Journal of
Translation and Textlinguistics

Note: The viewpoints expressed in the articles published in these papers do not necessarily reflect the viewpoints of SIL or the editors.

HINNĒH AND FOCUS FUNCTION
WITH APPLICATION TO TYAP

Carl M. Follingstad

ABSTRACT

This article investigates the pragmatic nature of the Hebrew particle *hinnēh* and explores how it might be translated into a different language (in this case, Tyap, a Niger-Congo language of Nigeria). A brief survey of the biblical studies literature is undertaken, and *hinnēh* is defined from a linguistic perspective. The definition uses Dik's functional grammar model presenting *hinnēh* as a marker of focus which specifically indicates emphasis prominence on the constituent or proposition with which it occurs. The translation of *hinnēh* into Tyap requires various syntactic and morphological adjustments, which include use of a fronted relative clause, a postposed adverbial construction, different types of focus markers, an additive marker, and an imperative form of the verb *to see*. The postposed adverbial construction has additional rhetorical effects in the context.

Introduction

In discussing *hinnēh* there are a number of issues that we must bear in mind; these include scope, methodology, discourse genre, utterance interpretation, and functional choice.

Scope. This study is based primarily on work done by Slager (1989:50–79). He analyzed the syntax, discourse function, and translation options of the particle *hinnēh* with respect to Genesis, Leviticus, and I Samuel. The scope of this article is generally limited to his analysis.

Methodology. Buth (1987) in his work on Aramaic made a number of statements about methodological dangers in doing discourse analysis of Aramaic/Hebrew that are relevant to this study of *hinnēh*. These statements are relevant because *hinnēh* functions as a marker of focus,

and pragmatic[1] concepts such as *focus* tend to be defined with less rigor than other linguistic terms.

The discourse analyst suffers from certain handicaps as he approaches the Hebrew text. These include: a limited corpus of data (e.g., certain pragmatic functions might not show up frequently), a lack of native speakers (e.g., hypotheses cannot be checked with native speakers for naturalness and acceptability), and a written-only form of communication (e.g., no body language, and a lack of original intonation) (Buth 1987:15–20).

Discourse genre. Finally, genre considerations are also relevant. Different genres can influence functions and syntactic constructions. Pragmatic functions may be valued and used differently in different genres, and different forms may be used more frequently in some genres than in others (20).

Utterance interpretation. However, while these problems certainly exist, they do not prevent the analyst from making some headway. Aristotle said that humans are much more like each other than they are like anything else. Relevance theory (RT) (Sperber and Wilson 1986) maintains that although time and culture may be different and distant, many aspects of discourse analysis are not. Though cultural assumptions may vary, inferential strategies that form language use do not (Blass 1990:14).

Therefore, according to RT we can look into the functions of a particle like *hinnēh* because of the universality in the way languages are interpreted. Communication takes place with "principled procedures for utterance interpretation" that can be investigated (ibid., 30). To approach certain linguistic or discourse phenomena as "grammaticalisation of processing strategies" (30) can help and encourage analysis into such pragmatically active particles as *hinnēh*.

Similarly, though the tendencies of different genres need constantly to be borne in mind, we might expect that especially those linguistic features

---

[1]Generally, *pragmatics* can be defined in the following way: "Pragmatics is concerned with the three-termed relation that unites (a) linguistic form and (b) the communicative functions that these forms are capable of serving, with (c) the contexts or settings in which those linguistic forms can have those communicative functions" (Dooley 1988:62). However, *pragmatics* will be used in this article more specifically according to Dik's functional grammar (FG) model. Dik comments, "By pragmatic functions we understand functions which specify the informational status of the constituents involved within the wider communicative setting in which they occur" (1978a:128).

which mark pragmatic function, being cognitively based, will have at least some resemblance to each other even when occurring in different genres.

Functional choice. Choice implies meaning (Levinsohn 1992a:8). The writer who uses *hinnēh* as opposed to no marking at all wants to achieve additional effects in the context. The reader/hearer assumes that the presence of *hinnēh* is relevant and that the additional processing effort he needs to make will be rewarded by his being able to better process the additional contextual effects.

Brief Survey of the Literature

The literature on the function of *hinnēh* will be discussed and certain modifications made to its definition. *Hinnēh* has been defined in four basic ways in the literature: a predicator of existence, a demonstrative particle, a particle demanding attention, and an interjection.

Predicator of existence. Lambdin regards *hinnēh* as a *predicator of existence* which adds vividness or importance to the fact stated, in contrast with the other existence predicator *yesh* (1971:168). *Hinnēh* is a predicator of existence but emphasizes the immediacy or "here-and-now-ness" of the information following it (ibid.). This definition of *hinnēh* probably approaches most closely the actual pragmatic function of the particle.

Brown, Driver, and Briggs (BDB) comment that *hinnēh* introduces predications with reference to the past/present and future. *Hinnēh* with the past/present points to "some truth either newly asserted, or newly recognized" (1907:244). However, the newness of the information is not always the necessary and sufficient condition for the occurrence of *hinnēh*.[2] There are many examples of new information being given in response to information questions, yet no *hinnēh* occurs (see I Sam. 27:10, 28:13–14).

Demonstrative particle. *Hinnēh* also is defined as a "demonstrative particle". As such, it "points out" persons, things, and actions (243). BDB notes that *hinnēh* with a first person suffix *hin'nî* often points out that the

---

[2]Similarly, Givón stresses that focused information is not necessarily *new* or *asserted*. Either the *old (presupposed)* or *new (asserted)* information may be put into focus. The *local discourse context* determines what information is counterbelieved or -expected (1990:700–01), or what is important or salient generally. *Focus* and *new information* are separate parameters.

speaker is ready to obey the person with whom he is interacting (244). The responses of Samuel to the supposed call of Eli, *"hin'nî" (i.e., "hinnēh-î"*, ' "Here I am" ') exemplify this observation. Though *hinnēh* does function demonstratively as a *pointer*, it does so in a way slightly different than *zeh* 'this', or *zot* 'that', or *sham* 'there'. As Lambdin and BDB indicate, *hinnēh* predicates existence with *immediacy* and *vividness*, though what these terms mean is difficult to explain specifically. The fact that *hinnēh* can co-occur with these words (e.g., Gen. 29:2) shows that it has more than a deictic function.

Attention-getting particle. *Hinnēh* is also defined as a particle that requires the reader to "pay attention" (Slager 1989:51; *Theological Word Book of the Old Testament* [TWBOT] 1980:220). Thus it is often translated by 'look!' or 'see!' But *hinnēh* does more than draw attention to some proposition. That is, attention getting can be marked by other verbs of seeing and so is not a sufficient condition in and of itself for the occurrence of *hinnēh*. For example, in Gen. 27:27 Isaac uses the verb *ra'ah* 'see!' to draw attention to the smell of Esau's clothes. That this is an extended meaning of 'see' is clear from the context as one cannot 'see' a smell.

> . . . and said, "*See*, the smell of my son is as the smell of
> a field which the Lord has blessed!"

Similarly, in Deut. 30:15 Moses uses the same verb 'see!' to draw the attention of the Israelites to the Lord's ultimatum.

> *See*, I have set before you this day life and good, death and
> evil.

Interjection. *Hinnēh* is viewed by many as an interjection (TWBOT 1980:220; Lisowsky 1959:417; Kohlenberger 1987:xxvii). Interjections are usually considered emotional or exclamatory words. The definition of *hinnēh* as an interjection is problematic. Schacter describes the linguistic nature and function of interjections (1985:58):

> Interjections are words, often of an exclamatory character, that can constitute utterances in themselves, and that usually have no syntactic connection to any other words that may occur with them. English examples are *ah, aha, bah, oh, wow*, etc. The class of interjections of a language often include [sic] words which are phonologically distinctive. For example, English words must in general contain at least one vowel sound, but interjections like *hmm, pst*, and *shh*, are vowelless

> . . . Although there are a good many linguistic descriptions
> that fail to mention interjections, it seems likely that all
> languages do in fact have such a class of words. In the case
> of extinct languages, interjections may not be attested in the
> written records because of the generally informal, colloquial
> character of this word class.

Hinnēh does not conform very well to this linguistic description of
interjections. First, *hinnēh* does not occur on its own. Second, *hinnēh* does
have a syntactic connection with other words in that it occurs in a particular
position in syntactic constructions.[3] *Hinnēh* also exhibits pronoun suffix
morphology (e.g., *hin'nî*). Third, *hinnēh* is not "phonologically distinctive"
as are prototypical interjections, but conforms to a common syllable struc-
ture in the language. Fourth, *hinnēh* occurs over one thousand times in an
ancient, written document, whereas interjections are typically left out of
written material. Fifth, interjections often are regarded as having emotional
content. *Hinnēh* does not seem to indicate emotion as such in contexts such
as this parenthetical comment in II Sam. 1:18:

> *Hinnēh*, it is written in the book of Jasher.[4]

Extended function. Finally, BDB describes an extended function of
hinnēh. *Hinnēh* often occurs "after verbs of seeing or discovering, making
the narrative graphic and vivid, and enabling the reader to enter into the
surprise or satisfaction of the speaker or actor concerned" (1907:244;
Slager 1989:51).

Slager's Analysis of *Hinnēh*

Slager discusses the discourse function of *hinnēh*,[5] describing four
basic functions in narrative discourse. *Hinnēh* is used " . . . to highlight

---

[3]The syntax of *hinnēh* will be discussed in greater detail later in the article. In narrative,
hinnēh typically occurs in clause initial position (just after initial *waw*). However, in the case
of a topical foil (or contextualized constituent), it occurs just after the fronted constituent.
Interjections, however, typically occur on their own or with a sentence/proposition initially.

[4]All examples will be taken from the King James Version (KJV), which literally translates
hinnēh in most cases. *Hinnēh* will be literally represented in transliterated form in the examples
instead of 'behold'.

[5]Slager's article will be the basis for the discussion in most of the remaining examples in
this article.

off-the-event-line material . . . to call special attention to a statement that is contrary to expectation . . . to call special attention to a goal that leads to an exhortation . . . to call special attention to the ground that leads to a conclusion . . . " (1989:50–79)

Slager gives many examples of *hinnēh* in context which support his thesis, so this article will not attempt to present his analysis in detail. His overall conclusion is that *hinnēh* "is used to highlight the noun/proposition that follows it. It raises the relative prominence of the information after it, so that the information has an impact on the reader/listener. Usually, it calls upon the reader to pay attention" (50). Thus Slager sees *hinnēh* as a prominence marker, and that is basically the position that is taken in this article.

However, concepts such as *prominence* and *emphasis* are notoriously difficult to define and are used by different analysts in different ways. Therefore, it is necessary to define some of these terms. For the same reasons, it is also necessary to define the term *focus*.[6]

Prominence, Emphasis, and Focus

It is important to place *hinnēh* within a useful linguistic model in order to account for its use in broader and hopefully clearer terms. Languages distinguish between, and use different devices to mark, different sorts of focus phenomena. Therefore, an accurate linguistic presentation of *hinnēh* is necessary in order to translate dynamically its function to match the focus types and devices of the receptor language.

In this section, the concepts of *prominence*, *emphasis*, and *focus* are examined and defined. *Hinnēh* is analyzed with respect to four perspectives on focus. *Hinnēh* is defined finally using Dik's (1978a) FG model of focus function.

---

[6]*Focus* will be defined in more detail below, but it is important to note the kind of focus the article does not deal with. *Focus* has been used in many ways. It has been used with reference to the Philippine voice system (Givón 1990:699; Longacre 1968). This is not the way focus is used in this article. Nor does this article address the issue of *unmarked focus, unmarked prominence* (Callow 1974:51), *focus of assertion, one chunk per clause* (Givón 1990:699, 703), *contrastive semantic peak* (Bolinger 1961:87), *comment*, and *rheme*. These all refer to a *norm* situation. In the cases above, *unmarked focus* represents the highest informational value of the clause in a *neutral* context.

Callow. Prominence.

> A story in which every character was equally important
> and every event significant can hardly be imagined. Even
> the simplest story has at least a central character and a
> plot, and this means one character is more important than
> the others, and certain events likewise. Human beings can-
> not observe events simply as happenings; they observe
> them as related and significant happenings, and they report
> them as such (Callow 1974:49).

Prominence is thus a natural function of human cognition and is
bound to turn up in human language. However, what exactly prominence
is still needs to be defined. Callow defines it in this way:

> The term prominence . . . refers to any device whatever
> which gives certain events, participants, or objects more
> significance than others in the same context . . . It here
> covers the entire area for which investigators have used
> such terms as theme, attention, focus, foreground, figure,
> topic, and emphasis (50).

Callow makes further distinctions among prominence types which are
relevant to the discussion of *hinnēh*, listing three types. "Thematic
prominence" is "what I am talking about" (i.e., discourse theme or
topic). There is also the "'theme'" of a clause which is the "'jumping-
off point'" at the clause level.[7] "'Focus'" involves the highlighting or
spotlighting of some constituent or event (52). "'Emphasis'" involves
the speaker-hearer relationship in some way. The speaker indicates a
strong feeling about something, typically because it is surprising to the
hearer (ibid.). In Callow's model *hinnēh* would probably be classified as
an *emphasis* prominence marker because it often indicates counterexpec-
tation and is a signal on the speaker-hearer axis that attention should be
paid to the particular marked proposition or constituent.[8]

---

[7]This use of *topic* would correspond to *topic* of the *topic-comment* pragmatic articulation of
the Prague school of linguistics.

[8]Callow's model accounts for the use of *hinnēh* in a simple and thus desirable way; i.e., it
is an *emphasis prominence* marker. However, since Dik goes into more detailed analysis of
focus types and defines focus in a way that suits the approach of this article more closely, his
model is chosen as the basis for the linguistic description of *hinnēh*.

Givón. Contrastive focus. Givón prefers to regard focus and empha-
sis, as Callow defines them, within the heading of contrastive focus.[9] In
his view, there are two extremes within the speaker's expectations of the
hearer's presuppositions: ignorance at one extreme, contrary belief or
expectation on the other. Between the extremes are degrees of ignorance
and contrary belief/expectation (1990:702–3).

Languages differ as to when the contrary belief is strong enough to
"place the relevant chunk of information in contrastive-focus" (ibid.).
The speaker makes an assumption based on the hearer's overt statements
or the deliberate buildup of the hearer's expectation by the speaker
(ibid.). Previous interaction and other contextual factors probably pro-
vide the source of the speaker's estimation of the hearer's unexpressed
assumptions. In Givón's model *hinnēh* would be a type of contrastive
focus marker when it presents information that is contrary to the expec-
tation of the hearer. However, it should be noted that *contrastive* focus
in Hebrew is normally considered to be marked by a change in word
order (i.e., fronting). (See, for example, Gen. 3:1, 2b, 4a, 5a; Num.
10:2). Thus, describing *hinnēh* with respect to contrastive focus in
Givón's terms is somewhat problematic.

Buth. Contraexpectation. Buth regards focus as pragmatic informa-
tion which is "contrastive, contraexpected, or overlooked by the reader-
decoder" (1987:48–9). Buth's definition of focus is broader and
delineates more clearly the respective differing functions of word order
and *hinnēh* in Hebrew than does Givón's. *Hinnēh* draws attention to
contraexpected and overlooked information, but change in word order
serves to contrast information with something else in the context.

Focus in the Functional Grammar (FG) Model

In this section the functional grammar model is chosen as the basis on
which to relate *hinnēh* and the concept of focus. First, focus is defined;
second, its scope is discussed; and third, supportive evidence is offered
to show that *hinnēh* marks focus as defined in the FG model.[10]

---

[9]He does not deal with Dik's *completive focus,* which does not involve contrast but yet can
receive focus marking in some languages (Dik 1980:60).

[10]It should be noted that *focus function* in the FG model is broader than *contrastive focus* or
other subtypes of focus.

Definition. Dik (1978) subsumes focus and emphasis into a broader definition of focus within his functional grammar model. In FG, focus "represents what is relatively the most **important or salient** information in the given setting" (19) (bolding mine).[11] That is, focus function bears "upon the difference in the pragmatic information between speaker and addressee, as estimated by the speaker" (49). Dik claims that the FG broad definition of focus as the most important or salient information is "relevant to the organization of all natural languages" (1980:42). That is, all languages are able to signal the pragmatic focus function in some way using various devices available in the language.

Scope. Focus can operate upon various domains. Many types of focus are restricted to individual grammatical constituents of a proposition.[12] Other types of focus have the whole predication as their scope. For example, negation is a common and universally marked type of focus which has the whole predication as its scope. *Hinnēh* can indicate saliency of both individual arguments and of the entire predication. In Gen. 12:19 below the *hinnēh* marks one grammatical argument as salient ('wife').

> Now, therefore, *hinnēh* your wife, take her and go thy way.

Hinnēh also indicates the saliency of a whole predication. In Gen. 1:29 *hinnēh* marks the whole clause (and, arguably, the following one as well) as salient.

> And God said, "*Hinnēh*, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed; to you it shall be for meat."

In Gen. 38:27 *hinnēh* marks the whole nominal clause.

> And it came to pass in the time of her [Tamar's] travail, that, *hinnēh*, twins were in her womb.

---

[11]*Salient* means "pointing outwards; jutting out, prominent, conspicuous, most noticeable" (*Concise Oxford Dictionary*, 6th Edition, s.v. "salient" 1976:996). Another way to understand the concept of *saliency* is as that which has the "highest informational value" in the context (Dooley 1987:3).

[12]For example, in the second of the two propositions 'I don't want maize, I want YAMS', the grammatical object YAMS is under focus, which is indicated in English by primary intonational stress (See Dik 1980:48–52).

In Gen. 42:27 *hinnēh* marks the location and presence of the money, not the money only, as prominent. *Hinnēh* occurs after the reference to money.

> And as one of them opened his sack to give his ass prov-
> ender in the inn, he espied his money; for, *hinnēh*, it was
> in the sack's mouth.

Because *hinnēh* marks saliency in such a broad way, it does not fit nicely into any of the focus subtypes listed above, which have restricted scope (either constituent or predication, but not both) in their morpho-syntactic marking. Thus, *hinnēh* can be best defined in the FG model as marking emphasis focus.[13] It may be wondered why *hinnēh* should not just be called an *emphasis* marker and the label *focus function* be discarded. There is, however, supportive evidence to show that it is useful to regard *hinnēh* as being a marker of focus function, but as such a one that does not have scope restricted to an individual grammatical argument or the whole predication.

Focus function. Further evidence now is given to show that *hinnēh* exhibits characteristics of a marker of focus function. *Hinnēh* is discussed with respect to syntactic position, pragmatics of dialog, presentative articulation, the pragmatic function of warning, and focus marker derivation.[14]

Syntactic position. Buth (1993:1) describes the functional grid of the Hebrew sentence in the following way (where CC means *contextualized constituent*[15], +/- means *optional*, FOC means *focus*, V means *verb*, S means *subject, and* O means *object*):

   +/- CC +/- FOC V S O

---

[13]That is, in Dik's model, *hinnēh* marks saliency that is noncontrastive or noncompletive (1980:48–52).

[14]Another possible proof that *hinnēh* marks focus function is with regard to Where? questions. In all of the examples this analyst has looked at (Genesis through Samuel), whenever a question is asked of the present physical location of a participant, the answer is marked by *hinnēh*. The answer is a predication of existence. In Tyap (and many other languages), such predications are marked by focus constructions. If this is true, then a default use of *hinnēh* may be as a predicator of existence. More data needs to be looked at, however, in order to make a definite conclusion.

[15]In the classification above, *contextualized constituent* means use of "a special marked structure to set off a constituent as a point of relationship to the context, either forwards (cataphoric) or backwards (anaphoric) or both" (Buth 1993:1).

Hinnēh typically occurs in the focus position, as in Gen. 9:9: "And I, *hinnēh*, I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you."

Carlton regards propositions marked by *hinnēh* and *rak* 'only' as second in prominence only to free subject pronouns (which occur without the participle) (1993:1). *Rak* 'only' is a contrastive quantifier which typically attracts focus (Givón 1990:715). It is important to note that *hinnēh* and *rak* occur in the same syntactic position within the functional grid of the Hebrew sentence (i.e., +/- focus). The fact that *hinnēh* occurs in the same position as *rak* is another indication that it is a focus marker.

Pragmatics of dialog. *Hinnēh* occurs in direct speech in certain types of conversational interchanges where challenges to presuppositions[16] occur. Again, this is also a typical environment for focus constructions. The Tyap example below illustrates the use of a focus construction in this type of conversational interchange.

The taxi in which the narrator traveled broke down. Typically, when such a thing happens, the people in the taxi just wait until the driver has finished repairing it; or if he cannot do so immediately, they catch another taxi. Usually the driver does not refund the money. The focus marker occurs to highlight the reason why contrary to the desire of the taxi driver, he should give the riders their money back to catch another taxi. The focus construction indicates that they felt the fact that they were in a hurry was salient. There is nothing in the context with which the sentence can contrast so there is no contrastive focus. Rather, the information is focused because it is regarded as especially informative or salient to the hearer, either because he overlooked the information or was intentionally disregarding it.

> zi   ghan wa, a   jong zit kurum la
> we hurry FOC, you give us money FOC
> we are in a hurry give us the money then

The first focus marker, *wa*, marks the grounds for the exhortation as salient. (In this particular case, the predicate is focused, though not for reasons of contrast.) The second, *la*, marks the exhortation as salient. *La*

---

[16]Counterpresupposition may include addressing information which is beyond expectation or is overlooked at the moment of the speech event. Thus, in certain contexts in Isaiah, for example, *hinnēh* is used to mark information that is not so much surprising to the hearer, but beyond what he could ever expect. This may also be the sense in which *hinnēh* is used in the Song of Songs where the beauty of the lovers is being hyperbolically extolled. *Hinnēh* also could have a presentative function in these contexts.

would be ungrammatical in the first clause (the grounds) because *la* only addresses the other persons' cognitive/pragmatic state, whether it be one of ignorance, reluctance, or resistance.

It should be noted that Hebrew marks the grounds (the first type of clause above) only, as opposed to Tyap which marks both. For fullest translation effect, both markers in Tyap should be translated because the use of the first focus marker indicates the grounds are salient, but in addition the *la* specifically indicates that there is some presuppositional reluctance, hesitance, resistance, or the like in the cognitive state of the hearer (compare the following Ruth 1:15 example in which Ruth is reluctant to leave Naomi). Typically, if the grounds are marked as salient, predicate focus markers are used as opposed to grammatical constituent focus markers (see footnote 12). Bentinck (1995:this issue) has stated from her experience with the Nyaboa language (Ivory Coast) that African languages tend to be more rich in focus devices than Hebrew, and this Tyap example supports that observation.

Similarly, *hinnēh* often calls special attention to the grounds either for an exhortation or conclusion (Slager 1989).[17] Because there is some counterpresupposition held by the hearer, *hinnēh* is often used to highlight the grounds of the exhortation as particularly salient to overcome this hindering presupposition.[18]

For example, in Ruth 1:15 Naomi uses *hinnēh* to point out to Ruth that Orpah's departure was salient to Ruth and so she also should depart. *Hinnēh* indicates to Ruth salient information which is used as a basis to

---

[17]Van Otterloo (1988) notes that Koine Greek *idou/ide* 'behold' indicates that the reader/hearer is to pay attention because the proposition marked by *hinnēh* is doubtful or counterexpected and the reader/hearer is expected to respond or conclude something. That is, *idou/ide* addresses the status of the hearer's pragmatic information in a way similar to *hinnēh*.

