 3%)  
9:14 יָדִי יְהוָה יָכֹס NPs PPc V  
9:14 יָדוֹ הַיְּהוָה נַעַם NPs PPa V

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%)

3:5 קהלך אליהו אתך 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 השקם רצוןﷺ נ/desktop V

Psalm 6 (2:6 eligible lines, 33.3%; 22 lines, 9.1%)

6:7ךְָּּכְּּמְּשֶּּׁרֶּׁשֶׁׁיְּךְּּאֶּׁמֶּׁׁסֶׁׁי נ/desktop V

6:10יהוה הפטחתי ישה NPs NPc V

Psalm 7 (4:9 eligible lines, 44.4%; 40 lines, 10%)

7:6ךְָּכְּבְּדוּךְּלָעֶּפֶר יְשֵׁבֶּשֶׁי NPe PPC V

7:8ךְָּצְּלֶּךְּלָאֵרֶּכֶּם שָׁבֶּה NPa PPa V

7:14ךְָּנֶּצֶּיא לָלֶךְּלָמֶּכֶּךְּ נ/desktop NPe PPC V

7:17ךְָּיֵשֶׁךְּלָאֵרֶּכֶּם וָדוּ PPC NPs V

Psalm 8 (0:2 eligible lines, 0%; 25 lines, 0%)

Psalm 9 (2:2 eligible lines, 0%; 40 lines, 5%)
Psalm 78 (2:43 eligible lines, 4.7%; 163 lines,\textsuperscript{122} 1.2%)

78:50 \(\text{חָיָתם} לַֽעֲדֵבַר \text{הָסִיר} \) NPoc PPli V

78:64 \(\text{סֵכַּנִי בַּֽעֲבַר} \text{עָפָל} \) NPs PPia V

Psalm 106 (1:18 eligible lines, 5.6; 106 lines,\textsuperscript{123}0.9%)

106:7 \(\text{שֶׁמֶץ} \text{כֵּמֶרֶה} \text{לָא} \text{הָשָׁכֵי} \text{נֶפֶל} \text{אֲבֹיתינּו} \text{בִּמְצַרִים} \text{לֹא־הָשִּכילו} \text{נְפֹלֶתיוֹך} \) NPs PPa V NPc

Psalm 107 (2:16 eligible lines, 1.3%; 89 lines,\textsuperscript{124} 2.2%)

107:5 \(\text{נְפָּשם} בֶּהֶם \text{תְתַעָּטף} \) NPs PPa V\textsuperscript{125}

107:26 \(\text{נְפָּשם} בּוֹרָעָה \text{תְתַמּוֹג} \) 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..

\textsuperscript{122} Michael P. O’Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 263.

\textsuperscript{123} Michael P. O’Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 278.

\textsuperscript{124} Michael P. O’Connor, *Hebrew Verse Structure*, 288.

\textsuperscript{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


word order had been used. He concludes that “the author or authors [of Lamentations] were freer in this aspect of syntax than were the writers of Genesis.”

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. This seems particularly true for clauses with three verbal arguments. Consider the following:

(1) Lam 2:1cd

He has thrown down from heaven to earth // the beauty of Israel.

The couplet (1) shows a case in which the patient-object (Israel) 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. 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

They lower to the ground their head // the virgins of Jerusalem.


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.\(^\text{135}\)

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: \(^\text{136}\)

\[
(3) \quad \# \quad V \quad S \quad O \quad C \quad L \quad \text{Inf}\#
\]

The variables represent the clause’s immediate constituents which have a fixed position.


\(^\text{136}\). 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.\textsuperscript{137} In fact, as a general rule of thumb in CBH both
a pronominalized PP and a NPc headed by נָא may precede non-pronominalized ones.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{140} a benefactive complement of a V of transfer,\textsuperscript{141} or a personal destination of a

\textsuperscript{137} For this reason, lines like Gen 49:8c (יִשַׁתֲחָו לְךָ בֵּנֵי אֶבֶן), 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 (צתָּרָה שֵם גָּבֹּר) 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, \textit{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).

\textsuperscript{138} Though there are cases in which this constraint is relaxed in CBH: subject-
pronominialized 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-pronominialized direct object with נָא (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.

\textsuperscript{139} See the discussion of flexibility of certain adverbial adjuncts in ch. 4.

\textsuperscript{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).

