

A Discourse-Functional Description of Participant Reference in Biblical Hebrew Narrative

by

Steven Edward Runge

Dissertation submitted for the degree of

DOCTOR OF LITERATURE

in BIBLICAL LANGUAGES



at the

University of Stellenbosch

Promotor: Prof. C.H.J. van der Merwe

Date submitted: March, 2007

Declaration

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this dissertation is my own original work and has not previously in its entirety or in part been submitted to any university for a degree,

Signature:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. R. J.', written in a cursive style.

Date: 15 October 2006

ABSTRACT

Each language has some means or system of referring to participants. This system of reference includes a participant's initial introduction, continuing reference to the participant, as well as reintroduction after some period of absence. A number of morphological, syntactic and pragmatic issues impinge upon the kinds of encoding used to refer to participants in various contexts. The primary concern of this study is to provide a cross-linguistic, discourse-functional description of the encoding of participants in Biblical Hebrew narrative. Our description is based on the analysis of a preliminary test corpus of Exod 1-12, which is then applied to our dissertation corpus of Gen 12-25. In order to narrow the scope of the project, the data considered in this dissertation will be limited to the corpora of Exod 1-12 and Gen 12-25. It will not consider embedded reported speeches, but instead focuses exclusively and exhaustively on the narrative proper of these two corpora.

Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:112) have identified three basic linguistic functions a participant reference system must be capable of accomplishing:

- Semantic: “identify the referents unambiguously, distinguishing them from other possible ones”. In other words, the reader must be able to track ‘who did what to whom’,
- Processing: “overcome disruptions in the flow of information”,
- Discourse-pragmatic: “signal the activation status and prominence of the referents or the actions they perform”.

We propose that these three functions are not discrete categories, but represent a hierarchical entailment scheme. In other words, overencoding a participant to accomplish the processing function at the same time accomplishes a semantic function of identifying the participant. The study begins by providing a description of the default encoding based on the semantic and cognitive constraints present in various discourse contexts. Our methodology is to develop a set of default encoding principles based on the semantic function of participant reference which can account for as much of the attested data as possible. These default principles are also used to identify pragmatically-motivated departures from the default norms. The non-default encoding is construed as explicitly marking the presence of some linguistic feature.

The non-default encoding data are then grouped based on the pragmatic effects they achieve, and are described in light of attested cross-linguistic principles. We claim that the processing function of participant reference is accomplished in Biblical Hebrew through the redundant relexicalization of agents. These redundant NPs have the pragmatic effect of segmenting the discourse into distinct developments. Next we describe the pragmatic use of referring expressions as accomplishing the discourse-pragmatic function of thematic highlighting. Finally, we describe participant encoding which exceeds that necessary for the processing function as accomplishing a second discourse-pragmatic function of cataphorically highlighting a following speech or event. The above-mentioned model is ultimately applied to Gen 27 to demonstrate its explanatory value for exposition of Biblical Hebrew narrative.

OPSOMMING

Elke taal het 'n manier of sisteem om na die deelnemers of partisipante in 'n verhaal te verwys, bv. hoe 'n partisipant bekend gestel word, hoe in die loop van 'n verhaal na hom of haar verwys word, asook hoe hy of sy na 'n periode van afwesigheid herbekend gestel word. 'n Aantal morfologiese, sintaktiese en pragmatiese oorwegings het 'n invloed op die manier van kodering wat gebruik word om na partisipante in verskillende kontekste te verwys. Hierdie studie wil graag 'n diskoers-funksionele beskrywing gee van die enkodering van partisipante in Bybels-Hebreeuse verhale. Hierdie beskrywing berus op sisteme wat in verskillende tale gebruik word om na partisipante te verwys. Ons beskrywing is gebaseer op 'n voorlopige analise van Eksod 1-12 wat dan toegepas word op die primêre korpus van die verhandeling, nl. Gen 12-25. Daar word op die verhalende gedeeltes gefokus. Geen aandag word aan gedeeltes in die direkte rede gegee nie.

Dooley en Levinsohn (2001:112) het drie basiese funksies geïdentifiseer wat 'n sisteem van partisipantverwysing moet kan uitvoer:

- Semanties: “identify the referents unambiguously, distinguishing them from other possible ones”. In other words, the reader must be able to track ‘who did what to whom’,
- Prosessering: “overcome disruptions in the flow of information”,
- Diskoers-pragmaties: “signal the activation status and prominence of the referents or the actions they perform”.

Ons stel voor dat hierdie drie funksies nie drie diskrete kategorieë is nie, maar dat dit 'n hierargiese skema verteenwoordig waarin een kategorie in die ander vervat kan word. Met ander woorde, die oorkodering van 'n partisipant ter wille van prosessering kan ook 'n semantiese funksie uitvoer, nl. om die partisipant te identifiseer. Die studie begin deur 'n beskrywing van die verstek-kodering. Hierdie beskrywing is gebaseer op semantiese en kognitiewe beperkings in verskillende diskoerskontekste. Ons poog om grond van so veel as moontlik empiriese data 'n stel verstek-koderingsbeginsels formuleer. Die verstek-beginsels word dan gebruik om afwykings van hierdie norme te identifiseer. Dié afwykings word dan op grond van pragmatiese oorwegings verklaar. Die nie-verstek-kodering word verklaar as die eksplisiete aanduiding van een of ander linguïstiese kenmerk.

Die nie-verstek gekodeerde data word dan gegroepeer op grond van die pragmatiese effekte wat hulle het, asook beskryf met behulp van beginsels wat in verskillende tale geld. Ons is van mening dat die prosesseringsfunctie in Bybelse Hebreeuse uitgevoer word deur die oënskynlike oorbodige releksikalisering van agente. Die oorbodige naamwoordelike frases het die pragmatiese effek dat dit 'n diskoers opdeel in verskillende ontwikkelingsmomente. Vervolgens bespreek ons die pragmatiese gebruik van uitdrukings wat na partisipante verwys om die diskoers-pragmatiese funksie van tematiese beklemtoning aan te dui. Ten slotte beskryf ons partisipantkodering wat nie nodig is ter wille van enige prosesseringsfunctie nie, maar wat 'n tweede diskoers-pragmatiese funksie het, nl. die kataforiese beklemtoning van 'n daaopvolgende uitspraak of gebeurte. Die studie word afgesluit deur die model toe te pas op 'n beskrywing van Gen 27.

Table of Contents

Abbreviations	vii
Acknowledgements	viii
1. Introduction.....	9
1.1 The Problem	9
1.2 The Purpose	10
1.3 The Scope	12
1.4 Hypotheses	13
1.5 Assumptions and Presuppositions	15
1.6 Methodology.....	16
1.7 Relevance	16
1.8 Outline	18
2. Linguistic and Theoretical Framework	20
2.1 Methodological Framework: Levinsohn’s Default/Marked Framework.....	20
2.2 Cognitive Framework.....	26
2.3 Information-Structuring Framework	33
2.4 Cross-Linguistic Functions of Participant Reference	38
2.5 Pragmatic Implicatures of Discourse Anaphora	55
3. Studies of Participant Reference in Biblical Hebrew	61
3.1 Introduction	61
3.2 Berlin (1983)	62
3.3 Fox (1983).....	64
3.4 Longacre (1989=2003).....	65
3.5 Andersen (1994).....	73
3.6 Revell (1996).....	76
3.7 De Regt (1999b) (1999a).....	79
3.8 Heimerdinger (1999).....	84
3.9 Conclusion.....	88
4. Default Encoding of Participants—the Semantic Function	90
4.1 Encoding Contexts for Biblical Hebrew Narrative.....	90
4.2 Initial Activation of Brand-New Participants: Context ‘Int’	91
4.3 Default Encoding of Continuing Reference in Subject Contexts	94
4.4 Apparent Departures from Expected Encoding Norms	107
4.5 Conclusion.....	119
5. Marked Encoding of Subjects—The Processing Function.....	121
5.1 Studies of the Processing Function in Biblical Hebrew	122
5.2 Demarcating the Development Unit Following Narrative Clauses	125
5.3 Demarcating the Development Unit Following Quotative Frames	137
5.4 The Pragmatics of Overspecification: Signal a DU or not?	142

5.5	Conclusion.....	144
6.	Marked Encoding of Participants-Thematic and Cataphoric Highlighting.....	145
6.1	Introduction: Theoretical Frame of Reference	145
6.2	Thematic Highlighting.....	152
6.3	Pragmatic Effects of Thematic Highlighting	161
6.4	Cataphoric Highlighting	168
6.5	Conclusion.....	174
7.	A Discourse-Functional Account of Participant Reference in Genesis 27	176
7.1	Participant Activation.....	176
7.2	Default Encoding for Continuing Reference to Participants	177
7.3	Marked Encoding for Discourse Processing.....	179
7.4	Marked Encoding for Thematic Highlighting	187
7.5	Marked Encoding for Cataphoric Highlighting.....	200
8.	Conclusion	206
8.1	Hypotheses and Research Results	206
8.2	Areas for Further Research.....	207
8.3	Conclusion.....	212
	Appendix 1: Division of Participants by Activation Type.....	214
	Appendix 2: Genesis 27	218
	Bibliography	221

Abbreviations

BHRG *Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*

Cl	Clitic Pronoun
DM	Development Marker
DO	Direct Object
DU	Development Unit
IO	Indirect Object
IPP	Independent Personal Pronoun
LXX	Old Greek Version or Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NET	New English Translation
NIV	New International Version
NJB	New Jerusalem Bible
NKJ	New King James Version
NLT	New Living Translation
NP	Noun Phrase
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
Ø	Zero Anaphora
PFC	Preposed Focal Constituent
PoD	Point of Departure
PoV	Point Of View
S	Subject
T/C	Topic-Comment sentence structure
V	Verb
3MP	Third Masculine Plural
3MS	Third Masculine Singular

Acknowledgements

This study began with the rather simple desire to learn more about what Berlin (1983) called ‘naming’ in 1993. I thought at the time that this might be a fruitful area of study, but had no idea where it would lead. I lacked both methodology and the necessary skills to pursue such a study. I did not even know what to call the field I was interested in. Then a whole new world was opened up to me in reading the contributions to Bergen’s *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics* (1994). I received encouragement and suggested readings from Randall Buth, Barry Bandstra, and most importantly Christo Van der Merwe. It was the latter’s encouragement in 2001 that helped me realize my interest merited more serious pursuit. He also told me that cognitive linguistics would likely hold the key to a number of issues I was investigating. His words were truer than I could have imagined.

The next pivotal event in my study was God providing Stephen Levinsohn via Google. It was his work paper (2000b) on participant reference which both gave me a name for my subject, as well as the beginnings of a methodology. He provided ongoing encouragement and readings to help me acquire the background I would need for this study, culminating in a discourse analysis workshop in early 2003.

Van der Merwe and Levinsohn have both provided incalculable support. Evidence of their influence can be seen throughout this project. Van der Merwe’s consistent challenge to be specific resulted in some of my best work, particularly in defining what I meant by ‘emphasis’. Levinsohn’s experience as a linguistics consultant proved invaluable in helping me understand how languages tend to work. This cross-linguistic framework allowed me to find supporting evidence for my claims in what otherwise would seem to be unlikely places.

Besides the significant contributions of Van der Merwe and Levinsohn, acknowledgment must also be given to the friends and family who have supported and encouraged me. Thanks to Reverends Friske, Gilfillan, McKeehan and Weston for encouraging me to keep the practical application in view. Thanks to Julie Weston for her attention to detail in helping me with the final editing process. Thanks also to my parents for instilling in me an unquenchable thirst for learning. I also owe a great debt to Glenda, Ruth and Abby for allowing me so many hours over the years to pursue this project. Dad finally ‘landed the plane’. Finally, I thank God who has so gifted and strengthened me to take on such a task and to finish. This study has truly been a spiritual journey which has borne much fruit in my life.

1. Introduction

1.1 *The Problem*

Each language has some means or system of referring to participants. This system of reference includes a participant's initial introduction, continuing reference to the participant, as well as reintroduction after some period of absence. A number of morphological, syntactic and pragmatic issues impinge upon the kinds of encoding used to refer to participants in various contexts. Thankfully, there is a discrete set of cross-linguistic principles which describes the constraints and motivations for using various levels of referential encoding in different context (e.g., use of a clitic pronoun versus an independent personal pronoun, versus a full noun phrase). The primary objective of this study is to provide a cross-linguistic, discourse-functional description of the encoding of participants in Biblical Hebrew narrative.

Grammatical descriptions of Biblical Hebrew have traditionally been based more on the translation of the grammatical phenomenon than on its linguistic function within the language. As a result of this translation-focused description, the principles of linguistic typology (i.e. how other natural languages encode participants) have only occasionally been incorporated into older grammatical descriptions. Furthermore, descriptions of Biblical Hebrew have tended to be more *formal* in nature than *functional*. Such descriptions are often unable to accurately describe the discourse-pragmatic functions of grammatical structures. This is particularly the case where the 'grammar' of the particular structure or system operates above the level of the sentence or clause. The encoding of participants is just such a system. It reflects consideration of higher-level discourse criteria to determine the level of encoding used in a particular context.

Numerous studies in the field of biblical poetics have been conducted on Biblical Hebrew narrative, describing the literary conventions used by the writers/editors to shape and structure their literary works (e.g. Alter 1982, Berlin 1983, Sternberg 1985, Bar-Efrat 1989). These poetic studies are noteworthy in that they seek to describe the higher-level factors which influence the encoding used to refer to participants. Berlin's (1983) work in the area of characterization and point of view clearly presents evidence of a pragmatic use of referring expressions by the biblical writers. However, due to her literary frame of reference, not much attention is given to a methodological framework for distinguishing semantically-required use of referring expressions from pragmatically-marked usage. Poetic methodologies have tended to be more driven by the analyst's intuition and appreciation of the literary art than by an empirically-grounded, linguistically-informed methodological framework. The work in the area of poetics illustrates well the exegetical fruitfulness of attention to the pragmatic use of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew narrative. Unfortunately, poetics provides little in the way of a methodological framework for analysts not formally trained in comparative literature to pursue this kind of research.

Conversely, a few monograph-length studies have been conducted on the specific topic of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew narrative (cf. De Regt 1999b; Revell 1996). Still others have simply touched upon the subject in passing (cf. Andersen 1994; Heimerdinger 1999; Levinsohn 2000b). The two formal studies (i.e. De Regt 1999b and Revell 1996) on the subject make reference to both literary and linguistic principles. However they do not comprehensively or systematically incorporate these principles into their description of participant reference. The shorter studies (Andersen 1994; Levinsohn 2000b) make solid contributions to our knowledge of participant reference. However, due to their limited scope they each leave a number of significant issues unresolved.

Thus, the current state of knowledge regarding participant reference is mixed. Literary and poetic studies have demonstrated that attention to the pragmatic use of referring expressions can make a significant contribution to both exegetical and translational studies of narrative in the Hebrew Bible. Yet these methodologies lack an empirically-based framework for analysis. This framework must be able to accurately identify marked forms and be able to accurately describe the pragmatic effects they achieve.

The formal studies which sought to describe participant reference have not strayed far from the traditional, translation-based descriptions typifying grammatical studies of the Hebrew Bible. These studies tend not to give sufficient attention to the cross-linguistic principles which govern and influence participant reference. As a result, the description of attested encoding data in Biblical Hebrew narrative is incomplete, or at times even incorrect. This is particularly true with respect to the pragmatic use of referring expressions. Misunderstandings regarding the default encoding requirements in various discourse contexts have led to incorrect conclusions about what represents marked encoding. Some significant contributions have indeed been made. However, a comprehensive, empirically-based description of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew narrative is still lacking. Such a description must be able to account for the default encoding constraints as well as the discourse-function of pragmatic departures from default encoding.

1.2 *The Purpose*

In light of our current understanding regarding the use and function of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew narrative, the purpose of this study is to provide a description which:

- is grounded and informed by cross-linguistic principles,
- is empirically based, and
- is able to account for non-formal, pragmatic functions of participant reference in discourse above the level of the sentence.

Let us consider each of these aspects in turn.

First, this study requires a clear understanding of the cross-linguistic functions of participant reference in discourse. Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:112-113) identify three linguistic tasks which a participant reference system must accomplish in a language:

- Semantic: unambiguously identifying who is doing what to whom;
- Processing: overcoming disruptions in the flow of information by providing more encoding (e.g., a change in topic); and
- Discourse-pragmatic: signaling the activation status and relative prominence of the participants.

The semantic task is prototypically accomplished using the minimum amount of encoding necessary to unambiguously communicate the discourse roles of participants (Givón 1983a:17-18). We shall refer to this minimum amount of encoding as the **default** level. The semantic constraints of various discourse contexts will require differing levels of morphological encoding to refer to the participants. The processing task and discourse-pragmatic task prototypically utilize non-default or marked encoding to indicate that something other than the default semantic function is being accomplished. Therefore, the accuracy of the default encoding values will in turn impact the accuracy of the identification and description of non-default, marked encoding values. An error in the foundation will affect the entire structure.

Therefore, a second requirement for our study is that it must establish an empirically-sound description of default encoding constraints as a prerequisite for describing non-default encoding. The literature survey of Chapters 2 and 3 illustrate the consequences of moving forward with an incomplete understanding of default encoding values. Two common consequences which occur are: describing default encoding values as marked, or alternatively describing marked encoding values as default.

There is significant evidence from other languages to support the premise that semantically-redundant, overencoded references to participants are used to accomplish other, pragmatic functions in addition to their basic semantic function. We shall refer to these as **supra-semantic** functions, in that a semantic purpose is still being accomplished, but something in addition to this semantic function is at the same time being accomplished. Thus, a third requirement of this study is that it must take into account the discourse principles affecting grammar, and not just the traditional understanding of sentence-level grammar. The majority of pragmatic functions utilizing participant reference are manifested above the sentence level. A description of these functions will thus require a theoretical framework that can account for paragraph- and discourse-level phenomenon, levels not traditionally the focus of Biblical Hebrew grammar.

Not only must this study examine the functions of participant reference at various levels of discourse, it must also be able to describe the non-formal, *pragmatic effects* achieved by the use of non-default encoding values in discourse contexts where default encoding is expected. We seek to propose a rationale for why a writer/editor would have chosen such a form as opposed to maintaining default encoding. Here we will rely heavily on attested function in other languages to formulate our description of the pragmatic effects achieved by marked encoding.

We will also incorporate the findings of empirically-based, cognitive studies. These studies describe how participant encoding affects the reader's mental processing of the discourse. Most

cognitive studies have been restricted to the processing of nominal versus pronominal encoding of active agents. As a result, we were unable to find cognitive studies which considered the effects of default versus non-default encoding of *patients*. Nor were there studies which considered the meaningful difference between *simple* versus *complex* lexical NPs to refer to active participants. Therefore, our study extrapolates a theoretical frame of reference from the conclusions of existing empirical studies. It also draws heavily upon principles from pragmatics and relevance theory, and is informed by descriptions of comparable usage in other languages. In light of these purposes, let us now discuss the scope of our study.

1.3 The Scope

In order to provide thorough account of participant reference the scope of this study has been purposefully limited in several ways. First, we have chosen to describe a limited but representative corpus of Gen 11:27-25:10. The rationale behind this decision is to comprehensively account for all of the encoding data in the corpus, as opposed to selectively treating representative tokens from a larger corpus.

Second, since this study represents an initial description of participant reference, we have sought to describe what some consider being the most basic genre of literature: narrative. As a result, we are only attempting to give an account of narrative proper, and not the reported speeches embedded in the narrative. We have excluded reported speeches on the basis that the encoding parameters there are quite different from those of narrative proper. In reported speech one faces the added morphological complications of 1st and 2nd person minimal encoding as opposed to simply 3rd person. It also utilizes features not observed in narrative proper such as vocatives, deferential speech, etc., that add numerous complicating constraints which would significantly expand the scope of this project. In light of the dissertation guidelines and in order to provide a comprehensive and thorough description, certain choices needed to be made, and the exclusion of reported speeches was deemed appropriate.

Third, attention will primarily be given to the pragmatics of overencoded subjects/agents rather than to objects/patients. Most of the empirical cognitive studies conducted in the area of participant reference have been restricted to agents. Thus there is little solid footing upon which to make significant claims about patients without the supporting empirical data. The use of complex referring expressions for thematic highlighting (cf. §6.2) does not appear to be bound or limited by grammatical role; therefore attention will be given to non-subjects in this area. Our treatment of the overencoding of agents and patients for cataphoric highlighting represents a preliminary proposal in the absence of supporting studies to further bolster our arguments. Thus, another limitation to the scope of this study is focusing primarily on the encoding of subjects.

Our methodology, discussed in §2.1, necessitates the analysis of encoding data from a discrete corpus as the basis for hypothesizing default encoding values for various discourse contexts.

After the defaults have been properly established, the remaining data which cannot be accounted for by these default principles are assumed to be non-default. The non-default encoding is assumed to mark the presence of some describable feature of discourse. In preparation for this dissertation, we undertook to write a preliminary description of Biblical Hebrew narrative participant reference for a workshop presented by the Summer Institute of Linguistics in 2003. The corpus for this workshop was the narrative of Exod 1-12. In order to test our proposed initial description, we chose to use a different corpus for the dissertation with the goal of testing and refining our description based on an expanded corpus.¹

The narrative of Exod 1-12 has an unusual number of what appear to be emotionally-charged dialogues. The narrative also has a limited cast of participants. We decided upon the corpus of Gen 12-25 based upon its focus on a single thematically-salient participant Abraham, and based on the fact that it manifested much more typical dialogues and many more participants coming and going from the discourse stage. This decision has proven to be prudent. Several of our defaults were shown to need revision in order to adequately account for the Genesis data. Thus, while our corpus for this study is technically Gen 11:27-25:10, our principles are also able to account for the attested encoding data of Exod 1-12. In order to narrow the scope of discussion, primary attention is placed on Gen 12-25. Only limited reference is made to the Exodus corpus. The final chapter applies the description that we assemble in Chapters 2-6 to Gen 27. This application further ensures that our description can provide a coherent account of attested participant reference usage in its discourse environment, and not just data from selected sentences in isolation.

1.4 Hypotheses

There are four basic hypotheses which form the basis of our study.

1. The use of participant reference observed in Biblical Hebrew narrative follows attested, cross-linguistic principles that are both self-consistent and describable. The usage is also consistent with attested usage in other languages. The use of referring expressions in narrative may at face value appear to be a matter of stylistics or Ancient Near Eastern literary conventions. Regardless of its origins, we propose that it nonetheless represents a describable system. Many have hypothesized a complex literary history lying behind the development of the book of Genesis (e.g. Von Rad 1972:13). However, it is our contention that even though many hands may possibly lie behind the composition and editing of the text we currently call ‘Genesis’, these writers/editors nonetheless utilized natural language conventions which are consistent with principles of usage attested in languages other than Biblical Hebrew. Furthermore, these conventions form a self-consistent system which can be cogently described, given the correct theoretical framework. The goal here is to avoid a translation-

¹ The default encoding principles have also been applied to Gen 1-11, the whole of Ruth and Jonah, and selections from Judges and 1 Samuel. However, the data presented here are restricted primarily to Gen 12-25.

driven description participant reference which is at odds with attested and expected cross-linguistic norms. Only a typologically-informed description of participant reference will be of any value to Bible translators seeking to effectively render a specific function of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew narrative into its counterpart in the receptor language.

2. Based on the pragmatic principle that ‘choice implies meaning’ (cf. Andrews 1990), we will construe departures from the expected default encoding values as being pragmatically motivated. We also hypothesize that such usage forms a self-consistent, describable system, which is consistent with attested usage in other languages. Levinsohn notes that often such choice is dismissed as representing ‘stylistic’ or ‘optional’ variations; however, such claims have no explanatory power, and often “are synonyms of ‘don’t know’!” (2000a:viii). It is our hypothesis that departures from default encoding norms are indeed meaningful, based on the typologically-analogous attested use of participant reference systems in other languages. We claim that non-default encoding is intended to accomplish some effect other than that achieved by use of a default encoding value. Rather than summarily dismissing irregular encoding as a consequence of stylistic variation, we hypothesize that such ‘irregularities’ are pragmatically intended to accomplish a definable, describable effect.
3. Our description of both default and marked encoding will be able to provide a reasonable account for the attested encoding data in a given representative corpus, viz. Gen 11:27-25:10, the Abraham narratives which will more generally be referred to as Gen 12-25. If our study is indeed able to accurately describe the linguistic use of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew narrative as a natural language, a test of its efficacy will be its ability to account for usage in a given representative corpus. Such a description will not have to *predict* usage, but instead describe it. It must not only be able to account for the *presence* of a given encoding value in a context, but should also be able to account for the *absence* of alternative encoding values in that context. For example, if the choice was made to use a marked form in a context, in our view it simultaneously represents the decision *not* to use a default or alternative marked form in order to accomplish some specific pragmatic effect.
4. Our description will both account for shortcomings of past studies of this area, as well as make a positive contribution to both the exegesis and translation of Biblical Hebrew narrative. Based on past studies of the pragmatic use of referring expressions conducted in the field of poetics, it seems apparent that an empirically-grounded description will make a significant contribution to the exegesis of narrative, whether in the area of unit delimitation, theme discovery, or narrative criticism and interpretation.

1.5 *Assumptions and Presuppositions*

Assumption 1: Literary Unity

Studies in the area of poetics and narrative criticism have demonstrated that many of the original ‘signs of redaction’ hypothesized by early Source critics to be evidence of underlying sources can be well accounted for as *literary* devices which actually add to the cohesion and flow of the text (cf. Berlin 1983:111ff). Furthermore, recent critical studies in the areas historiography and source criticism have called into significant doubt long-held assumptions which form the very foundation of modern documentary hypotheses (cf. Van Setters 2006). Rather than having an inept redactor editing a series of conflicting documents into a quilt-like composition, the final form of the Biblical Hebrew text is being held in much higher regard of late, especially with respect to the literary skill with which it was composed. In light of this, we will regard the text of our Genesis corpus as a unified literary composition. This is not to claim that it came from the hand of a single author. By ‘unified’ we mean that the final form of the text represents a coherent and cohesive composition that utilizes a unified set of literary and linguistic conventions that are describable and self-consistent. Thus, we will not appeal to disparate underlying sources to account for variations in encoding. Instead, we will assume that the writers and editors were utilizing a common set of linguistic conventions manifested in Biblical Hebrew as a natural language.

Assumption 2: Biblical Hebrew Represents Natural Language Usage.

A second assumption is that the Hebrew found in our corpus is representative of a natural language, and as such will conform to expected linguistic conventions and norms characteristic of natural languages. We are aware of the issue of diachronic matters related to language development and change, and thus have sought to select a corpus that would reflect a common period of language usage so far as we are able to determine. Therefore only limited appeal will be made to tokens outside of the Torah, and the assumption is made that the language of Genesis and Exodus, as received in the Masoretic Text, provides a representative corpus reflecting principles of natural language.²

Assumption 3: Markedness

We construe the participant reference system manifested in Biblical Hebrew narrative as being an asymmetrical system of marked and unmarked forms (cf. Andrews 1990). Usage of a marked form explicitly indicates the presence of a particular feature. Use of the unmarked form does not specify whether the feature is present or not. It may or may not be present; the form is *unmarked*

² We duly note that our assumption here has been questioned, cf. Ullendorff (1977) and Knauf (1990). The participant reference encoding data seems to betray an underlying *system*, in our opinion. Thus, while we acknowledge the alternative view, for the purposes of our study we shall nonetheless construe Biblical Hebrew as functioning like a natural language.

and thus does not explicitly specify one way or the other. Thus, the marked form does not inherently mean the opposite of the unmarked. It explicitly indicates that the feature in question is present.

1.6 Methodology

The methodology of this study entails four steps. The first step is to develop a discourse-functional and cognitive theoretical frame of reference, accomplished by a survey of studies in the following areas:

- information structure and the cognitive processing of discourse,
- language typology and its application to participant reference,
- pragmatics and the processing of marked forms, and
- anaphora resolution.

The insights and principles realized from this survey will then be used to construct a theoretical framework for evaluating the current status of participant reference studies.

Next we will survey studies in the area of participant reference, first in linguistics proper (Chapter 2), and then specifically in the description of Biblical Hebrew narrative (Chapter 3). This is intended to identify the questions left unanswered by previous descriptions of participant reference. The goal is also to verify that our theoretical framework is sufficiently constructed to resolve these questions. Our framework will also be used to select a suitable methodology which is flexible and comprehensive enough to identify and describe marked forms against a canon of default forms.

Next, we apply this methodology within our theoretical framework to the Genesis corpus to describe default encoding of participants in the various discourse contexts of narrative (Chapter 4). This description of default encoding will then be used to isolate and describe the non-default encoding data, which we will construe as marking the presence of some discourse feature. We will describe the discourse function played by these marked forms based on:

- the cross-linguistic functions of participant reference,
- the conclusions reached by empirical studies on the cognitive processing of overencoding, and
- the comparable function of such encoding in other languages.

Finally, we will apply our completed description of participant reference in the narrative of our corpus to the text of Gen 27, both to test and to illustrate the explanatory value of our conclusions for exegesis and translation.

1.7 Relevance

1.7.1 Implications for Exegesis

This study builds on the work of scholars from the disciplines of poetics, pragmatics, anaphora resolution, cognitive linguistics, discourse analysis and Old Testament narrative criticism. The methodology utilized will be relevant to poetics scholars as a means of systematizing literary analysis; this will help to provide more objective results, and to make the methodology more transferable to students. Current methods in this field rely heavily upon reader-response and reader-

intuition. This study contributes to the description of point of view, characterization, center of attention, and embedded evaluation.

Our discussion of prominence will be of relevance to those working in the area of pragmatics and cognitive linguistics in that we propose a cognitive account of how prominence markers are both discerned and processed. Description of marked forms too often results in nebulous appeals to ‘emphasis’ that do not have much explanatory value in and of themselves. Our proposed model—which describes the cognitive processing of prominence—will add clarity to our description of the pragmatic effects of marked encodings.

Linguists working in the area of anaphora resolution will also find this study relevant in that Biblical Hebrew heavily utilizes what we will refer to as ‘thematic highlighting,’ a task which is accomplished through the substitution or supplementation of proper names with thematically-salient referring expressions. This area is hardly addressed in the general linguistic literature, most likely due to the fact that this convention is not as heavily manifested in modern European languages. Therefore our description of this device represents a contribution to the description of discourse anaphora above the level of lexical NPs.