Also, as noted above, *hinnēh* has a presentative function. This context may be an example of the extension of this function to hortatory discourse. Because of presuppositional reluctance, *hinnēh* is used to strongly present the grounds to overcome the counterpresuppositional status of the hearer's information. Slager comments that the basic reason for highlighting an exhortation is "to point out the grounds to the listener", though he does not state why this is done (1989:60). Since secondary meaning is often extended from the direct, concrete, and physical world to less concrete meanings, it might be that the physical presentative nature of *hinnēh* has been extended. It might also be that even the surprises and surprise entries which *hinnēh* marks in narrative texts might originally be related to a presentative articulation.

[18]Presupposition refers to general/cultural knowledge and other contextual assumptions that the hearer has about the world. This knowledge and these assumptions together form the "pragmatic information of the addressee" (Dik 1980:45–6). *Hinnēh* typically directly addresses the status of the hearer's pragmatic information.

challenge her presuppositional state, i.e., her firm reluctance to leave Naomi which has been in evidence since verse 10. The presuppositional background of the interchange can be thought of in the following way:

Ruth's presupposition: a. I won't leave Naomi
Naomi's counter: b. *Hinnēh*, Orpah is going
                          c. Therefore, leave (counter a.)

The 'conclusion' component in the grounds-conclusion examples which Slager gives (e.g., Gen. 26:9a, 27:37ff.) are often rhetorical questions in which the real speech act is usually a proposition which challenges the presupposition behind the previous statement of the hearer. Again, the *hinnēh* clause marks the proposition which is salient—it is given as the basis for countering the presupposition of one participant.

For example, in Gen. 27:37 Esau pleads with Isaac to give him the blessing that Jacob has just stolen. The *hinnēh* marks the grounds (the fact that he has already blessed Jacob) and concludes that because of that he cannot bless Esau, which of course is contrary to the wish of Esau and/or overlooked by Esau (compare Buth's definition of focus above).

Esau's presupposition: a. Give me my blessing
Isaac's counter: b. *Hinnēh*, I've given it already
                          c. Therefore, I cannot give a
blessing (counter a.)

Presentative articulation. As mentioned previously, BDB note that *hinnēh* combines with the pronoun suffix to indicate "ready obedience" (1907:244). Another way to explain this use of *hinnēh* is to view it as a form of presentative articulation in which the person 'presents' himself at the disposal of the hearer (see also Slager 1989:60). Slager notes that there is an implication of "Tell me what you want" with respect to this use of *hinnēh* (62). It is also a way to answer in the affirmative, and so is sometimes translated 'yes' (see Gen. 27:18 New International Version [NIV]). In Tyap it is in precisely these types of situations that focus markers occur. For example, the author received a letter from a Tyap friend signed with a focus construction with the basic meaning 'It's I here (at your service).'

Pragmatic function of warning. The pragmatic function of warning is commonly encoded with focus devices in other languages. This is

probably because it involves highlighting information which will be very salient to the hearer, but due to pressure on his pragmatic assumptions it is something that he overlooks, does not expect, or is reluctant to believe. It has been noted in the literature that *hinnēh* "serves to introduce a solemn or important declaration . . . and is used esp. with the ptcp . . . in predictions or threats" (BDB:244).

In the example below a focus marker (FOC) occurs in connection with a warning that is made to Jesus. The focus marker does not indicate contrastive focus in this context as there is nothing in the context to provide a contrast. That is, the proposition does not contrast the ones that want to trap Jesus with another group that wants to trap Jesus. Contrastive focus in Tyap in this case would also be marked by different means (i.e., focus markers and fronting). Nor is there in the context an obvious contrast between trapping Jesus and doing something else.[19] The focus marker here marks what the speaker feels is salient information.

> *Atyoli   tabam   a   chat   tyeram ang hwa*
> teacher careful they want trap   you FOC
> teacher be careful they want to trap you

Derivation. It is typical for markers with focus function to derive originally from demonstratives. This is indeed the case in Tyap where the focus marker is an extension of the deictic system (e.g., *akya* 'that' and *kya* 'FOC'). *Hinnēh*, too, may have a deictic origin. In Hebrew, a closely related form of *hinnēh* is *hen* (often translated 'lo!'). *Hen* is transparently related to the third person plural and adverbial form *hennah*. Could it be that *hinnēh* is related as well?[20] It seems unlikely to be only coincidence that they all appear related. On the other hand, a derivational relationship may not be easy to prove.

---

[19]It could possibly be argued, however, that there is contrastive predicate focus. In the context of the example Jesus is asked a trick question, and it could be that he is told to be careful since the question is not meant to elicit information, but to entrap. This is uncertain, however. Unfortunately, at present there is no other Tyap data at hand for pragmatic contexts of *warning*.

[20]TWBOT defines a second *hinnēh* in the following way: "hither. When used in pairs, 'here and there'" (1980:220). This definition, of course, is directly related to deictic function.

Translating *Hinnēh* into Tyap

In this section the various uses of *hinnēh* are grouped in a way to facilitate organized translation into Tyap, not for any abstract theoretical validity. The major reason for dividing the translation of *hinnēh* into narrative and speech discourse is not only because of genre differences, but also because the devices used to translate them into Tyap are different.

The chart below summarizes the different devices that Hebrew and Tyap use to accomplish similar things. Note the broader range of focus function of *hinnēh* as compared with focus markers in Tyap. It becomes apparent that Hebrew and Tyap encode different areas of the focus spectrum with different devices.

NARRATIVE DISCOURSE

	HEBREW	TYAP
Surprise props	*hinnēh*	fronted relative clause + additive *kin*
Surprise entries	*hinnēh*	*nang* construction
Surprises	*hinnēh*	*nang* construction + additive *kin*

SPEECH DISCOURSE

	HEBREW	TYAP
Presentation	*hinnēh*	focus marker $+/-$ *di* 'see!'
Presupposition (grounds)	*hinnēh*	predicate focus marker $+/-$ *di* 'see!', *fak* /hear!'
(exhortation)	*0*	focus marker *la* $+/-$ *di* 'see!', *fak* 'hear!'
Warning	*hinnēh*	predicate focus marker $+/-$ *di* 'see!', *fak* 'hear!'

It should be noted that *hinnēh* marks a greater range of focus function than any single marker in Tyap. Translating *hinnēh* dynamically will require the use of various morphosyntactic devices in Tyap. Thus, *hinnēh* should be considered in each context in which it occurs in the original Hebrew in order to match the appropriate device in the receptor language. Of course, a corresponding careful study of the focus system of the receptor

language at both propositional and discourse levels should be made (see Dik 1980 and DeJong 1980).

Narrative Discourse

Narrative uses of *hinnēh* include surprises and surprise entries. Surprises include surprises for the reader alone and surprises for both participants and reader.[21] The only difference in translation between the latter two will be the fact that it will need to be made explicit that the participant was surprised as well. Surprise entries are participant introductions or reintroductions to the event line which are typically unexpected in some way. In narrative, both the surprises and surprise entries can be translated using a postposed adverbial construction. Surprises can also be translated with the additive marker *kin* 'also'; whereas surprise entries cannot. Surprising props, however, are translated using a fronted relative clause construction.

Hinnēh is often used to mark an unexpected prop or participant. In Gen. 28:12 Jacob has a dream and sees something unusual, i.e., a ladder or stairway. This prop, as are most props in dreams or visions, is marked by *hinnēh* (Slager 1989:52–3).

> And he dreamed and *hinnēh* a ladder set up on the earth,
> and the top of it reached to heaven:

In Exo. 3:2 it is the prop 'bush' that is marked by *hinnēh*.
> And he looked, and, *hinnēh*, the bush burned with fire, and
> the bush was not consumed.

In Tyap particularly salient props[22] in a story are given prominence by fronting them, typically in a fronted relative clause.[23] This is followed by a clause that does not immediately refer to the fronted prop. The result is to detach the prop from the context with the effect of

---

[21]Slager found it necessary to point out, for example, that in Gen. 38:27 there do not appear to be any participants around to share in the surprise (1989:53).

[22]Lode (1993:personal communication) uses the term "pre-climactic" for those occurrences in which *hinnēh* marks a salient prop which will be important to the local discourse at a broader level than the immediate sentential context (e.g., 'the burning bush' [Exo. 3:2], 'the leprous hand' [Exo. 4:6]).

[23]It is not always easy to determine whether an item has been fronted because it is a contextualizing constituent or for focus (or both). However, in example (4), there is already a contextualizing constituent 'After he took the child'. The fronted prop 'fingernails' was also spoken with markedly raised intonation, which is a common indication of focus.

surprise. In the following story, the fingernails are a salient (and surpris-
ing) prop. The fronted constituent occurs in (4).

1. The mother went out of the house to go grinding (grain).
2. After she went out grinding, the child started crying.
3. And the wizard took the child.
4. After he took the child—the fingernails that he removed from
   people he went to eat!
5. And he sewed.
6. And he tied the child with them.
7. As he tied the child the child with them, he tied them at the base
   of the child's waist.
8. The child cried even though he comforted the child.
9. The child cried even though he comforted the child.
10. He comforted the child with a song, the song went like this:
11. "See, see, see, Bashila [the mother] sewed the fingernails around
    the child. See, see, see, Bashila sewed the fingernails around the
    child."
12. He sang like that when Bashila returned from her grinding,
13. And she was listening to the song.

Gen. 42:26–27 might then be translated using this particular Tyap
discourse feature. The sack is fronted with a relative clause (16).

14. *ba   si   kpat   akazanki yak   mba-hu*
    they and loaded donkeys grain their-the
    and they loaded their asses with their grain

15. *ba   si   nkat*
    they and left
    and they departed

16. —*buhu nang an   khwot yak-hu   ani*—
    —sack that they poured grain-the SUB—
    —the sack into which they had poured grain

17. *atyu nyiung ma-mba   si   khwuk buhu gu-ji*
    man one   with-them and opened sack his-the
    (and as) one of them opened his sack

18. *da'vwuo khwat-anachen a nang akazanki gu yak*
     at-place sleep-visitors to give donkey his grain
     to give his donkey grain at the lodging

19. *A si kin di kurum gu-hu*
     he and also saw money his-the
     then he saw his money

The suddenness of such discoveries (of both props and other 'surprises') can be enhanced by use of the Tyap additive marker *kin* 'also' (see 19). This grammatical marker effectively joins two events, the opening of the sack in (17) and the discovery of the money in (19) into one event, thus giving a contextual effect of immediacy and suddenness.[24]

The unexpected entries of participants in the discourse are marked in Tyap by a postposed adverbial construction.[25] Tyap has an all-purpose word *nang* which can for brevity's sake be labeled as an *adverbializer* (ADV). It introduces all sorts of adverbial clauses (e.g., as, when, because, although). Typically it occurs with a particle *ani,* which is a subordinator (SUB). That is, it marks the *nang* clause with which it occurs as subordinate to the main clause. When it occurs in a postposed construction without *ani,* however, it effectively gives prominence to both parts of the sentence. In example (20) the *nang* construction is postposed and there is no *ani.*

20. *a bwom anya nang Bashila ma-neet   ma-kwang-hu*
     he sang that ADV Bashila also-returned from-grind-the
     he sang that when Bashila returned from the grinding

Such postposed adverbial constructions are often highly prominent. Hwang (1990) notes that in English there is a marked usage of a *when* clause when it is postposed yet describes an event that took place after that of the clause to which it is subordinated: "He was up in the tree,

---

[24]See Follingstad (1994) for more details on the contextual effects of the additive marker *kin* 'also'.

[25]This adverbial construction is transparently related to the counterexpectation construction in which two *nang* clauses occur without the subordinator *ani.*

      nang nggwon-ka tywei nang gu jang   nggwon-ka
      ADV child-the   cried ADV he comforted child-the
      the child cried even though he comforted the child

picking apples, when the wolf came along." Note that the arrival of the wolf took place after the little pig started picking apples. Levinsohn (1992b:29) (quoting Hwang 1990:73) notes:

> Such clauses convey information which 'is "important" in terms of the overall plot structure,' such as indicating 'a turning point or peak in the global context.' When this happens, 'the independent clause preceding the adverbial clause usually reports setting, background, or successive routine events' (73). Thus . . . the arrival of the wolf (before the little pig had finished picking apples) introduces an important, new complication into the story (1992:29).

Thus, the postposed *nang* construction used to introduce a participant in Tyap narrative not only indicates the counterexpectation aspect of *hinnēh*, it indicates the prominence of that participant's entry into the local discourse. *Hinnēh* can indicate this same kind of prominent participant introduction as, typically, the participant who is introduced in a surprising way features prominently in the following discourse.

Gen. 24:15 can therefore be translated:

21. *a   si   tyak   naai Agwaza-hu ani ba',*
     he and finish pray God-the   SUB not
     and he hadn't finished praying to God

22. *nang R. ghwit*[26] *abai   mang akurung azanghwan*
     when R. went-out come with   waterpot on-shoulder
     ADV Rebekah came out with waterpot on her shoulder

In certain contexts the suddenness of the entry could also be reinforced by a time phrase like *bwut ali* 'break eye [suddenly]' and, where relevant, idiophones.

In the example below, there is no surprising participant entry, but the participants themselves are the surprising factor. In this case, the fact that three flocks were sitting unwatered by a well is a surprise in itself. This type of narrative surprise can also be translated with the *nang*

---

[26]The additive marker *kin* 'also' does not occur after the postposed *nang* construction. This is because it typically occurs with main sequential storyline events, whereas the postposed *nang* construction introduces a participant concurrently into the action, before the event in the main clause is finished. Thus the event described in the construction is not a prototypical punctiliar sequential one.

construction as in Gen. 29:2b below (the first *hinnēh* which marks 'well' is ignored for the purpose of this example).

23. *A   si   nwuan   a   si   kin   li   bwong   swuo   sokhwot*
     he and looked   he and also saw well   drink   water
     and he looked and he saw a well in the field

24. *mi-kyai-hu   nang   akasorong   zonseap   atat   myian   abeam*
     in-field-the ADV   flocks   sheep   three rest   side
     as three flocks of sheep rested by the side (of it)

Speech Discourse

Speech genre uses of *hinnēh* include physical presentation, presentative counterpresupposition, and warning.[27] Direct or indirect dialog discourse can be separated in two ways. First, *hinnēh* is used presentatively in a physical way. Second, *hinnēh* marks the grounds of certain exhortations/conclusions where there is *extra* pragmatic information to be overcome or pointed out (see discussion above). In speech contexts, *hinnēh* will be translated with various types of focus markers. *Hinnēh*, when it presents one participant at the disposal of another as an indication of obedience, can be rendered with a combination of the imperative form of the verb 'see'[28] *(di)* and predicate focus markers. This identical combination will be used for presentations of participants or other physical location predications in Tyap.[29] Three examples of this are (25) II Sam. 1:8, (26) Gen. 26:9, and (27–28) Gen. 18:9, respectively.

25. *di   nung   wa   wu*
     see me   FOC   the
     see me here

---

[27]*Counterpresupposition* refers specifically to counterpropositional information between two participants in speech discourse. *Presentative* indicates that the information is *presented* to the attention of the hearer's presuppositional state.

[28]Even though it is true that *hinnēh* does not necessarily mean 'look!', in some receptor languages the verb 'see!' can draw the hearer to pay attention in a manner similar to *hinnēh* and thus can be used in some contexts. Birom (Niger-Congo) uses *di* 'see!' in both physical and non-physical contexts to translate *hinnēh* (Gyang 1993:personal communication).

[29]The imperative verb 'see!' *di* occurs in speech discourse when physical location is relevant in Tyap.

26. *di abyiuk ang wa wu*
     see wife   your FOC the
     see, your wife (is) here

27. *abyiuk ang-wu   shya aji*
     wife   your-the found where
     where is your wife

28. *di mami suswak-hu hwa*
     see inside tent-the   FOC
     see, in the tent (there)

In (27), (28) there is no other obvious structure in the context with which the tent could contrast, so there is no contrastive focus.[30]

If the context does not have to do with physical location, *hinnēh* can be translated with a predicate focus marker without *di*. In Gen. 19:20b–22, for example, a focus marker would be used without 'see' because the angel is not speaking of a location but a speech act.

Counterpresupposition speech contexts can be translated by means of predicate focus markers, *di* 'see!'/*fak* 'hear!' when appropriate, and *la* if the focused predication is grounds for a following exhortation (see abbreviated translation of Ruth 1:15 below).

29. *di ashunn-ang-wu   naat wa, nkat mang-anggu mamang la*
     see your sister-in-law going FOC, leave with-her   also   FOC
     see your sister is going, leave with her also

Finally, warnings can be translated with a predicate focus construction (as in the example concerning Jesus). The impact of *hinnēh* can be strengthened in the translation, if the context is appropriate, by placing *la* in a small hortatory phrase before the actual warning (e.g., *di/fak la!* 'see/hear then!'). Thus, Gen. 20:3 can be translated in the following manner:

30. *fak la, a   shya kwonu akhu wa*
     hear FOC, you are   near   death FOC
     hear then, you are about to die

_____

[30](Compare footnote 14). The question must again be raised here. Is *hinnēh* focusing here a basic predication of existence (i.e., a basic answer to a location question) or is it suggesting something unexpected about Sarah's location? More investigation is necessary.

Conclusion

The placement of *hinnēh* within a linguistic model of focus has made possible a wider understanding of the function of the particle. *Hinnēh* draws attention to a proposition indicating it is important or salient in the given context. Often this is done because the context indicates the presence of counterexpected, counterdesired, or overlooked presuppositions. The linguistic behavior of *hinnēh* is typical of focus function and can be considered a marker of emphasis focus in Dik's FG model. *Hinnēh* can be translated into Tyap by using a mixture of morphosyntactical constructions: a fronted relative clause, a postposed adverbial phrase, an additive marker imperative form of the verb *see/hear,* and different types of focus markers.

BIOGRAPHY

Carl Follingstad received his B.A. in linguistics and German from Augsburg College and his M.A. in linguistics from the University of Texas at Arlington. He became a member of the Summer Institute of Linguistics in 1985. He went with his wife, Joy, to Nigeria in 1988, and since then they have been on the teaching staff of the Nigeria Bible Translation Trust (NBTT) and have been working with the Tyap literacy and Bible translation project. He is presently pursuing a Ph.D. in linguistics and biblical Hebrew at the Free University, Amsterdam.

REFERENCES

Andrews, A. 1985. The major functions of the noun phrase, in Language typology and syntactic description. Edited by T. Shopen, I.62–154. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blass, Regina. 1990a. Relevance relations in discourse: a study with special reference to Sissala. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bolinger, Dwight. 1961. Contrastive accent and contrastive stress. Language 37.

Bentinck, Julie. A comparison of certain discourse features in biblical Hebrew and Nyaboa and their implications for the translation process. JOTT. This issue.

Brown, Francis, S.R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs. 1907. A Hebrew and English lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Buth, John Randall. Word order in Aramaic from the perspectives of functional grammar and discourse analysis. Ph.D. diss., Universtiy of California Los Angeles, 1987.

———. Seminar handout. SIL Hebrew discourse seminar. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics. 1993.

Callow, Kathleen. 1974. Discourse considerations in translating the Word of God. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Carlton, Matt. Referent theory. Hebrew discourse seminar. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics. 1993.

Davidson, A.B. 1894. Hebrew syntax. New York: Scribner's.

de Jong, Jan. 1980. On the treatment of focus phenomena in functional grammar. In Perspectives on functional grammar. Edited by Teun Hoekstra, Harry van der Hulst, and Micahel Moortgat. Dordrecht: Foris.

Dik, Simon. 1978. Functional grammar. North Holland Linguistic Series No. 37. Amsterdam: North Holland.

———. 1980. On the typology of focus phenomena. In Perspectives on functional grammar. Edited by Teun Hoekstra, Harry van der Hulst, and Micahel Moortgat. Dordrecht: Foris.

Dooley, Robert A. 1987. Basic configuration of pragmatic structuring. Work papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota session, Vol. 31. Edited by Desmond C. Derbyshire. Grand Forks, N. Dak: SIL.

———. 1988. Pragmatics and grammar: motivation and control. Work papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota session. Vol. 32. Edited by Desmond C. Derbyshire. Grand Forks, N. Dak: SIL.

Follingstad, Carl M. 1994. Thematic development and prominence in Tyap discourse. In Discourse features of ten languages of West Central Africa, edited by Stephen Levinsohn. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Givón, Talmy. 1990. Syntax, a functional-typological introduction. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hwang, Shin Ja. 1990. Foreground information in narrative. Southwest Journal of Linguistics. 9(2):63–90.

R. Laird, Gleason L. Archer and Bruce K. Waltke, editors. 1980. Theological wordbook of the Old Testament. Chicago: Moody Press.

Lambdin, Thomas. 1971. Introduction to biblical Hebrew. New York: Scribner's.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. 1990. Unmarked and marked instances of topicalization in Hebrew. Work papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota session, Vol. 34. Edited by Robert A. Dooley and John Clifton. Grand Forks, N. Dak: SIL.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. 1992a. Discourse features of New Testament Greek. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. 1992b. Preposed and postposed adverbials in English. Work papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota session, Vol. 36. Edited by Robert A. Dooley and David Marshall. Grand Forks, N. Dak: SIL.

Lisowsky, Gerhard. 1958. Konkordanz zum Hebraischen Alten Testament. Stuttgart: Wuerttemburgische Bibelanstalt.

Longacre, Robert E. 1968. Discourse, paragraph, and sentence structure in selected Philippine languages. Vol. 3 (Final report on HEW research contract OE-08–062838–0391). Santa Ana: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

The New international version interlinear Hebrew-English Old Testament. 1979. Edited by John R. Kohlenberger III. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Schachter, Paul. 1985. Part of speech systems, Vol I. Language, typology, and syntactic description. Edited by Timothy Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Septuagint version of the Old Testament and Apocrypha with an English translation. 1978. Edited by Charles L. Brenton. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Slager, Donald. 1989. The use of *behold* in the Old Testament. Occasional Papers in Translation and Text Linguistics 3(1):50–79.

Sperber, Dan and Deidre Wilson 1986. Relevance: communication and cognition. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Tanakh: The Holy Scriptures. 1985. New York: The Jewish Publication Society.

Van Otterloo, Roger. 1988. Towards an understanding of *lo* and *behold*: Functions of *idou* and *ide* in the Greek New Testament. Occasional Papers in Translation and Text Linguistics 2(1):34–64.

Weingreen, J. 1939. A practical grammar for classical Hebrew. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Williams, Ronald J. 1967. Hebrew syntax: An outline. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

A COMPARISON OF CERTAIN DISCOURSE FEATURES IN BIBLICAL HEBREW AND NYABOA AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR THE TRANSLATION PROCESS

Julie Bentinck

ABSTRACT

The article will discuss features of the biblical Hebrew and the Nyaboa verb systems as used in discourse. It will also discuss participant reference, which is very different in the two languages. Other important topics to be dealt with are topicalization and focalization (frequently used in Nyaboa discourse). The use of certain expressions for highlighting will be referred to.