\textsuperscript{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. 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

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

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

\[
נַחַתְךָ נְכוֹכְכָהַת \quad \text{V NPc PPc // V NPc NPs}
\]

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 אלהים 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:

\[(8) \quad V \text{XPx NPs} (\text{XPx} \neq \text{PRN})\]

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Constituent Structure</th>
<th>Trope</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen 49:24a</td>
<td>הָרוֹס הָאָבְרָהֳם קָשָׁת His bow remained steady</td>
<td>V PPC NPs</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 15:8b</td>
<td>נֵצְצוֹנִים כֹּרְסָו וּנְזִילים The waters stood up in a heap</td>
<td>V PPC NPs</td>
<td>Matching</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num 24:7c</td>
<td>וְיָשֵׁר מַלְאְךָ אֲגַגָּו His king is higher than Agag.</td>
<td>V PPC NPs</td>
<td>MatchGap</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num 24:18b</td>
<td>וְיָשֵׁר הַרְשָׁע שֶׁעְיַרֵנֵי Seir, his enemy, shall be a possession</td>
<td>V NPpred NPs</td>
<td>MatchNoGap</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 32:2a</td>
<td>יָשֵׁרָה הָעַרְבָּה לָכָה Let my teaching drip like rain</td>
<td>V PPC NPs</td>
<td>MatchNoGap</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 32:2b</td>
<td>יהָלַעְשׁוֹנֵי אֲמָרִי Let my speech flow out like dew</td>
<td>V PPC NPs</td>
<td>MatchNoGap</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 32:41b</td>
<td>נָתַתָּיו בִּמְשַׁפְּטֵי יָדָיו My hand takes hold on judgment</td>
<td>V PPC NPs</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Deut 33:5a  He will be a king in Jeshurun  
Judg 5:11e  Then the people of the Lord went down to the gates  
Judg 5:24a  May Jael be blessed among women  
Isa 40:24b  Their stock is hardly rooted in the earth  
Isa 41:12b  They will be like nothing at all // those who war with you  
Isa 42:17b  They will be put to shame // those who trust in images  
Isa 45:16b  Together, they go into confusion // the engraver of images  
Isa 48:18b  Your well-being will be like a river  
Isa 48:19a  Your seed was like sand  
Hab 3:3c  His splendor covered the heavens

144. Following the line division in the MT. The adverb יָהַדְו is not counted in this analysis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scripture</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Noun Phrase</th>
<th>Match Type</th>
<th>Gap Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hab 3:17c</td>
<td>ָּגַזר ִמִּמְכָלה ֹצאן</td>
<td>The flock is separated from the fold</td>
<td>V PPC NPs</td>
<td>MatchNoGap</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeph 3:13b</td>
<td>ְוֹלא־ִיָּמֵצא ְּבִפיֶהם ְלׁשֹן</td>
<td>a deceitful tongue will not be found in their mouth</td>
<td>V PPC NPs</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeph 3:5e</td>
<td>ְוֹלא־יוֹדַע ַעָּול ֹּבֶׁשת׃</td>
<td>The unjust will not know shame</td>
<td>V NPs NPs</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 2:12c</td>
<td>ִּכי־ִיְבַער ִּכְמַעט ַאֹּפו</td>
<td>because his anger is kindled quickly</td>
<td>V PPa NPs</td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 6:8a</td>
<td>ָעְׁשָׁשה ִמַּכַעס ֵעיִני</td>
<td>My eye wastes away from anger</td>
<td>V NPa NPs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 18:14a</td>
<td>ָעְׁשָׁשה ִמַּכַעס ֵעיִני</td>
<td>My eye wastes away from anger</td>
<td>V NPa NPs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 18:35b</td>
<td>ְוִנֲחָתה ֶקֶׁשת־ְנחּוָׁשה ְזרֹוֹעָתי׃</td>
<td>So my arms can bend a bronze bow</td>
<td>V NPc NPs</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 19:15a</td>
<td>ְיַהְהלל יהוה ֹּדְרָׁשיו</td>
<td>They will seek him, those who praise the Lord</td>
<td>V NPs NPs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 22:16a</td>
<td>ָיֵבׁש ַּכֶחֶרׂש ֹּכִחי</td>
<td>My strength is dried up like a potsherd</td>
<td>V NPa NPs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 22:27</td>
<td>ַוַּיְרֵעם ַּבָּׁשַמִים יהוה</td>
<td>The Lord thunders in the heavens.</td>
<td>V PPa NPs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 22:28a</td>
<td>ִיָּשְׁכָלַה יהוה ַחֲרָפתֹא</td>
<td>They will remember and return to the Lord // All the ends of the earth</td>
<td>V+V PPC // NPs</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ps 78:8d ְוֹלא־ֶנֶאְמָנה ֶאת־ֵאל רּוֹוח׃ Whose spirit was not true to God  