This study will also provide relevant insight into discourse analysis, particularly in the area of delimitation criticism. Participant reference is used in many languages to aid readers in segmenting the text into discrete chunks for easier processing. Our discussion on the use of overencoding of active participants provides a framework for analysts to test current methods of unit delimitation against the linguistic evidence for segmentation, viz. overencoding of active participants (cf. Chapter 5). We also make reference to the correlation of Masoretic *parashiyyot* accents with formal and pragmatic markers of discontinuity found at these textual boundaries.

The final area of relevance for this study is the exposition of Biblical Hebrew narrative. The pragmatic use of overencoding for thematic and cataphoric highlighting (cf. Chapters 6 and 7) will give exegetes insight into the writer/editor’s conception of the relative prominence of different parts of a narrative. These devices are used to pragmatically add prominence to narrative elements, prominence that they would not otherwise have naturally received. The pragmatic use of prominence markers is a key indicator for determining the communicative intent that the writer/editor is seeking to convey. The description of prominence markers in Biblical Hebrew is still being developed. Our description of the use of participant reference to mark prominence represents only a small part of the larger endeavor of determining how such devices interact with other known prominence markers attested in Biblical Hebrew narrative.

1.7.2 Implications for Bible translation

People working in the area of Bible translation and language consultation will find our study relevant for its description of discourse features based on cross-linguistic principles and examples, rather than primarily upon the translation of the feature into English or German. For those unfamiliar

with a functional approach to language, this study will hopefully add to their appreciation and understanding of how languages use devices such as the participant reference system to accomplish a variety of semantic and pragmatic tasks. We will strive to maintain a distinction between the formal *semantic meaning* of a construction and the *pragmatic effects* achieved by its use in a given context.

1.8 Outline

Chapter 2 provides an introduction to the building blocks of our theoretical frame of reference. This frame of reference is introduced through a review of the literature from which it is derived. This framework is then applied to a survey of linguistic studies of participant reference and anaphora. One goal of this literature survey is to ensure that the theoretical framework is sufficient to tackle the remaining questions left by previous studies. Another goal of this survey is to compare the explanatory power of various methods for describing participant reference, with a view to selecting the one that provides the most elegant and useful description.

Chapter 3 will apply the theoretical framework and methodology developed to evaluate and learn from past studies of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew narrative. It will also set an agenda of the issues that will need to be resolved in order to build upon previous participant reference studies in Biblical Hebrew narrative.

Chapter 4 provides a description of default encoding values for participants beginning with their initial introduction into the discourse. The description will also cover continuing reference to these participants, as well as their reactivation after a period of inactivity. Issues which constrain encoding decisions will also be discussed, including syntax, Biblical Hebrew verb morphology, and the discourse context. The goal is to ensure that default constraints are not construed as marked, and vice versa. As we will see, the default principles of participant encoding are only able to account for a portion of the encoding data from our corpus. The residual data will be discussed in the remaining chapters.

Chapter 5 describes one of the functions of overencoding the subjects/agents in contexts of relative continuity. It will be argued that the use of redundant subject NPs referring to active participants serves a processing function to pragmatically segment the text into discrete units, following Andersen (1994) and Levinsohn (2000b). This claim is grounded in evidence from empirical cognitive studies on anaphora resolution combined with the linguistic evidence from a large number of unrelated languages. While our description of the processing function of referential encoding does account for a large portion of the residual overencoding data, still more remains to be accounted for.

Chapter 6 provides a description of the remaining encoding tokens left unexplained from the previous two chapters. The remaining data are separated into two groups. The first group of data exhibits morphological overencoding that is in excess of what is prototypically associated with the processing function, i.e. an overencoded development unit. The second group exhibits manipulation

of participants' default referring expressions. This involves either the supplementation of a default expression with an appositive or some other descriptive expression, or the substitution of an alternative referring expression for a participant's primary referring expression. We argue that the morphological overencoding has the pragmatic effect of cataphorically highlighting a following speech or event. Additionally we claim that the supplementation or substitution of referring expressions has the pragmatic effect of thematically highlighting the information contained in the non-default expression.

In Chapter 7 we apply our description of participant reference to an analysis of Gen 27. This analysis serves not only to summarize the conclusions we have reached in the study, but also to demonstrate the exegetical value of our discourse-functional description to the exposition and interpretation of the Biblical text. This chapter also describes the interaction of the pragmatic use of participant reference with other prominence markers attested in Biblical Hebrew. Chapter 8 concludes our study, reviewing our hypotheses and discussing areas for further research.

2. Linguistic and Theoretical Framework

Several major studies in the area of participant reference have been conducted over the years, both in linguistics proper and in biblical studies. One common characteristic of these studies is that the analysts seemed to focus on only one aspect of participant reference, e.g. the processing function. Based on attention to the chosen aspect, the scholars were able to describe a bit more of the data than previous studies, yet still end up leaving a portion of the data unexplained. There are very few comprehensive studies which consider all three typological functions of participant reference: semantic, processing and pragmatic. The primary factor influencing the efficacy of a study's explanatory power is its theoretical frame of reference. The limitations of the theoretical framework seem to be directly proportional to the amount of data that is left unexplained.

The purpose of this chapter is to formulate a theoretical frame of reference which is capable of supporting a coherent description of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew narrative. We begin by discussing the rationale for selecting a functional, discourse-pragmatic approach. Next we outline the cognitive issues which impact a reader's processing of participant reference in order to incorporate these constraints into our description. The cognitive framework is followed by a discussion of syntactic issues which place certain constraints on the encoding of participants. The survey of cognitive and syntactic issues will allow us to understand how these factors influence default encoding values. It will also allow these constraints to be adequately incorporated into our description.

Next we consider the cross-linguistic functions of participant reference. These functions provide guidance in determining the function of both default and non-default encoding. This is followed by a brief discussion of pragmatic implicatures and how they influence the processing of discourse. Our goal for this theoretical frame of reference is that it be able to account the pragmatic functions of participant reference. It must also take into account cognitive principles of language processing, as well as cross-linguistic and typological principles of referential encoding. Finally we will evaluate the relevant linguistic studies on participant reference using our theoretical framework to verify that it is able to account for attested encoding.

2.1 *Methodological Framework: Levinsohn's Default/Marked Framework*

In this section we introduce Levinsohn's methodology for identifying and describing marked forms on the basis of a proposed default canonical form. This methodology is also used as an evaluative tool in this chapter and the next to critique studies in the field.

2.1.1 Introduction

The methodological framework for this study is that developed by Levinsohn (1978, 1990, 1994, 2000a, 2000b, 2003), Dooley and Levinsohn (2001), and Bailey and Levinsohn (1992). It has been referred to as the **default/marked** method by Clark (2000). The default/marked concept is not

so much a method as a methodological framework for both developing and adapting methods of linguistic description to fit a particular language or language feature. Levinsohn's approach combines three concepts into an eclectic, yet very adaptable framework for linguistic studies. His approach is a *functional, descriptive application of markedness theory*.³ Let us consider each of these ideas in turn.

Functional:

A functional approach according to Dooley is "an attempt to discover and describe what linguistic structures are used for: the functions they serve, the factors that condition their use" (1989:1). A structural approach to grammar prototypically describes how the possible encoding options are used; yet it rarely explains why one form is used in a particular context as opposed to another. In contrast, a functional approach is concerned with understanding *why* a particular form is used as opposed to simply *how* the form is used (Van Wolde 1997:21).

A functional approach to linguistics is grounded in the assumption that '*choice implies meaning*' (Andrews 1990). In instances where there is more than one option for grammaticalizing an utterance, there is likely some kind of pragmatic choice which guides the speaker to choose one encoding option over another. Each choice is assumed to have a unique, pragmatic implicature associated with it, i.e. *a meaningful difference*. Rather than simply listing the options available to the speaker, this study will attempt to provide a description of the pragmatic effect or 'meaning' underlying each choice.

The corollary of 'choice implies meaning' holds true as well: 'no choice implies no meaning'. It will be demonstrated that certain Biblical Hebrew constructions which have been viewed by some as 'marked' or 'emphatic' in fact represent a default encoding constraint. If there is no choice associated with the particular use of the form in a context, it is inappropriate to assign any pragmatic 'meaning' to its use. Assuredly stylistic differences between speakers account for some differences in usage. All too frequently though, such an explanation is cited when a grammarian is unable to explain the meaning underlying the variation. As Levinsohn has stated, "too often, the terms 'optional' and 'stylistic variation' are synonyms of 'don't know!'" (2000a:viii).

The study of Fox (1983) on topic continuity in Biblical Hebrew provides a representative illustration of the limits of structural studies as a heuristic tool. He found that the referential distance (number of clauses since the last mention of a referent) is virtually identical for *three* different levels of morphological encoding: clitic pronouns, independent pronouns, and 'Y-movement' (ibid:242). While Fox was able to empirically document the various options, he was unable to explain *why* one form was used and not another. While his study provided a useful description, it is of little heuristic value in helping the analyst determine the implicatures of using one form instead of another.

³ For a thorough, theoretical introduction to an asymmetrical view of markedness theory as applied here, cf. Andrews (1990).

To illustrate the principle of ‘no choice implies no meaning’, let us consider Fox’s description of independent pronouns in Biblical Hebrew. He claims that clitic pronouns are the default level of encoding for all Biblical Hebrew verbal forms. However, non-finite verbal forms (e.g., participles and infinitives absolute) do not grammaticalize subject agreement, nor do verbless clauses. Thus, non-finite verbal and verbless clauses *require* use of at least an independent personal pronoun to encode the subject. However, Fox fails to factor this into his account of Biblical Hebrew morphology. This leads him to observe: “In non-verbal clauses in EBH [Early Biblical Hebrew], unstressed, non-contrastive independent pronouns are almost obligatory, used much like subject agreement in verbal clauses” (ibid:252). It would seem more accurate to describe the use of independent personal pronouns as *required* for non-finite clauses, i.e. the *default* form. Such a view would bolster his claim that subject agreement is obligatory, a claim which we would agree with.

Descriptive:

A descriptive study seeks to move beyond cataloging the optional uses of a linguistic feature to describing the ‘meaning’ associated with each of the choices available. Such a description neither seeks to *predict* usage, nor *prescribes* how conventions should be used. A functional description analyzes actual usage. It develops a unified explanation which is not only able to account for the *presence* of a feature in a context, but which is able to account for its *absence* in a different context (Levinsohn 2000a:ix). The key to developing such a description lies in understanding what grammatical or pragmatic feature each choice specifically ‘marks’ as being present.

Markedness:

Markedness theory, as described by Andrews (1990), presupposes that asymmetrical sets of linguistic oppositions exist which function as markers for the presence or absence of a particular feature.⁴ The sets are said to be asymmetrical in that one member of the set indicates the presence of a particular feature (called the ‘marked’ form), while some other member of the set (the ‘default’ form) is considered to be *unmarked* for the feature. The recognition of asymmetry to this view of markedness is crucial, in that the default form does *not* signal the *opposite* of the marked form. Instead, the feature in question *may* or *may not* be present; the default form is not explicitly marked for the feature.

The novelty of Levinsohn’s application of markedness theory lies in the identification and utilization of default forms. Traditionally, defaults are identified statistically: the most frequently occurring form is assumed to be the default.⁵ An ancillary implication of such a statistically-based

⁴ Cf. van Wolde (1997:25ff) for a summary of markedness theory and an application of it to Biblical Hebrew syntax.

⁵ Cf. Andrews’ (1990:136ff) very insightful chapter entitled “Myths about Markedness” which debunks some commonly held notions regarding the use of statistics in distinguishing default and marked forms.

selection is to view frequency of use as inversely proportional to semantic significance.⁶ Such a framework does *not* describe the asymmetrical presence or absence of a feature, but instead results in a statistically-based semantic hierarchy, with the least frequently occurring forms conveying the most semantic meaning. Such a framework often turns out to have little heuristic value in differentiating the meaningful difference of using one form over against another other than to say it is somehow ‘more marked’.

Levinsohn’s approach is to organize descriptions based on the feature that is marked by each member of the set. Rather than selecting a default based on *frequency*, Levinsohn advocates selecting a provisional default based on identifying the *most basic* or simplex form of the feature in question through a preliminary study. The most unmarked form serves as the canonical baseline for the description of each marked form. This process of identifying the default might require that modifications be made to the proposal.⁷ Since the default form is the least marked, its use does not need to be explained. The default is used when the speaker has chosen *not* to mark the presence of any feature. The most basic form sometimes turns out to indeed be the most frequently occurring, but this is not always the case. The efficacy of the proposed default will directly affect the quality of the final description.

This preliminary study to isolate the least-marked member of a set has several objectives. First, the analyst must inventory the linguistic choices available for encoding a particular feature. Second, he or she must also identify the different contextual constraints which influence the selection of one encoding option as opposed to another. For example, to begin a study of participant reference, one would begin by cataloguing the various morphological encoding options available in the language. Many contextual constraints affect encoding decisions. Examples of these constraints include whether a participant is brand new or already established in the discourse, whether a participant is a major or minor one, the kind of participant he or she is interacting with, and the genre of the discourse.

Finally, the analyst proposes a least-marked encoding option as the ‘default’ based upon the results of the preliminary empirical analysis of the data.⁸ This *default* option then becomes the foil against which proposed *marked* options are described. For instance, the preterite verb in Biblical Hebrew is widely accepted as being the default narrative verb form, signaling *+continuity* and *+perfective aspect* (Buth 1995:99; cf. Longacre 1983:65f and Levinsohn 2002:128). With this default

⁶ E.g. Porter’s description of verbal aspect in Koine Greek is based on a symmetrical view, and is largely based on discourse frequency: “The perfective (aorist) aspect is least heavily weighted of the Greek verbal aspects, and hence carries the least significant meaning attached to use of the form... The imperfective (present/imperfect) aspect is more heavily weighted, and to use it in opposition to the perfective (aorist) implies greater semantic significance” (1992:22).

⁷ Cf. Dooley and Levinsohn (2001: 127ff) for a more complete description of the process.

⁸ The application of typological principles here is crucial. By respecting the demonstrable patterns to which certain language-types tend to adhere, the analyst may prevent many errors before they occur. The analyst may also glean clues about how comparable linguistic tasks are accomplished in other languages. (cf. Chapter 3).

as the baseline, the analyst would then describe the other forms—such as *w-x-qtI* or participial forms—based on what feature(s) their presence explicitly signals that the default does *not* explicitly signal. Such a method can be adapted and applied to virtually any feature, context, or language.

The default/marked methodology is exemplified in Li's (1997) study of zero anaphora in Late Archaic Chinese. He observes that very little of this language's grammar is based on morpho-syntactic rules, but instead on discourse-pragmatic ones. He further notes that many Western linguists have sought to account for the zero-slot in Chinese based on the fact that Western languages must 'drop' a pronoun in order to achieve zero anaphora. In Li's view, Chinese speakers *begin* with zero anaphora as a default, and use higher levels of encoding for pragmatic purposes (ibid:278). Previous studies of Chinese had characterized zero anaphora as a so-called 'reduced' form. Thus by hypothesizing that zero anaphora is the default encoding form for active participants, his goal is no longer to explain the presence of 'default' zero anaphora, but instead to describe the motivations and factors influencing *departures* from this default (ibid:275).

Claiming a certain form is the default is *not* to claim that it is used more frequently than any other form, or that it has less significance than any other form. A default is simply the most basic, encoding option available *for a particular feature*. It provides a heuristic canon against which to describe the explicitly-marked options. If one finds that the chosen form is *not* the least marked, there is freedom to reorganize the descriptions. Chapter 4 will provide a description of default encoding of participants for the narrative of our corpus, and will form the basis for our description of marked forms and usage in Chapters 5-7.

The so-called 'default/marked' methodology has been applied to participant reference studies in a variety of typologically-diverse languages. Levinsohn first applied the approach to the Inga (Quechuan) language of Columbia (1978), to Koine Greek (1992, revised as 2000a) and then to Biblical Hebrew (Levinsohn 2000b). He has also supervised its application to a wide variety of languages through workshops for Bible translators (cf. Levinsohn 1994, Dooley and Levinsohn 2001). Clark (2000) conducted a comparative study of three different methods for describing participant reference (Givón 1983a, Tomlin 1987, and Levinsohn 2000a) to the Sio language of Papua New Guinea. He concluded that Levinsohn's framework provided the most adaptable and accurate description of the three.

2.1.2 Benefits of a Default/Marked Framework

Adaptable

This framework has been used successfully to describe linguistic features of very diverse, non-Western, minority languages, including the description of participant reference. These languages utilize a variety of referential encoding systems (e.g. switch-reference systems, gender-based systems,

etc.⁹) and different anaphoric strategies (e.g. look-back strategies, VIP strategies¹⁰). Levinsohn's framework has also proven to be sufficiently flexible to allow for adaptation to the various constraints of diverse languages. Its application to studies of participant reference will be reviewed in more detail in §2.4.4.

Empirically-based

The importance of establishing an empirically defensible default cannot be underscored enough. Numerous problems arise and compound in the absence of a properly established default. First, a flawed default can lead an analyst to misidentify truly marked forms as 'default', or vice versa. Second, if the default has not been discretely isolated, one may end up describing what turns out to be *two* discrete features as a *single* feature, or worse yet classifying the anomaly as an exception. If the baseline is flawed, the initial error tends to be compounded in the description and classification of non-default usage.

Heuristic

The method provides a functional framework which allows the analyst not only to account for the *presence* of a feature via participant reference encoding, but also to account for its *absence* elsewhere.

2.1.3 Semantic Meaning versus Pragmatic Effect

Languages tend to be very efficient. They will frequently exploit the non-typical use of a grammatical feature to achieve a certain pragmatic effect. Some languages track participants using *switch reference* markers, whereby "the verb of a dependent clause is morphologically marked to indicate whether or not the subject of that clause is the same as the subject of its linearly adjacent, structurally related independent clause. If both subjects are coreferential, a SS [i.e. same subject] marker is used; otherwise, a DS [i.e. different subject] marker is employed" (Huang 2000:11). In spite of this default principle, Huang notes the non-referential, pragmatic use of the DS marker in the Amele language in certain SS contexts: "In this language, a change of place and/or time warrants the use of a DS marker *even if the subjects in question remain the same...* But typically the secondary functions of the switch-reference system are *in addition to its primary function* and are related to the encoding of some non-referential meanings" (2000:293, italics mine). Hence the *pragmatic effect* of the DS marker in a SS context is to signal something in addition to its basic *semantic meaning*. Language strategies like this use of the DS marker serve to economize the number of different devices a language requires to meet the needs of its speakers. Grammatical devices often play

⁹ Cf. Huang 2000:8ff for a typological description of each.

¹⁰ Cf. Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:117ff) for a description of these strategies.

double-duty, pragmatically marking the presence of a feature in (non-default) contexts where such a device is semantically unexpected or unnecessary.¹¹

Another example of the non-default use of a device to achieve a pragmatic effect is the non-spatial use of spatial-deictic markers, e.g. demonstrative pronouns, to encode the relative salience of discourse referents.¹² From a semantic perspective, the demonstrative pronouns *this* and *that* in English encode near and far spatial proximity, respectively, from the speaker's point of view. However, when these demonstrative pronouns are applied to non-spatial referents, particularly in a comparative context, the near demonstrative has the *pragmatic effect* of marking the proximate referent as more salient than the distal referent (cf. Levinsohn 2003). This 'feature' of marking relative salience is not a semantic component of the pronoun. Instead, it is a *pragmatic effect* of its use in a particular context. It will be argued that Biblical Hebrew narrative exploits overspecified or redundant NPs to accomplish several different pragmatic effects beyond their basic semantic function, depending upon the discourse context.

2.2 Cognitive Framework

2.2.1 Mental Representations

Understanding how humans process texts or discourse is foundational to understanding participant reference. Andersen et al. (1983) suggest the following model: "One way of looking at comprehension is to view it as a process of mapping elements in the sentence currently being interpreted into a [mental] representation established on the basis of the prior discourse. According to such a view a single integrated representation of the discourse is constantly being updated as new information is encountered" (1983:427). Information communicated via the discourse is then added to the hearer's developing mental representation. Lambrecht elaborates on this idea stating, "This representation is formed by the sum of 'propositions' which the hearer knows or believes or considers uncontroversial at the time of speech" (1994:43). The mental representation is built either by contributing new information to the 'files' of existing discourse referents,¹³ or by 'activating' new referents.

2.2.2 Identifiability

Before a speaker can add information about a referent, he or she must ensure that the hearer is able to uniquely identify the intended referent in his or her mental representation. Lambrecht defines

¹¹ Cf. §2.5 for a discussion of Huang's (2000) M-principle, which explains the cognitive processing of such devices by a hearer or reader.

¹² Cf. Levinsohn 2003 and Linde 1979.

¹³ Lambrecht notes, "Discourse referents are syntactically expressed in ARGUMENT (including adjunct) categories, such as noun phrases, pronouns, various kinds of tensed or non-tensed subordinate clauses, and certain adverbial phrases (those that can be said to refer to the circumstances of a predication). They cannot normally be expressed in phrases which serve as PREDICATES. Predicates by definition do not denote discourse referents but attributes of, or relations between, arguments" (1994:75).

this constraint of *identifiability* as “a speaker’s assessment of whether a discourse representation of a particular referent is already stored in a hearer’s mind or not” (ibid:76). A referent is considered identifiable either if it is represented in the addressee’s mind, or if it can be referred to deictically or anaphorically (ibid:77). Lambrecht likens the creation of a new discourse representation in the hearer’s mind “to establishing a unique information ‘file’ in the hearer’s mental representation, in which new information about the referent is stored throughout the discourse, and which can be retrieved in future discourses” (ibid:77). This process of establishing a new referent in a discourse is referred to as *activation* (cf. §2.2.4).

2.2.3 Discourse Register

As speakers and hearers begin a dialogue or discourse, both start with a certain amount of common knowledge about the world around them. This knowledge forms the basic framework of what is called a ‘discourse register’. Lambrecht defines the discourse register as “the set of representations which a speaker and hearer may be assumed to share in a given discourse” (ibid:47). As new participants and referents are introduced into the discourse, they are simultaneously added to the register. Information gathered about the discourse referents is cognitively utilized to build the ‘mental representation’ of both the referent and the discourse as a whole.

2.2.4 Chafe’s Activation States

The prominence of a discourse referent in a hearer’s mental representation does not remain static throughout a discourse. While it may figure prominently when first activated, a referent tends to lapse in its degree of ‘activation’ with each passing clause which does not make explicit or implicit reference to it. Chafe has identified the following potential activation states a discourse referent can have at any one point in time as a means of describing this process of deactivation:

- Active: A concept “that is currently lit up, a concept in a person’s focus of consciousness at a particular moment”.
- Semi-active: It is accessible, a concept “that is in a person’s peripheral consciousness, a concept of which a person has a background awareness, but one that is not being directly focused on”.
- Inactive: A concept “that is currently in a person’s long-term memory, neither focally nor peripherally active” (1987:22ff).

The cognitive status of a participant undergoes a process of decay in the absence of continued reference to it in the discourse, moving quickly to a semi-active state, and eventually to an inactive state. The second stage of decay, from semi-active to inactive, is much slower and is generally directly proportional to the participant’s salience and level of activity in the preceding discourse. Eventually, the participant is said to be ‘inactive’, stored in the reader’s long-term memory, and requiring more mental energy to reactivate than a semi-active participant.

2.2.5 Activation Potential and Participant Encoding

Lambrecht rightly notes that the issues of accessibility and activation are less a matter of discrete states, and more matters of degree. “I suggest, then, that we think of cognitive accessibility as a POTENTIAL FOR ACTIVATION rather than as the STATE OF A REFERENT in a person’s mind... I believe that the main criterion in manipulating the pragmatic states of referents in a discourse is not whether some referent is ‘objectively’ active or inactive in a hearer’s mind but whether a speaker assumes that a hearer is willing and able, on the basis of grammatical forms with particular presuppositional structures, to draw certain inferences which are necessary to arrive at the correct interpretation of a referent” (1994:104-105). Based on Chafe’s (1987) definitions of activation states, and Givón’s (1983a:18) Iconicity Principle, it is possible to sketch the expected morphological forms used to encode referents with different potentials for activation.

Active participants are normally encoded using the minimal morphological form available in a language (cf. Grice’s ‘Maxim of Quantity’, 1975:45-46; Givón 1983a:17-18; Gundel et al. 1993:278; Lambrecht 1994:96; Huang 2000:220-221). Language-specific examples of minimum encoding for subjects are: zero anaphora in Chinese, Japanese and Korean; clitic or bound pronouns¹⁴ in Biblical Hebrew, Koine Greek and Arabic; and independent pronouns in English, French and German. Though use of more encoding is frequently used to refer to active participants (e.g. a lexical NP or a demonstrative pronoun), such encoding is often pragmatically motivated to accomplish non-default purposes, as was illustrated from Huang (2000:11) in §2.1.2.

Givón (2001:175) describes the challenge of reactivation as follows: “In the grammar of referential coherence, a referent is coded as definite when the speaker assumes that it is *accessible* to the hearer but is not *currently activated* (in working memory/attention). The hearer’s task is then to *ground* (connect) the referent, either to its previous anaphoric trace in episodic memory or to some other accessible trace, and then to *reactivate* it in working memory”. Thus the re-establishment of the referent and the ‘ground’ (what we will call the *discourse anchor* or *anchoring relation*) is the primary task accomplished through reactivation from inactivity. Differences in activation potential require different levels of morphological encoding.

Semi-active participants require definite lexical NPs for reactivation since they are only peripherally conscious in the reader’s mental representation. These referents are not ‘lit up’, thus a lexically-specific form is needed to specify the intended referent and thus reactivate it. The cognitive task is to select the intended participant from among the possible candidates in the reader’s peripheral consciousness. As was the case with active participants, semi-active referents are also overencoded at times using anchored definite NPs. It will be shown that such encoding is pragmatically—and not simply semantically—motivated.

¹⁴ Givón (1983a:17) refers to such pronouns as ‘agreement markers’.

Inactive referents—those which have previously been discourse active but have passed into long-term memory due to disuse—have a higher semantic threshold to be met for reactivation. As a result, and based on Givón’s (1983a:18) Iconicity Principle, we can expect that inactive participants will require more morphological encoding than semi-active participants.¹⁵ Not only must the inactive participant be specified using a definite lexical NP, but the anchoring relation which grounds the participant to the discourse must *also* be reestablished. The anchoring relation can take the form of an attributive modifier, a restrictive relative clause, or an appositive. We propose the following table to describe default encoding of the three activation states:

Table 1. Anticipated Encoding Based on Activation Potential

ACTIVATION STATES	REACTIVATION	CONTINUING REFERENCE
ACTIVE	--	CL. OR Ø
SEMI-ACTIVE	SIMPLE NP	--
INACTIVE	ANCHORED NP	--

It stands to reason that there should be a difference in encoding required for reactivation between each activation state. While we may not know definitively the specific activation state of a participant in a reader’s mental representation at any one time, we *can* observe the assessments that speakers make about activation status based on how they encode participants in various discourse contexts. Such a working distinction is imperative in order for analysts to make informed judgments regarding whether a participant’s encoding is default or marked.

Lambrecht’s (1994) regarding the reactivation of inactive referents requires further discussion. Reactivation of a participant from the discourse register essentially requires a shift by the reader from *knowing about* the participant to *thinking about* the participant as the center of attention. Lambrecht claims that the required encoding for reactivating an inactive participant is “ACCENTUATION of the referential expression and FULL LEXICAL coding” (1994:96). His claim appears to be based on a corollary assumed from Chafe’s observation that active participants are usually “spoken with an attenuated pronunciation” (Chafe 1987:26). Lambrecht (1994:98) makes the assumption that prosody is a marking component of the morphological encoding hierarchy, forming a set of contrastive oppositions regarding the encoding of activation states. The following is extrapolated from his discussion:

- Active: -prosodic prominence, +pronominal encoding
- Semi-active: +/-prosodic prominence, -pronominal encoding¹⁶
- Inactive (and accessible?): +prosodic prominence, -pronominal encoding

¹⁵ Cf. Givón (1983a:19), where he notes “at least some studies in this volume demonstrate that NPs modified by restrictive modifiers code more discontinuous/less accessible topics than unmodified NP’s. This must be a reflection of the phonological size scale, since obviously a modification increases the size of the NP”. Cf. Givón (2001:175ff) for use of restrictive relative clauses to reestablish the ‘grounding’ relation of inactive referents.

¹⁶ Our construction of his semi-active position is just that. It appears that he claims that ‘activation accent’ is necessary for the promotion of both inactive and accessible referents (cf. 1994:270).

Lambrecht's conclusion regarding the function of prosody in the reactivation of inactive participants overlooks several very significant aspects of attested encoding data.

To begin with, prosody is not a recognized morphological marker in language typology. The nearest thing to the use of prosody in *any* morphological encoding scale concerns use of independent pronouns, never NPs (cf. Givón's 'Scale of phonological size', 1983a:18; or Ariel's 'Accessibility marking scale', 1990).¹⁷ Both of these scales, as well as the work of Chafe (1976, 1980, 1987), are all 'pre-Lambrecht'. In other words, Lambrecht's work on information structure *significantly* influenced subsequent discussion on everything from contrastiveness to word order. Subsequent study of prosody has placed its role squarely within the realm of pragmatics, *not* semantics.¹⁸ Within pragmatics, prosody is found to be a significant component of information structure, especially in languages with rigid word order. There is indeed a relation between activation state and prosody. However we would argue that it concerns the difference between topical and focal information, not activation states.

By definition, topical entities must be identifiable NPs, either active or accessible to the hearer. Default encoding of topical entities is characterized by attenuated pronunciation (i.e. unaccented). If one correlates topicality with activation state, one finds that by definition only active and semi-active participants can be topical. This would account for their lack of prosodic prominence in unmarked information-structure contexts (cf. §2.3). Thus, 'prosodic accent' serves as a distinctive marker of information status: a constituent is either topical or focal. We argue here that the case cannot be made typologically for its application as a distinctive marker of activation state. Consider the distinction between 'stressed pronoun' and 'unstressed pronoun' in Ariel's scale. From a pragmatic standpoint, the distinction between the two is *marked topic* versus *default topic*, respectively, since pronominal referents must be discourse-active by definition.¹⁹

Next, consider Lambrecht's definition of focal constituents. He defines the focus of an utterance as the difference between what is presupposed at the time of the utterance, and what is

¹⁷ Givón uses the term 'unstressed pronoun' as a synonym for a clitic or *bound* pronoun. He correspondingly links stressed pronouns with *independent* pronouns, presumably to differentiate languages like English (which do not use clitic pronouns) from languages such as Hebrew (which do). Ariel's scale seems to list all possibilities for all languages:

Ariel's accessibility marking scale (from Huang 2000:254)

Zero > reflexive > agreement marker > cliticized pronoun > unstressed pronoun > stressed pronoun > stressed pronoun+gesture > proximal demonstrative (+NP) > distal demonstrative (+NP) > ... > first name > last name > short definite description > long definite description > full name

Though she may indeed see a scalar function of prosody with respect to pronouns, *no scale* uses 'stressed NP' as a morphological class relating to activation.