Introduction

My approach in this article is that learned at the Institute of Holy Land Studies under Professor Randall Buth and which I applied in teaching the Hebrew discourse class in spring 1993. I realize that there may be different opinions on various aspects of this method, but my aim is not to prove or disprove any aspect. Rather, I wish to take the method as helpful in presenting what I see happening in biblical Hebrew discourse and to compare the source and target languages, considering the implications for the translation process.

For the purpose of this article, I will assume that the reader has a basic competence in biblical Hebrew. Nyaboa (the target language) is a Western Krou language of the Guéré complex spoken in central western Côte d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast), West Africa. It is obviously totally unrelated to biblical Hebrew, a northwest Semitic language spoken three thousand years ago.

The Verb System: Similarities

The first area in which I wish to make comparisons is the verb system.

TAM **systems.** Biblical Hebrew, as Buth has pointed out, has a two-way semantic contrast presented by four verb forms that are distinguished on the basis of their pragmatic functions.

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="2"></td><td rowspan="2"></td><td colspan="2">TAM (Tense/Aspect/Mood)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Past/perfective
More definite</td><td>Non-past/imperfective
Less definite</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="6">P
R
A
G
M
A
T
I
C
S</td><td>Time Sequence</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Continuity</td><td>*wayyiqtol*
(VSO word order)</td><td>*weqatal (+/- yiqtol)*</td></tr>
<tr><td>Discontinuity</td><td>*we x qatal*
Fronting</td><td>*yiqtol*</td></tr>
</table>

Examples

wayyiqtol (time line)

(1) Gen. 27:1–2

    1a *vayᵊhî kî-zāqēn a yiṣḥaq*
       and it happened that was old Isaac

    1b *vattikᵊhênā ʿênāyv mērᵊʾōt*
       and were dim his eyes for seeing

    1c *vayyiqrāʾ ʾet-ʿêśāv bᵊnô haggādōl*
       and he called Direct Object Esau his son the elder

    1d *vayyōʾmer ʾēlāyv bᵊnî*
       and he said to him my son

1e   *vayyō'mer 'ēlāyv hinnēnî*
      and-he-said to-him here-I-am

2   *vayyō'mer*
      and-he-said

we x qatal

(2) Jon. 1:5 (otherwise time-line series)

5   *v'yônâ yārad el-yark'tê hass'pînâ*
      but-Jonah had-gone-down to-the-two-sides-of the-ship

weqatal (theme line)

(3) Deut. 6:4–9 (complete injunctive series)

4   *š'ma' yiśrā'ēl YHWH 'ĕlōhēnû YHWH 'eḥād*
      hear Israel YHWH our-God YHWH one

5   *v''āhabtā 'ēt YHWH 'ĕlōheykā b'kol-l'bābkā ûb'kol-napš'kā
      ûb'kol-m' 'ōdekā*
      and-love DO the-Lord your-God with-all-your heart
      and-with-all your-soul and-with-all your-strength

6   *v'hāyû hadd'bārîm hā'ēlleh ... 'al-l'bābekā*
      and-may-be the things the-these [...] on your-heart

7a   *v'šinnantom l'bāneykā*
      and-impress-them on-your-children

7b   *v'dibbartā bam b'šibt'kā b'bêteykā ûb'lekt'kā badderek
      ûbešokb'kā ûbqûmekā*
      and-talk about-them when-you-sit at-home and-when-you-walk
      along-the-road and-when-you-lie-down and-when-you-get-up

8a   *ûqšartom l''ôt 'al-yādekā*
      and-tie-them as-signs on your-hands

8b   *v'hāyû l'ṭōṭāpōt bēn 'ênêkā*
      and-let-them-be for-frontlets between your-eyes

9   *ûk'tabtom 'al-m'zûzōt bêtekā ûbiš'areykā*
      and-write-them on (the)-door-frames-of your-houses
      and-on-your-gates

(4) Gen. 34:15–17 (future series)

    15a ... *nē'ôt* ... *(yiqtol)*
          we-will-consent

    15b ... *tihyû*   *(yiqtol)*   (condition)
          you-will-become

    16a ... *v³nātannû*
          (then)-we-will-give

    16b *v³ 'et-b³nōtêkem niqqaḥ-lānû*   *(yiqtol)*
          and-DO your-daughters we-will-take to-us

    16c *v³yāšabnû 'itt³kem*
          and-we-will-live with you

    16d ... *v³hāyînû*
          (and)-we-will-become

    17a *tišm³ 'û* ...
          you-will-listen *(yiqtol)* (negative) (condition)

    17b *v³lāqaḥnû 'ēt-bittēnû*
          (then)-we-will-take DO our-daughters

    17c *v³hālākenû*
          and-we-will-go

yiqtol

(5) See example (4)

Nyaboa, interestingly enough, presents the same large, binary cut of tense and aspect. The perfective (the unmarked form) and the imperfective are distinguished by the imperfective carrying a lengthened vowel at the end of the noun-phrase subject (a typical trait of Western Krou languages). Auxiliaries further distinguish the subcategories, and a sequential (SEQ) aspect *'ye* (auxiliary) functions in a similar way to the *wayyiqtol* in biblical Hebrew, as main time-line narrative verb form, carrying along the narrative sequence.

(6) *-yı 'lre-e mu'a -yi mυ*   *ε 'ke 'bhlυ cε*
when gazelle was about to come   to break up earth

ε -ka yi
at the moment when it came

ji 'cε-ε 'bhlυ see
the-panther had already broken up the earth

'le ε 'ye 'bhlυ "kpi 'kpa
then it added (water) to the earth

ε -ke 'ε "yreetı -ke 'ε 'nynυkpakpı
it and its children and its wives (Contextualizing Constituent)

ı 'ye 'bhlυ wlɔtɔ
then they crushed (and mixed) the mud

ı 'ye -budu bhla 'bho zɔ -lue 'zɔ
then they put mud on (the walls of)

ı 'ye "yigwε
the house on the same day, then they finished

   When the gazelle was about to come to break up the earth, at the moment when it came, the panther had already broken up the earth, added (water) to the earth, and it and its children and its wives had crushed (and mixed) the mud (and) put mud on (the walls of) the house on the same day and finished.

(7) *bhluo nυ'a -kaa*   *ε "du-o 'le 'ε -nε*
perdrix did this it put in its (bullets)

'le ı 'ye 'mυ-sɔ   *ı 'ye -jeyi 'kpa* (etc.)
then they (four animals) got up   then they set off

Semantic and temporal overlap

   Nyaboa, like biblical Hebrew, permits partial semantic and temporal overlap.

(8) Biblical Hebrew Ruth 1:3 (cause/result)

3a *vayyāmot 'ĕlimelek*
then-died Elimelech

3b *vattiššā'ēr hî'*
then-was-left she

(9) Nyaboa

'le ɔ 'ye 'mɛ 'le ʋn 'ye 'bho -sie
then he SEQ died then she SEQ was left

The Verb System: Differences

Hendiadys

The important function of hendiadys in biblical Hebrew is not dupli-
cated in Nyaboa. In biblical Hebrew this device seems to signal that
what follows is important: e.g., 'and answered and said' (1 Sam. 1:15,
17).

(10) 15 *vatta'an hannâ vattō'mer*
and-answered Hannah and-said
This introduces Hannah's anguish of soul and desire for a son.

(11) 17 *vayya'an 'ēlî vayyō'mer*
and-answered Eli and-said
This introduces Eli's words of benediction.

Materials needing to be flagged as important would be translated into
Nyaboa by the use of other devices. Thus 1 Sam. 1:15 might be trans-
lated as suggested in (12):

(12) *-gblee   po -lokui* etc. e.g.   *'le ʋn na: -gblee*
you see   listen   then she said: you see

From this we observe that although the sequential verb forms in both
languages possess significant similarities and thus frequently permit
direct translation, there are differences in the use of the systems that the
translator needs to be aware of. Most often, these differences will re-
quire the insertion of additional materials in Nyaboa renderings.

Overlay

The usage of the *wayyiqtol* or *weqatal* verbs in biblical Hebrew to express morphosyntactically unmarked temporal overlay has no counterpart in Nyaboa. All overlay in Nyaboa is *marked*, as indeed it can be in biblical Hebrew, usually by a subordinate clause marking repetition or a past-time link, or even by chronological reordering if absolutely necessary.

(13) Unmarked overlay Hebrew (Lev. 16:6–11) (lexical repetition: 6a, b and 11a, b)

> 6a *vᵊhiqrîb 'ahărōn 'et-par hahaṭā't 'ăšer-lô*
>   and-will-offer Aaron DO bull-for sin which to-him

> 6b *vᵊkipper ba'ᵊdô ûbᵊ 'ad bêtô*
>   and-he-will-make-atonement for-himself and-for his-house

> 11a *vᵊhiqqᵊrîb 'ahărōn 'et-par hahaṭā't 'ăšer-lô*
>   and-will-offer Aaron DO bull for-sin which to-him

> 11b *vᵊkipper ba'adô ûbᵊ 'ad bêtô*
>   and-he-will-make-atonement for-himself and-for his-house

(14) Marked overlay Hebrew

See example (2) (Jon. 1:5)

> *we x qatal*

(15) Marked overlay Nyaboa

> Jon. 1:5 *ʋn -nɪ'a -kaa nʋnamʋ a,*
>   when they were doing thus (added)

> *Zonasɪ -mnɔɔ 'dre-e 'le batoo 'mnɛ'ɛ glu,*
> as for Jonah he'd descended deep inside that boat

> *'le-e ɔ 'pɛ'ɛ ti 'le ɔ-ɔ 'mʋ'o -zbhɔkii*
> it was there he'd lain down and was sleeping soundly

The added clause replaces the Hebrew word order signal. Therefore it is important to be aware of the information order of the Hebrew while undertaking the task of translating into Nyaboa.

Time discontinuity distinction

The main difference between biblical Hebrew and Nyaboa in this area
is that whereas some verb forms are clearly marked as sequential, i.e.,
[+ continuity] in both languages, the time discontinuity trait is not a
relevant one for Nyaboa. Fronting may well produce a verb that is
temporally sequential (as it equally may not be). This is due to the
frequency of prominence structures in Nyaboa (see Prominence).

Fronted and sequential

(16) ı -ka 'le-e gbʊ a   lʊɛ 'yi-e zinamʊ.
      when they looked there   the elephant was about to pass

      ɛ nyni 'ı li "sɛɛ   bhluo 'po-o 'ɛ -kosu -tanyı
      when it approached them   the perdrix fired its gun first

      "kwla -ke sɔn 'ye 'tɔ po.
      the tortoise and the snail then fired

      lʊɛ nu'a -kaa   -da -kosu'a wlu -yi -nı'a
      the elephant did this   from where the sound of the gun came

      'bho-o ɛ 'wlaa'o
      it is there he directed himself (next action)

Fronted and not sequential (continuation of the same story)

(17) a -gblee   bhluo nʊ'a -kaa   -prr!   ɛ "blu-o'o
      you see   the perdrix did thus woosh!   it flew

      ɛ 'ya-a 'bho tu'a "klɛɛ "kpi   'bho-o ɛ -de'e ti
      it mounted onto a tree branch it's there it sat

      "kwla -nu'a -kaa   fıakafıakafıaka!
      the tortoise did thus   shuffle, shuffle, shuffle!

      ɛ 'pa-a -titi 'zɔ   ɛ -de'e-e ti
      it went under some leaves   it sat (there)

      sɔn -mnɛɛ 'bho-o ɛ -de'e ti   ɛ -see -gbaa 'mʊ -sɔ
      as for the snail   it's there it sat, it didn't move
                                           (simultaneous-not sequential).

This same fact is true of the Nyaboa nonpast. Future imperfective action is represented by the discontinuous structure *'ye* (auxiliary) ... *mʋ* which may be used alone or in sequence.

(18) (alone) *ɔ-ɔ 'ye-e -mu -mʋ*   he'll go

(19a) (sequence) *ɛ-ɛ 'ye -ɛ -yɛ -mʋ*   it will find it

(19b) *'le ɛ-ɛ 'ye ɛ   'mʋ "luo mʋ*   then it will take it
        ɛ 'ke ɛ   'mʋ 'luo

(19c) *ɛ-ɛ 'ye-e -budu 'gbate   -mʋ kplakpla 'wee*   then it will place all
        ɛ 'ke -budu 'gbate   kplakpla 'wee   the house beams

(19d) *'le ɛ-ɛ   'ye "yi-gwɛ mʋ*   then it will finish
        'le ɛ   'ke "yigwɛ

When there is a sequence, a different auxiliary may be used to form the chain with no change in meaning from *'ye ... mʋ*. This is the projective auxiliary *'ke;* i.e., the normal distinction is neutralized in this function of future sequence.

We note with interest that the normal distinction, however, is of vital importance after a conditional clause (or its equivalent), the *'ke* marking immediate, certain consequence and the *'ye ... mʋ* marking uncertain future consequence.

(20) *-bho ɔ po kafɛ 'pɛlʋ, ɔ 'ke mɔni'a -dadudu 'ye*
      if he sells (his) coffee, he'll receive a lot of money
      (sure, immediate)

(21) *-bho ɔ po kafɛ 'pɛlʋ, ɔ-ɔ 'ye-e mɔni'a -dadudu 'ye -mʋ*
      if he sells (his) coffee, he'll receive a lot of money
      (uncertain, vague future)

The theological importance of this must not be underestimated, especially as biblical Hebrew (and other languages) only use one verb form for real conditions in that situation. It is vital to be aware of the added distinction necessary in Nyaboa in the translation process.

(22) Hebrew

   'ăbārēk 'et-haššōmēa' 'et-miṣevōtay
   I'll-bless DO the-one-who-hears DO my-commandments

(23) Nyaboa

   nyɔ"o nyɔ-ɔ po'a 'an wlu -lokui
   whoever hears my word

   'ınnɔ 'ın-ı 'ye "niti-wʋnna mʋ.
   it is he that I'll bless (uncertain, vague future)

(24) *nyɔ"o nyɔ-ɔ po'a 'an wlu -lokui*
   whoever hears my word

   'ınnɔ 'ın 'ke "niti-wʋnna
   it is he that I'll bless (certain, sure consequence)

N.B. This same distinction needs to be observed in translating the New Testament, where Greek too has only one form. In passages concerning salvation and eternal life, for example, the distinction is vital (e.g., Mark 8:35).

Prominence Structures

The next area of discussion is that of prominence structures. Biblical Hebrew and Nyaboa find themselves at two extremes in this regard. Hebrew can be considered as *monotonous*, whereas Nyaboa makes frequent use of prominence structures. Even the so-called unmarked form is marked (Bentinck 1982). Other forms carry inherent focus and do not permit fronting (or subject focalization), or else there is deliberate fronting. Topicalization in the form of marked extrasentential structures (up to three sometimes) is very frequent and keeps track of thematic participant reference (see page 20), and this is often also accompanied by focus structures in the following clause.

Unmarked form *marked*

(25) *ɔ yi-ǫ'ǫ*   he came
     he come   Declarative Marker

(26) *ɔ 'mu-ǫ 'pɛlʋ 'mʋ*   he went to market
     he go DM market to

Inherent focus

(27) *'le ɔ 'ye mu*   then he went
    then he SEQ go

(28) **'le 'innɔ 'ye mu*   then he went
    then it's he SEQ go

(29) **'le 'pɛlʊ 'mʊ ɔ 'ye mu*   then it's to market he went
    then/to market FOC/ he SEQ go

Deliberate focus

(30) *'le 'pɛlʊ 'mʊ ɔ mu'o*   it's to market he went
    to market FOC he go DM

(31) *-budu ɔ po'o*   it's a house he built
    house FOC he build DM

(32) *'ınnɔ po'o-budu* it's he who built a house
    it's he build DM house

Extrasentential topicalization

   Simple

(33) *ɛ-bɛ -budu 'mnɛɔ   po -ɛ'o*
    this house   he built it

   Several

(34) *-buduklagba 'mnɛ   'le gwlɔ 'mnɛ 'mʊ   'ɛ -yowli*
    this big house   in this village   it's chief

    'ınnɔ po 'ɛ 'bho
    it's he who built it

    it's the chief who built this big house in this village

Extrasentential topicalization + focus

Subject

(35) *ɔ-bɔ nyɔ 'mnɔ   'ınnɔ po ɛ'o*
     this man   it's he who built it

Object

(36) *ɔ-bɔ nyɔ 'mnɔ   'ınnɔ 'ın "si'e 'nynı*
     this man   it's about him I was talking

Fronting in biblical Hebrew

Fronting in biblical Hebrew can mark many categories.

Focus

(37) Gen. 13:17 *kî lᵉkā 'ettᵉnennâ*   for it is to you I'll give it
                 for to-you I'll-give [it]

In Nyaboa this would often be the same.

(38) *-ınmɔ 'ın-ı 'ye ɛ "nyı mʋ*
     you FOC I'll give it

A problem occurs when the translator feels he wants to focus on another item:

(39) Gen. 12:6–7 Hebrew

   6   *vᵉ hakkᵉ na'ănî 'az ba'āreṣ*
   7   *lᵉ zar'ăkā 'ettēn 'et-hā'āreṣ hazzō't*

(and-the-Canaanites (were) then in-the-land) ... (it is) to-your-seed (that) I-will-give this-land

(40) Nyaboa (tentative)

   6   *-ın 'ye li-ɔ   ɛ-bɛ -nɔɔ 'mnɛ ti a*
       you see   at this time

       nyʋ-ʋ -de'e 'bho
       it was people who were living

kanaabhlʋkpa 'mne "kpi ti.)
in this land of Canaan.
(i.e., it wasn't unpopulated)

ε-bε 'bhlʋkpa 'mnε
this land

'ınnε 'ın-ı 'ye -a'a 'nynuu'a 'nynuu "nyı mʋ
it is this which I'll give your descendants

To focus on descendants here in Nyaboa suggests it might be given to others. The land here is topicalized. It is also focalized, being an inhabited land already. Perhaps in the light of this total context this change of focus can be permitted. This is certainly an issue I need to discuss with other translators.

In the translation process Nyaboa will need to add focus where Hebrew does not have it. This will be for important plot/theme-related details.

(41) Gen. 12:2 Hebrew

veh⁾yēh b⁾rākâ   and (your name) be (for) a blessing
and-be blessing

(42) Nyaboa (tentative)

'Le -ın 'mʋ 'ın-ı 'ye-e -zi -nı mʋ 'le 'ın 'ke nyʋ -lrʋʋ "niti-wʋnna
it's through you that I'll pass to bless other people.

Topicalization/contextualizing constituent

Interest in topic and topic change

(43) Gen. 39:1 Hebrew

v⁾yôsēp hûrah miṣrāymâ
now-Joseph had-been-taken-down-to to-Egypt

Nyaboa would also topicalize these cases (usually in an extrasentential structure).

(44) *'zızεεfʋ -mnɔɔ etc.*   *'pelʋpomʋ -ke ɔ mu'a Ezıpʋtıbhlʋkpa "kpi a, ...*
as for Joseph etc.   when the merchants/vendors had gone with him
to Egypt

Time sequence discontinuity

Simultaneous

(45) Ruth 1:14 Hebrew

> *vattiššaq 'orpâ laḥămôtâh vᵊrût dabᵊqâ bâh*
> and-kissed (good-bye) Orpah to-her-mother-in-law but-Ruth clung
> to-her

Previous

(46) See Jon. 1:5, example (2).

Nyaboa marks time discontinuity in other ways: e.g., simultaneous -
noun phrase + imperfective (vowel tone 4)

(47) *-Tapɛ -ka nyni a   seli-i wlu-o'o*
     when-Tape arrived   Seli was speaking

Previous (subordinate clause with '-a)

(48) See example (14).
     The translator needs to be aware of this.

Background comment

Gen 12:6 Hebrew, see example (39).

Paragraph demarcation

Initial

Gen. 39:1 Hebrew, see example (43).

Final

(49) Gen. 37:36 Hebrew

> *vᵊhammᵊdānîm mākᵊrû 'ōtô 'el-miṣrāyim lᵊpôṭîpar*
> and-the-Midianites sold him to Egypt to-Potiphar

Beginning of a new story

(50) Gen 4:1 Hebrew

> *vᵊhā'ādām yāda' 'et-ḥavvâ 'ištô*
> and-the-man/Adam knew DO Eve his wife

N.B. Eve is thematic, not Adam, who is fronted. This use is probably sequential.

Nyaboa can use topicalization in these kinds of ways, e.g., paragraph initial:

(51) -Agbiya!   *jisi-i 'nɪaa*
      section marking in folk tale   that eagle

      'ɪnnɛ lu'o -kpakpɪ "yi
      it is he who flapped his wings

However, one needs to be aware of the function, to bring into play all the right devices in the translation process, e.g., information repetition.

(52) -Agbiya!   *ɛ-bɛ -dɪan -lue 'mnɛ -yi'a li*
      section marking in folk tale   when that same potto had come along

      'ɪnnɛ -yɛ'ɛ 'bho jisi
      it was he who found there the eagle

Contrastive topic

(53) Gen. 4:3–5 Hebrew

> 3 *vayyābē' qain*
>   and-brought Cain
>
> 4 *vᵊhebel hēbî'*
>   and-brought Abel
>
>   *vayyiššа' YHWH 'el-hebel*
>   and-looked YHWH to Abel
>
> 5 *vᵊ'el-qayin   lō' šā'â*
>   and-to Cain   not he-looked (favorably)

Nyaboa may mark this extrasententially, with or without the contrastive marker *-mnɔɔ*.

ɔbɔ, or   ɔ-bɔ -mnɔɔ
he   he as for (as for him)

Dramatic pause

The use of *x qatal* structures for dramatic effect where *wayyiqtol* would normally occur.

(54) Esther 7:6–10 Hebrew

> 6. *vᵊ hāmān nibᵊ 'at*
>   and-Haman was-terrified

> 7a. *vᵊ hammelek qām*
>   and-the-king arose

> 7b. *vᵊ hāmān 'āmad*
>   and-Haman stood

> 8b. *vᵊ hammelek šāb*
>   and-the-king returned

Nyaboa (being an SVO language) does not use this device. In translating such passages we would use the sequential *'ye* and add the appropriate highlighting devices for climax, e.g., idiophones even replacing verbs in narrative (when there is much movement, as in a battle).

N.B. -*Gblee* functions in a very similar way to Hebrew and highlights important background details preceding a climax. However, in Nyaboa it can also highlight a mainline event (see Climax and thematicity, page 44).

Pronoun sets for prominence

Hebrew uses one basic set of pronouns for focus, emphasis, and topicalization:

Subject

(55) *gam hû'*   even he
     FOC EMPH

(56) *'ănî mᵊdabber vᵊhû' šōmēa'*   I am speaking and he is listening
     I speaking and he listening

Object

There is some evidence to indicate a distinction between *'et* + suffix pronoun forms and pronoun suffixes directly following the verb. The fuller forms may indicate greater thematicity.

(57) Gen. 37:18

> *vayyir²'û 'ōtô mērāḥōq ûb²ṭerem yiqrab 'ălêhem vayyit²nakkelû 'ōtô lahămîtô*
> and-they-saw him from-distance and-before he-approached
> to-them and-they-plotted him to-kill-him

(58) The use of the pronominal suffixes referencing Joseph on verbs in Gen. 37:14–15 seems to mark Joseph as less thematic at this point. The double employment of the independent pronoun *'ōtô* may indicate a change of status and mark Joseph as becoming a more independent participant in his own right. Compare the climax in v. 28 where Joseph's thematicity is clearly marked by the triple reference of *'et-yôsēp*.