Ps 78:65a ְּכִגּבֹור \ ַוִּיַקץ ְּכָיֵׁשן ֲאֹדָני \ מְתרוּנָנִי \ מָיִין The Lord awakes as if from sleep // like a warrior intoxicated with wine

**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; אדני Ps 78:8),
- 2 clauses in which the DN is a NPc that occurs before the NPs (יהוה Ps 22:27; אל יהוה Ps 78:8),
- 1 clause in which the DN is a PPc that occurs before the NPs (אל 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 כי (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). 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

חַבֹרֶךְ מַעְשֵׁים נַעַל \ אֶשֶּׁת חָבֹרֶך \ מַעְשֵׁים בֶּקֶרֶד בְּקֶרֶד
Jael is most blessed among women // the wife of Heber the Qenite // She is more blessed than tent-dwelling women

(10) Ps 78:65

בְּכָיֵׁשׁ קַמְוָר אָדָני \ כָּבֹר קַמְוָר מַתְּרוֹנָה
The Lord awakes as if from sleep // as if a warrior intoxicated with wine.

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 לֶשֶׁנֶם. 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’ = הָבִֽרָךְ 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 PPred NPs
  
  4 clauses (18.2%) in which the V is הָיָה and the predicate precedes the NPs (1 of which is V PPred PPred NPs).

- V PPa NPs

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 הוה in which the predicate NP pred 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 complements 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 הוה 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.” He gave only two examples of this unusual word order configuration, both of which occur in verse:

(11) Ps 34:22a

ְֹׂשְנֵאי ַצִּדיק ֶיְאָׁשמּו
ְּתָתֵמֹת ָרָׁשֵע ָרָעה

disaster will kill the wicked one //

and the haters of the innocent will be condemned.

(12) Job 15:5a

ְוִתְבַחר ְלׁשֹון ֲערּוִמים
ִּכי ְיַאֵּלף ֲעֹוְנָך ִפיָך

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

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 פֶּך 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” עֹות but are delivered in v. 20, whereas the “disaster” עֹות 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 פֶּך 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 המַאֲסָרֵ franca energy, the LXX reads מַאֲסָר as a adjective ο παράνομος apparently referring to the perpetrator of the transgression), and the presence of the NP פֶּך, the organ of speech, the
latter NP that should probably be recognized as the S, as Ewald reads it.\textsuperscript{148} This reading seems to be confirmed by the wording of v. 6a.\textsuperscript{149} 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, \( נִשְׁפַּךְ \) 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\textsuperscript{149} and Lars Lode (in two parts\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.”\textsuperscript{152}

\textsuperscript{148} It should be noted that the LXX renders Job 15:5 εἴνας ἐκ ἡμᾶς στόματός σου // οὐδὲ διέκρινας ἡμᾶς δύναστών· (“You are guilty by the words of your mouth // neither have you discerned the words of the mighty.”) Dahood and Andersen read \( נִשְׁפַּךְ \) as “to increase (a thousand fold)” which likewise renders \( נִשְׁפַּךְ \) the subject.


\textsuperscript{150} Lode, “Postverbal Word Order”; Lode, “Postverbal Word Order (Part Two)”.

\textsuperscript{151} Lode, “Postverbal Word Order,” 124.

\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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,

\begin{flushleft}

\vspace{1cm}


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, \textit{Functional Sentence}.


\end{flushleft}
(13) Prov. 7:7

I saw among the simple // I discerned among the youths, *a boy lacking sense*.

In (3), *נער חסר-לב* 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 "כַּלְּכָהָה וֶנֶּסֶן" and "מִמְלָה" 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


\(^{159}\) 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

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 שעריה is activated by the context: the preceding lines

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 חֲצָאֲפָה 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 הָרְעְמוּ can select an NPc but not a PP locative as a complement, so in this case the PP בָּשַׁמָּים 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 “he bowed the heavens and came down” and in the intervening imagery. 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,” and “right dislocation,” but Lambrecht uses the

163. HALOT classifies הָרְעְמוּ as an “internally transitive hif.” citing GKC §53d; Bergsträsser 2: §19d. "רֶעְמוּ (HALOT, 1266-7).