¹⁸ Cf. Hedberg (2002), and Hedberg and Sosa (2001).

¹⁹ A technical exception to pronouns being topical is the prospective or cataphoric use of demonstrative pronouns to highlight the introduction of a new proposition. E.g., "Know **this**, that you will never pass the course without studying". In this example, the referent of 'this' is the proposition "that you..." So far as we have been able to determine, such prospective uses of pronouns are resolved in the immediate context, and thus still follow the general principle claimed here regarding use of pronouns.

asserted in the utterance. By definition, inactive participants from the discourse register are construed as non-topical, and therefore are considered part of the focal domain at their reactivation. Lambrecht himself makes this point several times:

Different syntactic constraints on the coding of inactive and accessible referents have been observed by Prince (1981a)²⁰ and Chafe (1987), who both conclude on the basis of text counts that the vast majority of subjects in spoken English have active or accessible but not inactive referents (1994:100-101).

It is clear that any claim concerning a correlation between focus and cognitive state ‘inactive’ can be made only for focus constituents to which the activation parameter can be applied, i.e. to referential constituents in the sense of Section 3.1 (ibid:260).

Focus and inactiveness are independent information-structure parameters and their grammatical manifestations must be carefully distinguished (ibid:261).

The theoretical observation that pragmatically inaccessible discourse referents are most likely to be coded as focal constituents is strongly confirmed by statistical observations concerning the distribution of topic and focus constituents in texts. For example the text counts from spoken French presented in Lambrecht 1986b (Chapter 6) reveal that subjects overwhelmingly tend to be pronouns while objects overwhelmingly appear as lexical noun phrases. Given the necessary correlation between pronominal coding and activeness on the one hand and between inactiveness and lexical coding on the other (Chapter 3), and given the correlation between subject and topic on the one hand and object and focus on the other (Chapter 4), we can conclude that there must be a strong discourse tendency for referential focus constituents to have ‘new’ referents. And this tendency may have important consequences for the syntactic structuring of sentences. Nevertheless, there is no necessary correlation between focus and activation states of referents (ibid:262).

We completely agree with Lambrecht that focus must be understood as the difference between that which is presupposed and that which is asserted. Having said this, we believe that the relation that he is observing is the pragmatic marking of information structure, *not* the use of prosody as a distinctive marker of activation. By definition, focal constituents are marked by prosodic prominence, and any extension of prosody as a distinctive marker of activation states seems circumstantial at best.

There is one final point to make regarding Lambrecht’s account of reactivation of discourse-register participants. We claimed above that reactivation of inactive participants requires both a definite lexical NP and some kind anchoring relation that reestablishes the participant’s relation to the discourse. This is most frequently accomplished via appositives, restrictive relative clauses, or possessive pronouns whose anaphor is discourse-active. Lambrecht does not provide many different examples of such reactivation, but each of the ones he cites includes *has an anchoring expression*. Lambrecht capitalizes words to indicate that they receive primary sentence accent:

- a) I heard something TERRIBLE last night. (Ø) remember MARK, the guy we went HIKING with (Ø), who’s GAY? His LOVER just died of AIDS (ibid:119).

²⁰ Prince only cites one ‘new’ (unused) token occurring as a subject. It is the opening clause of a paper, and likely utilizes pragmatic bootstrapping for activation: “The late Uriel Weinreich (1966:399) observed...” (1981:247).

- b) My CAR broke down (in answer to the question, ‘What happened?’) (ibid:16).
- c) Her HUSBAND died (ibid:309).
- d) I saw your BROTHER yesterday (ibid:107).
- e) I finally met the WOMAN who moved in downstairs (ibid:51).²¹

Token (a) provides an example of the speaker asking the hearer to recall a participant from his/her shared knowledge. Lambrecht construes both MARK and AIDS as being inactive, and attributes the accenting to their reactivation. We would agree that MARK is inactive, but we attribute the accent to marking both as focal. AIDS is accessible from world knowledge, and thus requires no anchor. Notice that the reactivation of MARK includes two anchoring expressions to ensure that the hearer reactivates the correct MARK (i.e. ‘the guy we went HIKING with (Ø)’ and ‘who’s GAY’). Accent alone, without any anchoring expression, would almost certainly be insufficient to successfully reactivate the correct referent MARK in the hearer’s mental representation.

Tokens (b) and (c) are activating new but contextually-accessible participants in what Lambrecht calls ‘event-reporting’ sentences which do not have topics. Note that each accented NP includes a discourse anchor to relate the NP to the discourse context. The anchor renders it at least cognitively accessible to the hearer (i.e. ‘My’ with CAR in (b), ‘Her’ with HUSBAND in (c)). Exclusion of the anchoring expressions would completely change the referential meaning of each clause (except perhaps (b)), because the hearer would not be able to uniquely identify the speaker-intended referent. The anchor disambiguates the referring expression, marking that it reactivates a specific participant from the discourse register and *not* a brand-new participant. Tokens (d) and (e) reactivate participants from the shared discourse register via the comment of a topic/comment sentence. The anchoring relations in these sentences provide the same disambiguating function, indicating that the speaker is reactivating a known entity from the discourse register. On this basis we consider prosody to correlate to information structure, and anchoring relations to correlate with activation status. The claim that Lambrecht has made correlating prosody to activation state overlooks the role of the anchoring relation, and becomes untenable when this relation is removed from the context.

2.2.6 Identifiability and the ‘Givenness Hierarchy’

Gundel et al. (1993) have developed a more nuanced scale of activation, and one which is linked to the specific forms which grammaticalize each level, called the “Givenness Hierarchy”. Table 2 represents our application of their Hierarchy to Biblical Hebrew and Koine Greek.

²¹ Cf. Lambrecht’s (1994:130) comments on restrictive relative clauses often marking the head noun as focal. Cf. p. 165 and his ‘Topic acceptability scale’, which predicts that topic acceptability decreases as one moves down the following list: active, accessible, unused, brand-new anchored, brand-new unanchored.

Table 2. ‘Givenness Hierarchy’ Applied to Biblical Hebrew and Koine Greek

	In Focus	Activated	Familiar	Uniquely Identifiable	Referential	Type Identifiable
English	<i>It</i> (Un-stressed PRO)	<i>HE</i> (Stressed PRO), <i>this</i> , <i>that</i> , <i>this</i> N	<i>that</i> N	<i>the</i> N N _{Anchored} (Most inferables)	indefinite <i>this</i> N, <i>a certain</i> N ²²	<i>a</i> N
Biblical Hebrew	∅, clitic PRO	הוא הנה זאת הנה אלה N _{Def} הנה, etc.	N _{Def} הנה N _{Def} הנה	N _{Def} N _{Anchored}	N הנה	∅ N
Koine Greek	∅, clitic PRO	αυτος /ο /η εκεινος /ο /η N _{Def} ουτος...	N _{Def} εκεινος	N _{Def} N _{Anchored} , modified N	N τις	∅ N

Gundel et al. (1993) have found that the Givenness Hierarchy forms an entailment scheme in which the lower levels of activation are entailed in the higher levels. Thus, if a participant is activated, it is by definition also familiar, uniquely identifiable, referential and type identifiable. A list of definitions for the various levels follows:

Type identifiable: “Able to access a representation of the object” (ibid:276).

Referential: “The speaker intends to refer to a particular object or objects...must either retrieve an existing representation...or construct a new one” (ibid:276).

Uniquely identifiable: “The addressee can identify the speaker’s intended referent on the basis of the nominal alone” (ibid:277).

Familiar: “Is able to uniquely identify the intended referent because he already has a representation of it in memory”, either long- or short-term (ibid:278).

Activated: “Represented in current short-term memory” (ibid:278). Either retrieved from long-term memory, or constructed from immediate context.

In focus: “Not only in short-term memory, but also at the current center of attention” (ibid:278).

Their model is discussed in more detail in the description of thematic and cataphoric highlighting in Chapter 6. With regard to the discussion of Lambrecht above, note that description of pronouns as ‘stressed’ and ‘unstressed’ by Gundel et al. (1993) follows Givón’s (1983a) explanation.

2.3 Information-Structuring Framework

2.3.1 Pragmatic Presupposition, Topic and Focus

Information structure is the analysis of how speakers pair the propositions which they wish to communicate with the most appropriate lexico-grammatical structure, based on their assumptions about the hearer’s mental representation and the speaker’s own communicative goals. Thus “the information structure of a sentence is the formal expression of the pragmatic structuring of a proposition in a discourse” (Lambrecht 1994:6). As speakers communicate new propositions to

²² Added to reflect common translation of referential indefinites in Biblical Hebrew and Koine Greek.

hearers, the information becomes presupposed for both speaker and hearer, and will form the topical basis of new assertions which follow.

Most utterances can be divided into two parts: that which is presupposed, and that which is asserted. The presupposed information forms the basis from which *topical* entities of a clause are drawn, while the asserted information is classified as *focal*. Regarding *topic* Lambrecht states, “A referent is interpreted as the topic of a proposition if in a given situation the proposition is construed as being about this referent, i.e. as expressing information which is relevant to and which increases the addressee’s knowledge of this referent” (ibid:131). He defines *focus* as “the element of information whereby the presupposition and the assertion DIFFER from each other. The focus is that portion of a proposition which cannot be taken for granted at the time of speech. It is the unpredictable or pragmatically NON-RECOVERABLE element in an utterance. The focus is what makes an utterance into an assertion” (ibid: 207). For convenience sake in illustrations, **bold** font will be used to identify **focal** constituents, while underlining will be used to identify topical constituents.

2.3.2 Sentence Articulations

There are three basic types of sentence articulation (i.e. pragmatic structures) identified by Lambrecht (ibid:117ff; cf. Andrews 1985:77ff) which each accomplish a different pragmatic function. Each articulation presupposes different aspects of a proposition. The *predicate focus articulation* (also called *topic-comment*) presupposes that a topic X did something, and is used to answer the question, “What did X do?” For instance, if someone saw me sucking my thumb, the following question-answer set might be used.

- (1) *Question*: “What happened to you?”
Answer: “I just **hit my thumb with a hammer!**”

The question presupposes that ‘I’ did something. The answer takes the presupposed *topic* (‘I’) and makes a propositional *comment* about it (‘hit my thumb with a hammer’). The focus of the utterance is the predicate of the clause (Lambrecht 1994:222). Predicate focus is the default sentence articulation, the one used when there is no pragmatic reason to use another. Subjects encoded as clitic/unaccented pronouns are prototypically found in predicate focus clauses.

A second sentence articulation is *argument focus* (also called *focus-presupposition*). In this articulation, the proposition is presupposed by both the speaker and hearer, but the argument which makes the presupposition into an assertion is missing. The question and answer set changes to:

- (2) *Question*: “What did you hit?” or “What did you hit your thumb with?”
Answer: “I just hit my **thumb** with a hammer” or “I just hit my thumb with a **hammer.**”
Elided answer: “My **thumb**” or “A **hammer.**”

Notice that the argument focus answer is identical to the predicate focus answer with the exception of the prosodic stress on the arguments ‘thumb’ or ‘hammer’. The primary difference between these utterances lies in what is presupposed in each. The argument focus answer can use a default

constituent order as in (2), the elided answer, or use an *It*-cleft construction to achieve a *marked* constituent order for more pragmatic highlighting than the default answers in (2).

(3) *Marked Answer*: “It was my **thumb** that I just hit with a hammer.”

English must utilize *it*-clefts to obtain marked focus constructions due to its rigid constituent order. Languages such as Biblical Hebrew and Koine Greek allow pragmatic shifts in constituent order, and thus will manifest more frequent use of marked orders.

The third sentence articulation is *presentational articulation* or *sentence focus* (Lambrecht 1994:222). The primary function of sentence focus is “to introduce an entity whose semantic role is normally expressed with the subject function” (Andrews 1985:80; cf. Lambrecht 1994:39). The sentence focus clause does not contain presupposed information. The focus of sentence focus clauses is the *entire clause*. Typically a newly introduced argument will be the subject of a verb which predicates existence (e.g. ‘Once *there was* an X...’), a verb of motion (e.g. ‘suddenly three men *approached* the camp’), or a verb of perception (e.g. ‘A rabbit *appeared* from inside the magician’s hat’) (cf. Lambrecht 1994:137ff; Dooley and Levinsohn 2001:63ff). No comment is made about the focal argument in the main clause, though a subordinate relative-type-clause can be used for this purpose (Andrews 1985:80), illustrated in (4).

(4) Once there was **a carpenter** *who had a hammer*.

‘A carpenter’ is presented (and thus activated) into the discourse, and the subordinate relative clause assigns a comment to the new participant. Sentence focus clauses are a standard means of beginning a new discourse.

Lambrecht identifies an apparent sub-group within sentence focus clauses which he calls *event reporting* (1994:137). Event reporting sentences answer the question “What happened?” and the *whole clause* is considered to be in focus, not just the newly presented argument. Lambrecht notes that “in English the difference between event-reporting and predicate focus sentences is not [always] unambiguously marked” (ibid:137). The distinction lies in the presupposed proposition of each articulation: there is no presupposed information in a sentence focus or event-reporting clause.

(5) <u>Event-reporting</u>	<u>Predicate focus</u>
<i>Question</i> : “What happened?”	“What did you do to your thumb?”
<i>Answer</i> : “My thumb was hit!”	“It was hit .”

Although there are only three primary sentence articulations, there are multitudes of ways to adapt them to meet a speaker’s pragmatic communicative goals.

2.3.3 Pragmatic Ordering of Constituents

While this study does not focus on information structure, the various pragmatic structuring devices directly impact the default minimum encoding of participants. Therefore, we will provide a brief overview of constituent-ordering principles and conventions. As noted above, there are basically two pragmatic classifications for the information in an utterance: that which is presupposed

or *topical*, and that which is asserted or *focal*. According to the principle of Natural Information Flow (Comrie 1989:127-28), the default tendency is for a speaker to structure an utterance so as to move from what is *most* known to what is *least* known, to the degree that the word-order typology of the language allows.

The following is an adapted summary of the default constituent order of nuclear clauses in Biblical Hebrew, based on Lode (1984) and Levinsohn (2000b):

(6) Default or Least-Marked Ordering of Nuclear Clause Constituents

Verb—Pronominals²³—Subject—Objects/Complements—Adjuncts

This ordering scheme applies to finite verbal clauses, and represents what we construe as default ordering of the possible constituents; not all are required. In the case of non-finite verbal and verbless clauses, Buth (1999:107) has claimed the default order of nuclear clause constituents to be **Subject-Predicate**, though the ordering of constituents within the predicate is not specifically discussed. Our ordering of pre-nuclear constituents, described below, is consistent with Buth's model for verbless clauses.

Most verbless clauses from our corpora occur within the reported speeches of the narrative. The encoding of participants in such clauses manifests very little variation that is not accounted for either by our default encoding rules or by the principles of information structure. As will be shown in Chapters 5 and 6, most pragmatic conventions of participant reference necessitate the overencoding of participants. The minimum encoding requirements of verbless clauses are high enough as to render *unambiguous* cases of overencoding very rare. Thus, application of the claims made below regarding the overencoding of participants for discourse processing or cataphoric highlighting could only be made to such verbless or non-finite tokens manifesting demonstrable overencoding. We found this difficult to claim in most cases. Conversely, the principles describing thematic highlighting in Chapter 6 apply equally well to verbless and non-finite verbless clauses, and thus do not merit special attention. Finite verbal clauses contain the bulk of encoding data which *cannot* be accounted for either by default encoding principles or by principles of information structure. As a result, the encoding of participants in finite verbal clauses will necessarily receive the bulk of our attention.

As noted above, pragmatic ordering of constituents regularly occurs in Biblical Hebrew, prototypically by fronting or *preposing* the marked constituent before the finite verb. Preposed focal constituents will be referred to as PFCs. The pragmatic effect of preposing a focal constituent is to

²³ 'Pronominals' refers to any pronominal form, be it a deictic or demonstrative, a pronominal suffix bound to a preposition or the object marker, etc. In practice, 'pronominals' also primarily refers to non-subject pronouns. The default subject pronoun of finite verbs in Biblical Hebrew is a clitic or 'verb-agreement' pronoun (cf. Givón 1983a), and is encoded in the verb morphology. The use of independent subject pronouns is therefore construed as pragmatically motivated in narrative, and thus these pronouns prototypically occur in pragmatically marked positions. As a result, the category 'Subject' functionally refers to lexical NPs. For the post-verbal use of subject pronouns, cf. BHRG §36.1.I.2.ii.

lend greater prominence to the preposed constituent than it would otherwise receive in its default position. The speaker could have placed the constituent in default position, but chose instead to prepose it; therefore the choice implies a meaning.

Presupposed, topical information can also be preposed, but serves quite a different pragmatic function. Fronted topical constituents will be referred to as ‘points of departure’ (PoDs), following Levinsohn (2000a).²⁴ A PoD “cohesively anchors the subsequent clause(s) to something which is already in the context (i.e., to something accessible in the hearer’s mental representation)... It is backward-looking, in the sense of locating the anchoring place within the existing mental representation, but it is forward-looking in that it is the subsequent part of the sentence which is anchored in that place” (Dooley and Levinsohn 2001:68). In other words, PoDs provide a marked, pragmatic means of highlighting discontinuity, with the PoD forming the primary basis for relating what follows the PoD with what has preceded it.²⁵ A PoD is considered pragmatically marked because the information it contains could also be conveyed from its *default* position in the clause, but the writer/speaker has chosen to prepose it and thus *mark* the discontinuity. The following pragmatic ordering scheme is based on Dooley and Levinsohn (ibid:68) and Buth (1999:107):

(7) Left-Dislocated—PoD—PFC—Nuclear Clause—Right-Dislocated

If all constituents are present, (7) would represent the expected ordering. Note also that more than one constituent at a time can be preposed, and the ordering within the PoD slot is expected to be based on saliency, with the most salient occurring first.

Levinsohn identifies three primary kinds of PoD, based on Givón's (1984:43) discontinuity categories of time, place, action and participants.

(8) Levinsohn’s Categories for Points of Departure (cf. Levinsohn 2000a:7-28)

- (a) Temporal: a preposed adverbial phrase which establishes the temporal frame of reference for what follows;
- *Marked*: ‘After he smashed his finger, the carpenter let out a loud shriek of pain.’
 - *Default*: ‘The carpenter let out a shriek of pain after he smashed his finger.’
- (b) Spatial: a preposed locative expression (e.g. a prepositional phrase), which establishes the spatial frame of reference for what follows;
- *Marked*: ‘At the hospital, the medic bandaged the carpenter’s mangled finger.’
 - *Default*: ‘The medic bandaged the carpenter’s mangled finger at the hospital.’
- (c) Referential: a preposed nominal or prepositional phrase (or in English, receiving secondary sentence accent) which establishes a new topic, usually by switch from a previous topic. These can be accomplished in several ways in English;

²⁴ These constituents are also called ‘topicalized’ (cf. BHRG) or ‘contextualizing constituents’ (cf. Buth 1999), but the terminology of Levinsohn will be maintained here.

²⁵ Cf. Li and Thompson’s discussion on the notion of topic, and the rationale for fronting a constituent to establish a specific frame for what follows. They observe that subjects in subject-prominent languages (e.g., English, Greek, Hebrew or German) are weak topics, as compared to topics in topic-prominent languages. According to their research, the topic in a topic prominent language is always sentence initial (1976:465). The means they found for *strengthening* a subject, to make it more topical in a subject-prominent language, was by fronting it to a marked initial position such as using a spacer or left-dislocation (1979:484).

- Left-dislocated: ‘As for his finger, it was quite disfigured.’
- Prosodic marking: ‘His thumb was unhurt; however, his finger was quite disfigured.’
- Use of spacer: ‘His thumb was unhurt; his finger, however, was quite disfigured.’
- *Default*: ‘His finger was quite disfigured.’

Other kinds of PoDs found predominately in non-narrative discourse include:

- (d) Renewal: returns to a previous topic;
- (e) Conditional: preposed conditional clause such as, ‘If you don’t stop talking, I will...’
- (f) Purpose: ‘In order that this doesn’t happen again, you should...’
- (g) Reason: ‘Because of your dedicated work, we have decided to...’

It is important to keep in mind the pragmatic intentions that each of these phrases represent. A speaker could have encoded each clause using default word-order or default prosody. Instead a marked means was chosen, ostensibly to accomplish some pragmatic effect.

As noted earlier, the pragmatic ordering of constituents occurs fairly regularly in Biblical Hebrew narrative. Finite verbs in Biblical Hebrew do not require explicit subjects, but are able to encode the subject agreement information using bound, clitic pronouns. Some direct objects can also be encoded using enclitic pronouns on the verb. Since movement of the constituent is necessary to signal either a referential PoD or a PFC (i.e. argument focus), the minimal unbound encoding of referents in Biblical Hebrew is an independent pronoun. For instance, the choice to make a constituent a PoD or PFC *requires* that the minimum encoding of the participant be an independent pronoun, and therefore there is no meaning behind the choice to encode the participant using an independent pronoun other than the creation of a PoD or PFC. The independent pronoun plays a disambiguating function in Biblical Hebrew, explicitly indicating the presence of a marked information structure that would have remained unmarked using bound morphological forms. This issue will be discussed in much more detail in Chapter 4.

2.4 *Cross-Linguistic Functions of Participant Reference*

2.4.1 Introduction

Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:112) have identified three linguistic functions a participant reference system must be capable of accomplishing:

- Semantic: “identify the referents unambiguously, distinguishing them from other possible ones”. In other words, the reader must be able to track ‘who did what to whom’ (cf. Andrews 1985:66, Givón 1983a, 1983b, A Fox 1983).
- Processing: “overcome disruptions in the flow of information” (cf. Fox 1987a, 1987b, Tomlin 1987, Levinsohn 2000b),
- Discourse-pragmatic: “signal the activation status and prominence of the referents or the actions they perform” (cf. Andrews 1985:77ff, Huang 2000:213ff, Levinsohn 2000a:140).

These three functions are not discrete categories. We claim they form a hierarchical entailment scheme. Encoding for processing still accomplishes a semantic task, even if the encoding is redundant. Similarly, pragmatic encoding entails processing and semantic functions as well. The converse does not hold true, though. The significance of viewing these functions as entailing one

another will be treated much more fully in our discussion of pragmatic functions of participant reference in chapter 6.

(9) Entailment Hierarchy of Cross-Linguistic Functions of Participant Reference

Discourse-pragmatic entails Processing which entails Semantic

In §2.4.1, a brief description of each of the three functions will be presented in order to provide a framework for understanding the kinds of conventions languages use to encode participant reference information. In sections 2.4.2-2.4.4, we will review the three major quantitative methodologies which have been brought to bear in the description of participant reference in various languages (viz. Givón 1983, Tomlin 1987, and Levinsohn 1994, 2000a, 2000b). Each methodology has benefited from those which preceded, building on the previous conclusions and seeking to explain the remaining counter-examples and anomalies. Each study has a particular emphasis, which coincidentally parallels the three purposes of participant reference hypothesized by Dooley and Levinsohn (2001). Therefore, the three purposes will provide the outline for the sections.

In light of the existence of three, essentially competing methodologies for describing participant reference, a study was undertaken by Clark (2000) to apply these three approaches to the Sio language of Papua New Guinea. His goal was to determine which method most “accurately and thoroughly” described the Sio participant reference system, including apparent deviant usage (ibid:ix). Clark provides an evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of each method in participant reference description, and his assessments will be incorporated in our discussion below.

The Semantic Function

The semantic task of participant reference is primarily focused on ensuring that the reader is able to track the roles, and shifts in roles, of each participant in the discourse. The most common strategy of participant reference is a *sequential strategy*,²⁶ whereby “the reference of [other than a full noun phrase] is normally taken from the nearest candidate word before it” (Grimes 1978:viii).²⁷ The *candidate word* is the antecedent that most agrees with the anaphor by grammatical categories such as gender or number, by animacy, and based on the semantics of the context.

Use of full lexical encoding for continuing reference to participants would theoretically be the most unambiguous means of encoding participants. However, principles such as Grice’s (1975) ‘Maxim of Quantity,’ Foley and Van Valin’s (1980:270ff) ‘Interclausal Relations Hierarchy,’ and Givón’s (1983a:18) ‘Iconicity principle,’ assert that speakers tend to use the minimal level of encoding available for continuing reference. Speakers rely upon the conventions of the sequential-strategy system as the primary means of indicating continuity in the discourse. In a *closed* setting, where only one or two participants are involved, tracking participants encoded using minimal

²⁶ For other strategies of anaphora, cf. Huang (2000:1-8).

²⁷ Cf. Fox’s (1987a:158) comments regarding the cross-linguistic evidence affirming the prevalent use of sequential strategies.

reference is usually accomplished quite easily, even when the participants change roles. Consider the English translation of Exodus 4:2-3 for example:

(10) Semantic function of participant reference encoding

- (a) And the LORD₁ said to him₂ [Moses], "What is that₃ in your hand?"
- (b) And he₂ said, "A staff₃."
- (c) Then He₁ said, "Throw it₃ on the ground."
- (d) So he₂ threw it₃ on the ground,
- (e) and it₃ became a serpent₄;
- (f) and Moses₂ fled from it₄.

Once the participants are explicitly mentioned in (a), four changes of subject/agent are unambiguously accomplished using only minimal morphological encoding. Even if we had not added a lexical NP in (a) to specify participant₂, the reader *still* could have distinctly tracked the participants. In (f), a lexical NP has been introduced to clarify who flees from the serpent, since there are two possible antecedents for 'he'.

Clauses (a)-(c) are considered a *closed* context, since there are only two participants in the context, and their role changes can often be accomplished unambiguously with minimal encoding. In *open* contexts (clauses (d)-(f)), where more than two participants are involved, minimal encoding becomes less of an option, and lexical NPs are more frequently used to encode switches of participants in order to avoid ambiguity. Dooley and Levinsohn note that "*the amount of coding material in a referring expression increases with the danger of ambiguity*" (2001:113, italics theirs). They also note that quite often encoding one participant with a lexical NP is sufficient to disambiguate a context as seen in (11a) and (11f) above.

The Processing Function

The processing task has to do with how readers assimilate a text into a mental representation. Where there are discontinuities or disruptions in the text (such as those described in Givón's Discontinuity scale above), more specific encoding is expected. Thus, one expects that default, minimal encoding of participants is interpreted by the reader as signaling '+continuity'.²⁸ The corollary holds as well: disruptions in the discourse will require *more* encoding. Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:113) claim that such disruptions are found at *thematic boundaries*, or where there is discontinuity of action (such as transitions from event material to non-event material). Such disruptions guide the reader in how to segment the discourse into meaningful thematic units in the form of a mental representation. Thus, the processing task is not so much *semantic* as *cognitive*, helping the reader to recognize where a discrete segment of a mental representation should end and another should begin. There is good reason for breaking a discourse down into smaller, more manageable pieces.

²⁸ Cf. Nariyama (2000), who essentially argues that minimal encoding in Japanese, viz. ellipsis of an argument, is the 'unmarked representation of "sameness"'. We understand her claim to mean '+continuity' of participant. Evidence from other languages would suggest that this principle applies far beyond Japanese alone.

Paivio and Begg claim that humans do not process discourses as an unbroken chain, but instead break it into smaller mental *chunks*: “A chunk functions as a unit of memory, so that we can remember about the same number of chunks regardless of how many lower-order units are used in their construction” (1981:176). According to this view, humans practice a form of ‘cognitive segmentation’²⁹ in order to facilitate greater comprehension and retention of discourse content. Just as a play is broken down into acts, and acts are broken down into scenes, etc., humans can also hierarchically chunk discourse content into a series of recursively embedded units.

Levinsohn (2000a, 2000b) has demonstrated that the particle *de* is used in Koine Greek as a processing tool. It segments segment the text into what he calls ‘development units’; Follingstad (1994) has demonstrated that the developmental marker *kàn* in Tyap has a comparable function. Similarly, English typically utilizes adverbs such as ‘then’ or ‘next’ to chunk discourse. The following example is an abridged NASB version of the ordination rite recorded in Leviticus 8. Notice the use of *then* and *next* by the translator to segment the larger process into macro chunks, with the PoDs marking discontinuity within the chunk.

(11) Processing Markers in the English Translation of Leviticus 8:5-23

- (a) Ø Moses said...
- (b) Then MOSES had ...and washed...And he put...and girded...and clothed...and put...and he girded...
- (c) He *then* placed... Ø He also placed...and on the turban...he placed...
- (d) MOSES *then* took... and anointed...and consecrated...And he sprinkled...and anointed...
- (e) Then he poured...and anointed...
- (f) Next MOSES had...and clothed...and girded...and bound...
- (g) Then he brought...and Aaron and his sons laid...
- (h) Next Moses slaughtered...and took...and with his finger put...and purified...
- (i) Then he poured out...and consecrated... Ø He also took...and MOSES offered...But the bull..., he burned...
- (j) Then he presented...and Aaron and his sons laid...And Moses slaughtered...and sprinkled... Ø When he had cut the ram into its pieces, MOSES offered... Ø After he had washed the entrails and the legs with water, MOSES offered up...
- (k) Then he presented...and Aaron and his sons laid...And Moses slaughtered...and took...and put...

Since none of the adverbs are present in the Hebrew text, their presence in the English translation illustrates the translator’s desire to segment the text into smaller units, breaking the steps into sub-steps.

Next, consider the pragmatic effect of overencoding ‘Moses’ where Moses was the subject of the preceding clause. The ‘MOSES’ encodings, which *are* in the Hebrew text, illustrate the role the participant reference system plays in providing direction to the reader about how to process the

²⁹ We intentionally avoid the term ‘paragraphing’ to describe this phenomenon, as this term is more of a literary convention as opposed to a linguistic or cognitive one. There is little doubt that languages chunk, but there appear to be different preferences among languages as to the preferred *length* of chunks (cf. Clancy 1980:155-159 for a comparison of preferred lengths of sentences and chunks in English compared to Japanese). We prefer the more generic terms ‘chunk’ or ‘segment’ in order to avoid the importation of English preferences into Biblical Hebrew.

discourse. Two occur following the complex temporal PoDs in (j), likely to aid the reader in transitioning back to the main narrative line. Four uses of MOSES occur at thematic transition points: in (b) at the transition from reported speech back to narrative, in (d) following the preparation and clothing of Aaron, in (f) following the anointing and consecration, and in (h) after the completion of clothing Aaron's sons, but before beginning the processes of the sacrifices. This redundant use of a lexical NP as a processing tool will be fully explored in Chapter 4 below. It remains to be seen how faithful the NASB development units are to those development units in the Hebrew text, but this example nonetheless illustrates the propensity of speakers and writers to segment discourse content into manageable chunks for readers and hearers to process.