Nyaboa is remarkably interesting in respect to its pronoun sets for marking prominence and has two sets of marked pronouns with little overlap, one set functioning for focus and one set functioning for topicalization.

		Set 1 (forms)	Set 2 (topicalization)
Singular	1	'ınmɔ	'mna
	2 male	-ınmɔ	-mnaaa/-mnɔɔ
	2 female	a-bʋ	a-bʋ
	3 human male	'ınnɔ	ɔ-bɔ
	3 human female	'ınnʋ	ʋ-bʋ
	3 nonhuman	'ınnɛ	ɛ-bɛ
Plural	1	-a-bʋ	-a-bʋ
	2	a-bʋ	a-bʋ
	3 human	'ınnʋ	ʋ-bʋ
	3 nonhuman	'ınnı	ı-bı

(59) 'ınmɔ yi'o   I (focus) came
(60) 'ınnɔ yi'o   he (focus) came
(61) 'le ɛbɛ 'ye 'ɛ -budu po   then it built its house
     then it (topicalized) SEQ its house built

(62) ...   ɔbɔ -mnɔɔ ...   as for him ...
     he (topicalized) contrastive

This is obviously important for the translation process because it implies the need to distinguish clearly the functions in the Hebrew text and to know where to add prominence in Nyaboa, according to the need for prominence, either as focalization or as topicalization (marked information structures). Compare Gen. 12:7, example (39) above. In that illustrative translation the Hebrew pronoun *'ınnɛ* functions as a focusing device.

In the Nyaboa translation of Gen. 4:35 compare example (53). Contrastive topicalization is accomplished through the use of *ɔ-bɔ-mnɔɔ* 'as for him'.

Information Rate

The next feature to be analyzed is that of information rate. Nyaboa has a much slower information rate than biblical Hebrew. This implies that although Nyaboa has a sequential verb form, it cannot use it just where Hebrew does. The narrative chains need to be broken down in Nyaboa either by varied repetition or by the use of dummy verbs to slow down the information rate.

(63) *'ɔ "yu ɔ 'wlʋ'a*   *'ɔ 'nynı-ı 'mo-o -Tɔɔli*
     his son he bore   his name was -Tɔɔli

     A -gblee   *'ɔ -tita nʋ'a -kaa 'sɛɛ,*   *ɔ 'de-e*
     you see   *his father did thus*   he bought
              (dummy verb, initiating action
              after introduction)

     'nynʋkpakpı 'sɔn   *'le ɔ 'ye ʋ 'ɔ "yu "nyı.*
     women/wives two   then he gave them to his son

(64) *ı -ka 'le-e gbʋ a*   *lʋɛ 'yi-e zinamʋ*
     when they looked there   the elephant was about to pass
     (cohesive linkage)

     ɛ nyni 'ı li 'sɛɛ   *bhluo 'po-o 'ɛ -kosu -tanyı*
     when it approached them the perdrix fired its gun first
     (varied repetition for linkage)

'le "kwla -ke sɛn 'ye 'tɔ po   lʋɛ nʋ'a -kaa
then the tortoise and the snail fired   the elephant did thus

-da   -kosu'a wlu -yi -nɪ'a,
from where   the sound of the gun came
(dummy verb)

'bho-o ɛ 'wlaa'o.
that's where he directed himself

(65) Ruth 1:3 Hebrew

vayyāmot 'ĕlîmelek vattiššā'ēr hî'
then-died Elimelech then-was-left she
(two time-line verbs)

(66) Ruth 1:3 Nyaboa
a 'ye li-ɔ   Limelɛkɪ pa'a 'le a,   -du ɔ 'mɛ-ɛ'o,
you see   Elimelech (dummy verb)   (idiophone) he died
(highlighter)   fitting context

'le Naomi -ke 'wa "yreeti'a "sɛ 'ye 'bho -sie.
then Naomi and her children only remained

Participant Reference

Participant reference is another domain where biblical Hebrew and
Nyaboa function differently. In Hebrew noun repetition is used to mark
climacticity and thematicity (dramatic effect).

(67) Gen. 37:28

*vayya'abrû 'ănāšîm midyānîm sōḥărîm vayyimš'kû vayya'ălû
'et-yôsep min-habbôr vayyimk'rû 'et-yôsep layyišm' 'ē'lîm
b' 'esrîm kāsep vayyābî'û 'et-yôsep*
Then Midianite traders passed by: and they drew Joseph up and
lifted him out of the pit, and sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites for
twenty shekels of silver: and they took Joseph to Egypt.

The triple repetition of 'Joseph' is striking, and reinforces the climac-
tic nature of the events. In Nyaboa it works in the following way: the
longest noun form first, then pronouns, as long as the referent remains

thematic. (Thus a pile-up of extrasentential topicalizations and focus can come early on in the chain.)

(68) *nyʊ -yʊ -nɪ'a 'le "susufɔtɔ gbo a*   *'ɪnnʊ*
the people who were on the charcoal side   it's they who

'wa 'wee
all of them

ʊn
they

ʊn-ʊ depo-o'o   *ʊn-ʊ yɛ-ɛ'o*   *ʊn-ʊ vɔ-o'o etc*
they were arguing   retorting   fighting

The result is a clear mismatch and it is vital to identify functions in the Hebrew before translating into Nyaboa, using the appropriate functional devices.

1. Introduction   Noun + *-lue*
                       one/a certain

2. Back reference   Noun + *'mnɛ* or topicalization
                       that

                     like *ɛ-bɛ -dɪan -lue 'mnɛ*
                       that same potto it

3. Climax and thematicity
                     a. (like Hebrew *hinnēh*)
                        highlighting device, except that in
                        Nyaboa it can highlight the time line,
                        too. (See Ruth 1:3 example (66))

                     b. Idiophones for quick action (even to
                        the absence of the verb)

(69) *'le 'zɔ ɔ*   *-gboku!*   *ɛ 'ga-a ti*
then below   (idiophone)   it fell

(70) *'le 'ɔ "yri 'mʊ klɪmakpa*   *"bao!*   *ɔ-ɔ mu'a "mm! -nʊ mʊ*
then in his eyes slap   (idiophone)   he was about to say mm!

'le 'ɔ nata -kɔkɔ'ɔ "bao!   *-ka 'lelaa -gbu!*
then (on) his neck the hammers bao!   then -gbu! (idiophone)

ʋn 'lbha -gɔmna-ɔ!
they killed the white man (particle expressing feeling)

      c. Extrasentential topic and resumptive
         pronoun, etc.

(71) *-agbɪya!*   *jisi 'nɪaa,*
     section marker (folk tale)   that eagle

     'ɪnnɛ lu'o -kpakpɪ "yi 'le
     it's that that flapped its wings

     ɛ 'ye -drɛ kplokplokplo!
     and battled endlessly (idiophone)

Emphatic Devices

The final area to discuss here is Hebrew devices marking emphasis.
These are verb root duplication with the infinite absolute (72) and repe-
tition (parallelism) (73).

Infinite absolute

(72) *môt yāmōt*
    to die he will die
    he will surely die

Repetition (parallelism)

(73) Ps. 2:7 (Hebrew)
    bᵉnî 'attâ
    my-son you   you are my son

    'ănî hayyôm yᵉlidtîkā
    I today fathered-you   today I have become your father

Verb root duplication gives mismatching in Nyaboa, as the redupli-
cated verb root in Nyaboa implies reciprocity or repetition.

(74) *kɪkma -kɪkma dɪ*   love each other *(-kma)*

(75) *nʋnʋ*   repeat action *(nʋ)*

Repetition may be emphatic in Nyaboa, or an intensifier like *tenyi* 'very' may serve. This obviously brings up the whole problem of parallelism in Hebrew poetry and how to handle it in translation. What do you do when parallelism causes hendiadys, which is not natural in the target language?

Summary

On that question mark, I will resume the most interesting translation issues touched on by this paper:

TAM—discontinuity as such not marked in Nyaboa;
Prominence structures—much greater use in Nyaboa;
Information rate—much slower in Nyaboa;
Participant reference—use of system in different ways;
Parallelism—problem of translating Hebrew.

BIOGRAPHY

Julie Bentinck comes from Great Britain and has an M.A. in linguistics from the Sorbonne, Paris, and an M.A. in Hebrew from the Institute of Holy Land Studies, Jerusalem. She is a member of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, working on the Nyaboa language in Côte d'Ivoire, West Africa, since 1974. The New Testament was dedicated in 1994. She is also a translation consultant in the Côte d'Ivoire/Mali branch.

REFERENCES

Bentinck, Julie. 1975–1982, 1993. Language notes on Nyaboa from personal research.

——— 1982. Un suffixe mysterieux en Niaboua. Cahiers Ivoiriens de Recherche Linguistique No. 6 (Communication au premier colloque international sur les langues Kru). Abidjan: Institut de Linguistique Appliquée.

——— 1992–1993. My teaching notes from Hebrew discourse classes at the Institute of Holy Land Studies.

Callow, Kathleen. 1974. Discourse considerations in translating the Word of God. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Ellinger, E. and W. Rudolph, eds. 1990. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartsensia. Stuttgart: Wuerttemberg Bible Society.

Longacre, Robert E. 1989. Joseph: A story of divine providence. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbraums.

A CRYPTIC CHIASTIC ACROSTIC:
FINDING MEANING FROM STRUCTURE
IN THE POETRY OF NAHUM

Loren F. Bliese

ABSTRACT

The basic assumption of this article is that metrical chiasmus is essential in the discourse structure of Hebrew poetry. Traditional studies have seen metrical uniformity in many texts, but have been frustrated by finding too great a variation in line length in other texts. The author has found metrical chiasmus to be a common alternative structure, and in the prophetic books and Psalms the dominant pattern of Hebrew poetry. By starting at both ends and moving to the center, line length becomes consistent in poems which do not have the same basic length in each line. For discourse analysis this has the important correlative that the peak of metrically chiastic poems comes in the center of the poem, while the peak of metrically homogeneous poems comes at the end. This hypothesis is reinforced by another correlative: metrically chiastic poems often have semantic chiasmus while metrically homogeneous poems often have repeated words grouped in pairs in a terrace pattern building up to the final climax. Another discourse feature is that a double line in the center of a metrical chiasmus points to secondary emphasis in the beginning and end of the poem. Other predictable places for prominence are in the quarter lines of long poems. Various features of prominence predominate in such structurally defined peaks.

The overall structure of Nahum is presented as an intricate discourse defined metrically by the number of lines in each part. Patterns related to 22 are significant in defining major breaks. The structured repetition of key words within these parts gives strong support for overall patterns based on metrical as well as on thematic considerations. These and other discourse features are illustrated in this structural analysis of Nahum.*

Introduction

During the last thirteen years I have been testing a hypothesis that a substantial portion of biblical Hebrew poetry can be meaningfully analyzed by noting chiasmus. The basis of this hypothesis is that the well-known discourse feature of semantic chiasmus has a counterpart in rhythmical chiasmus. The theory is here presented in an analysis of the book of Nahum. (Also see a summary in the appendix.)

---

*This article was first presented at a Summer Institute of Linguistics workshop on Old Testament discourse analysis in Dallas, Texas, 1993.

A study of the principles of metrical chiasmus shows that Nahum is a well-organized text in which the parts and individual poems fit together into meaningful patterns that reveal points of emphasis. The overall theme is the fall of Nineveh. As an example of patterning for meaning, the key word NINEVEH occurs only once in each of the three main parts (in 1:1; in 2:8 [9][1] at the beginning of the center stanza and in 3:7). This is significant when compared to similar key word patterns used by other prophets, who restricted them to one occurrence in each major part. (See Bliese [1982, 1994:69] for 'covenant' and 'good' in the five parts of Hosea, [1988a:73–4] for 'day of the Lord' in the five parts of Joel, [1993a:211] for 'Jerusalem' in the two parts of Obadiah, and [1993b] for 'holy' in the three parts of Habakkuk). The importance of this NINEVEH pattern is further seen in that there is also a cryptic clue to the word NINEVEH in the first poem. (A similar pattern and cryptic clue exist for the 'King of Assyria' in both the first and last poems.)[2]

In addition to word patterns in Hosea and Joel, there are number patterns found to be based on the number 22, the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet (Bliese 1994:67, 1988a). Nahum, Obadiah, and Habakkuk show an interesting variation by basing their major divisions not as would be expected on multiples of 11 (half the Hebrew alphabet), but on multiples of 11 with an addition of 1. Freedman (1986:415–6) and Schoekel (1988:191) have also noted such patterns in Hebrew poetry. In the following analysis of Nahum it is proposed that the first part 1:2–2:2[3] has 34 lines of poetry (33 + 1), the second part 2:3[4]-2:13[14] has 23 lines (22 + 1), and the third part 3:1–19 has 45 lines (44 + 1). The number of poems is 11, and since the introductory line is extra, even the structure at this level might be called 11 + 1. Hosea and Joel according to my analyses also have a plus-1 structure in the total number of poems: Hosea has 45 (44 + 1), and Joel 23 (22 + 1).

This number pattern is also seen in the name the LORD in Nahum, which comes 11 times in part 1 and once each in parts 2 and 3, but here in an identical phrase, 'Behold I am against you says the LORD of Hosts' (2:13[14]; 3:5). The word AGAINST ('el) comes once in the first part as well as at 1:9 where it is AGAINST the LORD. This gives it the status of a key word occurring only once in each part, the same as NINEVEH. The importance of the key words NINEVEH, AGAINST, and LORD (with a reversal of which noun is subject and object) is enhanced by their

---

[1]Hebrew verse numbers are in brackets.

[2]The three key words are in capital letters in this analysis to show their prominence.

patterned occurrences within the overall structure of the book as it is defined by metrically determined groups of lines.

The analysis given here of the poetic lines of Nahum follows that used in my previous studies of Hebrew poetry (see the references under Bliese). Lines are defined as monocolon, bicola, or tricola,[3] and normally correspond to lines as printed in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS). The normal pattern for lines is the bicola, with monocolon and tricola counted as exceptional. Internal parallelism between the cola is a recognized feature of Hebrew poetry (Kugel 1981; Alter 1985).

Lines are metrically defined as each having a specific number of accents (Watson [1984], Margalit [1975], Schoekel [1988], Korpel and de Moor [1986] and most traditional studies; but in contrast to Kugel [1981], and others who disclaim it). In Nahum there is one monocolon bimeter line at the end of the poem at 1:15 [2:1], and the rest of the lines vary from trimeter to octameter. The last poem has five accents per line, in the Qinah Lament pattern. Even the number of accents per line is significant to meaning; for example, poems describing the military invasion and destruction of Nineveh have mainly short, quickly moving lines.[4]

These structural patterns of the individual poems in Nahum are mostly chiastic. This means that rhythmically they can be analyzed as having the same number of accents in the first and last lines, and that every pair of lines moving toward the center has the same number of accents. As in my other studies, I have called the center lines of chiastic poems *peaks*. They are usually marked for special emphasis by having distinct word or sound repetitions, poetic word pairs, or metrical, or syntactic uniqueness, as is noted in the discussion below. The frequent use of word chiasmus by the poet in a metrically chiastic poem further supports identifying the peak as being in the center of the poem. The musical lines of the original were probably also based on a chiastic inversion to fit the chiastic rhythm.

However, it is to be noted that studies in Hebrew poetry have emphasized the freedom of the poet to expand accentual units (de Moor 1978:127); therefore, once the musical setting was lost, the accentual tradition based on liturgical reading could have changed from the original sung patterns. So although this type of analysis by metrical chiasmus is hypothetical as we do not have the original rhythmical or

---

[3]Cola (singular colon): phrasal, rhythmical units of a poetic utterance.

[4]Taylor (1956:954) writes, "By this rapid, staccato meter the dramatic effect is greatly enhanced."

musical setting to verify it, we can observe it in the text. And in my opinion it gives a basis for a clearer exegesis of Hebrew poetry than studies which call such poems irregular or without meter.

The other type of Hebrew poetry is metrically homogeneous, meaning that all lines have basically the same number of accents. There are only three such poems in Nahum, two totaling 5 lines at the end of the first part, and one of 5 lines at the end of the last part—a pattern which helps to mark the overall chiastic structure of the book by relating parts 1 and 3. In homogeneous poems the last line is normally the climax. This is often supported with emphatic features similar to those marking the center line of chiastic poems as noted above. Instead of word chiasmus on the poem level, a terraced pattern of repetition often builds up to the final climax. It will be shown how 2:1[2] and the last poem of Nahum have such buildups to the climax.

Explanation of Symbols

In the analysis of the text below, a Hebrew word is represented by an English word or several English words connected by hyphens. If the Hebrew accentual unit already has a hyphen, it is indicated by =. Places where a hyphen is proposed to be added where the Masoretic Text (MT) does not have one are marked as +; and places where an MT text hyphen is proposed to be deleted are marked by (=). The actual number of proposed changes is small enough to indicate that the analysis is on the right track. An asterisk * is used to mark strophic divisions. The basis is semantic cohesion between lines. Most of the divisions are marked by the MT colon:[5] and correspond to verses in the versions. The great majority of strophes are couplets, so triplets and single lines are counted as exceptional strophes. Short introductory (1:12, 14) or closing lines (1:15) are sometimes added to strophes. When enjambment occurs, a line is divided with the first colon in the previous strophe, and the last colon in the following strophe. Such places are marked in the text, as at 1:7 and 2:5. When a larger semantic break than a strophe occurs within a poem, it is marked by ** as a stanza juncture (described as a *canticle* in Korpel and de Moor [1988:38–60]), as in 2:5, 8, 11 and 13.

In order to point to structural prominence in the print medium, peaks are printed in bold, and words in the peak or secondary peaks which are repeated

---

[5] As the MT marks the ends of verses.

in the poem are in bold italics. Secondary peaks as defined structurally in my other studies (especially monocolon lines) and words giving structural balance to a poem are put in italics. The number of units in a line is indicated by ( ). The number of units in exceptional cola in a line is shown by [ ].

Textual Analysis of the Poems

The book of Nahum is composed of an introduction followed by three parts made up of eleven poems.

Introduction 1:1
   1 An-oracle-concerning NINEVEH: the-book-of the-vision-of Nahum the-Elkoshite.

PART ONE: 1:2–2:2[3] Six poems totaling 34 lines (33 + 1)

1:2–11 Seventeen-line chiasm: 86865556 8 65556868

2	'	God-is jealous, and-the-*LORD* avenges;	
		the-*LORD* avenges, and-is-the-possessor-of fury.	(8)
	{n}	The-*LORD* will-take-vengeance on-his-adversaries,	
	{wn}	and-he reserves-wrath for-his-enemies.	(6)
3	{YHWH}	The-*LORD* is-slow to-**anger** and-great = in-power,	
	{wn}	And-the-*LORD* will-*not* at-all acquit.{YHWH}	(8)
*			
	b	*His-way is-in-the-whirlwind and-in-the-storm,*	
		and-the-clouds are-the-dust-of his-feet.	(6)
4	g	*He-rebukes the-sea, and-makes-it-dry,*	
		and-dries-up all = the-rivers.	(5)
	{'}[d]	Bashan languishes, and-Carmel,	
		and-the-flower-of(+)Lebanon {'} languishes.	(6/5)
*			
5	h	The-mountains quake at-him,	
		and-the-hills melt,	(5)
	w	And-the-earth shakes at-his-presence,	
		the-world, and-all = that-dwell therein.	(6)
*			

6 (z in 2nd word) **Before *his*-indignation *who* can-*stand*?**
   ḥ   And-*who* can-endure in-the-fierceness-of *his-anger*?   (8)
            His-fury is-poured-out like-fire,
            and-the-rocks are-thrown-down by-him.   (6)

  *

7 *ṭ*   The-*LORD* is-good for-a-stronghold
            in-the-day-of trouble;   (5)
   {w} y   And-he-knows those-who-trust in-him.
  **   [enjambment]
8   But-with-an-overrunning flood   (5)
   k   *He-will-make an-utter-end-of its-place,*
           and-darkness shall-pursue = his-enemies.   (5)
9 *{m}*   *What(=)do-you-plan AGAINST = the-LORD?*
           He will-make an-utter-end.   (5/6)

  *

   l   Affliction shall-*not*(=)*stand*-up a-second-time   (6/8)
10   to the-point-of(=)tangled thorns.
   {wk}   *And-those-who-are-drenched as-their-drink*
           will-be-devoured
           as-stubble fully dry.   (6)

  *

11 m   One-came-out of-you who-plans evil
           against(=)the-*LORD*,
           a-wicked counselor.   [6 + 2] (7/8)

The first poem in Nahum is an incomplete acrostic. The Hebrew letters are represented above in italics at the beginning of the lines. The question of whether Nahum intentionally created the broken acrostic has been raised on the basis of the completeness of the contents (Schulz 1973:10–1). This study supports the unity of the text and proposes the following intent of Nahum for the broken acrostic. Ending the first poem with *m*, leaving the *n* expected but not realized, serves as a cryptic hint of the theme of NINEVEH for the whole book. That the second line begins with *n* instead of *b*, and that *n* comes again (after *w*) in the first word of its second colon would be clues that the *n* line has been intentionally moved forward because it has a cryptic message. The third line continues the clues by delaying *b* again, and beginning and ending with *YHWH*, thereby providing all the other letters needed for NINEVEH, *nynwh*. The second colon of this third line begins with the same *wn* sequence as in the previous line. All of

these strategically placed repetitions of the letters of *nynwh* in these two extra lines of the acrostic point to the thematic NINEVEH. Similarly, the prominent positioning of *YHWH* at the beginning and end of the second extra line points to the main participant whose dealings with Nineveh are the message of the book. Associations of destruction relating to the letter *n* have been seen in Amos 5:2, the beginning of the prophecy of Israel's fall, in which the first letter of each colon also begins with *n*. Rabbinic tradition gives this as the reason for *n* being omitted in the acrostic of Psalm 145 (Pearl 1991–2:73–8).

The extra *{m}* and *{wk}* lines in 9a and 10b at the end, balance the two lines which are out of the acrostic at the beginning. The two are separated by *l*, which suggests that this is a clue to *mlk* 'King'. This ties in with the last line: 'one (masculine) came out of you' (feminine for Nineveh), 'who plans evil, a wicked counselor' (1:11).[6]

The references to the 'King of Assyria' in his various names are also patterned, with one reference in each of the three parts of the book. Besides this reference in 8–11 of part 1, he is referred to as the *lion* in 2:11–12[12–13]. Finally, he is identified as the 'King of Assyria' only in the first line of the last poem (3:18). This gives an inclusio with this cryptic *king* in the first poem.