164. In 18:11, the Lord comes “on the wings of the wind” מְעַל־כְּנֵפֶי־רֹוח, in v. 12, he is covered in “dark clouds” עֵבֵי שֵׁחָקִים and in v. 13 passing before him are עֵבֵי כָּרָד שֶׁקֶלֶת וְגָחֲלֵי אֲשֵׁר אִשָּׁי “clouds, hailstones and coals of fire.”

term “antitopic” following Chafe. Lambrecht illustrates the antitopic construction in the following example (his 4.59):

(17) He’s a nice GUY, your brother.

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.

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.”). In BH there is an analogy with the structure of pre-posing or casus pendens, in which a resumptive, 


167. Lambrecht, Information Structure, 203.


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. 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. As was discussed in ch. 4, the requirement of a resumptive pronoun in preposing constructions, however, is not rigid, 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.” The clause (18) provides an example of such virtual resumption,

(18) Exod 21:12

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:

\[
\text{(19) Amos 6:12 (emended)}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{נִרְצֵה} & \text{ בָּבָקר} \text{ סּוֹסִים} \\
\text{V PP S} & / / \text{ V PP S}
\end{align*}
\]

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 . Since the questions in the couplet expect a negative answer, the B-line of the MT is unintelligible unless one reads the PP of the A-line as being gapped in the B-line. The emendation follows Kittel (\textit{BHK}, 994). It is emended to \(\text{אֵמ יָחֵרׁש בָּבָקר} \) (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

יִכְּמוּ בְּעֵיתְךָ \ וְיַהֲלִי כַּחֲלָל הָזְרֶעָך

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 PPred “like the sand,” but in the B-line, the constituents are arranged in an unmarked word order NPs PPred 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:

\[(21) \ V \ XPx \ NPC \ (XPx \neq NP, \ XPx \neq PP[PRN])\]

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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Constituent Structure</th>
<th>Trope</th>
<th>Line</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen 49:11c</td>
<td>כָּבָּס בֵּיָהּ לָבָּשׁ He washed his garment in wine.</td>
<td>V PPa NPC</td>
<td>MatchGap</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 15:13a</td>
<td>נִחְיָה בְּחַסָדְךָ עַם-זֹּמֶת You have lead in faithfulness the people whom you redeemed.</td>
<td>V PPa NPs</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 32:26b</td>
<td>אַשְׁפִּיתָה מָאָנֹונֶז נֶבֶר I will remove their memory from humanity.</td>
<td>V PPc NPC</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 32:40a</td>
<td>כַּרְאֵשָׁה אֶל-שֶׁמֶם נָז I lift up to heaven my hand.</td>
<td>V PPc NPC</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 40:2c</td>
<td>כִּי לָכְּהָה מִן לְחָה קַפֵּלָנָה בְּכֵרֵי שֶׁמֶם בְּכֵרֵי שֶׁמֶם Because she has received from the hand of the Lord two-fold for all of her sins.</td>
<td>V PPc // NPC</td>
<td>SynDep</td>
<td>A-B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Isa 40:3c
Make straight in the desert a highway for our God.

Isa 40:12a
Who has measured the waters with his hand?

Isa 40:12c
Who has gauged the dust of the earth with a measure?

Isa 40:12d
Who weighed the mountains with a scale?

Isa 41:2c
He makes like the dust with his sword.

Isa 41:19a
I will put in the desert, the cedar, the acacia.

Isa 41:19c
I will set in the desert the juniper.

Isa 42:2b
Nor will he make his voice heard on the street.

Isa 42:4b
Until he sets judgment in the land.

Isa 43:19c
Yes, I will set in the desert a road.

Isa 43:20c
Because I have set in the wilderness water.

Isa 43:28b
I have given Jacob to the ban.
Isa 44:19c - Furthermore, I baked bread on coals.

Isa 44:22a - I have blotted out your transgressions like a cloud.

Hab 3:14a - You pierced with your arrows the chief of the warriors.

Hab 3:15a - You tread the sea with your horses.

Zeph 1:4c - And I will cut off from this place the remnant of Baal.

Zeph 3:9a - For then I will turn to the people a pure language.

Zeph 3:11c - For then I will remove from your midst your proudly exultant ones.

Zeph 3:12a - I will leave in your midst a humble and lowly people.