The Discourse-Pragmatic Function

Not every participant is encoded the same way; even the encoding of the same participant can vary significantly from one clause to the next. Factors influencing such encoding decisions involve the participant's activation state, the participant's salience to the discourse, and the salience of the events themselves. Generally speaking, "the higher the activation status, the less encoding material is necessary" (Dooley and Levinsohn 2001:113). We will discuss Huang's revision of Levinson's neo-Gricean pragmatic implicatures in §2.5, but one principle will be introduced now: the M-principle.

The M-principle is broken into the Speaker's maxim and the recipient's corollary:

(12) Levinson's Gricean M-principle (Levinson 1987)

- (a) Speaker's maxim: Do not use a prolix, obscure or marked expression without reason.
- (b) Recipient's corollary: If the speaker used a prolix or marked expression M, he or she did not mean the same as he or she would have had he or she used the unmarked expression U—specifically he or she was trying to avoid the stereotypical associations and I-implicatures of U (Huang 2000:207-208).

The M-principle predicts that a marked form will be understood by the reader as intending to convey some meaning *other* than that communicated by the default or expected form. Both underspecified and overspecified encodings are utilized to accomplish various pragmatic effects. Omission of the M-principle from an account of participant reference will impact the results of a study just as significantly as an improperly postulated default (cf. Clark 2000:44).

Salience of the Participant

Not all participants are equally salient to a discourse. Some will play a more prominent role, and others are simply props to move the plot forward. Correlations have been observed between type of activation, type of primary referring expression, and the amount of default encoding. Such factors aid the reader in differentiating the most salient participants from those that are secondary. Major participants are more apt to receive "a formal introduction," which Dooley and Levinsohn describe as "linguistic material that instructs the hearer not only to activate the participant, but also to be prepared to organize a major part of the mental representation around him or her" (2001:119). 'Linguistic materials' include use of a marked expression such as a presentational articulation or a referential

point of departure for activation. Minor participants and props (cf. Berlin 1983:23ff) on the other hand, are more likely activated as an anchored (and thereby accessible) topic in a topic/comment articulation. A topic/comment clause can quickly establish a relation between the new participant and some grounding aspect in the reader's mental representation of the discourse. Furthermore, the major participant in a discourse is usually also the center of reference to which other participants are related or 'anchored'.³⁰ Use of such conventions is language-specific. The point to be made here is that the choices for activating and relating new participants to the discourse have meaning, usually regarding their status and saliency to the discourse.

Differentiation of participant status is also observed in the *kind* of encoding used for continuing reference to active participants (cf. Maibaum 1978, Toba 1978, Levinsohn 1978, 1994, 2000a). Dooley and Levinsohn note that many languages make distinctions in the encoding of participants based on their importance to and role in a discourse (2001:119ff). This distinction is manifested in several ways. A unique NP is usually 'assigned' to the participant at the initial activation of a participant. This unique expression facilitates the ease and accuracy with which the hearer is able to identify the speaker-intended participant. We will call such NPs *primary referring expressions*. Revell (1996:44) identifies two kinds of primary referring expression in Biblical Hebrew: proper nouns and 'epithets'. An epithet is a definite NP, such as 'the baker' or 'the survivor', which type-identifies a specific participant and serves as their primary referring expression. Participants with proper names are more likely to function as major participants than those referred to with epithets.³¹

Another means for differentiating major and minor participants is the *amount* of encoding used for continuing reference to an active participant. Based on Givón's 'Iconicity Principle', one would intuitively expect that activation status and participant encoding would be inversely proportional; however, this is not always the case. For example, Levinsohn describes what he calls a VIP strategy (**v**ery **i**mportant **p**articipant) based on Grimes' concept of 'thematic participant'. "One referent is distinguished from the rest when introduced, and a special set of terms refer to it no matter how many other things have been mentioned more recently" (Grimes 1978:viii). The VIP marker can be a specific linguistic sign attached to the participant's referring expression, or simply the use of *underspecification*. The latter convention is observed in Koine Greek (cf. Levinsohn 2000a:136), Mambila (cf. Perrin 1978:110), Sio (Clark 2000:75), and at ostensibly at various points in Biblical

³⁰ E.g. expressions such as 'Sarah, *Abraham's wife*' and 'Lot, *Abraham's nephew*' both point to 'Abraham' as being the central participant. Thus, shifts such as 'Abraham, *Sarah's husband*' would also convey a shift in the central participant to 'Sarah', even if it is only temporary (cf. §6.3.2).

³¹ It is important to recognize that in many languages, non-human participants are referred to using epithets. These epithets often end up functioning essentially as a proper name, such as when an animal is personified. One finds this kind of phenomenon in the Warner Brothers cartoons about 'the coyote' and 'the road runner'. The expression 'the road runner' is uniquely referential to a specific participant.

Hebrew (cf. Revell 1996:65). We cite an example of VIP encoding provided by Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:119) below:

(13) “The Hare and the Dog” with VIP Strategy:

- (a) ‘One day the hare went and talked with **the dog-X**.
- (b) The hare told **X**, “Fry one of your pups for us to eat!”
- (c) **X** refused.
- (d) The hare asked **X**, “Why won’t you fry it?”
- (e) **X** answered, “...”

The linguistic marker represented by **X** is used to indicate that the dog is the VIP of the story, and this marker is used as an abbreviated lexical referring expression in lieu of the prototypical lexical NP.

It should be noted that VIP refers to an *encoding strategy* for a participant, and not to a participant’s thematic centrality, though the two are interrelated. The opposite extreme of encoding can also be used for indicating the discourse prominence of participants. Minor participants are often encoded using lexical NPs, even for continuing reference where a pronominal form would have been unambiguous. Such encoding runs counter to default expectations that continuing reference tends to be downgraded to the minimal anaphoric form, but serves the pragmatic purpose of communicating the saliency of the participant to the discourse.

Saliency of Discourse Context

Let us return again to Givón’s Iconicity principle: “The more disruptive, surprising, discontinuous or hard to process a topic is, the more *coding material* must be assigned to it” (1983a:18, italics mine). Levinsohn (2000a:136) notes that Givón’s principle fails to account for another use of overencoding besides processing, stating that “a sentence may be highlighted and a full noun phrase employed when the information concerned is important but neither disruptive nor surprising (e.g., a key speech)”. Levinsohn’s observation is consistent with Longacre’s description of ‘peak-marking devices’ used for pragmatic highlighting.

Longacre (1985) claims that the plot of most narratives builds toward two key elements: a *climax* and a *denouement*. “The first corresponds to the point of maximum tension and confrontation in a story; the second corresponds to a decisive event that makes resolution of the plot possible. Either or both of these may be marked for peak in the surface structure of a narrative discourse” (1985:84). The general cross-linguistic principle Longacre establishes for peak-marking devices is a marked shift *away* from the default, whether it be shifts in tense/aspect, shifts in the pace of narration by shortening or lengthening of clauses, shifts in the ratio of verbs to non-verbs for the pragmatic effect of ‘speeding up’ the flow, or increases in the amount of repeated or redundant material, etc. (ibid:96-97).³²

³² Heimerdinger (1999:56) gleans changes in “characteristic PRs” (i.e. participant references) as another peak-marking convention from his studies of Longacre (1983) and (1990).

It will be demonstrated that the overencoding³³ of participants in certain contexts is pragmatically motivated to obtain effects such as (but not limited to) Longacre's peak-marking devices, to highlight shifts in initiator, or to highlight a following speech or event. Most overencoding is *not* for the purpose of highlighting *the participant*; such highlighting is prototypically accomplished using the tools of information structure (e.g. PoDs and PFCs). Following Levinsohn (2000a), Clark (2000), and Callow (1974), we will argue that pragmatic overencoding using default constituent order is primarily *cataphoric* in nature. The goal is to highlight a speech or event that follows, *not* to highlight the participant; participant reference is simply the *means* of marking the feature of cataphoric highlighting.

2.4.2 Study of the Semantic Function

The most recognized function of participant reference is the *semantic* function, which enables a reader to track participants across clause boundaries (cf. Foley and Van Valin 1984), to understand 'who is doing what to whom'. Comrie illustrates how well participant reference systems are able to track referents, stating "Thus, in a story about Beryl and Charles, and with no other human referents, it would be possible, after the initial mention of Beryl and Charles, to use only forms of the pronouns *he* and *she* with unequivocal reference, even if the story were to grow to novel length" (1989:48). The semantic function was the center of attention in Givón's (1983) edited volume on *Topic Continuity in Discourse*. The studies Givón commissioned³⁴ clearly demonstrate that discourse anaphora is intimately tied to the semantics of participant tracking. He fundamentally establishes the prototypical expectations for referential encoding in a variety of discourse contexts.

Givón's cross-linguistic study attempted to establish an empirical relation between 'recency of reference' to a participant and the morphological level of encoding for the participant. The study was based on the premise that thematic paragraphs usually have a single participant that is "*most crucially involved* in the action sequence running through the paragraph; it is the participant most closely associated with the higher-level 'theme' of the paragraph; and finally, it is the participant most likely to be coded as the *primary topic* –or *grammatical subject* –of the vast majority of sequentially ordered clauses/sentences comprising the thematic paragraph" (Givón 1983a:8). The objective of the study was to determine how the following factors impacted "*the degree of difficulty* that speakers/hearers may experience in *identifying* a topic in discourse" (ibid:11).

(14) Factors Affecting Topic Availability (Givón 1983a:10-12)

- (a) *Length of absence from the register*: Measures the number of clauses a participant remains unmentioned. Brand-new, indefinite NPs were predicted to be the MOST difficult to process, while a definite topic from the register which returns after a long gap will be less difficult.

³³ We will maintain an important distinction between *overencoding* a participant by using a lexical NP where a pronominal form would suffice, and *overspecification*, whereby semantically redundant anchoring or other descriptive information is assigned to a participant that is semi-active or active.

³⁴ The languages studied included Japanese, Amharic, Ute, Biblical Hebrew, Colloquial Spanish, written English, colloquial English, Hausa and Chamorro.

The shorter the gap, the greater the ease in processing.

- (b) *Potential interference from other topics*: Ease of topic identification was hypothesized to be inversely proportional to the number of topics in the current [semi-active] register. The fewer the topics, the easier the topic identification is expected to be.
- (c) *Availability of semantic information*: Redundant semantic information (i.e. overspecification) may help the hearer identify a particular topic from a cluttered register. “This information comes primarily from the *predicate* of the clause, less so from verb-phrase *adverbials* (in particular of manner), less so from other *topics/participants* of the clause. This information concerns *generic probabilities* that a particular topic could participate in the clause in the specific semantic/grammatical role in question (i.e. as subject, agent, patient, recipient etc.)” (ibid:11).
- (d) *Availability of thematic information*: Similar to (c), but based on the content of the preceding discourse. This could be ranking of participants (e.g. major/minor), or other thematic information in the permanent file relating to the particular discourse. “Such information establishes *specific probabilities*—for this story, in this chapter, in this section or in this thematic paragraph—as to the topic identification within a particular clause and in a particular role” (ibid:11).

Givón’s study also sought to gain insight into the assumptions a speaker makes regarding the availability of a particular topic to a hearer. Givón made several assumptions based on Gestalt psychology:

- “What is more continuing is more predictable”
- “What is predictable is easier to process” or,
- “What is discontinuous or disruptive is less predictable”
- “What is less predictable, hence surprising, is harder to process” (ibid:12)

These assumptions, together with the factors affecting topic availability, were rolled into three measurement devices which were empirically traced in naturally occurring texts from various languages. The measures were “referential distance” (‘look-back’), “potential interference” (‘ambiguity’), and “persistence” (‘decay’) (ibid:13-14). Each of these measures was tallied based on clause counts, which were then formulated into ratios for each morphological level of encoding. It is important to note that Givón viewed this study as *preliminary*, with the conclusions forming the starting point for future studies. He envisioned these studies “correlating the grammatical and discourse-distribution data with *psycho-linguistic* experimentation and measurement” (ibid:13, italics his).

Givón gleaned a number of typological observations from the present and preceding studies he conducted on topic continuity. Several of the scales he developed from the study have proven significant:

(15) Scales in the Coding of Topic Accessibility

(a) Scale of topic accessibility (1983a:17)

most continuous/accessible topic

- zero anaphora
- unstressed/bound pronouns
- stressed/independent pronouns
- R-dislocated DEF-NP’s

neutral-ordered DEF-NP's
L-dislocated DEF-NP's
Y-moved NP's
cleft/focus constructions
referential indefinite NP's

most discontinuous/inaccessible topic

(b) Scale of phonological size (ibid:18)

most continuous/accessible topic

zero anaphora
unstressed/bound pronouns ('agreement')
stressed/independent pronouns

full NP's

most discontinuous/inaccessible topic

(c) The Iconicity Principle (ibid:18): "The more disruptive, surprising, discontinuous or hard to process a topic is, the more *coding material* must be assigned to it."

The results of his study provided an empirically-based, typological description of prototypical principles governing participant reference. While Givón's studies provided a description of default encoding principles, his methodology was unable to account for participant reference encoding which did *not* follow default principles.

While Givón's study made a significant contribution, it indeed proved to be only the first step. Though his empirical data³⁵ was able to show tendencies and patterns, his framework was unable to account for what appeared to be the regular overencoding and underencoding of participants, encoding which differed from the expected outcomes. For instance, Givón claimed that topic repetition could function as a discourse marker of discontinuity as a means of explaining overencoded NP anaphors; however, this explanation was not developed in any detail (ibid:349). Also, he noted that pronominal reference can be maintained across several clauses. Even though his principles argued against such usage (ibid:350), he did not provide an explanation of the discourse function of such usage.

Clark's application of Givón's method to Sio found that its basic assumptions regarding referential distance were upheld, once certain morphosyntactic restrictions of the language were taken into account (2000:72). However, neither 'potential interference' nor 'persistence' had much applicability in Sio. Clark found that "there was no significant relationship between potential interference and which of the three lower levels of encoding the speaker used" (ibid:72). Regarding persistence, it was only after a differentiation was made between animate and inanimate participants that any generalizations were able to be made. He cites a portion of text which exemplifies the problem, repeated below:

³⁵ Clark notes a methodological inconsistency in Givón's method: "Complement clauses, as well as clauses that represented direct speech quotations, were not considered to be 'gaps' when the referent did not appear in the clause, but they were counted as occurrences when the referent did appear in the clause" (2000:7, emphasis his).

355 They struck the abdomen,
356 but it didn't resonate.
357 They struck the head,
358 but it didn't resonate.
359 They struck the back,
360 but it didn't resonate (ibid:37).

According to Givón's framework, the persistence of the two boys (referred to as *they*) is theoretically zero and therefore necessitates relexicalization, since *they* are not referred to in lines 356 and 358. However, Clark notes that these participants clearly remain cognitively active due to the reduced pronominal reference to them. Givón's explanations are unable to account for Clark's attested data.

Clark's study also exposed the limitations of Givón's approach in accounting for what turned out to be a pragmatic system for encoding relative salience of participants, salience of certain events or speeches, and the internal thematic structure of the discourse itself (ibid:72-73). Clark finds that there is a meaningful difference in how animate participants are encoded and their persistence compared to that of inanimate participants. "Inanimate subjects tend to decay almost immediately, while animate subjects last for an average of five to nine clauses" (ibid:37). Clark goes on to state that combining these two types of participants, as Givón's method advocates, "totally masks this dramatic distinction" (ibid:38). The *Topic Continuity* study provided a foundational understanding of semantic issues and tendencies of participant reference, but it became quite obvious that much more was involved in participant reference than simply semantic disambiguation. Givón's default encoding principles were only able to account for a portion of the attested data, suggesting that other explanations were needed to account for departures from these norms.

2.4.3 Study of the Processing Function

Barbara Fox conducted two studies in which she sought to address the shortcomings she found in Givón's methodology. "While it must be acknowledged that much of the emphasis on distance and ambiguity in the continuity hypothesis arises out of a desire to provide quantitative evidence (and hierarchical text structure is hard to quantify), the *overemphasis* it produces on the linear nature of texts (and the encouragement it brings to such a view) needs to be recognized...it may be wiser to proceed cautiously with a qualitative approach that incorporates a hierarchical structural view of texts to see if we can understand the basic mechanism of anaphora before we begin collecting rough quantitative evidence" (1987a:159, italics hers).

Fox had good reason for appealing to discourse structure as a means of explaining overencoding of anaphors. In 1980, Chafe coordinated a series of studies in *The Pear Stories*, which sought to describe the cognitive factors influencing referential choice in languages such as English and Japanese. One study in particular by Clancy (1980) suggested that structural factors significantly influenced participant encoding. "The main discourse structures Clancy finds influencing referential choice are episode boundaries, wherein a new line of action starts, and world shifts, in which the speaker moves from one mode of talking to another (e.g., from digression to the plot line, from film-

viewer mode to story-teller mode). Both of these structure-types tend to be associated with use of full noun phrases” (Fox 1987a:159).

The first study Fox completed was a dissertation, *Discourse Structure and Anaphora: Written and conversational English* (1987b). The second was a study of anaphora in popular English narratives which reviewed and extended the conclusions of her dissertation, published as part of Tomlin’s study of *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse* (Tomlin 1987). Fox (1987a) will be the primary focus of this section.

Fox sought to “provide a broader and more satisfactory account of anaphoric patterning in written narratives than has previously been presented” (1987a:157), and she believed that describing the interplay between discourse structure and levels of encoding was the key. She found that in contexts with two participants of the same gender, “it seems that a referent is pronominalizable until another character’s goals or actions are introduced, unless those goals and actions are interactive with the first character’s... In other words, if another character begins planning and performing an action, and there is no immediate projected interaction between the two characters, then a subsequent mention of the first character will be done with a full NP” (ibid:162). This conclusion has several implications:

- (1) Long gaps can pass after which a participant can still be referred to without a NP as long as no other participant’s goals or objectives have been mentioned. This suggests the principle that participant reference encoding tends to ‘*skip over*’ *shorter background comments* off the narrative line “even if the off-line gap introduces a character of the same gender as the character in question” (ibid:164).
- (2) “Even if the material separating the references is not off-line, as long as it does not introduce the current actions of another character, a pronoun can be used to refer to the first character” (ibid:164). This suggests the principle that *shift of initiator* in the discourse calls for the use of a lexical NP.
- (3) The introduction of a second character interacting with the first does not automatically require use of a NP, such as in a fight, a chase, or in a conversation (ibid:165). This finding nuances finding (2) above about switch in initiator. Quite often the semantics of the verbs will indicate switch of roles so that encoding the switch via participant reference is unnecessary. Such conclusions about reported speech encoding were observed by Pike and Lowe (1969), and confirmed in Maibaum (1978:206). However, if the second participant is *not* interacting with the first, Fox notes that “pronominalization seems to be blocked” (1987a:165). This final observation is a natural extension of her observations about initiators. Two participants that are *not* interacting could be construed as *two* initiators.

Research conducted within cognitive psychology has provided quantitative support for redundant NPs being processed as a sign of discontinuity. In the study conducted by Andersen et al. (1983), the researchers found that observable patterns of reference exist, and these patterns correlate to episode boundaries. They note that main characters will be available across episodes, while episode-specific participants—such as those which are accessible via the schema of an episode—are largely bounded by the episode in which they appear. Thus, if an episode involves a change in cognitive scenarios, participants from the previous scenario will require a lexical NP for reactivation

(ibid:428-430). In their experiment, Andersen et al. noted that participants required more time to identify antecedents following a spatial or temporal shift, than when there was *not* a shift. “Both continuation and question-answering methods showed that if a time change is beyond the temporal scope of a scenario, then representations of scenario-dependent entities are less readily available than if the change is within the temporal scope. The availability of main characters is not so affected” (ibid:438).

Another quantitative study further confirms the cognitive perception of NPs signaling discontinuity. In a series of experiments, Vonk et al. (1992) asked subjects to do several different tasks which compared the presence of thematic shifts with subjects’ use of anaphoric encoding. The general principle they found was that thematic shifts were associated with “overspecified anaphoric expressions”, while thematic continuity was associated with pronominal encoding (ibid:315). Furthermore, when a thematic discontinuity was signaled using devices such as preposed temporal or spatial expressions (i.e. Levinsohn’s PoDs), subjects felt comfortable encoding referents using pronouns. However, where temporal or spatial markers were *not* used, there was a preference to use overencoded anaphoric expressions, i.e., NPs (ibid:329). In other words, overencoded expressions were preferred *in the absence of other macro-syntactic discourse markers*.

Gordon et al. conducted a similar experiment, comparing the reading time of continuing reference to a participant using pronouns versus NPs (1993:319). The researchers found that subjects took 11% longer to read the text encoded with NPs compared to those reading the same text encoded with pronouns. Such evidence draws a quantitative link between the processing of overencoded anaphors and perceptions of discontinuity.³⁶

We will make a few specific comments about Fox’s contribution now, but will reserve the larger discussion of the *episode/processing* method for the conclusion of §2.4.3. Fox has indeed been able to account for many of Givón’s counter-tokens, particularly overencoding, for which Givón was only able to offer suggestions. At the same time, there are overencoding data for which Fox also is merely able to offer suggestions. In particular, she notes overencoding in “fast-paced confrontation (fight/chase) where we could have expected pronouns” might be due to a generic structural scheme for such situations (1987a:167).

These contexts she describes sound very similar to what Longacre describes as a ‘peak’, which is prototypically marked by departures from the expected norms in order to attract the reader’s attention (cf. Longacre 1983, 1985). She notes that in certain situations, the pattern of two participants interacting (i.e. implication 3) “seems to be superseded (1987a:169). She believes that NPs are used to demarcate new development units (DUs), but not all DUs begin with NPs, nor do all

³⁶ Cf. to the studies of Hudson-D’Zmura (1988), Sanford and Garrod (1981), and Garrod and Sanford (1988), which all reach similar conclusions, discussed in Gordon, Grosz and Gilliom (1993).

redundant NPs signal a new development. Thus, Fox has provided a reasonable account for many of Givón's (1983) remaining counterexamples, yet she has left some of her own behind as well.

Tomlin (1987) conducted several experiments to study the cognitive processing of the 'on-line discourse production', related to the same phenomenon studied by Fox (1987a). Based on the evidence of two experiments, Tomlin argues that "the syntax of reference is directly a function of episodic or thematic boundaries at a relatively local level. The episodic boundaries in turn can be seen as a speaker-based re-orientation of attention during the on-line process of discourse production" (1987:455). Tomlin believes that "during the on-line process of discourse production, the speaker uses a pronoun to maintain reference as long as [the speaker's] attention is sustained on that referent. Whenever focus is disrupted, the speaker reinstated reference with a full noun, no matter how few clauses intervene between subsequent references" (ibid:458). Tomlin views the episodes as being defined in the speaker's consciousness, and that as speakers cognitively move across these boundaries, the activated referents drop in their activation state, which he refers to as 'attention' (ibid:457-58). He seems to view the overencoding less as a *signal* to the reader³⁷ than as a *response* by the speaker to the discontinuity in his or her online production of the discourse, based on the model he describes (ibid:459).

In Tomlin's primary experiment, he showed three groups of subjects a series of 21 slides. The first group saw the slides individually; the second group saw a single slide first, and the remaining ones in pairs; the third group saw the slides in pairs, except the last. He found that even though the subjects were shown different slides in different groupings, all three groups had roughly the same length episodes. The group that saw the slides singly produced nearly twice as many episodes and almost twice as much narrative as the other two groups. Thus, there was uniformity in the preferred length of the episodes. Also, the number of episodes in the narrative was proportional to the number of slide groupings seen.

Tomlin's study added empirical evidence for construing many instances of overencoding as accomplishing a processing function. He found that the episode boundaries accounted for 84% of the anaphors in the discourse production, meaning pronouns used within episodes, and overspecified NPs occurring at his engineered episode boundaries. The 16% of counter-tokens consisted of inter-episode pronominals and intra-episode nominals (ibid:469). He found that NPs used to mark the transitions between non-narrative evaluative comments and resumption of the narrative accounted for approximately 90% of the counterexamples. Such nominal marking was predicted by Prince's (1980) discussion of 'world shifts' which Tomlin interprets to be another case of 'attention shifting' (1987:469). This phenomenon has also been recognized and described as a 'point of view shift' by both van Vliet (2002) in Dutch and van Hoek (1997) in English. Other counterexamples he attributes

³⁷ I.e. Paivio and Begg's (1981) claim regarding segmentation of discourse into 'chunks' by speakers.

to ambiguity resolution or subjects not following the guidelines of the process, but still a total of 6% of the tokens lack explanation.

Tomlin closes by stating that “the primary drawback to the episode/paragraph approach lies in the difficulty of providing explicit and structure-independent means of identifying episodes and episode boundaries” (1987:475). Claiming that episode identification is difficult is a huge understatement.

As Clark applied Tomlin’s method to Sio, he regarded his own results as inherently suspect based upon the near impossibility of objectively and accurately identifying episode boundaries without reference to linguistic marking. “Even when linguistic evidence such as intonation and other formal devices is included in determining episode boundaries, the actual existence of the boundaries is not proven and can at best only be inferred” (Clark 2000:73). He notes that only 25% of the overencoded subjects could be accounted for as marking episode boundaries. This leaves three options: that Clark has misidentified the boundaries, that Tomlin’s ‘episode/paragraph’ model is unable to account for natural language usage of overencoding, or some combination of the two.

Clark concludes, “By focusing so exclusively on the thematic structure of the text, as important as this is, Tomlin’s method, like Givón’s, presents only a partial explanation of the over- and under-coding of participants in a text. He makes no attempt to identify the relative importance of participants in the text, and he treats direct speech segments in the same cursory way that Givón does. Thus, while his method correctly expands the study of participant reference to include discourse-level features, a full accounting of why certain expressions are used at certain places is still missing” (ibid:74).

These studies inform us of the factors influencing encoding, but they are of limited value in the formation of descriptive principles which account for the multitude of discourse features which influence participant reference. It has been demonstrated that none of these approaches can accurately *predict* encoding, as counterexamples for each approach abound. Nor can they be said to *describe* usage, since there is no framework to incorporate the counterexamples. Thus we believe it is more reasonable to view the studies of Givón, Fox and Tomlin more as *predictors* of factors affecting referential encoding than as *methods* for describing participant reference encoding.

The application of these approaches to Sio was significant, especially the resulting understanding of Fox/Tomlin. Fox mentions and dismisses methodologies developed by Grimes (1978) and Levinsohn (1978) due to their lack of applicability to English. However, *both* of these studies, even representing early stages of understanding regarding participant reference, provided a better framework for the *description* of natural language data from diverse languages. They also provided more heuristic results than either the group of studies by Givón (1983) or Tomlin (1987) could claim to provide. Maibaum (1978), Perrin (1978) and Toba (1978), while not quantitative,

provided a more comprehensive description of both default encoding as well as the pragmatic function of *departures* from the default (i.e., both *overencoding* and *underencoding*).³⁸

2.4.4 Study of the Discourse-Pragmatic Function

The collections of studies by Hinds (1978) on anaphora, by Grimes (1978) on discourse, and the study by Levinsohn (1978) on participant reference clearly demonstrated that something more than the semantic and processing purposes are involved in referential encoding. Though these studies did not utilize highly sophisticated methodologies, each description was based on a sound descriptive framework. The framework included establishing the default encoding constraints for new participants, as well as for continuing reference to them. Each study also addresses the relationship between referential encoding and the basic structure of narratives in each language. Finally, each study sought to describe the *non*-default functions of participant reference encoding. They demonstrated that over- or under-encoding of participants created various pragmatic implicatures, depending upon the language and context.

The initial methodology utilized by Levinsohn was developed over the years through application in linguistic workshops, and is most fully expounded in the final chapters of Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:109ff). The framework for description involves selecting a representative corpus of narrative for a language, and comparing the referential encoding in various contexts by discretely defining contexts which are typically found in narrative, for both subjects and non-subjects:

(16) Levinsohn's 'Default/Marked' subject and non-subject contexts

Subject Contexts

- **INTRO** very first mention of referent
- **S1** subject referent was the subject of the immediately preceding clause;
- **S2** referent was the addressee of a speech reported in preceding clause;
- **S3** referent was in non-subject role other than addressee in preceding clause;
- **S4** contexts other than those covered by S1-S3.

Non-subject Contexts

- **INTRO** very first mention of referent
- **N1** referent was in the same non-subject role in the preceding clause;
- **N2** referent was the speaker in a speech reported in the preceding clause;
- **N3** referent was in a role in the preceding clause other than N1-N2;
- **N4** contexts other than those covered by N1-N3. (Dooley and Levinsohn 2001:130-31)

The analyst then proposes default encodings for each context based on a preliminary study, keeping the provisos in mind mentioned in §2.1.1.

Next, tokens which deviate from the proposed default encoding for each context are examined to determine the rationale for using more or less encoding. It is at this point that the

³⁸ It is evident that much more work remains to be done to fully understand participant reference in minority languages. Cf. Watkins who concludes his study of participant reference in Kiowa stating, "What remains to be discovered, among other things, are the principles underlying the more usual distribution of overt pronouns, occurring every four to eight clauses or so" (1990:425). These pronouns are redundant, and might very well be serving a processing function.

context definitions and proposed defaults are reevaluated and adapted to describe the idiosyncrasies of the language's morpho-syntax. The functions of the remaining deviant tokens are then described. Levinsohn suggests taking into account such things as: textual discontinuities,³⁹ pragmatic structuring of information,⁴⁰ the relative salience of the participant or following event/speech,⁴¹ the absence of other participants on stage,⁴² or the fact that material is being repeated,⁴³ any of which might motivate departures from the default.

As noted in §2.1.1, the default/marked approach has an established track record as a flexible framework for developing a straightforward and thorough description of participant reference systems. In Clark's (2000) comparison of the three methodologies above, he found the default/marked method to be the most comprehensive and heuristic approach. The key component of its efficacy was differentiating default encoding from marked encoding. He used the default encoding constraints as the canon against which to describe the pragmatic effects achieved by marked encodings in various contexts. Clark summarized his experience as follows: "Default levels for each of the contexts were quickly identified, and once deviant tokens were isolated, the explanations for marked encoding closely paralleled those presented by Levinsohn. Practically every over-coded token was shown to exist at a point of discontinuity and/or to highlight the action, and under-coding was found to be totally explained by repetition or participant prominence. Thus not only was Givón's Iconicity Principle supported, but specific motivations were identified for every apparent violation of the principle" (ibid:75).