Similarly, the irregular ʼ instead of the expected *d* in the acrostic at 4c seems to be a covert reference to 'Assyria', which also begins with ʼ. This is especially true since the ʼ-initial word 'languishes' is repeated last in the line as *YHWH* was in 3. The hearer would know the repetition was not for lack of a *d* initial synonym, as is indicated by the BHS footnote. The last poem in Nahum has similar cryptic clues to the same three key words. There have been many attempts to get rid of the extra lines, and rearrange them or add words to fill out the missing letters (see New English Bible [NEB], which moves the end of 2 to 11, and the discussion in Watts [1975:103], and Taylor [1956:954], and a criticism of such efforts in Maier [1959:149–200]). No such editing is necessary for the alert hearer to realize the pattern and get the point.[7]

---

[6]Sweeney (1992:370–72) rightly notes that 2–8 and 9–10 are "structurally linked." However, the identification of the feminine you of 11 fits the context better as Nineveh as seen by "most scholars," rather than as Judah as proposed by Sweeney.

[7]Coggins (1982:82) writes, "It may be significant that the acrostic in Nahum is the only extended section of the book to have no reference to Assyria." Van der Woude (1977:123) proposes another cryptic message for the first letters of 1:1–8 (transposing the initial *w* in 7b and using the whole word *lpny* in 6a instead of just the *l*): *ʼny bgʼh wlpny ḥṭyk* 'I am the Exalted One and confronting them who commit sin against you.'

Although such plays on letters in poetry are not common, Psalm 29 has a similar pattern with all verses beginning with *qwl* except those which begin with the letters of the name YHWH. Strikingly, Psalm 29 also has a similar theme of YHWH coming in a storm. Coggins (1982:79–85 and 1985:10, 19) points out the liturgical nature of Nahum and its relationship to Psalms and Deutero-Isaiah. He suggests efforts be made to investigate the "significance" of acrostics "and whether or not they had a special purpose". The acrostic Psalm 145 has also been identified as having a "reversed rootplay" with the same *mlk* root as here (Watson 1981:101–2). And Lindars (1989:28–9) notes a possible patterning in the first line of Psalm 145, which also has *mlk*. Ceresko (1985) has found a patterning with meaning in the addition of *p* to the end of Psalm 34, making the letters of *'lp*, as 'alphabet', by the first, central and final lines of the acrostic.

The chiastic structure of this first poem is suggested by the LORD occurring in the first and last lines. It is further supported by the word *not* coming in the third line from each end. The central peak is line 6a-b, and is chiastically balanced by the repetition of *who* and the suffix *his*. This is seen in the inverted parallelism with

Before **his** indignation   **who** can stand?
Who can endure   before the fierceness of **his** anger?

Indignation and *anger* are a common word pair in Hebrew poetry, and such word pairs are often used by Nahum in peaks of poems. The expansion to 'the fierceness of his anger' in the second colon as compared to just 'indignation' in the first colon is typical of Hebrew parallelism. The synonym 'fury' in the first line of the poem is also a typical way for Hebrew poets to relate the first line with the peak. The repetition of 'anger' in the center and the third line and of 'stand' in the center and third line from the end gives further emphasis and symmetry.

The peak line is clearly marked by the *z* of the acrostic coming in the second rather than in the expected first word of the line. Its emphasis is obvious in that it consists of two rhetorical questions. This also relates the poem to the last poem in the book, which ends with a rhetorical question in its peak line. The peak here is "a direct and personal application of the lesson taught by the preceding illustrations" (Smith 1911:290–1). Metrically the center peak is a long octameter, set off since the only other octameters come at the periphery in the first and third lines from each end. This agrees with what Longacre (1983:32) speaks of as "change of pace" such as "length of units (clauses, sentences . . .)" as a feature of prominence in peak.

A common feature of Hebrew poetry, as I have noted especially in Hosea, is the break in the middle of a line (enjambment) for a stanza starting around the last third of the poem. The theme of 8–11 is clearly a change from describing the powerful anger of God, to his judgment against those who plan against him. The metrical line includes the end of 7 and beginning of 8, but their thematic break causes enjambment.

The terraced repetition of 8 'He will make an utter end', 9Aa 'plan AGAINST the LORD', 9Ab 'He will make an utter end', and 11 'plan AGAINST the LORD' gives emphasis and cohesion to this stanza. The use of both flood and fire as the instruments of the destruction is unique. The above translation of the difficult 9–10 is suggested by the metrical lines dividing best at 10b. This brings together the two instruments of drenching and burning (see Eaton 1961:61).

The length of the poem (16 lines or more) suggests another hypothesis developed in my studies (Bliese 1988a:65, 1994:75–81)). Such long poems often have lines of secondary prominence at the quarter points, as well as the primary peak in the chiastic center. Here the quarter points are the double lines 3B–4A and 8B–9A printed in italics. Features of prominence in 3B are the vivid imagery of God coming in the wind and storm, with the anthropomorphism of 'his feet' making dust, actually clouds. Line 4A shows the power of God's rebuke, drying the sea and rivers. On the other side are 8B–9A. They have the inclusio of 'He will make an utter end' coming in the first and last cola of this couplet to give it prominence. They also have the only other question in the poem besides those in the center peak, and have vivid imagery with 'darkness' pursuing God's enemies. The divine name LORD in 9A is also a common feature of prominence. The imagery of God's actions as 'darkness' and 'an overrunning flood', which comes in the first colon of this strophe, parallels the 'wind' and 'storm' of the quarter lines in the first half. (Note Sweeney [1992:170] who identifies 8 as the climax of 2–8.)

1:12–13 Introductory three feet and chiasm: 6 4 6

12	*Thus says the-LORD:*		(3)
	'Though = they-be-strong, and-likewise many,		
	yet-thus shall-they-be-cut-down, and-pass-away.		(6)
	Though-I-have-*afflicted*-you,		
	I-will-not *afflict*-you again.	[1 + 3]	(4)
13	For-now I-will-break his-yoke from-off-you,		
	and-will-burst your-bonds.'	[4 + 2]	(6)

The first 17-line acrostic poem is followed by five poems totaling another 17 lines. The first 17-line poem ends with a direct address warning God's enemies, and the second poem 1:12–13 switches to a direct promise of God to his people.

The form of 12–13 is metrically chiastic, with a tetrameter center. In BHS the central line has the unusual form of a one-word clause followed by a three-word clause. Such combinations would normally be changed to a trimeter, which is easily done by combining the 'not' with its following verb 'afflict'. However, since this line is the central peak, its unusual structure is probably intentional, with the function of prominence. (See Longacre [1983:25] for the role of 'turbulence' at peak.) The short tetrameter peak is further marked by having the long hexameters on each side. As was noted in the previous poem's peak, here again a word is repeated for emphasis, 'afflicted-you afflict-you'.

1:14 Introductory three feet and chiasm: 4 5 4

14	*And-the-LORD has-commanded about-you:*	(3)
	'Your-name will-not(=)	
	be-sown (perpetuated) any-more.	(3/4)
	From-the-house-of your-gods I-will-cut-off	
	graven-image and-molten-image.	(5)
	I-will-make your-grave,	
	for you-are-vile.'	(4)

This poem shifts to a direct speech of God's judgment on his enemy. The peak line has the Qinah Lament beat. The central peak is marked by being the longest line, and having the word 'gods' *(elohe-)*, which often comes in peak lines in Hebrew poetry (see Bliese 1994:83–4 and 1988a for statistics). There is also another word pair as in the peak of the first poem, 'graven-image' and 'molten-image'. The message is significant since destruction and deportation of objects of worship was a common way to demonstrate the powerlessness of the defeated nation's gods (Smith [1911:311–2] and Hosea 10:5–6).

1:15 [Hebrew 2:1] Chiasm: 6 5 6 and concluding two feet

15   Behold on = the-mountains the-feet-of
                 him-who-brings-good-tidings,
              who-proclaims *peace*.   [4 + 2]   (6)
           Judah, *hallow* your-*holidays*,
              fulfill your-vows.   (5)
           For it-will-not happen again
              that-the-wicked pass = through-you.   [4 + 2]   (6)
           He-is-utterly cut-off.   (2)

The addressee now shifts back to God's people. In this poem, instead
of an introduction there is a short conclusion. The poem is the central
one of five short poems, and functions as the peak of the five. This is
borne out by the chiastic arrangement of shifting the addressee in the
five poems: 'friends, enemies, **friends**, enemies, friends'. The final word
'cut-off' is the verb in the peak of the previous poem in 1:14. Here it
comes in the only bimeter line in the book, and should be considered as
an emphatic climax to the poem. In other studies I have called such short
lines secondary peaks because of their terseness (see especially Habak-
kuk 3 in Bliese [1993b]). The initial 'Behold' also sets up this poem as
a high point. Again the central peak is the line with repetition, with
'hallow' and 'holidays' having the same root. 'Holidays' and 'vows'
may be considered an idiomatic word pair. They both end with *-ayik*
giving rhyme at the end of the two cola. The word 'fulfill' is from the
same root as 'peace' in the previous line, and 'strong' in 12, giving
cohesion and emphasis. Verse 12 is the first line of this block of five
poems, so the repetition significantly ties the first line with this central
peak, a common pattern of repetition in Hebrew discourse (Bliese
1988a:57, 61; 1988b:214; 1990:296, 309, 312). The imperative verbs
also give prominence by being more personal (see Longacre on person
shift 1983:29). All of these literary features serve to give prominence to
this central poem in this block of five short poems.

2:1 [2:2] Two trimeters and final pentameter peak

1   *The-shatterer has-come-up against = you.*   (3)
               Man the-ramparts; watch = the-road;   (3)
            Gird the-loins;
               collect much strength!   (5)

The addressee is now the city (feminine) of Nineveh, and the subject is a taunt to get prepared for the invasion. The repetition of four emphatic imperatives (Taylor 1956:962) at the end serves as a buildup to the final peak line. The final word in Hebrew is 'much', which gives semantic emphasis. The buildup to the end is also facilitated by alliteration. The first two consonants in the first line are repeated in the third word. The central line has the same root in the first two words, and the first letter *ṣ* of that root is the first letter of the third word, giving alliteration. The same letter also comes once each in the first and last lines. The last line also has a geminated consonant preceded by *a* and followed by *ē* in the first word of each colon and the last word of each colon beginning with *m*, giving both assonance and alliteration.

2:2 [2:3] Anacrusis and two pentameters ending section 1

2   *Truly,*   [Anacrusis]   (1)
           The-LORD + is-restoring the = *majesty*-of Jacob,
              as-the-*majesty*-of Israel.   (6/5)
           For-plunderers have-*plundered*-them,
              and-ruined their-branches.   (5)

The last poem of part 1, although not in direct address to God's people, is a message of hope for them. The poem is the shortest in the book, with only 2 lines. Both lines have repetition, the first repeats 'majesty' and the second 'plunder'. The 2 lines also begin with the same word *kî*. The word pair 'Jacob' and 'Israel' comes in the first line. Because of these key words and the repetition, both lines are considered emphatic, functioning as the climax of the 34 lines of part 1. There are 11 words in the poem, which marks it for emphasis as half of the number of letters in the alphabet. The name the LORD comes again in the first colon of this poem as in the first cola of the first three poems in part 1. The second line has inverted parallelism with verb subject : subject verb, which is a strong feature of prominence. The initial *kî* is interpreted as a deictic 'truly', also giving emphasis. Metrically it is considered a separate introductory word (anacrusis), a common feature of Hebrew poetry at juncture.

Part 1 of Nahum in this analysis has six poems. The first four are metrically chiastic, and the last two homogeneous. The structure helps to direct one's attention to the peak of each poem. If chiastic, the central line is in focus. If homogeneous, the end is in focus. In the structure of

the whole 34 lines of part 1, it is important to note the balance of a 17-line poem matched by 17 lines of five poems. Just as the chiastic center of the 17-line poem is a high point, so the middle poem (1:15[2:1]) in the second 17 lines is the high point. It is a salvation poem set off chiastically by being bounded by a judgment poem on each side, and having a salvation poem in the first and last positions.

PART TWO: 2:3 [2:4]-2:13 [2:14] One poem totaling 23 lines (22 + 1)

2:3 [2:4]-2:13 [2:14] chiasm: 66544455564 7 46555444566

3	The-shield-of his-mighty-men is-made-red,	
	the-valiant(=)men are-made-scarlet.	(5/6)
	The-*chariots* flash=in-flame when mustered;	
	the-cypresses [spears or chargers] sway.	[4 + 2] (6)
*		
4	The-chariots dash-wildly in-the-streets,	
	they-overrun-one-another in-the-squares.	(5)
	Their-appearance is-like-torches,	
	they-dart like-lightning.	(4)
*		
5	He-summons the-officers,	
	they-stumble as-they-go.	(4)
	They-rush to-the-wall.	
**	[enjambment]	
	But-the-mantelet is-set-up.	(4)
6	The-gates-of the-rivers are-opened;	
	and-the-palace is-dissolved.	(5)
*		
7	The-queen is-led-away captive,	
	and-her-maids are-lamenting,	(5)
	As-with-the-voice-of doves,	
	beating(=)upon their-breasts.	[2 + 3] (4/5)
**		

8   And-NINEVEH is-like-a-pool-of=water;
          she-is from-(ancient) days.
          But-they are-fleeing-away.   [2+2+2]   (6)
       'Halt, halt!'
          But-*no*-one turns-back.   (4)
*

9   ***Plunder* silver! *Plunder* gold!**
          There-is-*no* end to-the-treasure!   (7)
       There-is-wealth from-every
          precious thing.   (4)
*

10   Desolation, devastation and-destruction,
          and-hearts+melt and-knees tremble.   (7/6)
       Anguish is-in-all=loins,
          and-the-faces-of all-of-them grow-pale.   [2+3] (6/5)
**

11   Where-is the-dwelling-of the-*lions*,
          and-the-feeding place+the-one-of the-young-lions, (6/5)
       Where the-*lion* walked,
          and-the-lioness was-there,   (5)
       The-cubs-of the-lion,
          and-no-one made-them-afraid?   (4)
*

12   The-lion+tore enough-for+his-*cubs*,
          and-strangled for-his-lionesses.   (6/4)
       And-filled=his-holes with-prey,
          and-his-dens with-torn-prey.   (4)
**

13   'Behold, I-am-AGAINST-you,'
          says the-LORD-of hosts.   [2+3]   (5)
       'And-I-will-burn her-*chariots* in-the-smoke,
          and-the-sword shall-devour your-young-lions.   (6)
       And-I-will-cut-off your-prey from-the-earth,
          and-the-voice-of+your-messengers
          will-not-be-heard again.'   (7/6)

Part 2 is one long metrically chiastic poem of 23 lines, or in terms of Hebrew poetic patterns 22+1. As in other Hebrew poems, the number 22 represents the 22 letters of the Hebrew alphabet, even when there is

no acrostic (Freedman 1986:408–31). This symbolic number gives spe-
cial status to this central part. The theme is the battle and plundering of
Nineveh. The central line 9A is a call to the invaders, repeating the
imperative verb 'plunder' twice. (Note the similar use of imperatives in
the peak of 1:15B, and of internal repetition in most of the previous peak
lines.) The word pair 'gold' and 'silver' without definite articles[8] also
gives prominence to this peak. The repetition (of 'no') in the peak and
in the previous colon is also a feature of prominence. The peak line also
stands out as the longest, the only heptameter, standing between short
tetrameter lines.

A chiastic balance occurs in the second line from each end of the poem
with the word 'chariots'. The ninth lines from each end have cohesion in
the use of body parts: 'breasts' 7 and 'loins' 10. These lines are also
marked by having an exceptional $2 + 3$ cola structure, adding to the chiastic
balance. The change in subject after 7 and 10 also recommends putting
stanza breaks here in connection with the unusual cola structure, a feature
which often marks juncture. This is also true for 13.

Although there is no structural marker at 5B, the change in scene
from the city streets to the palace suggests the beginning of a stanza
here as well. This is supported grammatically by the first stanza describ-
ing the battle with active voice verbs and the second stanza describing
the capture of the palace with passive voice verbs. The stanza break
comes in the middle of a line (enjambment), which helps to portray the
confusion and excitement. This line (5B) is also the middle line of the
first half of the poem. I have proposed the hypothesis that such mid lines
in long poems are secondary peaks with significant features of promi-
nence (see Bliese [1982, 1994:75–81] for several examples in Hosea).
Here the switch from frantic action to submission in defeat is significant
right in this middle line of the half. The corresponding line 11C, which
is the middle line of the second half of the poem, has prominence with
a semantic chiasm partly in this line (the first 'cubs-of the-lion'):

'lioness,' 'cubs,' 'lion' : 'lion,' 'cubs' 'lioness.'

The division by enjambment in 5B will make a chiastic pattern of
five stanzas similar to the chiastic pattern of the five small poems in
the second half of part 1. (Also note that the central part of the five
parts of Hosea has five poems, see Bliese [1982]. Such blocks of five
units are common in Hebrew discourse, probably based on the model

---

[8]Taylor (1956:964) notes, "*Silver* and *gold* have no articles; the bare picture is presented
without adornment, but with maximum vividness."

of the Pentateuch.) The first stanza here describes the confusion of the army of the king of Assyria. The pronominal affixes 'his' in 3 and 'he' in 5 are sometimes interpreted as referring to the LORD, but the Hebrew verbs 'dash wildly, overrun and stumble' seem better to describe the disarray of the defenders of Nineveh. The 'red' (2:3[4]) is then from their own blood (see 3:1), and the 'flames' and 'torches' are real fire burning the chariots.

The corresponding final stanza also uses active verbs to describe the LORD 'burning the chariots', the 'sword devouring', and 'the LORD cutting off the voice of your (masculine) messengers'. The final emphatic masculine 'your' corresponds to the masculine pronominal affixes of the king found in the first stanza. This masculine is unusual since the other pronouns in the stanza are feminine. An explanation of the change is that these are grammatical switches in the last two cola of the stanza. The next to the last line has third person 'her', which switches to 'your' (feminine) for the same referent of the city of Nineveh. The last line has 'your' (feminine) in the first colon (as does the first line 13Aa [14]), and then switches to the final masculine 'your'. Such grammatical switches are often found in Hebrew poetry giving special emphasis (see Bliese [1982, 1994:83, 89] for examples in Hosea).

The second stanza describes with passive verbs the defeat of the palace with its queen and maids being led away into captivity. The penultimate stanza describes the 'dwelling of the lion' with his 'lioness' and 'cubs', and how the lair is gone. Craigie (1985:70) notes that the "metaphor mocks the symbolic lion with which Ishtar, goddess of Nineveh, was traditionally associated." The description parallels the passive voice description of the dissolved palace, especially when one considers the initial intransitive question about the lair 'Where is it?' and the rest a description of the rapacious situation which is now gone.

The central stanza begins with the word NINEVEH, which occurs now for the first time after the introduction in 1:1, and marks this as the high point of the book. The ancient pool of water has turned into a source of 'plunder' (9[10]), resulting in 'desolation, devastation, and destruction' as described in the alliteration of 10[11]. The taunt to 'gird the loins' in the peak of 2:1 is now turned to the description of 'anguish in all loins'. The phrase 'no end' will be repeated in 3:3 and 9, thereby indicating its prominence in this peak line of 2:9[10].

PART THREE: 3:1–19 Four poems totaling 45 lines (44 + 1)

3:1–7 Sixteen-line chiasm: 4556445 55 5446554

1   *Woe to-the-bloody + city!*
     All-of-her is-falsehood;   (5/4)
     Full-of booty,
     no end-to plunder!   [2 + 3]   (5)
**

2   The-noise-of whip,
     and-the-noise-of the-rattling-of wheels!   [2 + 3]   (5)
     Galloping horses
     and-bounding chariots,
3   *horsemen charging!*   [2 + 2 + 2]   (6)
     And-flashing sword,
     and-glittering spear!   (4)
*

     And-multitudes-of slain,
     and-heaps-of corpses!   (4)
     No end to-carcasses,
     they-stumble on-their-carcasses!   (5)
**

4   **Because-of-the-multitude-of**
     the-*harlotries*-of + the-well + favoured *harlot*
     the-mistress-of *charms*.   (7/5)
     Who-sells nations with-her-*harlotries*,
     and-peoples with her *charms*.   (5)
**

5   Behold, I-am-AGAINST-you,
     says the LORD of-hosts.   [2 + 3]   (5)
*

     'And-I-will-lift-up your-skirts
     over your face.   (4)
     And-I-will-show + nations your-nakedness,
     and-kingdoms your-shame.   (5/4)
6   *And-I will-throw filth on-you,*
     and-despise-you,
     and-make-you as-a gazingstock.   [3 + 1 + 2]   (6)
**

7   And-it-will-be-that all = who-look-on-you

    will-shrink from-you and-say,   [2 + 3] (5)

  "NINEVEH is-laid-waste;

    who will-bemoan her?"   [2 + 3] (5)

From-where will-I-seek

  comforters for-you?'   (4)

The first poem in part 3 describes the city after the fall. The rhythmical patterning of the cola is interestingly balanced, with the second and third lines from each end having unusual 2 + 3 accents per line, and the hexameters at the quarter points dividing into three clauses instead of the normal two. The exceptional 2 + 2 + 2 and 3 + 1 + 2 colometry in these quarter lines of this long 16-line poem can be seen as a feature of prominence predictable by discourse expectations. Long chiastic poems such as this and the previous poem regularly have prominence in the quarter lines. The other exceptional colon structure is a 2 + 3 line beginning the stanza after the central peak. It seems feasible to make stanzas before the first of each of the 2 + 3 pairs of cola, and before the central peak. This gives a five-stanza poem similar to the previous poem.

The thematic relation between the first line and last three lines is in the initial word 'Woe' and the words 'bemoan' and 'comfort' at the end. The 'heaps of corpses' and 'stumbling on carcasses' in the second stanza may also relate thematically to 'throwing filth on you' and 'making you a gazingstock' in the second stanza from the end, giving thematic chiastic cohesion to the poem.

The peak is 4[5], and significantly gives the reason for the punishment of Nineveh—because of her 'harlotries' and 'charms' by which she sells nations. Again prominence comes from key word repetition. 'Harlotries' comes three times here, and 'charms' twice, once at the end of each line. The references tie Nineveh to her patron Ishtar, the goddess of war and sex with ritual prostitution (Watts 1975:116; Eaton 1961:73). Two of the three Hebrew letters for 'charm' are the same as in the Hebrew word for 'falsehood' at the end of the first line of the poem, tying the first and peak lines together by both sound and meaning. The word 'mistress' ties in with 'master' for God in the first line of the first poem (1:2). These are the only occurrences of this word, and their emphatic position is enhanced by coming in the second half of the parallelism in their respective lines.

The peak has a double line in the center which has been noted as a pointer to secondary emphasis in the first and last lines of chiastic poems (Bliese 1988a:65, 1990:276, 1994:69, 71, 81). 'Woe' at the beginning, and the rhetorical question at the end give prominence to these lines.

The close relationship between this poem and the previous one is obvious from the many similarities. The initial references to 'red' and 'scarlet' in the previous poem correspond to 'bloody' in the first line here. Rushing 'chariots' are the theme of the first part of both poems. Both continue with intense activity ending in defeat. The quick movement of both is developed in a series of short tetrameter lines. The central idea of 'plunder' in the previous poem is repeated in the word 'booty' in 3:1. Besides the reference to NINEVEH in the introduction, these are the only poems with NINEVEH explicit. The phrase 'Behold, I am AGAINST you, says the LORD of hosts' begins a stanza in each poem, and the key word AGAINST also comes only once more in part 1. Each poem continues with a direct speech sentence of judgment by the LORD. Such thematic repetition gives emphasis to clarify the overall theme of the prophecy.