Zech 9:4b - He will strike her power in the sea.

Ps 6:7b - I flood my bed with tears every night.

Ps 7:6b - And may he trample my life to the ground.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verse</th>
<th>translation</th>
<th>analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ps 9:8b</td>
<td>He has established his throne in judgment.</td>
<td>V PPc NPc B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 15:3b</td>
<td>He does not do evil to his neighbor.</td>
<td>V PPc NPc MatchNoGap A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 9:12b</td>
<td>Declare to the peoples his deeds.</td>
<td>V PPc NPc B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 18:7c</td>
<td>He heard from his temple my voice.</td>
<td>V PPc NPc A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 21:4b</td>
<td>You set on his head a crown of pure gold.</td>
<td>V PPc NPc B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 22:21a</td>
<td>Deliver from the sword my soul.</td>
<td>V PPc NPc MatchGap A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 23:5c</td>
<td>You anoint my head with oil.</td>
<td>V PPc NPc A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 24:4c</td>
<td>He does not lift up his soul to what is false.</td>
<td>V PPc NPc A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 78:2a</td>
<td>Let me open my mouth in parable.</td>
<td>V PPa NPc MatchNoGap A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 78:7a</td>
<td>That they might place their confidence in God.</td>
<td>V NPc PPc A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 78:16b</td>
<td>And he caused waters to flow down like rivers.</td>
<td>V PPa NPc MatchNoGap B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 78:26b</td>
<td>He caused the south-wind to flow by his power.</td>
<td>V PPc NPc MatchNoGap B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 78:33a</td>
<td>He end their days in a breath.</td>
<td>V PPa NPc MatchGap A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ps 78:44a  וַיְהֹפְךּ לָדם יֹאֵרֶהֶם
He turned their rivers to blood.
V PPc NPc MatchNoGap C

Ps 78:46a  וַיִּפְּטֹל לְחִסְּיל יְבוּלֶם
He gave their produce to the locust.
V PPc NPc MatchGap A

Ps 78:50b  וַיְאָרְבָּם מְשֻׁשְׁמָהּ
He did not spare them from death.
V PPc NPc MatchNoGap B

Ps 78:52a  וַיַּסֶּעֶנֶּהֶם כָּכֹצאָן עָמֹו
He led out his people like a flock.
V PPa NPc MatchGap F

Ps 78:55b  וַיִּפְּלֶנֶּהֶם בַּחֶבֶל נַחֲלָה
He distributed them a possession by territory.
V PPa NPc MatchNoGap B

Ps 78:55c  וַיֵּשֶׁכֶּנֶּהֶם בָּאֲהֵליֶם שֵׁבְטוֹיֶם יִשְׂרָאֵל
He settled the tribes of Israel in their tents.
V PPc NPc MatchNoGap C

Ps 78:61a  וַיַּפְּלֶנֶּהֶם לְשֵׁבֶת יְהוָה
He delivered his power to captivity.
V PPc NPc MatchGap A

Ps 78:62a  וַיְסֶגֶּר לְכֹצאָן שָׁם
He gave his people up to the sword.
V PP NPc MatchGap C

Ps 78:69a  וַיַּפְּלֵס תְּמֵרִים פָּרֶנֶתָם
He built his sanctuary like the heights.
V PPa NPc A

Ps 107:12a  וַיְכַנְעֶנֶּהֶם לְעַבְּרָם לְבָמָה
He bowed down their hearts with labor.
V PPa NPc A

Ps 107:41b  וַיְשַׁכֶּנֶּהֶם בֵּצָאָן מֵעָפָרָם
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

הָפַּשְׁתָּנוּ מַעְלֵלי־אֱלֹהִים \ וַיִּשָּׁatég גְּבוֹרֵיהֶם
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 וי (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).\textsuperscript{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

\begin{quote}
כְּפַלִים בָּכָל־חֹּטָאָה

V PPc // NPc

Because she has received from the Lord //

double for all of her sins.
\end{quote}

The structure of the clause is quite simple, though the 2 arguments include more than one word. This reading analyzes the final PP כְּפַלִים בָּכָל־חֹּטָאָה as a complement of the NP כְּפַלִים 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.

\textbf{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) position.