Clark went so far as to select another narrative to analyze based on the conclusions of his initial study. From a statistical standpoint, the default encoding for context S2 in the second study appeared to be NP, while in the first study a subject-agreement affix had been postulated and affirmed. Upon comparing the two narratives, he noted that the second contained much longer reported speeches. Rather than changing his default, Clark was able to account for the NP as marked encoding, only used "when the preceding quote is lengthy, or to show discontinuities or highlighting" (ibid:76). The morpho-syntax of Sio also required several changes and additions to the context descriptions. Clark found the framework flexible enough to incorporate such changes. The changes did not prove to be unwieldy for him from a practical standpoint.

We now have established a typological understanding of the general functions participant reference systems play in language: semantic, processing, and pragmatic. We have also identified a methodological framework based on establishing a default canon against which marked forms can be compared and described. Before moving on to a review of participant reference studies on Biblical Hebrew narrative, one more issue must be discussed: pragmatic implicatures.

³⁹ Cf. Givón's action continuity scale (1983a:8, 36), Hopper and Thompson (1984).

⁴⁰ Cf. Lambrecht (1994).

⁴¹ Cf. Levinsohn (2000a).

⁴² Cf. Givón (1983a:11).

⁴³ Cf. Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:133).

Up to this point, we have only informally discussed pragmatics and pragmatic effects. A more careful explanation is needed to protect against developing *ad hoc* explanations of pragmatic encoding which are not grounded in a typological understanding of the pragmatics of discourse anaphora and its resolution by readers.

2.5 Pragmatic Implicatures of Discourse Anaphora

The discourse-pragmatic function of participant reference has recently been theoretically affirmed and extended in Huang's (2000) cross-linguistic study of discourse anaphora. Huang has revised Grice's (1981) principles of conversational implicature, building on the work of Stephen C. Levinson (1985). Huang argues that a proper understanding of anaphora necessitates reliance upon both syntax *and pragmatics*. The latter, he argues, has too long been ignored. "What pragmatics does here is to provide a set of complementary, explanatory principles that constrains the interpretation or production of an utterance whose linguistic representation has already been antecedently cognized" (Huang 2000:213). His review of various approaches to anaphora reveals that most syntactic and some cognitive explanations of discourse-anaphora resolution fail to provide an adequate account of the data. Huang's revised, neo-Gricean account of discourse anaphora will be used as the theoretical framework for explaining discourse-anaphora resolution in Biblical Hebrew narrative.

There is significant overlap between Grice's 'conversational implicatures' and Sperber and Wilson's Relevance Theory (2002). While Sperber and Wilson in general agree with Gricean pragmatic principles, they claim "the principles governing this apparatus have their source in the human central cognitive mechanism. Consequently, they propose that the entire Gricean programme be subsumed within a single cognitive principle, namely, the principle of optimal Relevance... In other words, on Sperber and Wilson's view, in interpreting an utterance, one is always maximizing its 'contextual effects' and minimizing its 'processing efforts' to interpret the utterance as optimally relevant, that is, to interpret it in a way which is most consistent with the principle of Relevance" (Huang 2000:248). We will maintain the terminology of the Gricean scheme for precision' sake, granting that one is largely able to draw the same conclusions by appealing to Relevance Theory.

We will begin the review of Huang by presenting Levinson's revised Gricean principles. Next we present the principles Huang establishes for pragmatic anaphora resolution. His primary interest is to provide a pragmatic framework which coherently describes coreference and clause-level anaphora. In the final section, his conclusions will be adapted and applied to form a model explaining the cognitive process whereby marked, referential encoding is processed. Our final framework is an eclectic combination of the neo-Gricean pragmatic implicatures, Relevance Theory principles, and Lambrecht's description of mental representation.

2.5.1 The Quality Principle

Grice developed a series of ‘conversational implicatures’ in order to describe the pragmatic principles which speakers and hearers ostensibly follow in making their decisions about how utterances should both be formed and interpreted. “Grice suggests that conversational implicatures—roughly, a set of non-logical inferences that contains conveyed messages which are meant without being said in the strict sense—can arise from either strictly and directly observing or deliberately and ostentatiously flouting the maxims” (Huang 2000:206).

Levinson (1987) has condensed Grice’s nine implicatures into three principles which more fully differentiate the implicatures drawn by speakers as opposed to hearers. This same process has also been described using Relevance Theory. Relevance Theory states that hearers have the expectation that utterances are intended by the speaker to be relevant to the context. If the relevance is not immediately clear, the hearer begins a cognitive process whereby a relevant connection can be established based on the discourse context, cognitive schemata, world knowledge, etc. Levinson’s (1987) pragmatics model explains the same process, beginning with the Q[uality] principle, given in (17).

(17) Q-principle

Speaker’s maxim: Do not provide a statement that is informationally weaker than your knowledge of the world allows, unless providing a stronger statement would contravene the I-principle.

Recipient’s corollary: Take it that the speaker made the strongest statement consistent with what he knows (Huang 2000:207).

The Q-principle describes the propensity of hearers to infer that no stronger statement is intended than what is said. For instance, consider the following example:

(18) Question: Do you like broccoli?

Answer: Well, I don’t hate it.

In the question/answer pair of (18), the questioner has asked a yes/no question, which the responder has largely side-stepped with his reply. The Q-principle guides the questioner to infer that the responder indeed does not like broccoli, but is unwilling to bluntly admit it. The questioner infers that the response represents the strongest statement possible under the circumstances. Huang states, “The basic idea is that the use of an expression (especially a semantically weaker one) in a set of contrastive semantic alternatives Q-implicates the negation of the interpretation associated with the use of another expression (especially a semantically stronger one) in the same set” (ibid:208). The Q-principle forms the upper boundary of implicature, viz. if a speaker says X, he is not able to make a statement semantically stronger than X based on his knowledge.

2.5.2 The Informative Principle

The implicatures fostered by application of the Q-principle are counter-balanced by those drawn by the lower boundary, the I[nformative]-principle, stated in (19).

(19) I-principle

Speaker's maxim: *the maxim of minimization*

'Say as little as necessary', i.e. produce the minimal linguistic information sufficient to achieve your communicational ends (bearing the Q-principle in mind).

Recipient's corollary: *the rule of enrichment*

Amplify the informational content of the speaker's utterance, by finding the most specific interpretation, up to what you judge to be the speaker's M-intended point (ibid:207)

Huang explains that "the conversational implicature engendered by the I-principle is one that accords best with the most stereotypical and explanatory expectation given our knowledge about the world" (ibid:208). He gives the following examples to illustrate:

(20) 'John turned the key and the music box opened' I-implicates at least the following:

- (a) John turned the key and then the music box opened.
- (b) John turned the key and thereby caused the music box to open.
- (c) John turned the key in order to make the music box open. (ibid:209)

The 'maxim of minimization' explains the prototypical tendency to use the lowest level of referential encoding possible which still allows the hearer to identify a referent.⁴⁴ This appears to be a typological principle governing participant reference encoding. The corollary to this minimization maxim is highly significant, as (20) demonstrates. The I-principle describes the reader's tendency to 'enrich' an utterance in order to maximize its relevance to the context. Things which limit the amount of enrichment a hearer will exercise include contextual information (e.g. discourse context, perceived speaker intention, the semantic constraints of the utterance) and world knowledge (ibid:237ff). Based on these factors, the person reading (20) in its discourse context will draw the most relevant implicature of (a)-(c).

2.5.3 The Markedness Principle

The expectation created by the M-principle is that if a non-default form is used, it was done intentionally and with a purpose. The M-principle is stated in (21).

(21) M-principle

Speaker's maxim: Do not use a prolix, obscure or marked expression without reason.

Recipient's corollary: If the speaker used a prolix or marked expression M, he or she did not mean the same as he or she would have had he or she used the unmarked expression U—specifically he or she was trying to avoid the stereotypical associations and I-implicatures of U (ibid:207-208).

The primary point of the M-principle is that when a speaker uses a marked form or utterance M, he is intending to M-implicate something that using a default or unmarked form or utterance would *not* have implicated. Put another way, Huang claims "that the use of a marked expression M-implicates the negation of the interpretation associated with the use of an alternative, unmarked linguistic expression... Taken together, the I- and M-principles give rise to complementary interpretations: the

⁴⁴ Cf. preference for minimal encoding in cases of continuing reference described by Givón (1983a), Chafe (1976), and Perrin (1978).

use of an unmarked linguistic expression tends to convey an unmarked message, whereas the use of a marked linguistic expression tends to convey a marked message” (ibid:210). While this M-principle appears to be self-evident, it is nonetheless crucial to explaining the pragmatic effect of using a marked form as opposed to a default one. Let us consider an example.

(22) Pragmatic Effect of Marked versus Unmarked Referring Expressions:

Question from husband to wife

“How was your time shopping with the children?”

Responses

(a) “*The children* behaved themselves well...”

(a’) “*Your children* refused to listen to directions...”

There is a difference in the referring expressions in (a) and (a’). The former is an acceptable expression for referring to one’s children in an unmarked way. The latter, which simply exchanges the definite article for a possessive pronoun, significantly changes the implicatures drawn from the referring expression. Alternatively, one could change the referring expression “the children” in the question to “Bob and Sue”, with response (a) using the pronoun “they”, and the marked implicature of (a’) would still remain. The use of the marked referring expression in (a’) was purposefully used by the speaker to convey an implicature that the unmarked expression in (a) would *not* have communicated.

2.5.4 The Neo-Gricean Principles and the Cognitive Processing

We have examined the three typological functions of participant reference, and outlined how utterances are shaped and cognitively processed in order to build mental representations. We have also described the pragmatic implicatures utilized by speakers and hearers in communication. We would like to draw all of these elements together in order to propose a model for describing the cognitive path hearers follow in analyzing overencoded referring expressions. We are not concerned here with the semantic resolution of anaphora, either at the sentence or discourse level. Rather, assuming that the reader understands ‘who does what to whom’, we are interested in answering the following questions: what are the implicatures drawn from overencoded expressions, and in what order are these implicatures processed?

Based on the Q-principle and the I-principle, hearers appear to expect that speakers will use referring expressions which meet the semantic needs of the context. For instance when a new participant is introduced, the hearer expects that the speaker will provide both a primary referring expression for the new referent and an anchoring relation which grounds it to the discourse context. When two participants switch roles from one clause to the next, and the semantics of the verb are such that minimal encoding would create ambiguity, the hearer expects the speaker will provide sufficient encoding to avoid ambiguity. We would propose that hearers and readers analyze referential encoding as *first* fulfilling the semantic function of participant reference.

If the referential encoding is more than what the context requires (e.g., for reactivation or for disambiguation), the hearer then M-implicates that the extra information is intended for some purpose *other than* the unmarked, semantic purpose. Based on the findings of cognitive psychology discussed in §2.4.3, readers seem to resolve the extra encoding as a signal to create a new mental chunk.⁴⁵ Redundant NPs in the experimental discourse lead to slower reading times,⁴⁶ while numerous studies have demonstrated that hearers process redundant NPs as signaling slight discontinuities, referred to here as development units.⁴⁷ However, as the studies of both Fox and Tomlin demonstrated, there are yet other uses of redundant NPs for which the processing function is unable to give an adequate account.

Again, based on the M-principle and the findings of Maibaum (1978), Perrin (1978), Toba (1978), Levinsohn (1978, 1994, 2000a), and Clark (2000), it is reasonable to infer that redundant encoding, which exceeds the amount needed to signal a new development unit, is M-implicated by the reader as signaling something *other than* the processing function. The typological function that such encoding has been associated with is the cataphoric highlighting of a following speech or event. More explicit description of this pragmatic function of overencoding necessitates an established default baseline. Therefore we will reserve further discussion of this issue until Chapter 6.

These functions of participant reference are not mutually exclusive, but form an entailment hierarchy. Put another way, an overencoded referential expression may accomplish a processing function yet it still serves a semantic function as well even though it is redundant. An overencoded referring expression which serves a marked, pragmatic function, we would propose, is at the same time serving a processing and semantic function as well. This entailment hierarchy can be summarized as follows:

(23) Entailment hierarchy for cognitive processing of marked referring expressions

Semantic → Processing → Pragmatic

In this chapter we have introduced and outlined our methodological framework in preparation for developing a well-reasoned description of participant reference for Biblical Hebrew narrative. We also introduced a number of factors which have been shown cross-linguistically to impinge upon the encoding decisions of speakers/writers, e.g. information structure constraints, discourse boundaries, and cataphoric highlighting of speeches or events. With our theoretical and methodological framework assembled, we will now survey the studies of participant reference conducted in Biblical

⁴⁵ We do not agree with Tomlin's model (1987, cf. §2.4.3) that encoding reflects the cognitive conception of the *speaker*. Rather, we view overencoding as a pragmatic decision on par with the pragmatic structuring of propositions described by Lambrecht (1994). In our view, it appears that speakers make such pragmatic decisions quite naturally, without overt deliberation (except on very rare occasions). Therefore, we will proceed analyzing referential encoding as a pragmatic signal from the speaker to the hearer.

⁴⁶ Cf. Gordon et al. (1993).

⁴⁷ Cf. Clancy (1980), Anderson et al. (1982), Tomlin (1987), Fox (1987a), (1987b), Vonk et al. (1992).

Hebrew itself in Chapter 3. This survey will set the stage for proposing a description of default participant reference encoding in Chapter 4.

3. Studies of Participant Reference in Biblical Hebrew

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter we will review the current descriptions and understanding of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew studies. Only a few of these studies were solely dedicated to participant reference itself, and only three of them claimed to be linguistically oriented. The rest of the studies concerned broader topics related to discourse studies, and only peripherally touched on participant reference. The purpose of this chapter is to survey the previous studies, and to identify issues that were either left unexplained or misunderstood by the study. We will attempt to address these issues in our effort to provide a functional description of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew narrative. In light of these goals, this review will be as concerned with *methods* and *frameworks* used as with results.

In the previous chapter, we saw that assumptions or frames of reference heavily influence the results and descriptions of participant reference studies in linguistics. Two primary shortcomings with these studies were identified: an inadequate cognitive framework, and an inadequate understanding of the typological functions of participant reference. These two issues also affect the participant reference studies of Biblical Hebrew narrative. We noted in §2.2 that the cognitive component of our interpretive framework is necessary for understanding encoding requirements for each of the activation states (cf. Lambrecht 1994, Givón 1992). Understanding language processing also informs us about the reader's need to break the discourse into chunks in order to properly build a mental representation (cf. Paivio and Begg 1981). An inadequate cognitive framework undermines the accuracy of the default encoding frame, which in turn can undermine the description of non-default encoding.

Establishing a typologically informed description is also necessary. We fully recognize that typology does not explain every idiosyncrasy of language, but instead describes the general patterns or devices which typologically similar languages might use to accomplish these purposes. On the other hand, attempting to describe a language feature *without* attention to how languages typically work can lead the analyst to draw erroneous conclusions. A common consequence of an incomplete theoretical framework is to describe *two* discrete functions as though they were *one*. Another common consequence is to account for only a *portion* of the data, and to attribute the counter-examples to stylistic variation, 'emphasis', or some kind of ancient Near Eastern convention. Stylistic variation no doubt exists, as do cultural conventions. However, we contend that a well-developed framework should be able to provide a reasonable and more complete account of the anomalies left from previous studies.

Two additional factors have hindered the Biblical Hebrew studies. First, most of these studies lack an empirically-grounded description of default encoding for different discourse contexts. A dubious understanding of default encoding necessarily impacts the identification and description of

marked encoding. The second factor is to assign semantic meaning to a *form* that is more likely a pragmatic effect of its *usage*. At the end of the last chapter, Clark's (2000) study demonstrated the necessity of discretely identifying the different discourse contexts which influence referential encoding. While Givón's (1983a) typological predictions were largely upheld, such vindication was only possible *after* establishing a distinction between *default* and *marked* encoding. It also required describing the pragmatic effect of marked encoding as something other than a variable semantic meaning.

Our review of the Biblical Hebrew studies will be done chronologically. The development of thought in linguistics is largely paralleled in the Biblical Hebrew studies, though few of the studies were linguistically oriented. The cognitive framework, understanding of markedness, and the typological functions established in the previous chapter will all be brought to bear as we survey the current understanding of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew.

(24) Evaluation Criteria for Methods and Results of Participant Reference Studies:

- (a) **Cognitive framework:** activation states of participants, identifiability of new participants, the creation and use of text-based schemata within discourses;
- (b) **Defaults:** empirically established defaults based on discourse context and verb morphology.
- (c) **Typologically informed account of text segmentation/processing.**
- (d) **Typologically informed account of pragmatics:** distinguishing pragmatic effect from semantic meaning regarding:
 - i. Topic status and continuity of participants;
 - ii. Pragmatic marking of prominence/salience;

3.2 *Berlin (1983)*

The primary focus of Berlin's study was to systematically describe the literary conventions and devices which she believed are the 'building blocks' of narrative discourse. Literary studies had previously attempted this task mainly by describing discourse *structurally*, with the primary focus being the plot.⁴⁸ In response to these structuralist approaches, studies such as Alter (1981), Bar-Efrat (1989) and Berlin (1983) followed the theoretical framework adapted for Biblical Hebrew by Meir Sternberg (1985) called *poetics*. This approach seeks to undertake a systematic analysis of Biblical Hebrew narrative, informed by what might be called 'narrative typology'. The poetics scholars specialize in comparative literature, and thus understand how languages use various devices to build a narrative. Thus, by definition poetics "describes the basic components of literature and the rules governing their use. Poetics strives to write a [descriptive] grammar, as it were, of literature" (Berlin 1983:15).

This description is based upon observations made from actual literary texts, and is *literary* as opposed to *linguistic* in nature. One of the significant contributions of this school of Biblical studies has been to demonstrate that many traditional 'signs of redaction' could also be described as literary conventions, found in other languages both ancient and modern. While the methodology is not

⁴⁸ Cf. Culley (1992) or Hawk (1991) for examples of plot-based structural studies.

linguistic, it is *descriptive*. Many of the building blocks they identify are based on grammatical forms, so at some level the methodology is linguistically grounded. More typically, Berlin and others offer descriptions of the *pragmatic effects* of the devices, without establishing a default. We will review the work of Berlin (1983) as a representative example, as her work best covers the building blocks relevant to participant reference.

The most relevant contribution of Berlin is her discussion of the pragmatic use of referring expressions, which she refers to as *naming* (ibid:59ff). She notes that not all characters are referred to with the same amount of detail. Most scholars have recognized the patterns associated with main characters, but the description of secondary characters has proven much more elusive. The description she develops has three types of participants: full-fledged (i.e., ‘round’), type (i.e., ‘flat’), and agents (ibid:23). The full-fledged characters are essentially the main ones, who exhibit developed personalities and with whom the reader can identify. But she also notes that many biblical characters are ‘flat’, representing a character type (e.g. Nabal). In other words, they are either names without faces or faces without names.⁴⁹ Finally, ‘agents’ (called ‘props’ elsewhere) simply move the plot forward, with no character development whatsoever.

Berlin recognizes that proper names and epithets are used differently but predictably, and nuanced her descriptions accordingly. Main characters tend to have proper names, while secondary characters are usually assigned epithets. The three-way distinction she makes for the different kinds of participants is consistent with distinctions in participant salience observed in other languages as described by Dooley and Levinsohn (2001) and Levinsohn (2000a).

Not only does Berlin describe the relation between referring expressions and thematic salience, she also observes the intentionality with which these expressions are employed as poetic building blocks. One building block is *point of view* (PoV, cf. 1983:43ff). Berlin notes that the full-fledged participant of a narrative can usually be identified by how other participants are grounded to the narrative. We made reference earlier to *anchoring expressions* such as ‘*Abraham’s son*’ which is used to thematically ground the participant ‘*Isaac*’ to the narrative. In this example, Berlin would identify *Abraham* as the ‘point of interest’ (ibid:48), with the other participants anchored to him. She notes that a writer could shift the narrative center by shifting the referent of the anchoring expression (e.g., from ‘*Isaac, his son*’ to ‘*Abraham, his father*’).

A second pragmatic building block Berlin notes is the use of referring expressions for *embedded evaluation* (ibid:105f). One of the primary presuppositions of the poetics school is that biblical narrative is not objective, but is *purposefully* shaped to accomplish the writers’ communicative objectives. One of the means used to achieve implicit evaluation is to employ a non-default, thematically salient referring expression for the participant at a strategic point in the

⁴⁹ E.g., Elimelech, Mahlon and Chilion in Ruth 1 are names without faces or depth. The ‘servant in charge of the reapers’ in Ruth 2:6 is a good example of a face without a name, a character who moves the plot along, but has merely a generic identity.

discourse, e.g. the repeated reference to Ruth as ‘the Moabitess’ or ‘her daughter-in-law’ in the book of Ruth, or to Jethro 14x as ‘Moses’ father-in-law’ in Exod 18.⁵⁰ The practice of so-called ‘embedded evaluation’ is widely attested, and fits well with the typological principle that referential encoding can be used for pragmatic marking.⁵¹

Two methodological problems arise from Berlin’s study, one cognitive and one linguistic. From a cognitive standpoint, Berlin’s findings are consistent with the idea of a reader-oriented discourse where the writer is ostensibly shaping the reader’s mental representation through the pragmatic use of language. However, issues such as introduction and (re)activation of participants do not figure in to her discussion at all. Second, her study and the others like it are more intuitively based than empirically based, seeking to provide close readings of narrative texts. Default usage is not explicitly established as a canon against which to evaluate marked usage. Nonetheless, there is reason to believe that many of the insights made by poetics scholars will be upheld since most observations are based on grammatical markers. The research using poetics represents a large step forward from the previous structural studies, providing text-based descriptions of grammatical, discourse-level phenomena.⁵²

3.3 Fox (1983)

The study of topic encoding in Biblical Hebrew narrative conducted by Andrew Fox was commissioned to apply Givón’s (1983a) topic-continuity measurement system.⁵³ For brevity’s sake, we will focus on his conclusions and remaining questions. Fox’s study sought to measure three aspects of participant reference in non-reported speech clauses from Genesis 1-30:

- *Look-back* (‘referential distance’): The distance, in number of clauses, between the last *prior* mention of the referent in the discourse and the current appearance that is being counted;
- *Decay* (‘persistence’): The length of the unbroken chain, in terms of number of clauses, through which the referent remains an argument of the clause *after* the instance being counted;
- *Potential interference*: The presence vs. absence of other possibly competing referents in the immediately preceding discourse environment (ibid:220).

Fox identifies the specific morphological levels of encoding available in Biblical Hebrew (e.g. zero anaphora, clitic pronouns, independent pronouns, and noun phrases). He notes that certain syntactic constructions (viz. those mentioned above in the discussion of information structure) impact

⁵⁰ Berlin cites four well-attested means of achieving evaluation: use of *intensifiers* (e.g. ‘all’ or ‘every’), *comparators* (e.g. contrasting Ruth’s actions with those of Orpah in Ruth 1), *explications* (i.e. words which give “the reason or motivation for certain actions”, e.g. ‘while’, ‘though’, ‘because’, ‘since’), and *correlatives* (e.g. the use of thematically salient appositives such as Naomi’s description of Boaz as ‘the man is a relative of ours; he is of our redeemers’ in Ruth 2:21) (ibid:105f). It is the final means which is most salient to our study.

⁵¹ For a more complete illustration of how biblical writers used poetics to pragmatically shape discourse, read Berlin’s brief exposition of Ruth (1983:83-111).

⁵² Cf. Alter (1985), Berlin (1983), Sternberg (1985), Bar-Efrat (1989), Amit (1987a, 1987b, 1990, 1992, 1999a, 1999b, 2001).

⁵³ Cf. §2.4.2 for a description of Givón’s methodology and goals.

the morphological level of encoding for both subjects and objects. He also finds that many of Givón's primary encoding principles (e.g., the Iconicity principle) apply to Biblical Hebrew and can account for much of the attested encoding data. Finally, he posits preliminary relationships between syntactic constructions and morphological encodings regarding topic persistence and topic (re)activation.

While Fox's study is able to provide statistical measures which add to our understanding of referential encoding, the results leave many questions unanswered. At several points, Fox's data reveals heavy overlap in the distribution of different morphological forms in seemingly similar contexts. For instance, the referential distance to the previous reference to a human subject is nearly identical for bound pronouns, independent pronouns, and Y-movement (i.e., 'topicalization'), with a value between 1.0 and 1.71 clauses (ibid:242). Is there a meaningful difference associated with each level of encoding in this context? Fox's approach is unable to provide an answer.

The same type of overlap of encoding options is observed with human/non-human objects regarding the referential distance of zero anaphora, bound pronouns, independent pronouns, and Y-movement, with values between 1.0 and 1.66 clauses (Y-movement reference to humans is 2.5) (ibid:243). What are the meaningful differences among these forms in the context? How is one to determine these distinctions? The stated objective of Fox's methodology is to distinguish the meaningful difference in usage on the basis of the average number of clauses to the last reference to the participant. However, he finds that the distance measure does not provide a meaningful distinction because of the similar numerical values. He is also unable to suggest an alternative explanation; he primarily reports the data counts. Fox's methodology lacks a descriptive framework which can account for the overlapping values in his data. Furthermore, his study is primarily focused on *semantic* issues affecting referential encoding. As noted above, the study is admittedly preliminary, paving the way for work by others.

3.4 Longacre (1989=2003)

Longacre seeks to illustrate his own text-linguistic methodology, and the text-theory on which it is based, by applying it to the *Joseph* narratives of Genesis 37-48. The study consists of three parts: an introduction to the *Joseph* novella, considering source- and text-critical issues of the corpus; a text-linguistic and sociolinguistic analysis of verb rank and constituent [i.e. information] structure; and a discussion of the sociolinguistic dynamics manifested in participant reference, speech acts and dialogue in narrative. This final section includes:

- an overview of participant reference, including its functions;
- an overview of quotation formulas used, and their functions in the narrative; and
- an application of both to Longacre's exposition of *Joseph*.

We will focus primarily on Longacre's conclusions regarding participant reference.

Longacre seeks to demonstrate that there are predictable patterns of discourse above the sentence level (2003:18), which he refers to as the 'grammar of discourse'. He views the participant

reference system as a primary means of tracking coherence. He also recognizes several uses of participant reference beyond its basic semantic function.

One of Longacre's noteworthy contributions is correlating levels of morphological encoding to specific operations of participant reference. In other words, the encoding is not simply semantically determined, but can be correlated to certain operations within the discourse. Longacre recognizes that variations in referential encoding are used to differentiate major and minor participants or themes (ibid:18). Based on this conclusion, Longacre hypothesizes various operations of participant reference.⁵⁴ He then correlates the types of encoding with the various types of characters or operations. Following Berlin (1983), Longacre also distinguishes between major and minor participants, as well as props. Longacre's hypothesized 'operations' are also used for such pragmatic purposes as 'peak-marking', providing coherence to the narrative, and highlighting significant points in the discourse.

A second contribution is Longacre's correlation of 'peak-marking' to participant reference. His previous work identifies cross-linguistic patterns used to pragmatically highlight important portions of texts (cf. Longacre 1985). "It [the peak] represents a kind of a gear shift in the dynamic flow of discourse. Only rarely does a language have special peak-marking features that are used only at peak, rather it is the *shift* from one set of features to another that marks the onset of a peak in a given discourse" (2003:18, italics his). Examples he provides include:

- shifts in tense, aspect, and person,
- use/disuse of discourse particles,
- variation of sentence length and complexity of constructions,
- incidence of repetition, and
- rhythm of the text picking up.

Longacre states regarding the grammar of Gen 41, "The crowded action line is typical of peak in many languages. At the same time, the long dialogue culminating in the second longest speech of the entire story embodies features typical of peak in many languages and literatures" (ibid:33).⁵⁵ One specific device he describes is the pragmatic use of participant reference in quotative frames. Longacre observes a correlation between the level of encoding used in quotative frames and the

⁵⁴ Longacre describes the following operations:

M: introduction of participant, first Mention of X [i.e., activation];

I: Integration into the story as central in a narrative...or as thematic participant of a paragraph;

T: "Tracking, i.e. tracing references to participants through the text so as to keep track of who-does-what-to-whom, and other such considerations";

R: Reinstatement, [i.e., reactivation];

C: Confrontation, as at the climax of story, role change;

L: "marking Locally contrastive status (accomplished by fronting a noun in the second sentence of an antithetical paragraph (chap. 4, §1.6); fronting of a noun anywhere for local focus;";

E: "an intrusive narrator Evaluation" (2003:141).

⁵⁵ Cf. Longacre (1985:96-97) for a list of devices used for peak-marking in various languages

continuity of the narrative. He notes that such devices are used for highlighting significant points in the text, though his conclusions leave room for refinement.⁵⁶

Several key elements are missing from Longacre's theoretical framework which—either singly or in combination—affect the precision of many of his conclusions. These elements are:

- establishing an empirically-based set of default encoding minimums for various discourse contexts;
- an adequate cognitive framework which accounts for the activation of participants,⁵⁷ particularly with respect to the identifiability of brand new participants;
- recognizing the three typological functions of participant reference: Longacre recognizes only semantic and pragmatic functions;
- maintaining a meaningful distinction between semantic *meaning* and pragmatic *effect*.

Each of these issues will be considered in order, with illustrative examples to highlight the impact of these issues on his framework.

Longacre's analysis of participant reference does not sub-divide the data into the most discrete units of description possible. In several instances Longacre describes *multiple* features/issues as a *single* feature. This is a result of using loosely established default encoding values. Consider the issue of grammaticalizing verb agreement, for example.

Longacre, like Fox (1983), does not make a distinction between the uses of independent personal pronouns with finite verbs versus with non-finite verbs. It has been noted that participles and verbless clauses cannot grammaticalize subject agreement. Therefore use of an independent personal pronoun represents the minimum level of morphological encoding possible to encode subject agreement. Finite verbs grammaticalize subject agreement via morphological suffixes or prefixes. Overlooking this distinction leads Longacre to misconstrue the function of independent personal pronouns. For example, Longacre notes that such pronouns are used frequently with nominal and participial clauses, and infrequently with finite verbs, where “their occurrence always has some sort of contrasting/pointing function” (2003:140).