3:8–13 Fourteen-line chiasm: 754444 33 444457

8	*h*	*Are-you-better than + Thebes, that-sat by-the-Nile,*	
		with-water around her,	(8/7)
	,	Whose(=)rampart was-the-sea,	
		and-from-the-sea her-wall?	(4/5)
*			
9	*k*	Ethiopia was-[her]-strength,	
		Egypt-too; it-is-without + limit.	(5/4)
	p	Put and-Libya	
		were your [Septuagint *her*]-helpers.	(4)
*			
10	*gm*	*Also* = she was-carried-away,	
		she-went into-captivity.	(4)
	gm	*Also* + her-young-children were-dashed-in-pieces	
		at-the-head-of *all*-the-streets.	(5/4)
*			
	w	**And-for = her-honorable-men they-cast-lots.**	**(3)**
	w	**And-*all* = her-great-men were-bound in-chains.**	**(3)**
**			

11 *gm* = *'t Also* = you will-be-drunken,
            you-will be-dazed.   (4)
    gm = *'t Also* = you will-seek
            refuge from-an-enemy.   (4)
    *

12 *k*   *All*(=)your-strongholds
            are-fig-trees with = first-ripe-figs.   (3/4)
       ,   If = they-are-shaken they-fall
            into = the-mouth-of the-eater.   (4)
    *

13 *h*   Behold, your-troops are-women
            in-your-midst for-your-enemies.   (5)
    p   *Wide open are-the-gates-of your-land,*
            fire will-devour your-bars.   (7)

The unique structure of this poem is the initial words in the 6 central lines. The first words in the central peak lines are three-letter words beginning with *w* and ending with *l*. On each side of this central peak are 2 lines beginning with *gm* 'also'. The 2 lines after the peak also continue with the identical sequence *'t t*. This is a strong marker for the chiastic structure. Although the sequence is not the same, the 4 line-initial letters at the two ends are also identical, *h'kp . . . k'hp*. All lines in the poem pair semantically into couplet strophes, giving further balance.

The poem divides into two stanzas with the first stanza vv. 8–10 being a description of defeated nations which will be types for Nineveh. The second stanza shifts to *you* with emphatic pronouns in the repeated 'Also-you' lines of 11. The Septuagint 'her' is probably correct in 9. The initial 'Are you better' in 8 makes an inclusio with the second person 'you' in 11–13.

The peak lines are unique in being trimeters (see BHS), the shortest lines in the poem. There is a progression toward the ends with . . . 33444457, which also helps to set off the central 33. 'Wide' and 'open' in Hebrew repeat the same root. The 'her' endings of the first accent unit, and the *-û* third person plural endings of the second unit in each line of the peak give assonance. The roots of 'honor' and 'great' serve as a word pair. The root for 'honor' *(kbd)* is a key word coming twice in the peak of the next poem, and earlier as 'heaps' in 3:3. The word 'all', which is the first word of the second line of the peak, comes once on each side, in 3:10 and 12. Coggins (1985:53) notes that these lines have a "striking link" with Ps. 149:8,

suggesting "that this language was regularly used in oracles against foreign nations or perhaps, more specifically, that it may have been part of some liturgy associated with holy war."

Although structurally the peak is the last couplet before the stanza break, it is obvious that the couplet in 11 beginning the 'Also you' stanza likewise is emphatic in theme, and is reinforced with word repetition and assonance. 'Enemies' occurs after 11, again in 13, and was a key word in the first poem at 1:2 and 8.

Theoretically, the double line in the center can be seen as a pointer to the first and last lines for secondary emphasis. The opening verse 8 is significant as a rhetorical question. 'Water' in 8 has prominence by being repeated in 3:14. The closing verse 13B has significant repetition of 'open gates' from 2:6[7], and 'fire eats' with 3:15.

3:14–17 Ten-line chiasm: 5453 44 3545

14	m	*Draw siege water = for-yourself;*		
		strengthen *your-strongholds.*		(5)
		Go-into the-clay,		
		and-tread the-mortar.		(4)
*				
	h	**Strengthen** the-brickkiln;		
15	{š}	there the-fire will-devour-you.	[2+3]	(5)
		The-sword will-cut-you-off,		
		it-will-eat-you-up + as-locusts.	[2+1]	(4/3)
*				
	h	*Multiply-yourself as-locusts;*		
		multiply-yourself as-grasshoppers.		(4)
16	h	**You-increased your-merchants**		
		more-than-the-stars-of the-heavens.		(4)
*				
		The-*locust* spoils		
		and-flies-away.	[2+1]	(3)
17	m	**Your-princes are-*as-grasshoppers*,**		
		and-your-officials as-clouds-of locusts,	[2+3]	(5)
*				
	h	Settling on-the-fences		
		on-a-day-of cold.		(4)
	{š}	*When-the-sun rises they-flee-away,*		
		and-it-is-not = known where + its-place-is.		(6/5)

This poem resembles the previous one in that the 2 center peak lines begin with the same letter, and 2 of the 4 lines on each side also have the same initial letters. The *š* of the colon-initial 'there' in 15 may also intentionally correspond to the *š* of 'sun' beginning the last line. Following the above lineation rather than BHS and MT, this poem can be analyzed into strophes of couplets as in the previous poem. The last two couplets pair semantically, although not grammatically, since the sentence continues across the juncture.

As in all the chiastic poems, the rhythm of the lines points to the center. Chiastic balance also comes in the exceptional $2+3$ cola in the third lines from each end, and the unusual $2+1$ cola in the fourth lines from each end. The central peak has emphasis by repetition of the word 'multiply' based on the root *kbd,* which is also in the peak of the previous poem. 'Multiply' is significantly imperative (see the double imperatives in the peaks at 1:15B, 2:1, and 2:9). The line also has a gender switch from feminine to masculine. Three geminate *b*s also give prominence by alliteration in this first peak line. The repetition continues with the similes 'as the locust' and 'as the grasshopper', which are both repeated outside the peak. 'Locust' and 'grasshopper' serve as a word pair in the first line of the peak, as do 'increase' and 'more than the stars of the heavens' in its second line. The word 'merchants' here relates to the word 'sell' with the same semantic field in the peak at 3:4. Prominence is further given by the use of the short trimeter line and the repetition of 'locusts' in the corresponding short lines of 15c and 16Ba, as well as in the peak at line 15d.

Following theoretically from the double line in the center, the last line is a secondary peak. There is inverted parallelism with subject verb : verb subject. It has a play on words giving emphasis. The word 'flee' is *nôdd* and the word 'known' is *nôd'*. The final word is 'where', which ties this poem to the central poem, in which the last stanza begins with 'where' in describing the lion's lair which is gone (2:11[12]). 'Where' comes once also as the first word in the last line of the first poem in part 3 at 3:7, another secondary peak. The repetition of the word 'water', which begins this poem and also comes in the first line of the previous poem, gives prominence to the initial lines of both of these poems with double lines in the center of the chiasmi.

3:18–19 Final five pentameters

18   *n*   *Your*-shepherds are-asleep, O-king-of + Assyria,
            *you*r-nobles slumber.   (6/5)

     n   *Your*-people are-scattered *over* = the-mountains,
            with-*no*-one to-gather-them   (5)

*

19   *'*   There-is-*no*(=){k}healing {l}for-*your*-hurt;
     {n}   *your*-wound {m}is-grievous.   (4/5)

*

     k   All who-hear the-news-of-*you*
            clap + their-hands *over-you*.   (6/5)

     k   For *over* = whom has-not = passed
            your-evil {t}unceasingly?   (5)

The patterning of initial letters found in the cryptic initial acrostic poem and in the previous two poems is also evident here, with two *n*s for NINEVEH before ' and two *k*s for 'king' after it. The identical letters significantly come in terraced pairs of consecutive lines in this homogeneous poem, in contrast to the chiastic structure of the identical pairs coming in each half of the previous two metrically chiastic poems. The central line has the key letter ' representing 'Assyria' at the beginning of the line, *n* for NINEVEH at the beginning of the second colon, and *mlk* for 'king', counting the initial letters of the other words in the line reading backwards. The cryptic message is to 'the King of NINEVEH of Assyria'. As was noted above, this is the only poem with an explicit 'King of Assyria'. The final word of the poem concludes the patterning of the whole book by beginning with *t*, the last letter of the Hebrew alphabet.

This last poem is the climactic end of a cline in number of strophes per unit, with 13 in part 1, 11 in part 2, and 9, 7, 5 and now finally 3 strophes in the poems of part 3. This final poem has a homogeneous structure of 5 pentameters. They correspond to the only other homogeneous lines, the 5 at the end of part 1, the last 2 of which are also pentameters and also begin with *k*. The cryptic patterning in the central line and the strophic pattern leaving it as a single line between two couplet strophes suggest calling it the peak. However, thematically it is probably best to call the last line the climax, as is normal for homogeneous poems. The rhetorical question makes this an espe-

cially strong conclusion.[9] A buildup begins in the first, third and
fourth lines with -kā 'you' (masculine) ending the first and last cola
in each line. -kā then comes emphatically on the next to the last word
of the poem 'your evil'. The word 'over' also occurs in the final line
as well as twice earlier in the second and next to last lines. The
repetitions of -kā and 'over' serve as buildups ending on the final
climax. The repetition of 'no' in 18 and 19, and of 'hear' and 'news'
which have the same root in 19Ba, along with 'your' and 'over'
which end on the final climax, recommend calling all of these repeti-
tions a loose terrace pattern building up to the last line. This is often
the case in homogeneous Hebrew poems (Bliese 1988a:55; 1990:269,
273–4; 1993b on Habakkuk 3:17–9; 1993a:219–220 on Obadiah 12–
14; and 1994:72–4, 88 on Hosea). The final line of the book empha-
sizes Nineveh's universal and unceasing evil, which has brought
God's judgment on the city.

Repetition of Key Words between the Major Parts

A computer count of the words in Nahum showed some patterns
which seem to be intentional, and therefore carry meaning. The most
obvious word pattern is the eleven occurrences of the LORD in part 1,
and one each in an identical phrase in the other two parts (2:13[14]; 3:5),
as noted above. It was also noted that the thematic word NINEVEH occurs
only once in each part. Connected with this are the occurrences of
AGAINST with the unique preposition 'el which occurs in these two
phrases, and then once more in the first part with AGAINST the LORD at
1:9, once in each of the three parts. This is significant since the more
common preposition 'al AGAINST is used in the other occurrences at 1:11
and 2:1[2].

Although there are several candidates for intentional patterning of
less obvious key words between parts, the correspondences between the
first poem and the final peak of the last poem should not be passed over.
The word 'evil' in 1:11 is only found again as the climactic next to the
last word of the book. The word 'pass over' in 1:8 and 12 is the third
word from the end. The word 'not' which comes in the third lines from
each end of the first poem is the fourth word from the end. The word

---

[9]The book of Jonah (also about Nineveh) is the only other book in the Bible ending with a
question (Coggins 1985:12 noting Glasson).

'who' which is repeated twice in the first peak at 1:6 is the fifth word from the end, and the word *kî* in 1:10 comes as 'for' in the first word of the final peak. Of all the words in the final line, only the previously mentioned *t*-initial last word 'unceasingly' is not in the first poem. This may have been intentional in order to mark it as a unique closing *t*, relating to the incomplete acrostic in the first poem. The rhetorical question in the center peak of the first poem 'Before his indignation who can stand . . . who can endure?' is given an emphatic answer when the leaders of Nineveh are described as 'sleeping' (dead) and the people 'scattered'. God has intervened and once-powerful Nineveh is destroyed.

Conclusion

The exegete or translator who is faced with a Hebrew poetic text has more to deal with than the message found in the words or sentences. The structure of the whole text as it fits together gives emphasis to particular parts. Individual poems also have their means of showing emphasis, such as chiastic poems pointing to a central peak, and the use of repetition, word pairs, and sound patterns in giving prominence to one line over the others. Nahum also shows how poets use cryptic devices, such as patterns of initial letters in Hebrew, to carry messages not conveyed by words.

Clues for hidden meaning are common in poetry in general, so structural messages should not be considered untranslatable. The normal method is for translations to ignore such cryptic messages, or to relegate them to footnotes or study Bibles. However, a serious effort to find a poetic device which will have the same function in the translation as in the original should be made. The structure of Hebrew poetry has much to offer, revealing emphasis and cohesion, and therefore meaning. It certainly deserves a place in translation.

APPENDIX

Structural and Metrical Parameters
in Hebrew Poetry

Hypothesis I: Metrical chiasmus in OT poetry is an alternative to homo-
geneous line length in many texts (meter is based on the number of
word accents in the cola of each line of poetry).
  Corollary 1: Peak can be predicted from the type of metrical structure.
    A. Metrical chiasmus points to the peak in the center (Nah. 1:6A,
       12B; 2:9a; 3:4, 10C, 15B).
    B. Homogeneous lines point to the peak at the end (Nah. 2:1–2;
       3:18–19).
  Corollary 2: Patterns of word repetition coincide with metrical structure.
    A. Metrically chiastic poems prefer chiastic repetition (usually
       proceeding from both ends to the center [Nah. 2:3, 13 'chariots'
       in the second line from each end, 3:15–16 'locusts' in the peak
       and line on each side of the peak], initial letters in parallel lines
       of 3:8–13 and 14–17. Sometimes the symmetry occurs between
       the first line and the center [Nah. 1:3, 6 'anger', and the sound
       and semantics of 3:1 'falsehood' and 3:4 'charms'], or center
       and last line [Nah. 1:6, 9 'stand']).
    B. Metrically homogeneous poems prefer terrace patterns of serial
       repetition—often with a bunching of repeated words in the final
       peak (Nah. 3:18–19 'your' and 'over', and initial letters in
       pairs, *n* twice in 18 and *k* twice in 19).

Hypothesis II: Secondary prominence can also be predicted from struc-
ture.
    A. Bimeter and trimeter lines all have prominence by breaking the
       normal pattern of bicola, and having concentrated terseness.
       They often come at juncture, especially at the first and last lines
       (Nah. 1:12a introduction, 15D conclusion; 2:1A, B first lines;
       3:10C central peak, 3:15b, 16B enclosing a central peak).
    B. Chiastic poems with a double line as the central peak will have
       secondary prominence in the first and last lines of the poem
       (Nah. 3:1–19, 8–13 and 14–17).
    C. Long chiastic poems of 16 or more lines will have secondary
       prominence in the quarter lines halfway between the central
       peak and the two ends (Nah. 1:2–2:2; 2:3–13; 3:1–7).

D. Individual lines outside the above may also be marked for
   prominence by exceptional features such as unusual colometry
   (Nah. 1:11, 12C, 13, 15A, C; 2:13A; 3:6, 7B, 15B, 16B, 18A),
   inverted parallelism (Nah. 1:3B-4A, 8b-9A), word play (Nah.
   2:10[11]), divine names, or as in Nahum with exceptions in an
   acrostic.

Hypothesis III: Numerical configurations influence Hebrew poetic struc-
   tures at all levels.
   A. Macrostructures are influenced by a preference for the follow-
      ing:
      1. Five units in large books (following the Pentateuch—note
         Psalms and the prophets Hosea and Joel). Song of Songs has
         seven units. In smaller books such as Nahum and Habakkuk
         three units are found (the short Obadiah has two units). Key
         words are repeated once and only once in each unit of several
         books so far analyzed (Nahum 'against' and 'Nineveh',
         Hosea 'good' and 'covenant', Joel 'day of the LORD', Habak-
         kuk 'holy', and Obadiah 'Jerusalem'. Song of Songs has the
         noun 'love' three times in parts 1 and 7, and once in each of
         the middle five parts).
      2. The number of poems in a book is related to the number 22
         (the number of letters in the Hebrew alphabet) or a multiple
         of 11 or 11+1 (Nahum 11 poems, Hosea 45, Joel 23).
      3. The number of poetic lines in each unit is related to the number
         22 or a multiple of 11 or 11+1 (Nahum 34+23+45, Hosea
         88+88+50+88+88 with each 88 made up of 44+44 giving
         nine blocks in Hosea, Joel 44+22+33+44+22, Obadiah
         23+23, Song of Songs 34+33+22+55+33+22+22, Habak-
         kuk 30+30+34).
      4. Numerical balance between parts, which are intentionally re-
         lated to the numbers 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 22 and multiples of 10, 11
         or 11+1, and the divine name equivalent of 26.
         a. Number of poems, stanzas, strophes, or lines in each unit
            (Nah. 1:12–2:2 five poems, 2:3–13 five stanzas and 11
            strophes, [which is the central poem in a cline starting
            with 13 strophes in part 1 and continuing in the rest of the
            poems in part 3 with 9, 7, 5, 3 strophes each], 3:1–7 five
            stanzas, 3:14–17 five stanzas. Also note that 1:2–11 and
            1:12–2:2 each has 17 lines totaling, 34 for part 1 with six

poems; Habakkuk $7+7+7$ poems; Hosea with 22 in various places, as number of lines in poems and number of letters in strategic lines such as the center of the book in 8:2 and the first peak of the autobiographical introduction in 1:2D).

b. Number of words in a poem (Nah. 2:2[3] as a climax has 11 words; Hosea has the first four biographical poems $11+22+26+11$, central fifth block $44+100+26+50+44$ (note the products of 5), the sixth block has $12+96+96$, which are products of 6, and the seventh block begins with $84+84$ as products of 7).

c. Number of occurrences of key words in a book or unit (Nahum LORD 11 times in part 1, Hosea 'return' and 'God' 22 times, 'Israel' 44 times).

Theoretical basis: The samples above show that except for 5, 10 and 26, which are all connected to the name YHWH, the above numerical patterns are related to proportional fractions with a dividend of 1, producing infinitely recurring remainders. For example 1/22 equals the infinitely recurring number .0454545 . . . , perhaps explaining why 22 is often associated with 45, as in the number of poems in Hosea and number of lines in part 3 of Nahum. Similarly, 1/44 produces the proportional fraction .0227272 . . . showing a relation between 44 and 22 plus a recurring remainder close to 23. The fact that 22 and all the multiples of 11 divided by 1 will produce a proportional fraction (which has a recurring remainder) may explain why the multiples of 11 are often replaced by plus 1. Note especially the number of lines per unit in Nahum $(34+23+45)$ and Obadiah $(23+23)$, and the 23 poems in Joel. For another example, the $30+30+34$ lines of Habakkuk may be related to 1/33 producing .0303030 . . . Of particular interest is the special status of completion and fullness in Biblical literature given to the other numbers less than 11 producing proportional fractions when divided into 1: $1/3 = .33333 . . . 1/6 = .16666 . . . 1/7 = .142857142857 . . .$ (especially suggesting fulfillment because of the progression 7, 14, 28 and $56+1$), and $1/9 = .11111 . . .$ This last fraction may be the basis of Hosea's nine blocks of text in the

midst of his preoccupation with 11 and its multiples 22, 33, 44, 55, and 88. (Were the prophets mathematicians?)

B. Line and strophic structures are based on a binary division with normal exceptions being only plus or minus 1, and parallelism occurs in both line and strophic structures.

   1. The bicola is the basic structure of a poetic line, with mono-colon and tricola exceptional. Bicola divide with an equal number of word-accent units in each half. If the number of units is not divisible by 2, the extra unit will normally be in the first half. Exceptions often indicate juncture and/or chias-tic balance by exceptional colometry in parallel lines of each half of a poem. Another type of exception often comes in the double line of a central peak giving a pattern of metrical inversion such as $2+3:3+2$ (Nah. 1:15B–16A; Hos. 2:18–20 [20–22] with second lines $2+2+2$ and central peak $3+2:2+3$, and 7:3–7 with $3+4$ lines bordering a central peak of $2+2+2:2+2+2$).

   2. The couplet is the basic structure of the strophe (Nah. 3:8–17), with single line strophes and triplet strophes exceptional and often adding prominence to peak lines (Hos. 8:1–4A, 4B-8 and 13:2–3 with couplets bordering central single line peaks, with 5 strophes in each poem).

Hypothesis IV: Features of prominence can be identified by their greater occurrence in peak lines as compared to nonpeak lines:

Statistical probability was calculated for many features in my Hosea study (Bliese 1994:83–4), and other books suggest similar variations between peak and nonpeak lines, with individual authors having idiomatic use of some features. The following examples come from Nahum, with secondary peaks in parentheses.

A. Divine names (1:9A, 12, 14a), 14C; 2:2[3] Hosea has 46.6% of peak lines with divine names, as compared to 17.2% of secondary peaks and 11.9% of nonpeak lines. Joel has comparable figures, see (Bliese 1988a:76–77).

B. Inverted parallelism, chiastically arranged grammatical units: 1:6 prepositional phrase 'who' verb : 'who' verb prepositional phrase; 2:2[3] verb subject : subject verb; (3:17C subject verb : verb subject). (See Bliese 1994:86–8 on Hosea.)

C. Repetition
  1. Within peak lines 1:6, (1.8B-9A, a three-word inclusio), 1:12C; 1:15[2.1]; 2:2[3], 2:2[3], 9[10]; 3:4, 4, 4, 4, 4, (13B), 15B. Repetition within the same line has been calculated for Nahum giving the significant ratio of 53% in peak lines and only 23% in nonpeak, which is statistically significant with a chi-square of 5.92, giving a p smaller than .01. Sometimes the repetition is enhanced as word play, see below.
  2. Between the peak and other lines of the same poem (1:9A), 1:15[2:1]; 2:(11[12]C); (14A, 15B), 15B, 15B, (16B), 19C.
  3. Between the peak and other poems; (2:9[10]; 3:3, 9 'no end'). Other studies have shown patterns such as peak to peak, or end to peak.
D. Length of peak line
  Shortest (1:12C, 14a, 15[2:1]C); 3:10C, 10C, (15B & 16B parallel bordering peak)
  Longest (3:2 & 6 parallel, 8 & 13 inclusio of longest with shortest lines in central peak)
  Longest bounded by the shortest 2:9[10]A
  One of shortest 1:(4A, 8B, 12C), 15[2:1]B; (2:5[6]B, 11[12]C; 3:1, 7C)
  One of longest 1:6; (3:14A)
  All peak lines are covered in the above lists except 1:12 and 15[2:1], which have peripheral monocola smaller than otherwise smallest peak lines.
E. Imperatives 1:15[2:1], 1:15[2:1]B, 2:1[2], 2:1[2], 9A, 9A; 3:(14A, 14A), 15B, 15B All imperatives are in peak or secondary peak lines or lines adjacent to such lines, 2:1B, 8B; 3:14B-C.
F. Questions 1:6, 6, (9A); 2:(11[12]C whole strophe); 3:(7C, 8 whole strophe), 19C. All questions are in peak and secondary peak lines except 3:7B which has the key word 'Nineveh', and introduces the secondary peak question in 3:7C. This is similar to the use of emphatic questions in Joel (see Bliese 1988a:79–80).
G. Metaphors and similes (1:3B); 2:2[3]; 3:4, 4, 15B, 15B
H. Grammatical switches
  To a more personal second person than previous context: 1:(9a, 12C), 15[2:1] with vocative; (3:7C)

Gender (1:3B, 4A, 8B); 2:(5[6]B), 9[10]A; 3:(1A, 2B), 4B, 15B, (16c, 17C)

Number (1:4A, 9A); 2:1[2]C, (5[6]B); 3:(1A), 4A, (6A), 10C-D, (13B-C)

Aspect 1:(9A), 12C; (2:5[6])

I. Dropping synonymous parallelism (1:9A; 2:11[12]C); 3:(1), 4A, (8A initial line)

J. Regular colometry, only irregular are listed (3:2B, 6, 15B, 16B)

K. Word play 2:2 'plunderers plundered'; 3:(17C 'flee . . . known'), 19C 'passed evil'

L. Rhyme 1:15[2.1], 4B; 3:10 C-D, (14A, 15b)
    Assonance 1:6A; 2:1[2]C; 3:(2Bb), 19C
    Alliteration 1:12C, 15[2.1]; 2:3[4]; 3:4Aa, (6), 10C-D, 13B, 15B, 19C

M. Deitic 2:2[3]

N. Enjambment (1:8 strophe opener before secondary peak; 2:5[6]B)

O. Interjection (3:1 'Woe')

P. Syntactic complexity 2:2[3] 'for', 11[12] verb gapping; 3:2B no matrix verb, 4 'because/from', 4 three appositives, (17C 'where'), 19C 'for'.