\textsuperscript{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,\textsuperscript{178} 2.5%; 70 lines [possibly 79];\textsuperscript{179} 2.9%)
- Exodus 15 (2:14 eligible clauses, 14.3%; 56 lines,\textsuperscript{180} 3.6%; 66 lines,\textsuperscript{181} 3%)
- Numbers 23-24 (2:27 eligible clauses, 7.4%; 80 lines,\textsuperscript{182} 2.5%)
- Deuteronomy 32 (5:20 eligible clauses, 20%; 140 lines,\textsuperscript{183} 3.6%)
- Deuteronomy 33 (1:11 eligible clauses, 9.1%; 97 lines,\textsuperscript{184} 2.1%; 2:78 lines,\textsuperscript{185} 2.9%)

\textsuperscript{178} Michael P. O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 169.

\textsuperscript{179} Cross and Freedman, \textit{Studies}, 49–53.

\textsuperscript{180} Michael P. O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 179.

\textsuperscript{181} Cross and Freedman, \textit{Studies}, 35–38.

\textsuperscript{182} Michael P. O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 185.

\textsuperscript{183} Michael P. O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 194.

\textsuperscript{184} Michael P. O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 208.

\textsuperscript{185} Cross and Freedman, \textit{Studies}, 66–70.
Judges 5 (2:15 eligible clauses, 13.3%; 106 lines, 1:60 lines, 1.7%)
2 Samuel 1 (0:3 eligible clauses, 0%; 30 lines, 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%; 44 lines, 0%)
  48 (2:11 eligible clauses, 18.2%; 84 lines, 2.4%)
Habakkuk 3 (4:24 eligible clauses, 16.7%; 65 lines, 6.2%)
Zephaniah 1 (1:6 eligible clauses, 16.7%; 69 lines 1.4%)
Zephaniah 2 (0:6 eligible clauses, 0%; 65 lines, 0%)
Zephaniah 3 (5:10 eligible clauses, 50% ; 79 lines, 6.3%)

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,\textsuperscript{193} 9.8%)
Psalm 106 (0:20 eligible clauses, 0%; 106 lines,\textsuperscript{194} 0%)
Psalm 107 (2:14 eligible clauses, 14.3%; 89 lines,\textsuperscript{195} 2.2%)

\textbf{Canonical Context Breakdown}

Genesis 49 (2:25 eligible clauses, 8%; 80 lines,\textsuperscript{196} 2.5%; 70 lines [possibly 79];\textsuperscript{197} 2.9%)

\begin{align*}
49:11c & \text{כְּבָשׁ בָּיִין לֻבּוֹ} \\
49:24a & \text{נְשָׁב בְּאָיִיתָן קַשְׁתֹּו}
\end{align*}

Exodus 15 (2:14 eligible clauses, 14.3%; 56 lines,\textsuperscript{198} 3.6%; 66 lines,\textsuperscript{199} 3%)

\begin{align*}
\text{Exod 15:8} & \text{נָצַב כֹּמֹמָו־נֵסוֹלָּם} \\
\text{Exod 15:13} & \text{נְעָה בְּחָסֶדֶךְ עָפָר וֹזֵאֲלָּה}
\end{align*}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{193} Michael P. O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 263.  \\
\textsuperscript{194} Michael P. O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 278.  \\
\textsuperscript{195} Michael P. O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 288.  \\
\textsuperscript{196} Michael P. O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 169.  \\
\textsuperscript{197} Cross and Freedman, \textit{Studies}, 49–53.  \\
\textsuperscript{198} Michael P. O’Connor, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 179.  \\
\textsuperscript{199} Cross and Freedman, \textit{Studies}, 35–38.
\end{flushright}
Numbers 23-24 (2:27 eligible clauses, 7.4%; 80 lines, 200 2.5%)  

Num 24:7  יְרוּם מַלְאַכְּתִּים  

Num 24:18  הַכְּתַב הַרְשָׁעֶשׁ שֵׁשֶׁר אָנֵכְּךָ  

Deuteronomy 32 (5:20 eligible clauses, 20%; 140 lines, 201 3.6%)  

Deut 32:2a  יִשָּׁר כָּלַח  

Deut 32:2b  וְיָדַע בֶּאֵר בַּמָּצָא  

Deut 32:26b  שַׁחְשֵׁי יְדֵי שֶׁעֲמֹר  

Deut 32:40a  וְיִכְּכְּרֶשֶׁת אֵלֶּה שֶׁעֲפַר  

Deut 32:41b  וְנָתַן בְּשֶׁשֶׁר פְּנֵיהֶם  

Deuteronomy 33 (2:11 eligible clauses, 9.1%; 97 lines, 202 1%; 1:78 lines, 203 - 1.3%)  