Longacre's loose description of the minimal encoding of finite verbs versus non-finite verbs has two ramifications. First, his current description opens the door for mistaking default uses of pronouns in non-finite verbal clauses as somehow marked. Second, in the case of finite verbal clauses, Longacre associates the ‘contrasting/pointing function’ with the presence of the personal pronoun, *not* with the clause-initial positioning. This description of independent personal pronouns significantly affects his account of information structure, resulting in context-based explanations rather than a more uniform grammatical description.

Another impact of Longacre's loose description of defaults is manifested in his use of ranking scales to differentiate marked encoding from default (ibid:139-140). In his discussion of the level of morphological encoding used for Joseph's brothers, Longacre states that they are referred to using

⁵⁶ Cf. Miller's (2003:7-8, 149ff) response to Longacre claims regarding quotative frames.

⁵⁷ His **R**einstatement category is more semantically- than cognitively-based.

Level 3 encoding (i.e. anchored epithets), as opposed to using a higher level of encoding for thematicity (i.e. proper name or modified proper name). Such an observation overlooks the fact that *one cannot refer to most groups with a proper name*. Calling these men ‘Joseph’s/his brothers’ is the most specific referring expression available. What higher-level option does Longacre envision? Proper names are nearly exclusively associated with individuals, or with people-groups which can be treated as a single discourse entity (e.g. ‘the Egyptians’). Where there is no choice, there is no meaning to be inferred. Longacre’s frequent appeal to ranking schemes often hurts his cause more than it helps (cf. Heimerdinger 1999:56ff). He also appeals to sociological factors, such as ‘rank-pulling’ by a subordinate toward a superior in order to account for certain marked constructions. While such explanations might be able to account for certain encoding data in *Joseph*, how can such a description account for comparable encoding where rank is not a factor?

A second element missing from Longacre’s study is a cognitive framework which can fully account for the mental processes of activation. The absence of this cognitive framework results in *ad hoc* appeals to sociolinguistics to explain the encoding, rather than a systematic explanation of the discourse phenomena observed. For instance, he claims that a participant must be lexicalized twice in order to establish it as thematic (ibid:141). It would appear that this claim is linked to his assessment of redundant NPs as intended for thematic highlighting rather than for discourse processing (cf. Levinsohn 2000b). This assessment leads Longacre to view the lexicalization of a participant as directly proportional to its thematicity. Cross-linguistically, Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:119-124) have generally found the opposite to be the case; Very Important Participants (VIPs) most commonly are *underencoded*. Furthermore, Longacre’s analysis of participant reference often does not take into account the semantic necessity of relexicalization for reactivation in certain contexts, such as role changes from one sentence to the next.

Let us illustrate these issues with an example from Gen 39. Longacre notes that the writer takes care to reestablish Joseph as a thematic participant by the use of full NPs (2003:143). However, in the scene where Potiphar’s wife attempts to seduce Joseph, Longacre construes *her* as the thematic participant, since Joseph is encoded using only pronominals, even though such an interpretation seems to be *counter-intuitive* in his opinion. Looking at the context from a cognitive standpoint, there is *no semantic need* to relexicalize Joseph. He is a discourse-active, 3MS participant interacting with a 3FS participant. Relexicalization would not be expected for semantic reasons in such a context. Furthermore, according to our analysis of the passage, there are only two overencoded references to Potiphar’s wife: just before Joseph refuses her on the grounds he would be dishonoring his master (v. 8a), and at the point that his master feels dishonored (v. 19a). It seems much more plausible that both references are intended to thematically highlight the woman’s salient relation to the discourse as ‘*his master’s wife*’, and *not* to identify her as the central participant.

The anchoring of the participants in the context further corroborates Joseph’s role as the central participant. In 39:7 and 8, the woman is *not* called ‘*Potiphar’s wife*’, but ‘*the wife of his lord*’.

Thus she is anchored to *Joseph*, not to *Potiphar*. One finds Potiphar himself anchored to Joseph in vv. 16, 19 and 20; he is encoded as '*his lord*', not as '*Potiphar*'. According to Levinson's (1985) Gricean implicatures, use of a longer, less informative referring expression is construed as conveying something *other than* what the default referring expression would have conveyed. In this case, it seems quite clear that the pragmatic effect is to anchor the participants to Joseph. The marked encoding used here functions to affirm Joseph's thematic centrality. Longacre's framework leads him to reach the opposite conclusion.

Longacre's analysis of addressees in quotative frames is another instance where questionable conclusions are drawn as a result of his incomplete cognitive framework. Longacre argues that using a null subject for the speaker and NP for the addressee must be 'addressee-oriented', presumably as a corollary to his conclusion that encoding speakers with NPs and addressees with zero anaphora indicates a 'speaker-oriented' speech. He uses Gen 3:16-17 as examples of 'addressee-oriented' speeches. However, his analysis fails to take into account the need to *reactivate* the addressees from semi-activity, which *necessitates* the use of full NPs. These verses even use referential points of departure to achieve the switch of addressee from '*the serpent*' to '*the woman*' to '*the man*'. Again, there is no choice available regarding the level of encoding. How can one assign such special significance to this encoding when it is semantically required?⁵⁸ Failure to account for the various cognitive requirements influencing encoding decisions leaves some of Longacre's claims open to question.

A third aspect missing from Longacre's interpretive framework is an understanding of the *processing* function of participant reference. Generally speaking, Longacre recognizes the semantic and pragmatic functions of participant reference. However in our view he misinterprets the data which accomplishes the processing function. On the whole, his analysis respects the semantic requirements for clear communication, but there are exceptions. As noted above regarding use of the expression 'Joseph's/his brothers', Longacre's preoccupation with ranking schemes (i.e. assigning significance to encoding based on the morphological complexity used) at times ignores the semantic requirements of a given context, or the options available to the speaker. On the whole, his ranking schemes, like Givón's (1983a) scales, provide a summary of *general tendencies*; but they prove less useful when it comes to accounting for the pragmatics of *specific* applications.

With respect to the pragmatic function of participant reference, we consider the ranking schemes to be more of a hindrance than a help to Longacre's cause. Recall that the concept of asymmetrical markedness, and exemplified in Grice's pragmatic implicatures, is grounded in the idea of variation. Longacre essentially applies this idea of variation to how one participant is referred to as compared to another, with the goal of developing a ranking of participants based on thematicity.

⁵⁸ Any argument that these speeches are addressee-oriented would be better made on the basis of information structure rather than on the level of encoding.

Thus, his ranking schemes utilize a *symmetrical* theory of markedness. Longacre's ranking scheme forces comparisons of dissimilar entities as though they were ostensibly comparable. Recall Longacre's claim that the higher the level of morphological encoding a participant receives, the more thematic it is. Thus, use of a proper name indicates that the participant in question is more thematic than one encoded using an anchored epithet. His symmetrical view of markedness leads him to create synthetic comparisons of dissimilar entities as though they were similar. We mentioned that certain groups of participants cannot be referred to using a proper name, rendering an anchored epithet the highest level of morphological encoding available. This framework leads Longacre to claim that 'Joseph' is more thematic than 'his brothers' on the basis of morphological encoding levels. This claim necessitates that each participant have the same encoding options available to choose from. How can comparison of dissimilar entities provide sound conclusions? Is the level of morphological encoding indeed directly proportion to thematicity, or inversely proportional as claimed by Dooley and Levinsohn (2001)? Longacre's use of a symmetrical system of markedness creates synthetic comparisons of dissimilar entities as though they were similar, which in turn impacts the efficacy of his conclusions.

A general scheme of 'major versus minor' participants emerges from Longacre's ranking scheme. However, a much more productive use of Longacre's ranking-scheme would be to analyze variation in how a *single* participant is referred to. This is something that Longacre does not do. As noted earlier regarding the encoding of Potiphar as '*Joseph's/his lord*', variation in individual referring expressions demonstrably accomplishes specific pragmatic effects. One misses these effects by comparing only referring expressions used for different participants and not those used for a single participant. Variation in proper names such as the use of '*Jacob*' versus '*Israel*' is the kind of individual variation to which Longacre gives attention (2003:147-148).

Longacre's account of the pragmatic use of referring expressions also encounters problems describing point of view. Berlin (1983) has made a significant contribution in describing the way referring expressions are used to convey or change the narrator's point of view. Longacre notes that anchoring participants to a single participant results in portraying the latter as thematically central (2003:146); however he does not apply this principle consistently. Thus, in Gen 42, where Joseph's house steward interacts with Joseph's brothers, the brothers are referred to as '*the men*'. Longacre concludes that such encoding is intended to indicate that the steward is more thematically salient, since he is referred to using a more complex referring expression (ibid:146). This application of Longacre's ranking scheme ignores Berlin's contributions regarding point of view. Berlin presents numerous examples of where the writer/editor adopts a participant's point of view to achieve a certain effect.

For example in Gen 12:13ff, Sarah is simply referred to as '*her*' or '*the woman*' during Abraham's deception. And *after* Pharaoh discovers her true relation to Abraham, she is only referred to using the epithet '*wife*', *not* a proper name. Such encoding betrays an apparently intentional

referential strategy. It is as though the writer adopts the Egyptian's point of view during the ruse, essentially playing along with Abraham's deception. The referring expressions used for Sarah during the deception do not portray *any* kind of relation to Abraham, in marked contrast to *highlighting* her relation both before and after the incident. The same kind of strategy appears to be at work here in Gen 42. Joseph's house steward ostensibly has no idea who these men really are, or of their relation to Joseph. Thus, use of a generic epithet presents the scene from the *steward's* point of view, as opposed to the brother's. To refer to the men as '*Joseph's brothers*' opens the door for the reader to believe that someone other than Joseph knows who they are. Again, Longacre's appeal to ranking schemes obscures this strategy. We would argue that he draws a flawed conclusion by construing the steward as the most thematically salient participant in the episode based upon his description of overencoding.

With respect to the processing function of participant reference, Longacre interprets the widespread use of redundant NPs in Biblical Hebrew narrative as being *thematically* motivated. He makes this claim on the basis of his morphological ranking scheme. In his discussion of subject changes in *wayyiqtol* chains, he notes that many times a switch of subject can be achieved based on the semantics of the verb, without an overt NP. "When, however, the implied reciprocity is sufficient to indicate the switch without an overt noun phrase and the latter occurs anyway, then the motivation for the occurrence of the noun phrase is to mark a thematic participant in some stretch of the discourse" (ibid:73). This interpretation of redundant NPs leads him to claim that a participant must be overtly referred to *twice* before it can be considered anything more than a prop (ibid:149). Levinsohn (2006:§8.1.1) observes that in many languages minor participants are "often identified in full each time they are involved in the story", ostensibly due to their lower activation status and persistence. Dooley and Levinsohn's claims regarding the underencoding of VIPs are consistent with Givón's Iconicity Principle. These findings add further support to Levinsohn's claim that minor participants tend to use lexical encoding. Thus we would argue that Longacre's analysis misconstrues the function of redundant subject NPs, leading him to attribute the overencoding to thematicity rather than to cognitive processing.

Longacre's analysis of the anonymous man in Gen 37:15-17 illustrates well the implications of overlooking these two principles. He notes that '*the man*' is lexicalized in consecutive clauses, even though the second lexicalization is redundant. He concludes,

It is not simply assumed that the newly introduced participant will naturally be subject of the next preterite; rather the noun is repeated here and yet once again in v. 17; this seems to be regular procedure in regard to operation I[ntroduction]. Although this minor participant is anonymous and no detail is given concerning him, he is integrated into the paragraph and made thematic by being doubly mentioned at its beginning and again at its end so as to bracket the span wherein he is local theme [sic] (ibid:149).

The idea that '*the man*' is thematic is misguided; he is a face without a name (cf. Berlin 1983:23), simply a prop to move the plot forward. We would argue that thematicity is NOT directly

proportional to the use of lexical NPs, and that the lexical references to this participant are either semantically required (37:15a, 15c), or are intended to signal the beginning of a new development unit (37:17a).

The final aspect to be critiqued of Longacre's work is his propensity to assign semantic meaning to pragmatic effects achieved by various devices. The first example is taken from his treatment of Gen 40. The chapter begins with an introductory exposition, introducing the participants and background information necessary to understand the following narrative. The overspecification of the participants is typical of exposition.

Gen 40:1-2

And it came about after these things that the cupbearer of the King of Egypt and the baker to their lord sinned in regard to the King of Egypt. And Pharaoh was enraged against (the) two officials, against the chief of the cupbearers and against the chief of the bakers.

Longacre construes the two-fold nominal reference to the two courtiers as indicating that they are "made central to the following narrative" (2003:150). If this is true, should not the same claim be applied to Pharaoh since too is lexicalized more than once in the context. What motivates Longacre not apply the same principle to Pharaoh? Is there a more suitable explanation which can account for this encoding data?

We noted above that redundant NPs are best understood as demarcating development units rather than as indicators of thematicity. Furthermore, the officials are not only mentioned using simple NPs, but also in right-dislocated phrases. The use of the right-dislocation, along with calling each a 'chief', enables the writer/editor to use the appositional phrases for both participants. Thus, we would argue that it is the use of the right-dislocation that provides the thematic highlighting, not simply the repetition of the referring expressions.

Longacre reaches comparable conclusions regarding the encoding of Reuben in the analysis of Gen 37:21-22, where Reuben makes his plea for sparing Joseph's life. Reuben's speech is broken up in v. 22a by the insertion of a redundant quotative frame. Longacre views the repetition of the NP 'Reuben' as indicating that he is a thematic participant. However, use of a mid-speech quotative frame characteristically highlights the speech that follows, and separates it as a new development (cf. Dooley and Levinsohn 2001:100-101). To claim that the writer intends to make Reuben thematic seems counterintuitive, since he is only mentioned once more in vv. 29-30. A better analysis is to view the mid-speech frame as dividing what would otherwise be one speech into two separate development units (cf. §5.3.2). This convention is used quite regularly in Biblical Hebrew narrative, as in Gen 24:24-25, where Rebekah's answers to the servant's questions are each indexed by separate quotative frames, even though there is no intervening speech (cf. Miller 2003:239-241).⁵⁹ It would

⁵⁹ Mid-speech quotative frames can also create a dramatic build up, as in Gen 38:25, Tamar's speech to Judah as she is being brought out for execution. Miller comments, "By representing Tamar's message in two parts, the narrator draws attention to the locution that provides the climax of the story" (2003:241n).

seem that Longacre has correctly recognized a thematic build-up, but has drawn his conclusion from the wrong convention.

In conclusion, Longacre has unquestionably made a significant contribution to discourse studies of Biblical Hebrew narrative by pointing out ways writers use linguistic conventions to achieve their communicative purposes. Unfortunately, many of Longacre’s conclusions are based on faulty descriptions of discourse phenomenon (e.g. his ‘two mentions = thematic participant’ principle). This is due to the fact that he establishes only loose default encoding minimums, lacks a complete cognitive framework, overlooks one of the three purposes of participant reference, and does not distinguish semantic meaning from pragmatic effect. Longacre ends up formulating descriptions which would likely not obtain outside of the *Joseph* narratives if applied to the broader Biblical Hebrew narrative canon. Even within *Joseph* he must either modify or selectively apply his descriptions in order for them to work.

3.5 Andersen (1994)

Andersen states the objective of his study as, “Salient readings—those that make the first claim on the listener/reader—are explored for various clause and paragraph structures. Particular emphasis is given to determining strategies employed by classical Hebrew writers to convey the temporal significance of clauses containing *qatal*, *weqatal*, *yiqtol*, and *waw + yiqtol* verbs” (1994:99). His study makes several significant contributions.

One significant contribution of Andersen’s study is his use of a default/marked framework to present his linguistic descriptions. In his discussion of repetition, Andersen presents three basic patterns of reference which are possible, positing one as the ‘preferred’ or default. Based on his explanation of the preferred pattern and what it signifies, he is able to provide cogent descriptions of the other patterns by using the preferred pattern as the basis for his description. He thus describes what the marked patterns pragmatically signal by contrasting them with what is communicated by the default pattern.

A second contribution is Andersen’s description regarding the three potential patterns of reference to participants, each of which has a different pragmatic effect upon the reader’s interpretation. “For any given clause-level constituent (A)—predicator, complement (referring to actants: subjects and objects of various kinds), and adjunct (referring to time, location, and other kinds of ‘adverbial’ modifiers)—that sustains an unchanged contribution to the presentation of the story, movement of the discourse from one clause to the next can involve the following patterns:

	Pattern 1	Pattern 2	Pattern 3	
Clause 1	A explicit	A explicit	A undisclosed	
Clause 2	A explicit (repeated)	A=0 (implied)	A explicit	(ibid:104)

It is significant that Andersen includes zero anaphora in his model, since such implicit reference contributes to the reader's mental representation, yet is often ignored by analysts (cf. Heimerdinger 1999 below).⁶⁰

Andersen identifies pattern 2 as the preferred (i.e., default) construction, whereby the A entity is activated and assumed to remain active until otherwise indicated. He notes that using pattern 2 for encoding subjects has the pragmatic effect of "clustering" the clauses together as a unit, due to the fact that each null subject clause is relying anaphorically on the preceding clause for subject identification. Most of his attention is devoted to patterns regarding subjects⁶¹ and objects, not adjuncts.

Based on Andersen's description of pattern 2 as 'clustering' the clauses, he makes claims consistent with Levinson's (1985) M-principle for patterns 1 and 3, namely that some pragmatic effect other than that achieved by pattern 2 must be intended. Regarding pattern 1 he states,

My hypothesis is that a seemingly redundant unnecessarily repeated subject noun serves to highlight the distinctiveness of an event, to mark that event as sequential in time more clearly [than pattern 2, SER], but not to the extent of giving that event episode status on the main storyline. Hebrew has special high-level transition markers for clustering events into episodes. Fronting a subject is one device. Such patterns add another dimension to the repertoire of clause types (1994:106-107).

He notes that the inclusion of a redundant NP represents the writer's *pragmatic choice* to mark the particular clause as 'distinct' from the preceding one (ibid:115).

Andersen discounts the desire to claim that pattern 1 is somehow emphatic, or intended to promote the referent as a thematic participant as Longacre (1989) claims. Regarding the repetition of 'God' in Gen 1-2 Andersen states, "It does not seem necessary to keep on repeating 'God' just to make that point [that God is the only actant]. The device has a function, not so much in a clause (emphasis) as in clause-clause syntax. Throughout the narrative the seemingly needless repetition of the unchanged subject (always 'God') marks off the distinct actions, successive in time" (ibid:107).

Levinsohn (2000b) develops Andersen's ideas regarding pattern 1, claiming that repetition of redundant NPs has the cross-linguistic function of demarcating a new development unit, i.e., performing an additional processing function of participant reference. In comparing Biblical Hebrew to Koine Greek and the Nigerian language of Tyap, Levinsohn notes that the latter two make use of preverbal particles or connectives to signal the beginning of new development units, while Biblical Hebrew has no such particle. Levinsohn notes further that Biblical Hebrew has a significantly higher proportion of full NP references to active participants compared to Koine Greek and Tyap. Based on this information, he hypothesizes that Biblical Hebrew utilizes redundant NPs as the primary means

⁶⁰ Anderson states, "In every kind of clause-clause construction it is necessary to work out not only what an item such as A is doing in its own clause, but also what it might be doing in a nearby clause in which it is implicit" (1994:104).

⁶¹ Andersen notes that in the case of subjects of finite verbs, omission of the subject is not zero anaphora in the strict sense due to the verbal affixes of the verb morphology (1994:109).

of accomplishing the processing function in the language, whereas Greek and Tyap use particles. His exposition of Gen 22 confirms this preliminary hypothesis, and is consistent with Andersen's findings.

Clearly stated, Levinsohn's hypothesis claims that redundant NPs for active participants signal a new development unit, accomplishing a processing function. Based upon the cross-linguistic evidence, Levinsohn's hypothesis provides a more compelling description in comparison to Longacre's description above. We will provisionally adopt this explanation of redundant NPs signaling new developments. Further discussion of this issue will be deferred until Chapter 5.

Returning to the discussion of Andersen's patterns, he states regarding pattern 3 that "clause 1 lacks information about the participant or feature indicated by A. The listener is placed and left in a state of suspense on that point until A comes up in clause 2. Then this information is fed back into clause 1, resolving the suspense; in other words, A in clause 2 does retroactive double duty in clause 1" (1994:108). The pattern 3 data which Andersen considers are primarily from the Psalms, but can also be found in narrative, e.g. Gen 24:54a, Gen 25:34b-34f, 1 Kings 14:18, and 2 Chronicles 20:3. He concludes, "Just as repetition of a (redundant) subject makes successive clauses more distinctive, so ellipsis of an object expected with a transitive verb binds clauses closer together" (ibid:109). Andersen is thus claiming that the use of pattern 3 has the pragmatic effect signaling marked continuity, i.e. binding the clauses in question more closely together compared to the default pattern 2.⁶² In contrast, pattern 1 has the pragmatic effect of signaling marked discontinuity, demarcating distinct developments of the action, in comparison to pattern 2.

Based on his discussion of minimal reference using pattern 2, Andersen recognizes that the default operation of the null subject in reported speech is *opposite* of that in narrative proper: "Here, besides pragmatics, a convention operates that a new 'and he said' implies a change in subject, even if the subject is not identified" while in narrative proper a null subject signals same subject (ibid:111). Recognition of such distinctions in the processing of minimal encoding is crucial to developing a coherent and complete account of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew.

As significant as Andersen's findings are regarding participant reference, this subject is tangential to the overall focus of his paper. His investigation of the pragmatic effects of anaphora and redundancy are only preliminary conclusions to suggest directions for future research. Levinsohn's (2000b) work paper, while focused exclusively on participant reference, was very narrow in scope, and its data corpus was narrow as well.

The issue of a narrow corpus appears to impinge upon Andersen's conclusions regarding pattern 3, which he claims is used to create 'suspense'. This claim is almost solely based on poetic tokens from the Psalms, where his description may indeed be accurate. But based on preliminary counter-tokens from narrative and the evidence from other languages, it seems prudent to

⁶² Cf. Nariyama (2000) for more of a cross-linguistic account of the same phenomenon.

provisionally regard the pattern as simply signaling marked continuity. More data is needed in order to both confirm the hypotheses of Andersen and Levinsohn, and to provide any necessary nuancing based on genre/text type.

3.6 Revell (1996)

The purpose of Revell's study is to describe what he believes is the intentional variation by the narrator in the use of referring expressions for participants, which he refers to as 'designations'. "This term is understood here as including any noun or nominal structure used to address or refer to an individual which could be replaced by a pronoun, and, of course, pronouns themselves" (1996:13). As his study of designations in Judges-2 Kings progressed, he found that their use by the writer/editor followed consistent patterns (ibid:11). He comments that this might be somewhat surprising in light of the hypothesized literary history of the Hebrew Bible, i.e. being compiled from numerous sources. In light of the consistency of use, he adopts a synchronic approach. "The description is consequently based on the assumption that the usage studied is self-consistent, and that variation is deliberate and is likely to carry meaning" (ibid:12). Several of his contributions are noteworthy.

The first contribution of Revell's study is his framework for classifying referring expressions, grouping them into pronoun, simple designations, and complex designations. Only a handful of scholars in either linguistics or Biblical Studies have recognized a meaningful distinction between complex designations and simple NPs. A simple designation consists of either a proper name or an epithet (e.g., 'Saul's servant', 'the king'). A complex designation adds some sort of modifier to the simple designation, such as an appositional phrase or an attributive modifier.

Revell describes expected or default usage for new and reintroduced participants based on his classification system (ibid:18). He then describes the uses and functions of deviation from the expected patterns in different contexts based on his conclusions regarding the unmarked usage of designations. He makes the significant claim that a form should be considered marked based on its context, *not* on the form itself (*contra* Longacre's ranking scheme). Thus a form could rightly be viewed as marked in one context, and unmarked in another (ibid:19). These conclusions are then applied to specific classes of designations in his corpus:

- The designation of rulers: David, Saul, Solomon, kings of Judah, and kings of the Northern Kingdom.
- The designation of others: priests and prophets, named individuals, unnamed individuals, and God.
- The relationship of referents and grammatical concord.
- Expression of deference/social distance expressed through designations.

Revell's study convincingly demonstrates the expressive use of designations in these classes, i.e., the intentional variation in referring expressions by the writer/editor to achieve certain thematic results. He moves the discussion beyond *ad hoc* interpretations of specific passages or terms, providing a more comprehensive description of how designations are used. A good example of this is Revell's discussion of the usage of the term 'king'. He notes that the term is used in Michal's

scornful speech to David in 2 Sam 6:20, and in 1 Sam 26:20 in David's speech to Saul where he states that "The King of Israel has come out to search for a flea..." (ibid:17-18). He notes in both cases that even though the term 'king' accurately describes the participant, "the term representing the ideal is contrasted with the far from ideal conduct described in the clause. As these examples show, the 'meaning' of the term chosen—the value of the choice, the extent to which it is 'expressive'—is determined by the situation in which the term is used, the range of terms available for use in that situation, and the extent to which the term chosen is consistent with the usage expected in that situation" (ibid:18). Although Revell advances our understanding of the pragmatic use of referring expressions, several factors undermine the thoroughness of his descriptions.

The first factor is the consistency with which he appeals to the three typological functions of participant reference. To one extent or another, Revell ends up mentioning all three purposes, but he does not systematically incorporate them into his description of expressive usage. He notes the semantic need to identify and track participants, grounding this idea in Givón's (1983a) work (1996:15). He cites the pivotal contributions of Clancy (1980) regarding text-processing as another function of participant reference, yet does not consistently bring this issue to bear in his analysis. Consider his following statements on the issue:

"In general, it can be said that, once a character has been designated by a nominal, a pronoun is used for further references as long as it would not be ambiguous. In fact, however, the use of pronouns is typically more limited than this implies. There is a tendency (in much of the corpus) to avoid long strings of pronominal reference. A nominal designation is often used to remind the reader who is acting, even where the use of a pronoun would not be ambiguous. Such usage often coincides with a new aspect of the character's activity" (ibid:60)

On the one hand he construes redundant relexicalization as a 'reminder', and in other cases as marking what sounds like a new development, viz. "a new aspect of the character's activity".

Finally, the very name of the study assumes a pragmatic function of referring expressions, claiming that the use of marked designations reflects the pragmatic intentions of the writer/editor. However, though Revell is familiar with the three purposes and makes a positive contribution to our understanding of participant reference, the inconsistent attention to them limits the clarity of his descriptions. Consequently, at times Revell's conclusions rely more heavily upon subjective interpretations of specific contexts than on an empirically grounded framework.

Revell, like Longacre, seeks to explain certain usages as being sociologically motivated, leading him to propose explanations that often run counter to expected linguistic norms. The choice by Revell to focus on specific *classes* of designations appears to obscure the more pervasive variation attested between simple and complex designations. He presupposes that sociological concerns motivate many of the narrator's decisions regarding use of referring expressions, based largely upon the earlier work of Longacre (1989).

For instance Revell states, "For men and unmarried women the epithet typically names the father... A married woman is usually identified by reference to her husband" (1996:47). While his

point is indeed valid in some cases, Berlin has shown that the anchoring of participants tends to be much more pragmatic, driven more by the identity of the central character than by cultural issues, particularly outside of the introductory exposition of a narrative. Berlin claims that the central character can usually be identified by considering to whom the participants are anchored (1983:59ff). The main characters are usually male, hence the apparent legitimacy of Revell's observation about *patronymics*. However in narratives where women act as initiators (e.g. 'Eve' in Gen 3, 'Sarai' in Gen 16), the writer/editor often reflects this by anchoring participants to the woman (e.g. 'her husband' in Gen 3:6; 16:3). Thus, by grounding his conclusion in sociological factors, Revell obscures the broader referential pattern.

Revell does acknowledge the pragmatics of anchoring based on participant-salience. He states, "Where an unexpected relationship is mentioned because it is relevant to the context in this way, the epithet is considered as a personal relationship term (cf. §3.2.4), not as a patronymic" (ibid:47). Despite mentioning this principle, Revell inconsistently applies it in his analysis.

Another issue which Revell recognizes, but inconsistently applies, is the issue of pronominalization of certain participants and not others. "The thematic actor indicated by the narrator's focus is typically the character most frequently represented in a passage of a clause as subject and most commonly referred to by pronouns. Other characters in the context are typically distinguished by nominal reference. 'Thematic actor' is thus a sub-class of what is called 'topic' as used in Givón, 1983, so that the features noted there as indicators of topic continuity also distinguish the thematic actor (cf. Givón 1983:8, 18)" (ibid:23). However, in practice Revell's focus on socio-cultural issues at times supersedes the application of this principle. One example of this is his discussion of titles. He states, "no doubt some individuals were generally identified by epithets indicating lower status occupations where this was their most significant source of importance or individuality in the eyes of the community, as with master-servant relationship[s]" (ibid:49). How does Revell reconcile this claim with those of Berlin (1983) which he has referred to? She observes that expressive usage of expressions for different types of characters (i.e. *full-fledged*, *type* and *agents*) is based on their salience to the narrative. Revell at times cites literary and linguistic factors which influence encoding. At other times he assigns similar encoding to sociological factors. However, he does little to reconcile how the two issues interact.

While Revell's primary focus is on variation in usage of referring expressions, and its impact on the narrative, he does *not* consistently analyze its impact of the data on the reader's mental representation. This is largely due to the fact that he focuses on only specific classes of designations. In the case of the designations found in 2 Sam 6:20, he focuses exclusively on the expressive encoding of David without mentioning that of Michal. He states "A probable example of a similarly expressive choice in Hebrew occurs in Michal's scornful speech to **her husband**, King David, in 2S 6:20..." (ibid:17, emphasis mine). Revell's point is that Michal refers to David as the '*King of Israel*', but this is not the only expressive usage found in the passage. Michal is reactivated in the

passage with the anchoring relation ‘*Saul’s daughter*’, rather than her previous designation as ‘*David’s wife*’. Yet Revell makes no comment about this. Does this encoding not also count as expressive usage? Do not the two marked designations play off of one another?

What is even more surprising is that Revell himself uses her default appositive in his comment (cf. **her husband** in quotation above), further obscuring the expressive usage which possibly serves as an interpretive key for the passage. Reverting to the anchor ‘*Saul’s daughter*’ anticipates the situation obtained by her disdainful comments to David, viz. that Michal bore no children for the rest of her life. The closing scene in v. 23 repeats the complex designation ‘*Michal, Saul’s daughter*’, as if to say that though she may have been David’s wife, she functionally becomes ‘*Saul’s daughter*’ again since David apparently no longer has sexual relations with her (cf. Berlin 1983:25). Thus, Revell’s study provides useful insight into expressive usage of certain classes of designations. However, it does not describe the more pervasive expressive usage observed in Hebrew narrative due to its focus on only certain classes of expressions.