Q. Word pairs (1:3B 'whirlwind-storm', 1:4A 'sea-rivers'), 1:6A 'indignation-wrath', 'stand-endure'; 1:14B 'graven image-molten image'; 2:1[2]C 'loins-strength', 2:2[3] 'Jacob-Israel' 2:9[10] 'silver-gold'; (3:2B 'horse-chariots-horsemen'), 3:4 'harlotries-charms', 3:10C-D 'honored-great', (3:13B-C 'gates-bars'), 3:15B 'locusts-grasshoppers'.

Biography

Loren Bliese has a B.A. in literature from Texas Lutheran College, an M.Div. and D.D. from Wartburg Theological Seminary, and an M.A. and Ph.D. in linguistics from the University of Texas at Austin. Since 1960 he has been serving under the Ethiopian Evangelical Church Mekane Yesus, being sent by the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. Since 1979 he has also served as translation consultant in Ethiopia with the United Bible Societies and since 1986 as a professor at Mekane Yesus Seminary.

REFERENCES

Alter, Robert. 1985. The art of biblical poetry. New York: Basic.

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia: Liber 12 Prophetarum. 1970. Edited by K. Elliger and W. Rudolph. Stuttgart: Wuerttemberg Bible Society.

Bliese, Loren F. 1982. Metrical chiasmus, peak and structural symmetry in Hosea. Paper first presented to the 1982 United Bible Societies Afrescot workshop, Kenya. Revised 1992. Parts of this are published in Discourse perspectives on Hebrew poetry, below, 1994.

————1983–7. Workshop papers on Isaiah 20, and Psalms 23, 25, 33, 34 and 145, and a manuscript on Psalm 137.

————1988a. Metrical sequences and climax in the poetry of Joel. Occasional Papers in Translation and Textlinguistics 2:(4):52–84.

————1988b. Chiastic structures, peaks and cohesion in Nehemiah 9: 6–37. The Bible translator 39(2):208–215.

————1990. Structurally marked peak in Psalms 1–24. Occasional Papers in Translation and Textlinguistics 4(4):266–321. First given 1988 Summer Institute of Linguistics Old Testament seminar, Nairobi.

————1992. Structural prominence in second Isaiah 40, 45, and servant poems. Paper presented to UBS Afrescot workshop in Nairobi.

————1993a. Chiastic and homogeneous metrical structures enhanced by word patterns in Obadiah. Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics 6(3):210–227.

————1993b. The poetics of Habakkuk. Paper presented to UBS Afrescot workshop, Nairobi.

————1994. Symmetry and prominence in Hebrew poetry: with examples from Hosea. Discourse perspectives on Hebrew poetry in the scriptures. Edited by Ernst Wendland. New York: United Bible Societies.

Ceresko, A. R. 1985. The ABCs of wisdom in Psalm 34. Vetus Testamentum 35:99–104.

Clark, David J., and Howard A. Hatton. 1989. A translator's handbook on the books of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah. New York: United Bible Societies.

Coggins, Richard. 1982. An alternative prophetic tradition? Israel's prophetic tradition: essays in honor of Peter R. Ackroyd. Edited by Richard Coggins, A. Phillips, M. Knibb. New York: Cambridge.

————1985. In wrath remember mercy: a commentary on the book of Nahum: Israel among the nations. International theological commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Craigie, Peter C. 1985. The daily study Bible: twelve prophets. Vol. 2. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Eaton, J. H. 1961. Obadiah, Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah: introduction and commentary. London: Student Christian Movement.

Freedman, David N. 1986. Acrostic poems in the Hebrew Bible: alphabetic and otherwise. Catholic Biblical Quarterly 48:408–431.

Halle, Morris and John McCarthy. 1981. The metrical structure of Psalm 137. Journal of Biblical Literature 100(2):161–167.

Korpel, Marjo and Johannes de Moor. 1986. Fundamentals of Ugaritic and Hebrew poetry. Ugarit-Forschungen 18:173–212. Also in Willem van der Meer and Johannes C. de Moor, below.

Kugel, James. 1981. The idea of biblical poetry: parallelism and its history. New York: Yale.

Lindars, Barnabas. 1989. The structure of Psalm 145. Vetus Testamentum 29(1):23–30.

Longacre, Robert. 1983. The grammar of discourse. New York: Plenum.

Maier, Walter A. 1959. Nahum. St. Louis: Concordia.

Margalit, B. 1975. Introduction to Ugaritic prosody. Ugarit-Forschungen 7:287–313 Edited by K. Bergerhof, M. Dietrich and O. Loretz. Neukirchen: Butzon & Bercker.

van der Meer, Willem and Johannes C. de Moor, eds. 1988. The structural analysis of biblical and Canaanite poetry. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, supplement 74.

de Moor, Johannes C. 1978. The art of versification in Ugarit and Israel 1: the rhythmical structure. Studies in Bible and the ancient Near East. Edited by Y. Avishur and J. Blau. Jerusalem.

Pearl, Chaim. 1991–92. The theology of Psalm 145 - Part II. The Jewish Biblical Quarterly 20:73–78.

Schoekel, L. Alonso. 1988. A manual of Hebrew poetics, Subsidia Biblica 11. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico.

Schulz, Hermann. 1973. Das Buch Nahum: eine redaktionskritische untersuchung. New York: de Gruyter.

Smith, John M. P. 1911. A critical and exegetical commentary on Nahum. International critical commentary. New York: Scribner's.

Sweeney, Marvin A. 1992. Concerning the structure and generic character of the book of Nahum. Zietschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wiessenschaft 104:364–377.

Taylor, Charles L. 1956. The book of Nahum. The interpreter's Bible. Vol. 6. New York: Abingdon.

Watson, Wilfred G.E. 1981. Reversed rootplay in Psalm 145. Biblica 62:101–2.

——1984. Classical Hebrew poetry. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 26.

Watts, John D. W. 1975. The books of Joel, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, Habakkuk and Zephaniah. London: Cambridge.

Van der Woude, A.S. 1977. The book of Nahum: a letter written in exile. Instruction and interpretation: studies in Hebrew language, Palestinian archeology and biblical exegesis. Oudtestamentische Studien 20. Leiden: Brill.

TENSE, ASPECT, AND MODALITY IN SOME THEORIES OF THE BIBLICAL HEBREW VERBAL SYSTEM

Bo-Krister Ljungberg

ABSTRACT

The approach in this paper emanates from the idea that the notions of tense, aspect, and mood (TAM) are general and have to be considered when attempting to assign meaning values to the biblical Hebrew verbal system (BHVS), as well as when trying to transfer that meaning to a receptor language. Three theories are presented because they represent clear-cut and outspoken conceptions of the BHVS as basically temporal (Blake 1951), aspectual (Turner 1876), and modal (Zuber 1986). One important conclusion is that there is a clear structural affinity between the theories even when chosen from as different starting points notionally as possible.

It is pointed out that most presentations of TAM are done from a sentence-or-lower perspective, and that TAM should probably be assigned to different hierarchical levels of realization in language. In most presentations of TAM mood is left out (e.g., Binnick 1991). It is suggested that mood ought to be more actively considered when describing aspect, which mostly is discussed with reference to the lexicon or with regard to temporal considerations only. The theory of Turner (1876) is probably better understood as modal rather than aspectual, and may as such be related to point-of-view or speaker/reader perspective.

Introduction: On the Impenetrability of TAM

You do remember the discussion between Alice and Humpty Dumpty in Lewis Carroll's *Through the Looking-Glass* (1984). In making reference to it, I claim no originality, quite the contrary: one finds it quoted over and over again in textbooks on linguistics. After Humpty Dumpty has given his famous verdict on the meaning of words: "The question is, ... which is to be master—that's all", from my point of view, the really interesting part then begins (and this part is not often quoted).

Listen: "Alice was too much puzzled to say anything; so after a minute Humpty Dumpty began again. 'They've a temper, some of them—particularly verbs: they're the proudest—adjectives you can do anything with, but not verbs—however, *I* can manage the whole lot of them! Impenetrability! That's what *I* say!'"

To summarize: Verbs were the proudest or most difficult, and "impenetrability" meant one should not talk about them, which is of course precisely what I intend to do.

I want to address the question of tense, aspect, and modality in some theories of the biblical Hebrew verbal system each from the vantage point of tense-aspect-modality (TAM) analogous to the working model given by Givón (1984:272), that is, according to "the pretense that each forms a separate, self-contained functional domain." This may not be commendable, but while sharpening my tools for treating TAM in a wider discourse perspective I hope I am granted to take on the proud verbs in this preliminary fashion in order to avoid the Humpty Dumptyan standstill of impenetrability.

One issue is whether the verbal forms have any inherent meaning at all; that is, do they bring to the text a semantic core of some kind, or are they empty in the sense that they are merely markers which receive their meaning from the type and structure of the discourse? Or should they not even be ascribed meaning at all, but are only parts in a structure which contribute toward the impact of the total discourse?

My article assumes that the verbal forms do have an inherent meaning which partly derives from, and partly contributes to, the whole discourse. Binnick (1991:446) argues that "... there is a basic meaning (or use) for each of the verb forms in opposition ... [but] as yet no general agreement on whether it is meaning or use which is primary ... [and] if meaning is primary ... what kind of meaning that meaning is: deictic/absolute tense, relative tense, aspect or status or mood".

We might say then that verb forms serve to do things related to the larger discourse, and that what they do is related to what they mean. There is a wide range of things that verbs can do: structure discourses by foregrounding/backgrounding information, provide logical structure, indicate discourse genre, glue events together or indicate their independence, show different perspectives within the discourse, interrelate with systems of marking, invite references, and provide overtones (Binnick 1991:446–7).

This present article has its roots in an earlier investigation of theories of the verb system, which explicitly viewed it as temporal, aspectual, or modal, respectively, but from a sentence-level perspective. The reader may have ideas how the notions of tense, aspect, and modality may interact with discourse considerations and verb morphology within the overall framework of interpretation and translation, and the author would welcome such communications.

Three Theories Introduced

My presentation of tense-aspect-mood will be related to three not-so-well-known theories on the Hebrew verb system, and first a brief sketch of these.

Blake—Tense

Historically, tense has been the totally dominating notion in the under-standing of the biblical Hebrew verb system. From the earliest Jewish grammarians such as Japhet ha-Levi and David Qimhi up to Elijah Levita, who coined the expressions *waw-conversive = waw hippuk / waw conjunctive = waw hibbur* introduced into the many editions of Gesenius' grammars, Jewish and Christian grammarians accepted the tense and *waw* conversive theories (Waltke-O'Connor 1990:458–9). Leslie McFall (1982:16–26) lists three main solutions advocated before 1827: the Jewish conversive theory, the relative tense theory, the *waw* indictive theory, which all share the common assumption that tense is the very core of the verbal system. As for the present time, the tense solution is still recommended by prominent Israeli scholars, such as Blau (1971:24), who is blunt in his position: "... in Biblical *prose* the Hebrew verbal system denotes tenses, rather than aspects".

I have picked Blake as a proponent of a purely temporal conception of the Hebrew verb system. Blake (1951:2) states that it is: "A priori ... unlikely that any language would vary the forms of its verb without regard to the most prominent function of that part of speech, which indicates process, and which imparts the idea of motion in time to a sentence ... namely its indication of the time point of an action or state, its tense."

Blake (18) regards the suffix form in Gen 1:1 (New International Version [NIV]) 'In the beginning God created' as preterite, derived from verbal adjectives denoting action which implies a former activity 'he created' (normal meaning; stative verbs, although usually present, are also capable of past meaning).

The prefix form (imperfect to Blake) presents examples of all the varied meanings of an original single omnitemporal form: "variations in meaning ... are not due to verb form itself, but to the character of the construction or the general sense of the context" (9). There are "various modal meanings both in simple sentences and in dependent clauses" (11); Gen 2:16 (NIV) 'you are free to eat' Blake narrows down to *permission* 'thou mayest indeed eat' (12). Blake holds the traditional view of *waw*-conversive, "... giving an imperfect a past meaning and of

changing the meaning of the perfect to any of the numerous meanings of the imperfect" (38).

Turner—Aspect

Von Ewald and Driver are regarded as having introduced the idea of aspect, with an opposition of perfect/imperfect as against the older view in which the conjugations gave temporal indications (Waldman 1975:1286; Rabin 1970:311–2; 1984:391). This feature of aspect had by the end of the 1980s become the "base for study" of the Hebrew verb system (Waltke-O'Connor 1990:475). I have picked William Turner (who wrote as early as 1876) as a clear-cut representative of an aspectual approach. Turner (405) explicitly stated that "the doctrine which I have proposed regarding ... the so-called tenses is important mainly as a matter of theory ... (it) is either identical with or very similar to ... Ewald, Böttcher and Driver". Turner's contribution focuses on a more radical conception of *aspect,* trying to distinguish it from tense as well as from *aktionsart* (113–63). He feels the aspectual theory of Ewald is a secondary derivate from temporal distinctions (343).[1]

Regarding the theories of Ewald, Driver, and others, Turner (1876:364) states: "I accept one most important tenet, that that on which these verbal forms depend is not an objective relation but a subjective view ... the act as it appears to the speaker."[2]

Turner (365–77) gives strong precedence to the noun over the verb, treating the verb as nothing but a nominal or adjectival term of attribution. He summarizes:

> The suffix form undergoes no change through collocation with the other elements of the sentence (disregarding some minor accentual or vocal alternations): 'the act or state expressed by the verb is represented as an independent thing a "Ding-an-Sich", or existing fact'. The suffix form answers to the question What?

---

[1] According to Waltke-O'Connor (1990:464) Ewald is incited to do so because of mistakenly regarding *completed* as representative of perfectivity and the suffix form.

[2] Because of Turner's expressly assigning subjectivity to the verbal system as such, I arrive at somewhat different conclusions from that of Waltke/O'Connor (465–6) according to whom Turner ascribes subjectivity to the prefix form only. A plausible position may be that according to Turner, all choices with regard to conjugations are subjective: something might *subjectively* be stated as an objective fact or as something evolving from the subject (the speaker).

The prefix form is variously modifiable in construction, variously dependent on the will of the agent and on outward circumstances (and the changes it undergoes correspond closely to those of the noun). "The act or state expressed by the verb is represented as in, or of, the subject, the product of the subject's energy, the manifestation of its power and life". The prefix form (Turner includes cohortatives and jussives, and the so-called *waw* conversivum, to which he assigns no special meaning) answers to the question How?

Summing up: in the suffix form the act is prominent, in the prefix form the actor is.

Zuber—Mood

The concept of describing the forms of the Hebrew verb as mood is not common. Neither is it, however, new, as already expressed by Driver (1881:1): "... the *tenses* in Hebrew ... might almost more fitly be called moods". Driver drops it only because the imperfect develops several moods (cohortative, jussive), but he is intrigued by the idea of *modification* to describe the difference in meaning between the verbal forms. Ewald also reasons along these lines (McFall 1982:44–7).

Zuber presents his theory as an opposition to a German textbook of biblical Hebrew in the Ewald/Driver tradition, where the two conjugations are presented as describing whether an action is completed, done and finished (suffix form) as compared to uncompleted, durative or inchoative (prefix form).[3] Zuber's thesis is that there is in the Hebrew verb system a fundamental opposition between the indicative and the modal/future (1986:16; further developed pp. 27–30).

The indicative excludes the future as is done in Latin grammar (1986:141). The complex category of *modal* includes all cases where the Hebrew grammar modifies a sentence. The labels *recto, obliquo* are intended to signal differing attitudes to reality.

The suffix form and the *wa*-prefix form are identical in meaning. The choice between the two is determined on stylistic grounds and they are interchangeable. Zuber calls these forms *recto* and believes they make indicative statements.

---

[3] ... aussagen, ob eine Handlung als vollendet, fertig, abgeschlossen bzw unvollendet, dauernd, werdend zu gelten hat' (Zuber 1986:1).

The choice between the prefix form and the *waw* + suffix conjugation form is also made on stylistic grounds, the meaning being identical. Zuber labels these forms *obliquo;* they express modal/future statements.

Three Notions: Tense, Aspect, Modality

Givón (1984:269) gives a strong impetus for dealing with tense, aspect, and mood: "Of all grammatical sub-systems, tense-aspect-modality is probably the most complex and frustrating to the linguist. For one thing, it is an obligatory category without which simple sentences cannot be produced. Because of this, one must confront tense-aspect-modality (...TAM) relatively early in studying the structure of simple clauses of a language, in some cases earlier than the complexity of TAM vis-à-vis other areas of the grammar would warrant."

Tense Preliminaries

(a) Tense locates the event in time: It is a deictic category, by which is meant that it deals with the spatio-temporal orientational features of language (Chung and Timberlake 1985:202).

(b) Tense is related to the speech moment in principally one of two ways. In absolute tense, S = point of speech, it serves as tense locus. In relative tense, E = point of event, or R = point of reference, it serves as speech locus. This would then be indicated by the context, or else the deictic status would not be decisive (for relative tense).

(c) As verb forms perform their various discourse duties, we should especially note the particular way in which subordination places restraints (and these may in principle not be different from other higher level discourse constraints) on whatever inherent meanings the verbal forms have. In the case of tense, not enough attention has been paid to distinguishing tense in main narrative lines from subsidiary lines. This could also be expressed: "that the R point pertains to the text, and not to the sentence ... a sequence in a tense such as the pluperfect indicates a shift of *perspective* away from the one that is general in the narrative" (Binnick 1991:415). A better way of saying this may be that a shift in the narrator's perspective (through free indirect discourse, flashbacks, parentheticals, or relative clauses) may in English find a good discourse-translational equivalent in the pluperfect tense.

Aspect Preliminaries

As for the present state of the art, Binnick (1991:213) is rather categorical: "No complete aspectual description of any language exists. Nor does current aspectological theory provide an adequate theoretical base for such description."

Two current definitions of aspect need to be kept distinct:

(a) *Aktionsart:* the objective reality of the verbal action (objective aspect or mode of action). "Verb lexemes differ as to their *aktionsart* or *inherent lexical meaning*" (Dahl 1985:26). Semantic correlates of verbal derivation which express differences in the internal temporal structure of a situation (such as long time/short time, repetition) may be called *aspectuals* or *aktionsarten* (Comrie 1985:343). The intrinsic meaning of verb roots are seldom, if ever, wholly neutral to aspect. The *intrinsic aspect* (Talmy 1985:78) which consequently equals aktionsart will determine how a verb interacts with aspectually loaded grammatical elements. Talmy's list of different aktionsarten includes: one-way non-resettable, one-way resettable, full cycle, multiplex, steady state, and gradient.[4]

(b) *Aspect:* the attitude of the speaker (subjective aspect) has a propensity for being defined in terms of time. An often quoted definition runs as follows: "aspects are different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation" (Comrie 1976:3). The definition upon which it in turn was built does not use the term *temporal*—'les manieres diverses de concevoir l'ecoulement du proces meme' (Holt 1943:6), but Bernhard Comrie's definition has won much support and deserves attention.[5]

Chung and Timberlake (1985:239) hold that "the basic issue in an aspect system is the relationship between the predicate and the frame in an event". In their workable definition, "aspect characterizes the rela-

---

[4]Another, and perhaps better, way of looking at aktionsarten is as subcases of the Aristotelian categorization. Aristotle is credited with having distinguished between states and activities (being and doing). Vendler developed further the classification of verbs into states, activities, accomplishments and achievements; possibly also series—also called Vendlerian categories, as the latter denotes the phasic structure of whole events and the former, subsequences within them (Binnick 1991:210, 457).

[5]Friedrich translated Holt's definition "a way of conceiving the passage of action", whereas Comrie's own literal translation is "different ways of conceiving the flow of the process itself" (Binnick 1991:208).

tionship of a predicate to the time interval over which it occurs" (213).
There appear to be two possibilities: either that
(1) the frame is internal to the event (which means the predicate goes
on before, during, and after the frame):

```
   x          x          x
        (_____)
```

or (2) the frame includes the event (here the predicate occurs only
within the frame, or within nested frames) :

```
           x
     (_____)


                      x
        (_____)_____)_____)
```

Binnick (1991:212) regards past imperfective as giving a view of the
action as ongoing *over* the frame, while the perfective indicates that the
action occurs *within* the frame.
Examples:

> When I got your postcard, I was writing a letter to you.
> When I got your postcard, I wrote a letter to you.

Here "was writing" indicates a process, while "wrote" speaks of a
completed event which is looked upon in its totality. Neither of them
may be taken in isolation from time.
In the first example the getting of the postcard is included in the time
of the writing, but in the second example the person probably wrote the
letter after having received the postcard. It is only when a comparison is
made between aspects and absolute tenses that one rightly may call
aspect non-deictic and tense deictic (Dahl 1985:24). Comrie (1976:79)
even goes as far as saying that "...the difference between the aspects
Perfective and Imperfective is one of relative tense".
Binnick (1991:209) regards the term *view* as sufficiently neutral to
allow both objective and subjective interpretations, but the problem

comes when we try to understand "what it is that the speaker of a language with aspectual oppositions[6] knows which a nonspeaker does not know".[7]

Modality Preliminaries

The choice of moods is often governed by the choice of verb or conjunction (he says that he is ill; he demands that he be released); "In fact, mood (morphological marking) is independent of modality (meaning categorization) ... [and] ... there are many devices for expressing modality other than mood. Palmer cites modal verbs ... and modal particles" (Binnick 1991:73–4). Modality does neither necessarily nor usually indicate the opinion or attitude of the speaker. It is syntactically conditioned and may be expressed as "... a grammatical way of indicating that the proposition is embedded into a modal or non-assertive context" (Dahl 1985:26).

There have been two different types of theories as to the nature of the modes marked by these moods: the attitudinal theory and the functional theory. It is in independent clauses that the moods most clearly seem to reflect the "attitude" of the speaker (Binnick 1991:70).

The subjunctive and optative moods have two roles: a syntactic, where they merely mark the verb as subordinate, and a pragmatic, where they actually mark some difference in function from that of the indicative. At times unique meanings have been ascribed to subjunctive and optative forms, which need not have these meanings, because of subordination (Binnick 1991:68).