Deut 33:5a  וְנָתַן בְּשֶׁשֶׁר פְּנֵיהֶם  

Judges 5 (2:15 eligible clauses, 13.3%; 106 lines, 204 1.9%; 2:60 lines, 205 3.3%)  

Judg 5:11d  לַשָּׁעָם שֵּׁשֶׁר נְכֻר  

Judg 5:24a  חַבְּרַה שֵׁשֶׁר יָגִיל  


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
כִי לְךָ תִּתֶּן חֵרְבֹו בָּּפֶלּס אֲרֵץ
Isa 40:3c
לָשׁוּוּ בָּּאָרֶץ מִסָּלֶה לְאָלֶבָּה
Isa 40:12a
מִרְּפֵּץ בָּּשֻׁלִּים מִים
Isa 40:12c
וְעֵילָּשׁ שֵׁרֶשׁ טַאְרֶנִים
Isa 40:12d
לָשְׁלֹה בָּּפֶלּס הַרֶם
Isa 40:24a
אֶת בָּּאָרִים בָּּאָרֶץ דּוּנִים

41 (4:23 eligible clauses, 17.4%; 119 lines, 3.3%)
Isa 41:2c
וְיָשָׁר הָרְשׁוּ פֶתֶר
Isa 41:12c
וְיָשָׁר קָנָה יָרֵסָפַק אַנְשֶׁי מְלָכֶּם
Isa 41:19a
אֲחַז בִּמְדָּבָּר שֵׁשׁ
Isa 41:19c
אֶשֶׁר יָשָׁרָה הַרֶם

42 (3:14 eligible clauses, 21.4%; 91 lines, 3.3%)
Isa 42:2b
וְאֶרְּפֵּשׁ בִּחְמוֹ וַעֲפַל
Isa 42:4b
נַדְּרִישׁוּ תָּאָרֶנִים מְשַׁפֵּט
Isa 42:17b
בְּכָל בֵּית הַמֵּשְׁגָּרָה בָּפֶלּס

43 (3:17 eligible clauses, 17.6%; 66 lines, 4.5%)

Isa 43:19c
אף אישים עם קר

Isa 43:20c
כיJake עם קמדר

Isa 43:28b
稞עה לחרים צדק

44 (2:13 eligible clauses, 15.4%; 81 lines, 2.5%)
Isa 44:19c
אף אישים על-InBackground

Isa 44:22a
 bâtiment כቡב פניע

45 (1:12 eligible clauses, 8.3%; 115 lines, 8.7%)
Isa 45:16
הלוכ בכם בו צרי

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
והי בנות שלפע

Isa 48:19a
והי חולה וך

Habakkuk 3 (4:24 eligible clauses, 16.7%; 65 lines, 207 6.2%)
Hab 3:3c
תקע אלים הזר

Hab 3:14a
תקע במשי ראש פדר

Hab 3:15a
חרק עם ספק

Hab 3:17
זא כמעל צא

Zephaniah 1 (1:6 eligible clauses, 16.7%; 69 lines 1.4%)
Zeph 1:4c וַהֲכַרְתָּי מְרֵיָּפִיקָהוּ נְהָה

Zephaniah 2 (0:6 eligible clauses, 0%; 65 lines 0%)

Zephaniah 3 (5:10 eligible clauses, 50%; 79 lines 6.3%)
Zeph 3:5 וְלָא־יֹוֵדַע עָּול בּוֹשָׁת׃
Zeph 3:9a וְכִי־אָז אֲהֹּפְךָ אָל־עִּימי שֵׁפֶחַ בּוֹרָה
Zeph 3:11c וּכְרִיאֲךָ אָסִי רַכָּבָךְ עֲלֵיהֶם סֵאָהָּתָךְ
Zeph 3:12a וַהָּפְשַארָתָךְ בָּכָרְפֶּךָ אָמֹן עָלָה
Zeph 3:13b וְלָא־יָמֵצא בִּפְיָהוּ לְשׁוֹנָה תַּרְוִיתָה

Zechariah 9 (1:16 eligible clauses, 6.3%; 66 lines 1.5%)
Zech 9:4b וכַּה בָּם חֲלַה