In conclusion, Revell’s study makes important contributions to our knowledge of expressive usage of referring expressions. However the limitations of his theoretical framework correspondingly limited the comprehensiveness of his explanations. These limitations are manifested in his limited discussion of minimum encoding constraints, his preference for assigning sociological explanations, and the limitation of his study to only certain types of expressions. As a result of these limitations, many facets of expressive usage of designations in Biblical Hebrew await description.

3.7 *De Regt (1999b) (1999a)*

The objective of de Regt’s study is to describe the patterns and conventions which govern references to participants in Biblical Hebrew in order to better understand their rhetorical significance. This description is intended to help translators in correlating these conventions to comparable conventions in receptor languages.

De Regt establishes a solid linguistic framework in the beginning, acknowledging the cross-linguistic purposes of participant reference: semantic,⁶³ discourse processing,⁶⁴ and pragmatic.⁶⁵ However, it seems as though de Regt has difficulty systematically bringing these principles to bear in his study of Biblical Hebrew. His linguistic framework also acknowledges the major/minor distinction among participants, and the impact this distinction has on the level of encoding based on

⁶³ Cf. de Regt (1999b:13-48).

⁶⁴ Cf. de Regt (1991-92:150-172), (1999a:279), (1999b:3ff, esp. 13-16) for reference to the processing function. He recognizes its use for structuring narrative into distinct units (1999b:14).

⁶⁵ Cf. de Regt (1999a:280), (1999b:55-94) for reference to the discourse pragmatic function; he recognizes its use for signaling redirection in reported speech (1999b:20); the use of lexical NPs to highlight the discourse peak in 1 Sam 3:9 (1999b:9); the use of redundant, overspecification for highlighting, and implicit commentary comparable to van Vliet’s (2002) PoV shift to narrator’s commentary (1999b:57).

Givón's (1983a) 'quantity principle' (cf. 1999a:3-4, 23-32, 294). He also notes the underencoding of major participants in closed settings, essentially Levinsohn's VIP strategy.⁶⁶

Significant concepts from cognitive linguistics are also incorporated into de Regt's framework. He recognizes several methods of participant activation. He also correlates the type of activation process used to the type of participant it activates. Minor participants tend to be introduced in a two-step process,⁶⁷ while major participants tend to be introduced in verbless clauses.⁶⁸ He further notes that there is a correlation between activation states and participant encoding (1999b:2-3). Finally, he notes the differences in the cognitive processing of null subject clauses between reported speech and narrative proper. In narrative, null subject signals 'same subject', where as in reported speech, the expectation is 'different subject'.⁶⁹ In cases of possible ambiguity, he states that the semantics of the verb often disambiguate switches of participants from no switch.⁷⁰

The major drawback of de Regt's study is that while he recognizes the issue of 'special patterns of reference' in Biblical Hebrew and the problem of rendering these patterns into the corresponding linguistic form in the receptor language, he tends not to describe the *pragmatic functions* these devices serve in Biblical Hebrew. At times several issues compound to hamper his explanations. This leads him to ground his conclusions in the *semantics* of the context, instead of describing the specific *typological functions* of these devices. As a result, much of the study

⁶⁶ "In such a global strategy the pronoun or affix is assigned to one of the major participants early in the story and is retained throughout the discourse as referring to this entity, even if there are intervening local instances of other potential referents" (1999a:44). He cites Comrie (1989:47-48, 51) in support.

⁶⁷ "This first clause refers to the participant only in terms of class or group membership... This kind of introduction delays the identification of the participant till the following clause, which is frequently verbless" (1999b:32-33). He notes that this method generally indicates that the participant is minor, even though they may have a significant impact on the events.

⁶⁸ "The present device of naming the participant in a following, verbless clause only occurs incidentally when the character introduced will become a major participant later in the narrative: Laban (Gen 24:29), Leah and Rachel (29:16), Tamar (38:6), Micah (Judg 17:1), Saul (1 Sam 9:2), Goliath (1 Sam 17:4, 23), Job (Job 1:1), Ruth (Ruth 1:4) and Mordecai (Esth 2:5)" (1999b:33). He notes that those introduced in a following verbal clause using וַיִּקְרָא אֶת־שְׁמֹו turn out to be major participants a bit more frequently. "In narrative text, it turns out to be a frequent, and hence a usual pattern that the name of a participant is mentioned in the clause following the clause in which he is introduced" (1999b:33-34).

⁶⁹ "After the speaker has finished his direct speech, the addressee is expected to respond and to be the next speaker. This makes it unnecessary to refer explicitly to the next speaker when his direct speech is introduced. The reference of the inflectional affix on the introductory verb is already unambiguous" (1999b:29).

⁷⁰ "Similarly, when the speaker commands the addressee to do something, the addressee will be the participant who carries out the order in response to the direct speech, e.g., in Gen 43:31-32, 44:2, 2 Kgs 4:44, 9:21 and Ruth 4:1" (1999b:31). He also considers tokens where minimal reference in reported speech does NOT indicate switch. "In such instances, the contents of the following direct speech make clear that the speaker and addressee have not changed their roles; the speaking subject remains the same" (1999b:31), e.g. Gen 15:5, Jer 37:17, Exod 3:6. He explains the pragmatic purpose of this device as indicating "a temporal gap between the various parts of the direct speech", as well as serving "to separate self-addressed speech from the words addressed to somebody else" (1999b:31), e.g. Gen 27:36, 2 Kgs 20:19.

describes various encoding patterns and their distribution, but does not offer the heuristic explanations that he initially projects.⁷¹ The following examples illustrate the point.

To begin with, de Regt claims that until a participant is given a proper name, it remains ambiguous, apparently not fully activated.⁷² This claim overlooks the activation process of moving from a general statement ‘there was *an X*’ to a more detailed ‘and *the X* was named *Y*’ (cf. §4.2.2 regarding the two-step process of introducing minor participants). Activation of a participant is sufficient to render them cognitively accessible; in fact many are accessible via a schema even *without* explicit activation. Consider the initial activation of Joseph’s house steward in Gen 43:16:

וַיֵּרָא יוֹסֵף אֶת־בְּנֵי־מִיָּן וַיֹּאמֶר לְאִשְׁרָ עַל־בֵּיתוֹ

And Joseph saw Benjamin with them and he said to the one over his house...

This steward has not previously been mentioned in the narrative, yet his description is sufficient to enable readers to incorporate him into their mental representation of the story. However, such a participant is viewed as apparently not fully activated in de Regt’s scheme on the basis that a proper name has not been supplied. De Regt’s account of participant activation leads him to draw this conclusion.

Secondly, de Regt does not take into account the minimum encoding requirements of certain information structures in his description of participant reference. Following the traditional explanations, he assigns either ‘emphasis’ or ‘contrast’ to the *presence of independent personal pronouns*, not to the *pragmatics of constituent order* (cf. *ibid*:57-59). Such an explanation forces him to develop a second, parallel explanation for full noun phrases which precede the verb, rather than a unified description based on information structure (cf. Lambrecht 1994). For example he states, “The first three chapters of 1 Kings contain two instances where a proper name is mentioned to mark the fact that the event is unexpected”, viz. 1:4 and 3:4b (*ibid*:64). The first is a marked switch of topic from ‘*Abishag*’ to ‘*David*’ using a referential PoD, stating that though she lay with the king, the king did not know her. The second token has direct object ‘*a thousand burnt offerings*’ preposed for focus, which is preceded by a switch of referring expressions used for Solomon. 1 Kings 3 recounts the various behaviors of Solomon which were displeasing to the LORD and unbecoming of a king. The change in referring expressions from the default expression ‘*Solomon*’ to the epithet ‘*king*’ comes at the point in the narrative where the writer/editor lists what Solomon does that displeases the LORD.

⁷¹ E.g. de Regt states that w-x-qtI (with x=NP subject) can start a new paragraph, but so can wayyiqtol+NP subject (1999b:16-17). Knowing the possibilities tells us nothing of the pragmatic differences, nor how best to translate them.

⁷² It seems as though de Regt does not distinguish activation from formal introduction with a proper noun. In other words, until a proper noun is assigned, activation is not complete. Cf. his explanation of the introduction of Reuel in Exod 2 (1999b:73). The tokens he provides to support his view are: 2 Sam 4:4; Gen 32:25-31 (angel wrestling with Jacob); Exod 2:2-10 (Reuel); Num 25:6-15; Ruth 1:1-2 (Elimelech); 2:1 (Boaz); 1 Sam 16:11-13 (David); 1 Sam 25:2-3 (Nabal); Jdg 13:3-24 (Samson). Others include: Gen 3:20 (Eve); 2 Sam 11:3 (Bathsheba); 2 Sam 12:1-7 (David); Jdg 9:7-16 (Abimelech) (1999b:75). Such an explanation must also be reconciled with the fact that many minor participants never receive a proper noun.

וַיֵּאָהֵב שְׁלֹמֹה אֶת־יְהוָה לְלַכֵּת בְּחֻקֹת דָּוִד אָבִיו רַק בְּבָמוֹת הוּא מִזְבֵּחַ וּמִקְטִיר: ³
וַיֵּלֶךְ הַמֶּלֶךְ גִּבְעֹנָה לְזִבְחַ שָׁם כִּי הִיא הַבָּמָה הַגְּדוֹלָה אֲלֵף עֲלוֹת יַעֲלֶה שְׁלֹמֹה עַל הַמִּזְבֵּחַ הַהוּא: ⁴

³ *And Solomon loved the LORD so as to walk in the statutes of David, his father; only on the high places he was sacrificing and burning incense.*

⁴ *And the king went to Gibeon to sacrifice there, for that was the great high place; 1000 burnt offerings Solomon offered up on that altar.*

The switch of referring expressions coincides with the use of several marked information structures, each of which highlight some aspect of Solomon’s practice of sacrificing on the high places, another ironic use of the term ‘king’ similar to that mentioned by Revell in §3.6. De Regt construes the encoding as marking the event as ‘unexpected’, whereas in our view the marked structures add prominence to Solomon’s displeasing behavior while thematically contrasting his action with his role as ‘king’. De Regt’s theoretical framework prevents him from providing a unified explanation.

At times de Regt misconstrues pragmatic devices, most visibly the pragmatic use of compound designations for indicating shifts in PoV, even though he cites Berlin (1983) at several points.⁷³ He instead adopts Kuno’s (1987) ‘empathy principle’, wherein the length of a participant’s referring expression is viewed as inversely proportional to the narrator’s ‘empathy’ for that participant. While this is an attractive explanation, it fails to adequately explain the pragmatic overencoding of *protagonists* frequently observed in Biblical Hebrew narrative. Consider for example the expression ‘ark of the covenant of God/YHWH’ used in 1 Sam 4:3, 4(2x) and 5 just before it is captured by the Philistines. According to Kuno’s view of longer expressions, the analyst should construe these references as indicating a distancing of the writer/editor from God’s physical representation of His presence: the ark. The data do not appear to substantiate the application of Kuno’s principle in Biblical Hebrew.⁷⁴ A better explanation is to view the overencoding as intended to *cognitively reorient* readers to the ark, perhaps to suggest that it is much more than a ‘good luck charm’ to be recklessly carried about. This explanation fits well with the following narratives regarding the problems the Philistines encounter in trying to maintain possession of the ark.

Another factor affecting de Regt’s analysis is his understanding of how the functions of participant reference relate to one another. He views each function as being mutually exclusive rather than as entailed one in another. This view constrains him to apply only one principle per context. In

⁷³ He recognizes the shift in point of view within 1 Sam 4:19, but does not describe the larger pattern observed in narrative. He focuses instead on the ordering of compound designations when there is more than one appositive, e.g. Gen 11:31; 12:5. On 2 Sam 6, he states, “the distance between David and Michal is not commented upon but is indicated by the extended descriptions: she is the daughter of Saul and she sees him as the king” (1999b:69). Since he applies Kuno’s empathy principle to Michal, why does he not also apply it to David’s comparably longer referring expression in the same passage?

⁷⁴ Here is a prototypical statement made by de Regt based on the application of principles from other languages: “The remarks made above apply to languages in general. The characteristics of participant reference that are attested in Biblical Hebrew texts often differ from these phenomena. Sometimes, however, they are similar. This applies, for instance, to empathy with a participant and, conversely, to negative assessments.” He then applies the “longer designations show negative assessment” principle to Biblical Hebrew (1999b:5). How is one able to determine when these principles apply and when they do not?

other words, marked encodings must be analyzed as serving either a processing function or a pragmatic function. Marked encoding cannot simultaneously serve both functions, in his view.

For example, de Regt discusses several instances of overencoding in Ruth (ibid:61ff). He notes that in passages such as Ruth 2:20-22, redundant NPs serve to mark a climactic peak in the narrative, following Longacre (1989). “In general, devices of repetition often mark a peak, i.e., various devices are used to insure that the peak does not ‘go by too fast’” (ibid:61). On the same page, he concludes that the repetition is to “draw attention to the material that is introduced by the repetition,” or “to indicate the importance of her words that follow” in Ruth 2:20-22. How is the analyst to know when to apply one principle instead of another? De Regt gives no explicit account of how he arrives at these conclusions. Sometimes the repetition is to mark a new paragraph, but at other times it can mark a peak, or highlight the following speech.

By adopting an entailment scheme of explanation, one is able to account for Longacre’s observation that the pace slows down. Repeated NPs create a series of short development units, which has the pragmatic effect of slowing down the flow of narration. Encoding which is clearly in excess of the amount expected for processing is thus construed as pragmatically motivated to cataphorically highlight a speech or action which follows. Unfortunately, de Regt identified only one function at work at a time, leading him to analyze comparably encoded passages as marking the close of a paragraph, rather than anticipating a peak to come.⁷⁵

Another example of de Regt’s reticence to apply more than one principle at a time is found in his analysis of overencoding of participants in quotative frames. He interprets the NP references in quotative frames as primarily indicating paragraph initiation, not as also having the pragmatic effect of redirection, where one speaker’s intentions are countered by another (ibid:20).⁷⁶ At the same time, de Regt analyzes other full NP encoding of quotative frames as pragmatically motivated to mark countering speeches. For example, he notes that Uriah’s reaction to David in 2 Sam 11:11-12 is unexpected (ibid:64). Elsewhere he states, “Rather than starting a new paragraph, the repetition of Elisha’s name in 2 Kgs 8:10, 13 marks that his words come unexpectedly and as a surprise” (ibid:66). De Regt’s description leaves the analyst to make *ad hoc* determinations as to whether overencoding is for processing or pragmatics. He recognizes the various functions, but the limitations of his ‘one function per context’ framework frequently force him to ground his explanations in the *semantics* of the context and not in the *consistent function* of the pragmatic device throughout the data (cf. ibid:66).

⁷⁵ Cf. de Regt’s comments regarding the overencoding of Samuel in 1 Sam 16:10 (1999b:16). As in Ruth 2:20-22, one finds in 1 Sam 16 speeches broken up by redundant quotative frames, with overencoding of both speakers and addressees. We construe this overencoding and redundancy as all building up to the identification of David as the future king. Simply based on the content (evaluating seven of Jesse’s sons and finding none of them to be the one, asking if there are any more), it should be quite clear that anticipation or suspense is building. This anticipation is encoded both with respect to participant reference and the use of quotative frames, in our view.

⁷⁶ Such a view is *contra* Longacre (2003: 152-53) and Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:101).

While de Regt's study furthers our knowledge of participant reference, the resulting descriptions do not provide sufficient heuristic guidance regarding when to apply one principle as opposed to another.

3.8 Heimerdinger (1999)

Heimerdinger's study has several objectives. First, he seeks to provide a better understanding of pragmatic articulations of clauses, based on the theoretical framework established by Lambrecht (1994); he also seeks "to find out the role these [articulations] have in foregrounding" information (1999:12). Second, he seeks to demonstrate that the foregrounding/backgrounding distinction in narrative is not merely a binary distinction between certain morphosyntactic forms (viz. *wayyiqtol* vs. *w-x-qtll*). His ultimate goal is to provide a proper understanding of foregrounding, and to identify the ways in which foregrounding is grammaticalized in Biblical Hebrew. Finally, he seeks to provide a less formal and more pragmatic understanding of various syntactic forms and their function in actual narrative contexts.

Heimerdinger's greatest contribution is applying Lambrecht's (1994) model of information structure to Biblical Hebrew narrative, which correlates the pragmatics of clause construction to information flow. He provides a satisfactory introduction to topic and focus in Biblical Hebrew, adding the concept of a 'dominant focal element' or DFE to the discussion (cf. 1999:101-220). He concludes by linking foregrounding/backgrounding of information to the speaker's pragmatically-marked purpose(s) as outlined by Labov's concept of 'evaluation' (ibid:221ff).

There are three basic shortcomings of Heimerdinger's treatment of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew: his account of the processing function of participant reference, his interaction with the contributions of poetics regarding the pragmatic functions of encoding, and his understanding of the cognitive constraints of accessibility as it relates to the semantic function of participant reference.

First, Heimerdinger gives little attention to the processing function of participant reference. He recognizes Givón's principle that the most accessible participants will tend to be underencoded, but then has trouble reconciling this principle with the overencoding of 'Abraham' attested in Gen 22. He states, "This seems to go against the principle mentioned above as throughout the story *Abraham* is the main participant on stage and so is highly accessible. It could be argued that these clauses are episode initial: they start a new scene or open a new burst of closely related actions and so they function as reaffirming the topic for a new episode. But this explanation is not satisfactory in the light of what can be observed in other stories" (ibid:124). Though he draws a proper conclusion in this instance, he does not extend the principle beyond its single application to Gen 22 (ibid:154). Discussion of his position on this issue necessitates significant development of our position on the processing function, which is beyond the scope of this present chapter. Therefore, we will defer this discussion until Chapter 5 where our model will be developed in much greater detail.

A second problem is Heimerdinger's treatment of poetics in Chapter 6. He concludes this chapter by stating, "The analyses of this chapter have taken us into the domains of literary pragmatics

and cognitive psychology. We have reached the point at which the study of foregrounding becomes interrelated with the ‘poetics’ of Biblical Hebrew narrative” (ibid:260). He links foregrounding and backgrounding of information to the speaker’s pragmatically-marked purpose(s) as outlined by Labov’s concept of ‘evaluation’ for narrative (ibid:221ff). However, he contributes little to the application of poetics to Biblical Hebrew, just points to its future use.⁷⁷ In fact, Labov’s concept of evaluation has already been applied to Biblical Hebrew narrative by Berlin (1983:102-108), yet Heimerdinger provides no discussion of or reference to her work on this matter. In the end, his closing discussion does little to integrate linguistics with poetics, and represents a lost opportunity to build on the earlier, if less empirical, work of poetics scholars.⁷⁸

The third and most significant shortcoming of Heimerdinger’s treatment of participant reference is his description of the identifiability constraints upon activation of brand-new participants. This shortcoming significantly affects major portions of his account of participant reference. In spite of its importance, Heimerdinger provides only a circumspect description of initial activation of brand-new participants.⁷⁹ The problem is somewhat difficult to explain due to the number of facets involved.

To begin with, Heimerdinger’s account does not make a meaningful distinction between ‘specific’ and ‘non-specific’ indefinites, even though his primary sources on the subject do maintain such a distinction (i.e. Chafe 1987, Gundel et al. 1993, and Lambrecht 1994). Lambrecht states, “One way of describing the specific/non-specific distinction in pragmatic terms is to say that a ‘specific indefinite NP’ is one whose referent is identifiable to the speaker but not to the addressee, while a ‘non-specific indefinite NP’ is one whose referent neither the speaker nor the addressee can identify at time of utterance” (1994:80-81). Similarly, Gundel et al. maintain this distinction through use of the categories ‘referential indefinite’ NPs and ‘type-identifiable indefinite’ NPs (1993:276).

According to Heimerdinger’s view a participant must be identifiable to the *hearer*, not just the speaker. Heimerdinger makes his position clear stating “If a hearer cannot identify the referent, it is impossible for them to decide whether the predication made about the topic is true or not” (1999:133). It is very strange that he would maintain such a position when the primary source of

⁷⁷ “Through evaluation, speakers lead hearers to draw the conclusions favoured by them. Evaluation determines the response of the hearer to the story” (1999:241). He states elsewhere, “The involvement of the speaker carries as much weight as the events of the story themselves because they indicate what the true meaning of the story is. The examination of evaluation shows above all that foregrounding is the preserve of the storyteller and is constructed by the speaker by a variety of means. It is not dictated by grammatical forms” (ibid:259).

⁷⁸ Heimerdinger’s discussion of poetics is primarily restricted to Chapters 1 and 2, and is more characterized by citation than critical interaction.

⁷⁹ Heimerdinger states, “When speakers want to make an assertion about an entity which is assumed not yet represented in the hearer’s mind, they must create first a mental representation of the entity in the hearer through linguistic description. The creation of such representation can be compared to the opening of a referent ‘file’, and the opening of the file is directly connected to the referent’s *identifiability*” (1999:133). He does not elaborate on what is meant by ‘linguistic description’ to add clarity to the activation process as he conceives of it. Cf. §4.2 for our description of the initial activation of brand new participants.

Heimerdinger's theoretical reference frame debunks the relation of truth conditions to information structure (cf. Lambrecht 1994:44f, 157ff). By definition a referential indefinite is identifiable to the speaker only, not the hearer. Furthermore, this level of encoding—as attested in numerous languages—is judged to be sufficient for hearers to open a mental file for the participant in question and to be able to add information to it (cf. Gundel et al. 1993, Lambrecht 1994:82-85, Dooley and Levinsohn 2001:58-59). The fact that Heimerdinger either overlooks or dismisses this evidence adversely affects his description of first mentions of referents in Biblical Hebrew (cf. 1999:133-153).

Heimerdinger's view of referential indefinite NPs also overlooks the role of Gricean implicatures to 'fill in the blanks', what Lambrecht refers to as 'pragmatic bootstrapping' (1994:105). Heimerdinger seems troubled by introductions like that of *Abigail* in 1 Sam 25:3, or *the woman* in 2 Sam 17:19. In the case of *Abigail*, the participant is identifiable to the speaker, and thereby identifiable enough for the reader to activate a new file in the mental representation at the first mention and to accept her as a valid topic in the following clause. In the second example of 2 Sam 17:19, one finds the indefinite NP '*a boy*' as the topic of a verb of perception in v. 18. This is followed immediately by the activation of '*the woman*' as the topic of an active verb in v. 19, ostensibly based on the fact that she is accessible as part of the house/courtyard schema.

In spite of such data, Heimerdinger states, "introducing a not-yet-activated referent and giving it at the same time the role of topic must be avoided" (1999:145).⁸⁰ This statement confuses the relationship between *activation state* and *identifiability*. He seems to argue that a participant is not identifiable until it has been formally activated. Such a view would disallow Lambrecht's mechanism of pragmatically boot-strapping a topic. Constructions such as left-dislocations and referential indefinites allow pragmatic boot-strapping to occur *without* harming the communication. As long as a participant is identifiable—even a referential indefinite—it may play a topical role in the clause.⁸¹ Recognition of Lambrecht's point that the referent only need be identifiable to the *speaker* is crucial. Consider the introduction of both *Deborah* and *Jael* in Jdg 4. Both are anchored to entities that may or may not have been familiar to the Israelites. They certainly are not familiar to us as modern readers. Nonetheless we are able to create files for them and understand the comments made about them (cf. Jdg 4:4, 17).

⁸⁰ While this might indeed be a preference, it is not a rule, as examples such as 2 Sam 17:18 and Gen 37:15 would seem to indicate. One finds minor participants are regularly introduced in this way elsewhere using either verbs of motion or perception, e.g. Gen 14:13; 1 Sam 4:12.

⁸¹ Lambrecht states, "As we shall see, what counts for the linguistic expression of the cognitive distinction in question is not that the addressee know or be familiar with the referent in question (a newly opened file may contain no more than a name) but that he be able to pick it out from among all those which can be designated with a particular linguistic expression and identify it as the one which the speaker has in mind" (1994:77). Lambrecht states elsewhere, "The fact that identifiability can be created through the mere mention of a referent in the discourse, without any further semantic specification, confirms our observation that identifiability of a referent (and corresponding definite coding in English) does not necessarily entail familiarity with or knowledge about, the referent" (1994:89).

Heimerdinger’s misunderstanding of activation and identifiability is apparent from his description of the use of discourse anchors in Biblical Hebrew in Chapter 4. Lambrecht states, “In certain languages the presence vs. absence of a numeral expression in association with the noun can have a function analogous to the function served by the contrast between *a* and *this* in English. In languages with numerical classifiers it is often the case that the noun phrase which is preceded by a classifier is marked as topical for subsequent discourse” (1994:83). Lambrecht then cites evidence to support this claim from Japanese, Malay and Chinese. He continues, “In other languages, the same distinction is expressed via the contrast between the presence or absence of the numeral *one*” (ibid:83-4). He cites data to support this claim from Latin, Turkish, Hebrew and English. This general use of classifiers, including the use of the Biblical Hebrew numeral *ehad*, is apparently overlooked by Heimerdinger. In his discussion of five devices which make brand new referents identifiable, *four* of them involve the use of classifiers. For instance, his examples of generic and deictic anchors both utilize numerical specification to achieve identifiability (1999:135-36).⁸² Does not the use of two categories obscure the common convention underlying both?⁸³

Another factor hindering Heimerdinger’s results is not recognizing the cross-linguistic use of verbs-of-motion/perception as a viable class of presentational verb—in addition to copular verbs—for activating brand-new participants. Heimerdinger notes that verbs of motion are used as ‘presentational devices’ for not-yet-activated participants. He cites a number of tokens where brand-new participants are activated as subjects of verbs of motion or perception (1999:144-145). These tokens run counter to his hypothesis that major participants should be introduced using presentational articulations, that “introducing a not-yet-activated referent and giving it at the same time the role of topic must be avoided” (ibid:145).

In light of his hypothesis, Heimerdinger is forced to conclude that verbs of motion which activate brand-new participants as subjects are somehow semantically modified in the process. “Although they are encoded as subjects of verbs, as these verbs are intransitive verbs of movement which tend to lose [sic] their literal meanings, the referents are divested of their role of topical agent.

⁸² For an example of a generic expression, he cites 2 Kgs 7:3 (‘There were *four* men with leprosy’). For examples of deictic references, he cites 1 Sam 1:1 (‘There was *one* man from Ramathaim...’), Jdg 17:1 (‘There was a man *from the hill country of Ephraim*’), Jdg 17:7 (‘There was a young man *from Bethlehem in Judah*...’), 2 Kgs 4:8 (...there [was] a *wealthy* woman’) and 1 Kgs 21:1 (‘...there was a vineyard belonging to Naboth *the Jezreelite*’). We construe both of these categories as using the same underlying convention, viz. a classifier (indicated in *italics*). The classifier renders the participants referentially indefinite and thus accessible enough to be acceptable topics.

⁸³ It would seem that numbering a generic NP would move it from non-specific to specific, with no other modification required (cf. cross-linguistic Givenness Hierarchy of Gundel et al. 1993). Heimerdinger overlooks the use of this convention in Biblical Hebrew even though it is well attested (e.g. 2 Sam 18:10; 1 Kgs 22:8=2 Chr 18:7; Dan 10:5; cf. anchored participants that are introduced as topics of clauses in Appendix 1). Each of these uses only *ehad*. Elsewhere an accompanying appositive is frequently observed, and is another acceptable means of accomplishing the anchoring of participants. On the other hand, consider the introduction of an unanchored generic referent as topic in Gen 37:15: וַיִּמְצְאוּהוּ אִישׁ. The apparently acceptable introduction of ‘*a man*’ without numerical specification as the topic in this verse would seem to indicate that much less information is needed to bootstrap a participant than Heimerdinger allows.

Such *wayyiqtol* clauses must be seen as having a special presentational function” (1999:144). His comments overlook the fact that major, thematic participants are characteristically introduced in a two step activation process, while minor participants are characteristically introduced more quickly, especially those that are anchored and accessible. Heimerdinger tends to view this second option as a special anomaly, and not as a prototypical process.

Heimerdinger’s study makes a significant contribution by providing a linguistic account of the pragmatic structuring of information in Biblical Hebrew narrative. He also provides a helpful overview of participant reference. However, his cognitive framework obscures aspects of the activation process. Heimerdinger’s impressions regarding the processing function of redundant NPs is correct, yet unfortunately He rejects them since he is not able to fit them into his overall framework.

3.9 Conclusion

In Chapter 1 we introduced a number of linguistic and typological principles which form the foundation of our theoretical framework for a discourse-functional description of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew narrative. In this current chapter we have reviewed a number of studies which provide some discussion of the encoding of participants in Biblical Hebrew narrative. We have shown the adverse repercussions an incomplete theoretical framework can have. Before we undertake to describe the issues left unresolved from previous studies, let us review the components which we claim are requisite to successfully describing the participant reference system of Biblical Hebrew narrative:

- a) Adhering to an asymmetrical view of markedness: Marked forms must be described in terms of the feature which is presumed present, in contrast to a default which is *unmarked* for the feature. The asymmetrical view of markedness not only helps the analyst draw implications from the choice to use a marked form, but also from the choice *not* to use a marked form.
- b) Respecting the cross-linguistic principles of participant reference: The cross-linguistic principles governing anaphora, participant reference, and overspecification must be consistently taken into account in order to avoid creating unnecessary ‘exceptional’ classes. The cross-linguistic functions of participant reference must also be accounted for, and especially that they form an entailment scheme rather than being mutually exclusive.
- c) Utilizing a proper cognitive framework: A loose or incomplete cognitive framework undermines one’s understanding of activation states as well as the cognitive encoding constraints on referential encoding in Biblical Hebrew narrative.
- d) Distinguishing semantic meaning from pragmatic effect: Recognizing the meaningful distinction to be made between the two avoids drawing unnecessary or incorrect conclusions.
- e) Affording poetics provisional deference: Many insights from the field of poetics have been contributed to the study of participant reference. Many of the studies reviewed cite the

standard works on poetics, yet fail to critically interact with their contributions. While these insights are not to be blindly accepted, they should serve as indicators of potential solutions which must be empirically verified.

Now that we have established the framework for our study and have examined previous studies in the field, we will proceed in Chapter 4 to describe the semantic function of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew narrative. This description will provide an account of the attested encoding data from Gen 12-25. The principles established will form our default canon against which non-default encodings from our corpus will be identified and described. Our goal is to account for as much of the attested encoding data as possible using default principles. Once the default principles are established in Chapter 4, the remaining encoding data will be construed as marked and will be described with respect to our default encoding principles in Chapters 5 and 6. Finally, this entire framework will be applied to the narrative of Gen 27 in order to demonstrate both the viability and utility of our methodology.