---

[6]Is it necessary to speak of aspectual oppositions? Does this stem from when *wayyiqtol* was not regarded a proper narrative tense, and it was easier to make partition in two, and take care of the *we-s* thereafter? Or does this thinking reflect the structuralist theory that *meaning* is always found exactly in a binary comparison? Does this reflect sentence-level linguistics where words more easily could be extracted and examined? Will *wayyiqtol* as narrative tense and verb forms regarded in the context of discourse type paragraphs (Longacre 1989) or hierarchially structured clauses (Talstra 1992) call for a redefinition of the problem? Can the aspect as *view* be retained, but the binary oppositions be abolished and replaced with a multidimensional framework?

[7]"In summary, the Aristotelian categorization represents a classification of situations (and the linguistic expressions denoting these) in terms of abstract phasic structures. The *Aktionsarten* represents rather a classification of (expressions for) phases of situations and subsituations. But aspect proper is a distinction having to do with the relationship of a situation to the temporal frame against which it is set; it does not classify types of occurrences" (Binnick 1991:312).

Comparing worlds subjectively. Attitudinally speaking, mood gives a characterization of the actuality of an event by comparing the event's world to a reference world, which we might term the actual world. When the event world is identical to the actual world, it is described in the indicative mood—realis; when it is less than identical (it may be so in numerous ways), in the irrealis mood. Languages differ as to which events are morphologically evaluated as actual and expressed in realis mood and those which are evaluated as non-actual—irrealis mood. The actuality of the event may then be described in terms such as possibility, necessity, or desirability (Chung and Timberlake 1985:241, 202).

Within this framework—mood as truth conditions—we may say that mood expresses the attitude of the mind of the speaker toward the contents of the sentence (Jespersen 1924:313), "the speaker's attitude to a proposition" (Dahl 1985:26), "the atittude of the speaker towards what he is saying" (Lyons 1968:307). In summary: "mood refers to a subjective judgment about the factuality of the situation" (Waltke-O'Connor 1990:506).

Epistemic and deontic modality. Epistemic modality (from the Greek word meaning 'knowledge') deals with the truth conditions of propositions; whereas deontic modality (from the Greek word meaning 'what is binding') is used in connection with morally responsible agents (Lyons 1977:823). This would largely coincide with a division of modality into: not containing an element of will/containing an element of will (Jespersen 1924:313–21). Another way of expressing it: epistemic mode evaluates the actuality of an event, and deontic mode expresses the imposition of actuality (Chung and Timberlake 1985:250).

"Epistemic logic ... lends itself ... to formalization in terms of the notion of possible worlds" (Lyons 1977:93). Consider the following summary of examples from Chung and Timberlake (1985:242, 246). There may be subtypes of epistemic modality, such as:

Necessity—where the event belongs to all alternative worlds:
John must be in Phoenix by now.

Possibility—the event belongs to at least one alternative world:
John can/may be in Phoenix now.

In deontic mode we also find subtypes, related to the number of worlds that could develop at any time point, that of:

Obligation—the event must hold in all subsequent worlds— "there is an intrinsic connexion between deontic modality and futurity" (Lyons 1977:824):
John must go to Phoenix.

Permission—an event may hold in some subsequent world:
John may go to Phoenix.

Deontic necessity and permission are usually understood to have their origin in some causal source, which in this regard is to be understood as a morally responsible agent.[8]

Blake, Turner, and Zuber Compared

My decision to let one theory present itself from the vantage point of *meaning*—at times called *function*—(Zuber) while another is viewed from the *form* perspective (Turner) may be disputed; and Blake carries as integral parts of his system a diachrone component. But concepts may occupy differing places in the structural system of theories of the biblical Hebrew verbal system as well as of those of religions. Concepts, as integral parts of a system, cannot be compared on a strict one-to-one basis. Consider a parallel in the phenomenology of religion: prayer is not the same entity in Judaism and Buddhism; eternity is a different concept in Hinduism and Christianity.

Blake and Zuber are clearly opposed to the aspectual completed/uncompleted conception of the Hebrew verb system. They call it aspect, but it is in my understanding not ascertained that they intend subjective aspect. Their criticism might concern objective aspect, viz., aktionsart. Be that as it may, it is probable they would oppose both notions in light of the fact that they wish to clear way for a basic understanding of the conjugations as temporal or modal, respectively.

Turner is in like manner straightforward in his opposition of a temporal (whether absolute or relative) or aktionsart-oriented comprehension of the Hebrew verb system. His thrust resides in the conviction of an aspectual (subjective) foundation for the conjugations.

The three seem to agree that the *suffix form* is the marked component of the conjugations. Thus their basic conceptions concerning the very nature of the verbal system (as temporal, aspectual, or modal) surface here. This implies it is difficult to find some common denominator, other than markedness as such.

---

[8]Lyons (1977:843) uses the distinction *necessity* and *possibility* for the *obligation* and *permission* distinction coined by Chung and Timberlake to fit the deontic mode. In my opinion the latter is more congenial since it more overtly refers to morally responsible agents. The former is however clearly understandable: what is permitted is possible; what is obligatory is necessary.

To Blake preterite seems foundational, since even in stative verbs (with present meaning) a former activity is presupposed.

To Turner suffix form is used where conditions and occurrences are emphasized by the speaker, are act-oriented, and answer to the question What?

To Zuber indication of reality implies facts in the past.

The positions on the *prefix form* are the easiest to summarize. It seems all authors may be described as being in agreement that this is the unmarked form. Its contours are very loose.

To Blake it is 'an omnitemporal form'; to Turner it 'paints a picture', is 'actor-oriented' and answers the question 'How?'; to Zuber it describes in a 'modified manner'; to Blake it may represent all tenses; to Turner it carries intentions and wishes, and narrates events (in the form of pure prefix form or with *wa-*); to Zuber it is modal/future. One may at least venture to say the theories have a certain structural resemblance.

Tense-Aspect-Mood Interrelated

John Lyons (1968:316ff.) states that tense, aspect, and mood, may "merge" into one another: the English progressive is not exclusively aspectual, but may have modal implications as well, such as intention, "I am going to London tomorrow". In Lyons' example the progressive aspect may be regarded as incomplete (imperfective), thus fringing upon the notion of factuality/modality; and, as is easily seen, this in turn borders on the tense-category *future*. A pure future is obtained when the ingredient of intention is removed, "I shall be in London tomorrow."

Turner, Modality and Beyond

In the discussion of mood, a clear distinction of epistemic mode and deontic mode is made.

We now find that the suffix form, according to Turner (1876:394–404), has many characteristics which fit the necessary value of epistemic mode: "statements of fact", "where source is hidden", "emphasized by lack of description", "explanatory statements in historical narrative".

The prefix form (388–93), on the other hand, has characteristics which fit the permission value of the deontic mode: "intention", "wishes", "questions related to the will".

The kernel of Turner's aspectual approach is that the choice between the suffix and the prefix conjugations is not dependent upon objective relations of the things spoken of, but rests "in the personal feeling and purpose of the person who speaks" (405).

Turner admits of a wide borderland where forms freely interchange, and sees no significant difference in questions asking from whence someone came (using suffix/prefix forms respectively). Here a possible inherent weakness of Turner's conception surfaces: neglecting context in favor of simpliticy of concept. In Gen. 16:8 the suffix form for 'come' is used since Hagar was resting when asked. Similarly in Gen. 42:7, Joseph uses the suffix form since it was obvious that his traveling brothers had arrived at their destination. Contrariwise, in Jos. 9:8, Joshua is fooled by the Gibeonites in believing they were still on their journey, and uses the prefix form.[9] Now if the ancient reader was sensitive to the difference in nuances regarding suffix/prefix form, he must have been tickled by realizing that the Gibeonites answer was in the suffix form all along, 9:6, 9.

Conclusion

Returning to Humpty Dumpty, we know "he had a great fall."
All the King's horses and all the King's men
Couldn't put Humpty Dumpty in his place again.
The impenetrability of verbs may probably be likened to the Humpty Dumptyan insistence of mastering them one by one. And they got their reward Saturday nights for behaving his way. He paid them extra. But after the fall of this attitude—which has also manifested itself in linguistics and literary criticism—verbs are, happily it seems, mingling with other parts of speech in the healthy environment of discourse analysis, and the Aliceian enquiry may continue. Alice and other children within or without us may continue asking. Maybe that is the real antidote to impenetrability.

---

[9]Waltke-O'Connor (1990:504–05), elaborating the observations of McFall (1982:84–5).

BIOGRAPHY

Bo-Krister Ljungberg received his B. Th. from Uppsala University, Sweden, with complementary subjects at Stockholm Theological Institute, and his Lic. Th. from Lund University, Sweden. He holds an E. Dip. from Linköping University College, Sweden, studied Judasim at the Swedish Theological Institute in Jerusalem, and linguistics at Stockholm University. He headed the Old Testament and Biblical Languages department and directed a program for theological education by extension at Brommaskolan Bible College, Stockholm. He is presently finishing his D. Th. in relation to Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam. He and his wife, Ruth, are members of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, and they plan to serve in an Old Testament project in Papua New Guinea.

REFERENCES

Binnick, Robert I. 1991. Time and the verb. A guide to tense and aspect. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blake, Frank Ringgold. 1944. The Hebrew waw conversive. Journal of Biblical Literature. 63:271–295.

———. 1951. A resurvey of Hebrew tenses. Scripta Pontificio Instituto Biblico. Scripta 103. Roma: Pontificium Institutum Biblicum.

Blau, Joshua. 1971. The problem of tenses in biblical Hebrew. Marginalia Semitica 6, 24–26.

Carroll, Lewis. [1872] 1984. Through the looking-glass and what Alice found there. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, Puffin Books.

Chung, Sandra. and Alan Timberlake. 1985. Tense, aspect and mood. Language typology and syntactic description Vol. III: Grammatical categories and the lexicon. Edited by Timothy Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernhard. 1976. Aspect. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 1985. Causative verb formations and other verb-deriving morphology. Language typology and syntactic description. Vol III: grammatical categories and the lexicon. Edited by Timothy Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, Östen. 1985. Tense and aspect systems. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Driver, Samuel Rolles. [1874] 1881. A treatise on the use of the tenses in Hebrew. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Givón, Talmy. 1984. Syntax. A functional-typological introduction. Vol. 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Jespersen, Otto. 1924. The philosophy of grammar. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Holt, J. 1943. Etudes d'aspect. Acta Jutlandica. Aarsskrift for Aarhus Universitet 15,2. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget.

Longacre, Robert E. 1989. Joseph, a story of divine providence. Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns.

Lyons, John. 1968. Introduction to theoretical linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

————. 1977. Semantics, Vol. II. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McFall, Leslie. 1982. The enigma of the Hebrew verbal system: solutions from Ewald to the present day. Sheffield: Almond Press.

Palmer, F.R. 1986. Mood and modality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rabin, Chaim. 1984. The genesis of the Semitic tense system. Current progress in Afro-Asiatic linguistics. International Hamito-Semitic Congress 3, London. 1978. Edited by James Bynon. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Schubert, K. 1988. Review of tense, by Bernhard Comrie, and of Tense and aspect systems, by Östen Dahl. Studies in Language 12(1):194–8.

Talmy, Leonard. 1985. Lexicalized patterns: semantic structure in lexical forms. Language typology and syntactic description. Vol. III: Grammatical categories and the lexicon. Edited by Timothy Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Talstra, Eep. 1992. Text grammar and biblical Hebrew: The viewpoint of Wolfgang Schneider. Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics. 5(4):269–97. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Turner, William. 1876. The tenses of the Hebrew verb. Studies Biblical and Oriental. Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black.

Waldman, Nahum M. 1975. The Hebrew tradition. Current trends in linguistics Vol. 13: Historiography of linguistics. Edited by Thomas A. Sebeok, 1285–1330. The Hague: Mouton.

Waltke, Bruce K. and Michael O'Connor. 1990. An introduction to biblical Hebrew syntax. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.

Zuber, Beat. [c. 1985] 1986. Das tempussystem des biblischen Hebräisch. Eine untersuchung am text. Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. 164. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

JOTT STYLE SHEET

In general, the style is to conform to that of the journal LANGUAGE—especially in regard to citations of articles and books in the body of the article and to the necessity of and placing of complete bibliographical references at the end. Please note also the conventions in regard to capitalization, language forms, translation glosses, and use of quotation marks.

For citation of forms or passages in biblical languages, if the Roman alphabet is used, please follow the transcription conventions set for the Society of Biblical Literature as presented in B. If the Greek alphabet is used, hand-printed forms are not acceptable. Either a Greek typewriter/typehead must be employed or a good black photocopy must be made, cut, and pasted in the appropriate space. Only Roman transliterations of Hebrew characters will be accepted.

A. NOTES ON MANUSCRIPT PREPARATION:

1. Submit all manuscripts in duplicate, doublespaced, with 1.5″ margins to facilitate editing, and accompany them by a file in ASCII code on a 5.25″ or 3.5″ MS-DOS formatted diskette.

2. Number the pages of the copy in the upper right corner. Include all pages of the manuscript in a single pagination. Use one side of the sheet only.

3. All manuscripts must be accompanied by an abstract that describes the main thrust and contribution of the proposed article.

4. Every author, except those writers who have previously prblished in JOTT, must submit a brief biographical note as to the author's background, education, present assignment, and activity.

5. Underscores
   a. A single straight underscore indicates italic type and a double underscore boldface. Contributors are asked to use these underscorings for only these purposes and no others.
   b. Use italics (single underscore) only for cited linguistic forms and for titles of books and journals. Do not use italics to mark familiar foreign words used as part of an English sentence: e.g., a priori, ad hoc, inter alia, ipso facto, prima facie, facon de parler, langue/parole, Sprachgefuhl, ursprachlich, etc. All are to be without underscore.

6. Punctuation
   a. Use single quotation marks in the text stream for a translation gloss. Punctuation marks follow a single quote unless the other mark is itself part of the quoted matter: The word means 'cart' not 'horse'. Does that mean 'You heard me!'? It means 'Did you hear me?'
   b. Do not use quotation marks to enclose a word or phrase cited as a linguistic example from another language. Use italics instead.
   c. Use double quotation marks for direct quotations from literary sources and for reported speech, as in John said, "I am coming." Periods and commas precede a closing quotation mark; colons and semicolons follow it.
   d. Words containing prefixes are written solid, without hyphens, when no misreading will result: antimentalism, contradistinction, extrasystemic, prevocalic, semivowel,

subdialect, superstock, nonexistent. The prefix is followed by a hyphen when the next element begins with a capital: non-Germanic, pre-Greek.

e. Ellipsis is indicated by three periods, close set, with a blank space before and after, like this: . . . Do not add a fourth period even if the ellipsis precedes or follows the end of a sentence.

f. Use a comma after e.g. and i.e. Use a comma before the conjunction that joins the last of a series of three or more coordinate terms: A, B, and C; X, Y, and Z. Do use a comma between independent clauses but not between parts of a compound predicate. Use commas around nonrestrictive elements of a sentence (where the meaning will not change by leaving out the phrase) but not around phrases that restrict or qualify the meaning of the main part of a sentence.

7. Footnotes
   a. Footnotes are numbered serially throughout the article.
   b. The footnote reference number is a raised numeral following the word or passage to which it applies; it is not enclosed in parentheses nor followed by a parenthesis or a period. Reference numbers follow marks of punctuation.
   c. In the disk copy, all footnotes must follow the main text and bibliography. In the hard copy they may appear at the bottoms of text pages.
   d. Each footnote is typed as a separate paragraph, with the first line indented. It begins with its reference number, raised and written as in b.

8. Cited forms
   a. A letter, word, phrase, or sentence cited as a linguistic example or subject of discussion appears in italics: the suffix -s, the word *like*, the construction *mich friert*. Do not use quotation marks for this purpose.
   b. Cited forms may also appear in phonetic or phonemic transcription, enclosed in square brackets or in slant lines: the suffix [s], the word /layk/. Symbols between brackets or slants are never underscored.
   c. Cited forms in a foreign language should be followed at their first occurrence by a gloss in single quotation marks. No comma separates the gloss from the cited form: Latin *ovis* 'sheep' is a noun. No comma follows the gloss unless it is required by the sentence as a whole: Latin *ovis* 'sheep', *equus* 'horse', and *canis* 'dog' are nouns. Note that the punctuation follows the closing quotation mark.

9. Abbreviations
   Abbreviations ending in a small letter have a following period; abbreviations ending in a capital generally have none.

10. Titles and headings
    a. Do not underscore any part of a title, subtitle, or section heading. Leave the choice of type face to the editor.
    b. Use normal capitalization: capitalize only the first word and such other words as the orthography of the language requires.

11. Bibliographical references
    a. Full citation of all literature referred to should be given in a bibliography at the end of each article. Within the text brief citation will be made, normally, by giving the author's surname, year of publication, and page number(s) where relevant, e.g., Smith

1982:25. Give such brief citations in the body of the text, not in footnotes, unless they refer specifically to a statement made in a footnote.

b. The full bibliography should be doublespaced, beginning on a separate page of typescript with the heading REFERENCES. Arrange the entries alphabetically by surnames of authors; multiple works by one author should be listed chronologically, with suffixed letter a, b, etc., to distinguish several items published in a single year. Works by multiple authors must have all authors listed. Each entry should contain the following elements in the following order: Author's or editor's surname, given name(s), coauthors if any (given names first), date of publication (copyright), title and subtitle of work, title of series, if any, and volume or number in the series, edition, reprint if not the original, or revision (include name of reviser), city of publication, and publisher's name. For an article in a periodical, give name of author, date, title of the article, name of the periodical, volume number or part number (if applicable) and sometimes the issue number, pages occupied by the article, and if a journal is not well known, the city and country of publication and publisher. If an article is part of a collection, also include the editor's name and title of the collection and the edition used. If an edition is a reprint edition (new typesetting), include the original publication (copyright) date in brackets, location, and publisher, as well as the reprint date, location, and publisher. If no edition is indicated and if no part of the work appears as a quotation in the text, use the most recent copyright date. Dates of impressions or reprintings do not apply. All numbers will be in Roman type. Use punctuation as in the following examples:

Bolinger, Dwight. 1965. The atomization of meaning. Language 41:555–73.
Brennan, Paul William. 1968. The structure of Koine Greek narrative. Ph.D. dissertation, The Hartford Seminary Foundation. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
Brugmann, Karl. 1906. Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatick der indogemanischen Sprachen. 2d ed., vol. 2, part 1. Strassburg: Trubner.
Chafe, Wallace L. 1965. Review of grammar discovery procedures, by R. E. Longacre. Language 41:640–47.
Chomsky, Noam. 1957. Syntactic structures. (Janua linguarum, series minor, 4.) The Hague: Mouton.
Hockett, Charles F. 1964. The Proto Central Algonquian kinship system. In Ward Goodenough, ed. Explorations in cultural anthropology, 239–58. New York: McGraw-Hill.
Wenham, J. W. [1965] 1984. The elements of New Testament Greek: Based on the earlier work by H. P. V. Nunn. Reprint ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

c. The brief citations given in the text should take a form such as (Hockett 1964:240–41). If the author's name is part of the text, use this form: Bolinger (1965:564) said that . . . Note that the page numbers given here are only for the passage to which reference is made, not the whole paper. In text only use initials for authors' given names when necessary to distinguish, e.g., N. Chomsky and C. Chomsky, within a single article.

d. Do not replace given names of authors or editors in the bibliography with initials unless such abbreviation is the normal practice of the individual concerned: thus Miller, Roy Andrew (not Roy A. or R. A.); Hooper, Joan B. (not J. B. or J.); but Palmer, F. R. That is, use the name as given on the title page.

12. Tables
    a. Plan each table so that it will fit into the printed page without crowding. Leave ample white space between columns. Do not use vertical and horizontal rules unless the table would be unclear without them.
    b. Column heads should be short, so as to stand clearly above the several columns. If you need longer headings, represent them by numbers or capital letters and explain these in the text preceding the table.
    c. If two or more tables appear in one article, number them and refer to them by number. Do not speak of the 'preceding' or 'the following table', nor 'above' or 'below'; in paginating, the original position of the table may not be able to be preserved.
    d. Each table should have a title above, rather than below it. The legend contains the table number and optionally a concise title, sometimes also (as a separate line) a brief explanation or comment.

13. Author's alteration policy. Once a manuscript has been accepted for publication, it cannot be withdrawn or revised. The contributor will be billed for all changes other than printing errors and changes requested by the editor.

B. TRANSLITERATION RULES FROM SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE:

1. Transliteration of Hebrew
    a. Consonants: ' b g d h w z ḥ ṭ y k l m n s ' p ṣ q r ś š t (' Alep and ' ayin should be written in with a pen, if the raised semicircle is not available on a typewriter/typehead. Do not use ' for alep or raised ᶜ for ayin or any other symbol.)
    b. Vowels: a (pataḥ), ā (qāmeṣ), â (final qāmeṣ hē), e (sĕgōl), ē (ṣērê), ê (final and medial ṣērê yōd and medial sĕgōl yōd), i (short ḥîreq defectively written), î (medial or final ḥîreq yōd), o (qāmeṣ ḥātûp), ō (ḥōlem defectively written), ô (ḥōlem fully written), u (short qibbûṣ), ū (long qibbûṣ defectively written), û (šûreq). Other final vowels are to be written with the appropriate vowel sign followed by hē (or ālep) or mater lectionis (e.g. Šĕlōmōh, yigleh, qārā' [but qārâ], hinnēh, sûsāyw). Furtive pataḥ is to be recorded as pataḥ (e.g. rûaḥ). Reduced vowels are to be written with the breve: ă, ĕ, ŏ. (No distinction is made between simple šĕwâ and ḥātēp sĕgōl.) Short vowels fully written should be shown as o(w), u(w), i(y), e.g. bĕqu(w)štā'. Accents are usually not indicated; if really needed, the acute is to be used for the primary and the grave for the secondary accent. A hyphen is to be used for maqqēp.

2. Transliteration of Aramaic
   The system described above for Hebrew is to be followed, even though sere and holem are frequently not markers of long vowels in Aramaic.

3. Transliteration of Greek
   Th is to be used for , ph for φ, ch for χ, ps for , ē (not ê) for ſ, ō (not ô) for ω, h for the rough breathing, and y for υ, except when it is part of the diphthong (e.g., au, eu, ui). Iota subscript should be represented by a cedilla under the vowel concerned: ą for ç, ę̄ for , ǭ for ω.

If you have liked the JOURNAL OF TRANSLATION AND TEXTLINGUIS-TICS, please give a copy of this subscription order form to your library acquisitions clerk or to a colleague.

Please enter my 1996 subscription for the JOURNAL OF TRANSLATION AND TEXTLINGUISTICS. I understand that journal subscriptions cover the period from January to December and must be paid for by check drawn on a U.S. bank.

Name_____

Address_____

City_____State_____Zip_____

This is a   __ Library, bookstore, educational institution subscription
               __ SIL member subscription
               __ Other

Please order from and make checks, drawn on a USA bank (no credit cards), payable to:

       International Academic Bookstore
       Summer Institute of Linguistics
       7500 W. Camp Wisdom Road
       Dallas, TX 75236

Retail subscription price, 1996:

     USA: $34.95   Foreign (including Canada): $45.95

Prices are subject to change without prior notice. Back issues are available upon request. Discounts are available to SIL members and, upon request, to libraries, bookstores, and educational institutions.