Psalms 1-25 (18:145 eligible clauses, 12.4%; 761 lines 2.4%)
Psalms 1 (0:2 eligible clauses, 0%; 19 lines 0%)
Psalms 2 (1:4 eligible clauses, 25%; 29 lines 3.4%)
Ps 2:12c וַכִּירְבֵּץ בַּגִּשְׁתָּא מַפיֶר

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 אָשֶׁרְךָ בַּכָּל־לְיָלָה
Ps 6:8a לִשׁוֹחֵךְ מַכַּע הָיִין

Psalm 7 (1:10 eligible clauses, 10%; 40 lines, 2.5%)
Ps 7:6b וּרְפָאָה לָאֶרֶץ נִני

Psalm 9 (2:11 eligible clauses, 18.1%; 40 lines, 5%)
Ps 9:8b מַגְנָה לֶמְשָּפֵט כָּפָא
Ps 9:12b תֹגְדוּ בּעָמִים שֶלושֵׁי

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 לא дешא לארוה רעה

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 ישמועEuro אקול
Ps 18:14a ונרשנסשא יהוד
Ps 18:35b ונהוה קשתיתנחושה Trọngך:

Psalm 19 (1:6 eligible clauses, 16.7%; 41 lines, 2.4%)
Ps 19:15a והי כתארם אפרידי

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 והשי כתארש נערת ות

Psalm 22 (4:10 eligible clauses, 40%; 75 lines, 5.3%)
Ps 22:16a יבש סותרש חתי
Ps 22:21a הערתי אתרב בוש
Ps 22:27b נקלו יהוה ורשמי
Ps 22:28a-b  יִזְכּוּנּוּ וְיַשְׁבִּימוּ אֵל-יְהוָה כַּעֲפָרְיָאֶרְץ

Psalm 23 (1:2 eligible clauses, 50%; 20 lines, 5%)
Ps 23:5c  דְּשִּׁמָּה בַשְּׁמָּה רָאִישׁ מְפָשֶׁר רֹנֶה

Psalm 24 (1:2 eligible clauses, 50%; 18 lines, 5.6%)
Ps 24:4c  לֵא-נַשְׁחֵאָה לֹעָה כִּפְשֶׁר

Psalm 25 (0:6 eligible clauses, 0%; 18 lines, 0%)

Psalm 78 (16:43 eligible clauses, 37.2%; 163 lines, 9.8%)
Ps 78:2a  אֲפַתְּחֵה בְּבֶשֶׁלָה
Ps 78:7a  נִשְׁאָרְיָא לַבָּאָלֶה מִסְּכָלָה
Ps 78:8  לַרְאֶנִּפֵּכּוּ הָאִירָאָל רָוֶה׃
Ps 78:16b  יִקְוֹרְדוּ כָּפָרְיָה יָפָם
Ps 78:26b  יִנְֽהַגְו יְבַשְׁנָאְתָן
Ps 78:33a  נְכַלְבּוּ פֶּתֶקְלָא יִשְׁמָה
Ps 78:44a  נַשְׁפָּה לִבְּדָמְא יָאִירָה
dataյ
Ps 78:46a  נַשְׁפָּה לְהַסְּלֵי יִבָּלְמ
Ps 78:50b  לַאֲרִישּוּת מְפַשְׁשָׁמ בְּשֵׁמָה
dataյ
Ps 78:52a  נַשְׁפָּה מַשְׁאָא שְׁמָא
dataй
Ps 78:55b  נַשְׁפָּה בְּבֶשֶׁלָה נַעָלָה
dataй
Ps 78:55c  נַשְׁפָּה בְּעַבֹּדְיָאָה שְׁבֵּטָא יְשָרָאָל
dataй
Ps 78:61a  נַשְׁפָּה לַשְּׁבָל עָזָא

Ps 78:62a נֶסֶר לַחַרּוֹב אֶּמְוָא
Ps 78:65a וְיִשֵּׁר קַלָּשׁ אָאָלִי
Ps 78:69a וַנְּכַמֶּרְדֵּמַיִם מְקוֹדֶשׁ

Psalm 106 (0:20 eligible clauses, 0%; 106 lines, 0%)

Ps 107:12a וְהָנָּתִין בֵּעָמָל לִבָּם
Ps 107:41b וַנָּתַם בֵּצָאָהֲנָהֲהוֹת

Psalm 107 (2:14 eligible clauses, 14.3%; 89 lines, 2.2%)

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


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 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
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.
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