4. Default Encoding of Participants—the Semantic Function

The objective of this chapter is to describe the default morphological encoding of participants in Biblical Hebrew narrative. We will begin by defining the various encoding contexts found in Biblical Hebrew narrative for subjects and non-subjects. Next we will describe the prototypical level of encoding needed in each context, with illustrative examples taken from our corpus of Gen 12-25. Care will be taken to provide an account of the pragmatic and morphological factors which impact default encoding, some of which have not received adequate description in previous studies. These issues will each be discussed, incorporating them into a comprehensive description of default encoding of participants. Our goal is to account for as much of the actual encoding data from our corpus as possible through the development of default encoding principles, allowing us to consider the remaining non-default encoding data in Chapters 5 and 6. This description of default encoding will also serve as the canon against which non-default participant reference encoding will be analyzed and described.

4.1 *Encoding Contexts for Biblical Hebrew Narrative*

Below are the definitions for the various discourse contexts found in Biblical Hebrew narrative. They have been adapted from Dooley and Levinsohn's (2001) default/marked method of participant reference analysis, first mentioned in §2.4.4. These definitions will form the basis of our description of the discrete encoding contexts observed in Biblical Hebrew narrative, for which we will postulate default morphological encoding values.

(25) Subject and non-subject contexts

Subject Contexts

- **INT** initial introduction of a brand new participant
- **S1** participant was the subject of the immediately preceding clause;
- **S1+** participant was the subject of the immediately preceding clause, and at least one other subject participant is added in the present clause to create a compound subject.
- **S2** participant was the addressee of a speech reported in preceding clause;
- **S3** participant was in non-subject role other than addressee in preceding clause;
- **S4** participant is semi-active/accessible, context is other than those covered by S1-3;
- **S5** participant is inactive, context is other than those covered by S1-S4.

Non-subject Contexts

- **INT** initial introduction of a brand new participant
- **N1** participant was in the same non-subject role in the preceding clause;
- **N2** participant was the speaker in a speech reported in the preceding clause;
- **N3** participant was in a role in the preceding clause other than N1-N2;
- **N4** participant is semi-active/accessible, context is other than those covered by N1-3;
- **N5** participant is inactive, context is other than those covered by N1-N4.

(Adapted from Dooley and Levinsohn 2001:130-131)

4.2 Initial Activation of Brand-New Participants: Context ‘Int’

4.2.1 Cognitive Tasks of Activation

As noted in §2.2.1, readers form a mental representation of the information communicated in a discourse as they read (Lambrecht 1994:43). When a brand new participant is activated into the discourse, the reader creates a new ‘file’ which allows storage and retrieval of discourse information about the particular participant (Givón 1992:9). Two tasks must be successfully accomplished in order to facilitate activation.

One task of activation involves establishing a *primary referring expression* for the participant. The primary referring expression becomes the *default* expression used when relexicalizing a participant. It serves as a label for the reader’s cognitive file, and is prototypically used for subsequent lexical reference to the participant in the discourse (ibid:9). Referring expressions in Biblical Hebrew are usually either proper names or epithets⁸⁴ (Revell 1996:44-51). It should be noted that epithets are typically semantically less restrictive than proper names, having a greater likelihood of ambiguity (ibid, 58). Consider the reference to ‘*Eliezer*’ in Gen 15:2, compared to ‘*his servant, the oldest of his household...*’ in 24:2. Waltke points out that it is unclear if the two expressions are co-referent due to the use of an epithet in 24:2 (2001:327).⁸⁵

The second task of activation involves creating a semantic *connection* of the newly activated participant to the discourse context by establishing an *anchoring relation*. The anchoring relation instructs the reader in *how* to ground the new participant to his or her own mental representation of the discourse (Givón 1992:9). Cognitively, the anchoring relation tells the reader where in the mental representation to place the new participant’s file. After activation, anchoring relations remain implicitly in force unless another relation is specified by the writer/editor.

From a grammatical standpoint, anchoring expressions prototypically consist of syntactically linking a definite NP to an indefinite NP, either as an attributive modifier (e.g. ‘*his wife*’), as an appositive (e.g. ‘*Eli, the priest*’), or in a construct relation (e.g. ‘*the two sons of Eli*’). Consider 1 Sam 1:3:

וְעָלָה הָאִשׁ הַהוּא מְעִירוֹ מִיָּמִים | יְמִימָהּ לְהִשְׁתַּחֲוֹת וּלְזָבַח לַיהוָה צְבָאוֹת בְּשִׁלֹּה^{3a}
וְשָׁם שְׁנֵי בְנֵי-עֲלִי וּפְנִיָּהס כֹּהֲנִים לַיהוָה:^{3b}

^{3a} This man would go up from his city yearly to worship and to sacrifice to the LORD of hosts in Shiloh.

^{3b} And the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas were priests to the LORD there.

⁸⁴ E.g., ‘*the messenger*’ in 2 Sam 11:19, ‘*Saul’s servant*’ in 1 Sam 9:5. Berlin (1983:59-61) notes that proper names are generally associated with major participants, while epithets are generally associated with minor participants, though there are exceptions. Consider Elimelech, Chilion and Mahlon in Ruth 1:1-5. Berlin describes them as ‘flat’ characters, names without faces i.e., characters without depth or development.

⁸⁵ Cf. to the use of הַאֲנָשִׁים in Gen 19:10-11 to refer to both ‘the messengers’ sent by YHWH and ‘the men of Sodom’. This situation illustrates well the semantic imprecision of epithets compared to proper names.

Verse 3b activates ‘*the two sons of Eli*’, with their names being provided in an appositional phrase. Although the participant ‘*Eli*’ has not yet been mentioned in the discourse, the anchoring relation is still sufficient to ground ‘*the two sons*’ to the discourse, and to enable the reader to create a mental node on which information like ‘were priests before the LORD [at Shiloh]’ can be hung. Regarding *Eli*’s relation to the discourse, one can draw the inference (i.e., pragmatic bootstrapping) that he too is a priest like his sons. The first time that ‘*Eli*’ is mentioned as a participant—and not an anchor—is in 1:9b, where the anchored NP ‘*Eli the priest*’ is utilized.

From a typological standpoint, there are essentially three types of anchoring expressions observed in Biblical Hebrew. First, there are *generic* geographical or genealogical anchoring expressions (e.g. ‘*a young man from Bethlehem in Judah, who was a Levite*’ in Jdg 17:7; ‘*Hirah the Adullamite*’ in Gen 38:12). Second, there are *titular* anchors (e.g. ‘*Jethro the priest of Midian*’ in Exod 18:1; ‘*Melchizedek the king of Salem*’ in Gen 14:18). Finally, there are *relational* anchors, which relate a participant to another participant (e.g., Lot as ‘*Abraham’s nephew*’ in Gen 12:5, ‘*the shepherds of Abraham’s livestock*’ in Gen 13:7). Relational anchors are prototypically used to relate non-initial participants to a specific, discourse-active participant using a possessive relationship.⁸⁶ This anchoring participant prototypically plays a prominent role in the narrative, and will be referred to as the *center of reference*.⁸⁷

4.2.2 Methods of Activation

There are two primary methods of activating brand new participants in Biblical Hebrew (Floor 2004:269). The first method involves two clauses. The first clause predicates the existence of the participant and establishes an anchoring relation of the participant to the discourse. A following clause then assigns a referring expression. The activation of Sarah and Milcah in Genesis 11:29 are representative. Abraham and Nahor have already been activated in v. 27:

וַיִּקַּח אַבְרָם וְנַחֲזֹר לָהֶם נָשִׁים שָׁם אֵשֶׁת-אַבְרָם שָׂרַי וְשָׁם אֵשֶׁת-נַחֲזֹר מִלְכָּה

And Abram and Nahor took for themselves wives. The name of Abram’s wife was Sarai, and the name of Nahor’s wife was Milcah.

This first method provides a formal introduction of the participant, and is used to introduce the first participant in a narrative, such as in Jdg 17:1 or 1 Sam 1:1. It is also associated with the introduction

⁸⁶ Not every anchor which refers to a potential participant will prove to be relational. Generally speaking, the anchoring participant must be currently active to achieve this effect; otherwise such anchors are better viewed as titular. This is particularly the case with government officials or deities. Consider the introduction of *Potiphar* in Gen 37:36 as ‘*Pharaoh’s officer...*’ wherein Pharaoh has not yet become a prominent participant in the narrative, or ‘*Mamre the Amorite*’ in Gen 14:13, who is further anchored as ‘*brother of Eshcol and brother of Aner*’. Neither *Eshcol* nor *Aner* are discourse active, nor do they function as anything more than props in Genesis. We also noted the introduction of *Hophni* and *Phinehas* by anchoring them to *Eli* even before the latter had yet been introduced to the discourse.

⁸⁷ Berlin (1983:59ff) talks rather generally about the use of referring expressions to indicate point of view. Her ideas form the point of departure for our description of discourse anchors.

of major participants, those participants which play a thematically significant role, and which persist in the narrative (cf. ‘*Ishmael*’ in Gen 16:15a-b; ‘*Isaac*’ in Gen 21:2-3).

The second method of activation is to introduce the new participant’s referring expression and anchoring relation in the comment of a topic/comment articulation. Consider the activation of ‘*Abram*’ and ‘*Lot*’ in Gen 11:27b.

תָּרַח הוֹלִיד אֶת־אַבְרָם אֶת־נְחוֹר וְאֶת־הָרָן וְהָרָן הוֹלִיד אֶת־לוֹט:

Terah became the father of Abram, Nahor and Haran; and Haran became the father of Lot.

The discourse relation ‘*son of Terah*’ is implicitly established for *Abram*, while several potential relations exist for *Lot* (e.g., ‘*grandson of Terah*’, ‘*son of Haran*’, or ‘*nephew of Abram*’). The writer will clarify the most salient relation in a subsequent reference, but establishing *some* kind of discourse relation is required for activation. This second method is used to introduce many non-initial participants due to the fact that another participant is available to function as a relational anchor. Many minor participants who do not persist or play a thematically significant role are introduced using this one-step method.⁸⁸

It should be noted that not all participants require formal activation to be accessible. Fillmore notes that participants can become accessible as part of a *schema*, which he defines as “any system of concepts related in such a way that to understand any of them you have to understand the whole structure in which it fits; when one of the things in such a structure is introduced into a text, or into a conversation, all of the others are automatically made available” (Fillmore 1982:111). Lambrecht (1994:100) extends this idea, stating that there are three different means of rendering a participant accessible to the reader:

- **Textually**, via previous mention in the discourse, becoming part of the discourse register, i.e. any participant previously activated (cf. §2.2.3);
- **Inferentially**, via a cognitive schema, e.g. וַיָּבֹא הַפְּלִיט ‘and *the refugee* came’ in Gen 14:13, where the participant is accessible as part of a ‘battle schema’;⁸⁹ or
- **Situationally**, via the reader’s knowledge of the text-external world, e.g. heavenly bodies such as ‘*the sun*’.⁹⁰

Lambrecht’s descriptions provide a succinct account of accessibility without creating special classes of participants or exceptions. His explanations are able to account for the different kinds of

⁸⁸ Examples of other participants from our corpus activated using a one-step process include Terah (11:24a), Haran (11:26b), Amraphel, Arioch, Tidal, and Chedorlaomer (14:1); Bera, Birsha, Shinab, and Shemeber (14:2); Mamre, Eshcol, and Aner (14:13c); 318 trained men (14:14b), Melchizedek (14:18a), Three men (18:2b), Abimelech (20:2c), Phicol (21:22a), Uz (22:21), Buz, Kemuel, Kesed, (22:22), Hazo, Pildash, Jidlaph, Bethuel (22:22), Rebekah (22:23a), Sons of Heth (23:3b), Ephron (23:8c), Zimran, Jokshan, Medan, Midian, Ishbak, Shua (25:2), Sheba, Dedan (25:3a), Ephah, Epher, Hanoah, Abida, Eldaah (25:4).

⁸⁹ Examples of other participants which are activated inferentially include Pharaoh’s officials (12:15a), Lot’s two daughters (19:8a), Lot’s sons-in-law (19:12c), Lot’s wife (19:15c), Abimelech’s servants (20:8b), Abraham’s servant (24:2a), Rebekah’s mother’s household (24:28b), Rebekah’s mother (24:28b/53c), and Rebekah’s nurse (24:59). For a further discussion of the use of schemata in narrative, cf. Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:50-53).

⁹⁰ Examples of participants from our corpus which we construe to be situationally accessible based on their initial activation are Pharaoh (12:15a), the Canaanites (12:6b), the Egyptians (12:12a), and the Perezites (13:7).

activations observed in our corpus, and will be adopted as part of our framework. For a comprehensive catalog of the activation strategy used for each participant from our corpus, see Appendix 1.

4.3 *Default Encoding of Continuing Reference in Subject Contexts*

Now that we have described the process by which brand new participants from our corpus are introduced for the first time, we will move on to describe the prototypical encoding used for continuing reference to activated participants, as represented by our data. Properly understanding the cognitive processing of participant reference encoding is crucial to properly establishing meaningful contexts and default morphological levels of encoding. The distribution of various morphological forms in discourse contexts 1-3 are summarized in Tables 3 and 4. The encoding for context S4/N4 is a lexical NP and does not evince variation as in the other contexts. We will treat each discourse context in turn, beginning with S1.

	Clitic Pronoun on Verb	Clitic Pronoun on Verb	Indep. Personal Pronoun	Indep. Personal Pronoun	Lexical Noun Phrase	Lexical Noun Phrase	Total
	<i>Raw #</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Raw #</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Raw #</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Raw #</i>
S1⁹¹ (Narr)	193	78.14%	6	2.43%	48	19.43%	247
S2	39	45.88%	N/A	N/A	46	54.12%	85
S1 (RS)⁹²	11	61.11%	N/A	N/A	7	38.89%	18
S3	1	1.14%	10	11.36%	52	59.09%	88

4.3.1 *Continuing Reference Following Narrative Clauses: Contexts S1/N1*

Givón has determined that continued reference to a subject/agent in most languages prototypically utilizes the lowest level of morphological encoding available (1983a:17-18; cf. Huang 2000:278-329). Biblical Hebrew follows this principle, utilizing subject agreement markers on finite verbs to encode continuing subject reference. Non-finite clauses such as participial or verbless clauses, which cannot grammaticalize subject agreement on the verb, also utilize minimal encoding.

⁹¹ Left- and right-dislocations in context S1 were analyzed based on the encoding of the previously active participant, i.e. if the dislocation utilized a pronominal form to refer to the active participant, we cataloged it as such even though the other participants that may have been added were lexicalized.

⁹² As will be pointed out in §4.3.2, the default processing of minimal encoding following a quotative frame is *switch* of speaker and addressee. Therefore a lexical NP is required to counter this expectation in context S1, which is opposite the level of encoding for context S1 following a narrative clause. We have therefore grouped the data separately in order to avoid confusion.

These clauses utilize either an independent personal pronoun⁹³ and on one occasion, zero anaphora.⁹⁴ Stated another way, readers tend to cognitively process minimal reference in narrative to signal continuity of subject with the preceding clause (cf. Nariyama 2000). The data from Table 3 bear out this cross-linguistic expectation. The use of clitic pronouns in consecutive S1 contexts is illustrated from Gen 14:14-16.

וַיִּשְׁמַע אַבְרָם כִּי... וַיִּרְק אֶת־חַנִּיכָיו... וַיִּרְדֹּף עַד־דָּן;
וַיִּחַלֵּק עֲלֵיהֶם... וַיִּכּוּם וַיִּרְדֹּפֶם עַד־חֹבֹבָה... וַיָּשֶׁב אֶת כָּל...

And Abram₁ (S3) heard that... and \emptyset_1 (S1) drew out his₁ trained men₂... and \emptyset_1 (S1) pursued them₃ to Dan.

and \emptyset_1 (S1) divided against them₃... and \emptyset_1 (S1) struck them₃ and \emptyset_1 (S1) pursued them₃ up to Hobah... and \emptyset_1 (S1) brought back all...

Thus in narrative proper, if the subject is the **same** as in the previous clause, no overt encoding is required other than the subject agreement encoding, which we shall refer to as ‘minimal reference’. The primary exception to this is use of a construction which requires an overt subject, such as a referential PoD. Referential PoDs in Biblical Hebrew narrative are not frequently observed in context S1 since most PoDs are utilized to achieve a marked switch rather than a renewal of the topic. PoDs are thus more typically found in contexts S2-S4. The only S1 PoD observed in our corpus is in context S1+ in Gen 14:3, where several subjects of the previous clause is compounded using a plural pronoun:

כָּל־אֱלֹהֵי חִבְרוֹן אֶל־עַמְקֵי הַשְּׂדִימִים

All of these [kings] (S1+) joined together in the valley of Siddim...

Verse three follows two very long lists of kings in vv. 1 and 2, and provides a summary statement that the second group came together for the purpose of rebelling. In light of the S1 context, minimal encoding could have been utilized. The use of the quantifier ‘all’ plus the preposing of the subject NP before the verb add prominence to this statement, highlighting the comprehensiveness of the gathering and setting the stage for the battle that follows in v. 5.

The fact that the default encoding level for context S1 is minimal encoding leads to the default interpretation of minimal reference as indicating *continuity of subject*.⁹⁵ Use of a full NP is required to counter this expectation in most cases, and is described below in our discussion of context S3/4. We noted in §2.4.3 that Biblical Hebrew appears to utilize redundant NPs to mark the beginning of new development units, which vary from 1-7 clauses in length in our corpus. In light of

⁹³ Examples of pronominal encoding in non-finite clauses from the narrative of our corpus are Gen 12:14c, 14:3, 7c, 12c, 13c, 13d, 17c, 18b; 18:1b, 8c, 10c; 19:37c, 38c, 23:2b, 19b; 24:62b. For examples from RS, cf. Gen 12:13, 18b, 19a; 13:8b, 14a, 15a; 15:1c, 2a, 2b, 7b, 14a.

⁹⁴ The only example from our corpus of zero anaphora with a non-finite verb in narrative is found in Gen 24:30: וַיָּבֹא אֶל־הָאִישׁ וְהָנָה עֹמֵד עַל־הַגְּמְלִים עַל־הָעֵין: ‘And [Laban] came to the man and behold, [the man] was standing with the camels by the spring.’

⁹⁵ For other examples from our corpus of minimal encoding used to indicate continuity of subject, cf. Gen 12:7c-8d; 13:18b-d; 14:5b-7c, 11-12b; 15:10a-10d; 18:7b-8c.

the apparent use of redundant relexicalization to segment the text, it is implausible to expect to find extended chains of minimally-encoded clauses which are not broken at some point by either a switch of participants (i.e. a natural discontinuity) or a redundant NP (i.e. pragmatic segmentation) to break the chain into smaller chunks.⁹⁶ The example of Gen 14:14-16 given above represents the longest string of minimally encoded clauses with the same subject found in our corpus.⁹⁷ Another example of minimal encoding to indicate continuity of subject is found in Gen 18:1-3:

...וְהוּא יֹשֵׁב פֶּתַח-הָאֹהֶל בְּחֹם הַיּוֹם:¹

וַיִּשָׂא עֵינָיו וַיֵּרָא וְהִנֵּה שְׁלֹשָׁה אַנְשִׁים נֹצְבִים עָלָיו וַיֵּרָא וַיֵּרָץ לְקִרְאתָם מִפֶּתַח הָאֹהֶל וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ אֶרְצָה:²

וַיֹּאמֶר³

- ¹ ...He [Abraham] (S3) was sitting at the opening of the tent at the heat of the day.
² Ø (S1) lifted his eyes and Ø (S1) saw, behold, three men standing before him. Ø (S1) saw (them) and Ø (S1) ran to meet them from the opening of the tent. Ø (S1) bowed to the ground
³ Ø (S1) said...

Abraham has been the referential center and VIP of the narrative since 17:23, and is even pronominally encoded across the transition from chapters 17 to 18. Verse 1 begins with an introductory statement that YHWH appeared to Abraham, switching back to Abraham as the subject in v. 1b. Abraham remains the subject of the minimally encoded verb forms through verse 3a. A potentially competing subject occurs in v. 2b, but based both on the morphology and the semantics of the context it is understood that Abraham continues to be the subject antecedent through v. 3a.

The examples we have provided illustrate that Biblical Hebrew, like many other languages, tends to use minimal encoding for continuing reference to active subjects by default. Departure from minimal encoding in context S1 will be shown to correspond to pragmatic functions of participant reference: creation of a marked information structure (e.g. a referential PoD), creation of a new development unit, or cataphoric highlighting of a following speech or event. The signaling of the latter two of these tasks requires the use of a lexical NP. On this basis, we shall consider the default encoding for context S1 to be minimal encoding.

Continuing reference to non-subjects without role change follows the expected typological norm of utilizing minimal morphological encoding. We observe several different morphological forms used in this context. The form used seems dependent upon both the transitivity of the verb and how established the non-subject participant is in the context. The three morphological levels of encoding observed are zero anaphora, clitic pronouns suffixed to the verb, and clitic pronouns suffixed to prepositions or the direct object marker. Use of such minimally encoded forms accounts for nearly 75% of the N1 data found in our corpus.⁹⁸ The distribution of the morphological forms in non-subject contexts is summarized in Table 4.

⁹⁶ Cf. Heimerdinger's (1999:124-25) discussion of minimal references to Ahaziah in 1 Kgs 22:52-2 Kgs 1:18 as example of an exceptionally long development unit.

⁹⁷ The topic of pragmatically marking developments will be reserved for Chapter 5.

⁹⁸ The use of lexical NPs in context N1 will be discussed in Chapter 6.

Table 4. Distribution of Morphological Forms in Non-Subject Contexts									
	Zero Anaphora	Zero Anaphora	Clitic Pronoun On Verb	Clitic Pronoun On Verb	Clitic Pronoun On Prep.	Clitic Pronoun On Prep.	Lexical Noun Phrase	Lexical Noun Phrase	Total
	Raw #	%	Raw #	%	Raw #	%	Raw #	%	Raw #
N1	35	31.82%	9	8.18%	38	34.55%	28	25.45%	110
N2	37	59.68%	N/A	N/A	13	20.97%	12	19.35%	62
N3	2	3.23%	10	16.13%	19	30.65%	31	50.00%	62

While it is not possible to delineate a single default form, it is possible to describe the prototypical encoding patterns observed in context N1 in our corpus. The most common level of encoding for cognitively-active non-subjects is the use of clitic pronouns suffixed to the direct object marker or to a preposition (34.55%). The use of this level of encoding enables the writer to make explicit both the presence of the non-subject participant as well as the grammatical role it is playing. The use of clitic pronouns on the verb, observed only 8.18% of the time, only allows explicit reference to the participant, but cannot specify the role played. The use of zero anaphora, found 31.82% of the time, does not allow for either explicit reference either to the entity or to their grammatical role in the clause. In cases where more than one patient is present in a narrative clause, at least one of them is encoded using a lexical NP (e.g. Gen 27:25). More commonly one finds a single pronominalized non-subject; if another non-subject is present, it is typically encoded using a NP. Consider the case of Gen 12:20a:

וַיִּצַו עָלָיו פַּרְעֹה אֲנָשִׁים

²⁰ *And Pharaoh (S1) commanded the men (N4) concerning him (N1).*

In this clause Pharaoh is the active agent and Abraham is the active patient. The use of the clitic pronoun with a preposition allows both Abraham and ‘the men’ to be mentioned without causing confusion over which of the patients is the recipient of the command and which is the topic of the command.⁹⁹ Had the writer/editor used zero anaphora to encode Abraham, the topic of Pharaoh’s command would be unclear. Alternatively, use of a clitic pronoun attached to the verb to encode Abraham might also create confusion since recipients of commands are suffixed to the verb elsewhere

⁹⁹ Cf. Gen 2:16 and 28:6 for a similar use of עָלָיו that may be intended to refer to the participant as the *topic* of the command rather than just the *recipient*. Gen 12:20 is the only other instance in Genesis where this preposition is used with the verb צִוָּה and it is clearly intended to differentiate recipient from topic.

in Genesis.¹⁰⁰ This example illustrates the role the transivity and the semantics of the verb play in determining the kind of pronominal encoding in context N1.

Another example illustrating the encoding of non-subjects is found in Gen 22:13b-c, where Abraham offers up the ram in place of Isaac:

וַיֵּלֶךְ אַבְרָהָם וַיִּקַּח אֶת־הָאֵיל
וַיַּעֲלֶהוּ לְעֹלָה תַּחַת בְּנֹוֹ:

^{13b} And Abraham¹⁰¹ went (S1/--) and took the ram (S1/N3)

^{13c} and he offered it as a burnt offering instead of his son (S1/N1/N4).

In v. 13a, the ram is first activated as the patient of a verb of perception. Both Abraham and the ram are relexicalized in v. 13b either to highlight the event or at least to signal a new development (Levinsohn 2000b). This is followed by another reference to the ram using a clitic pronoun attached to the verb. The ram is well-activated in the reader's mental representation, especially due to the relexicalization in v. 13b; thus the reference in v. 13c using the clitic pronoun is unambiguous.

Based on the data in our corpus, use of zero anaphora seems to be limited only to well-established referents in specific contexts: addressees in quotative frames¹⁰² (what we have referred to as context N2),¹⁰³ to patients of verbs of perception¹⁰⁴ or motion,¹⁰⁵ and to non-human referents in narrative proper.¹⁰⁶ Consider Gen 14:17-19:

וַיֵּצֵא מֶלֶךְ־סְדֹם לִקְרֹאתוֹ אַחֲרֵי שׁוּבוֹ...^{17a}
וּמֶלְכִי־צֶדֶק מֶלֶךְ שְׁלֹם הוֹצִיא לֶחֶם וַיֵּיזֵן^{18a}
וְהוּא כֹהֵן לְאֵל עֵלְיוֹן;^{18b}
וַיְבָרְכֵהוּ וַיֹּאמֶר...^{19a}

^{17a} And the king of Sodom₁ came to meet him₂ (S3/N3) after his₂ return

^{18a} And Melchizedek, king of Salem₃ brought out bread and wine (to Ø₂) (S5/N1)

^{18b} and he₃ was the priest to God Most High (S1/--)

^{19a} and he₃ blessed him₂ (S1/N1) and said to Ø₂... (S1/N1)

¹⁰⁰ Cf. Gen 3:11, 17; 7:5; 28:1; and 50:12 for instances where the recipient is encoded using a clitic pronoun suffixed to the verb. For use of the object marker to encode the recipient cf. Gen 6:22; 7:9, 16; 18:19; 21:4; 26:11; 32:5, 18, 20; 44:1; 49:29, 33; 50:2.

¹⁰¹ Use of a full NP here is construed by Levinsohn (2000b) as marking the next development in the story. Such encoding will be discussed in Chapter 5 below.

¹⁰² This is particularly the case in complex quotative frames. There are two supposedly opposing viewpoints regarding what entails a quotative frame, and what does not. Longacre (2003:155-157) has noted that non-speaking verbs which precede a reported speech often function to frame the speech just as much as the speech verbs, establishing both the context, as well as the identity and proximity of the speech participants. On the other hand, Miller (2003:7-8, 149ff) is strictly concerned with the verbs of speaking themselves, and therefore both excludes non-speaking verbs from consideration and takes issue with Longacre's position. In light of our purpose of studying participant reference and how a reader's mental representation develops, we will follow Longacre's broader definition based on the participant reference encoding data which link non-speaking verbs to quotative frames. Cf. Gen 14:17-19b; 18:22-23; 19:1-2a, 6-7a; 20:14-15a; 24:17a-b.

¹⁰³ Cf. 12:7b, 18b; 15:2a, 3a, 5b, 8a; 16:8a, 8b; 18:9b, 17a, 20a, 26a, 27a, 28b, 29b, 30a, 30b, 31a, 31b, 32a, 32b; 19:2a, 2b, 7a, 9a, 9b, 17a; 20:4b, 11a, 15a; 21:26a, 30a; 22:1c, 2a, 7b, 7c, 11b, 12a; 24:12a, 17b, 18a, 19b, 23a, 27a, 31a, 33b, 33c, 50a, 54d, 55a, 57a, 58c, 65b.

¹⁰⁴ E.g. Gen 18:2c; 19:1-2a.

¹⁰⁵ E.g. Gen 14:5a, 7a, 10a; 18:23a.

¹⁰⁶ E.g. Gen 17:26a; 18:2c; 19:3f.

The two kings are understood to be the agents of vv. 17a and 18a-b, while Abraham is understood to be the patient for vv. 17a, 18a and 19a (2x). The continuing reference to the subject referent in v. 18b and 19a is encoded using the minimum encoding available: an independent personal pronoun in the verbless clause of v. 18b, and clitic reference in v. 19a. Regarding the encoding of patients, we would construe the indirect object in v. 18a as implicitly referring to Abraham in context N1 using zero anaphora.¹⁰⁷ In light of the S1 interpretation of vv. 18b-19b, Abraham is understood to continue as the patient of v. 19aff. The use of the clitic pronoun on the verb to encode ‘Abraham’ specifies that Abraham is the intended referent without using the object marker or preposition. Thus we see a variety of encoding levels utilized in context N1 based both upon the semantics of the verbs as well as the cognitive status of the referents.

Consider also Gen 18:2-8:

	וַיִּשָׂא עֵינָיו ^{2a}
	וַיֵּרָא וְהִנֵּה שְׁלֹשָׁה אַנְשִׁים... ^{2b}
וַיֵּרָא	וַיֵּרָא וְהִנֵּה שְׁלֹשָׁה אַנְשִׁים... ^{2c}
	וַיֵּרָץ לִקְרֹאתָם... ^{2d}
	וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ אֶרְצָה: ^{2e}
וַיֹּאמֶר...	וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ אֶרְצָה: ^{3a}
	וַיֹּאמְרוּ בֵּן תַּעֲשֶׂה... ^{5d}
	וַיַּמְהַר אַבְרָהָם הָאֵלֶּהָ אֶל־שָׂרָה ^{6a}
	וַיֹּאמֶר מַה־רִּי שְׁלֹשׁ... ^{6b}
	וְאֶל־הַבָּקָר רָץ אַבְרָהָם ^{7a}
	וַיִּקַּח בֶּן־בָּקָר רֹדֵד וְטוֹב ^{7b}
	וַיִּתֵּן אֶל־הַנָּעִר... ^{7c}
	וַיִּקַּח חֶמְאָה וְחֵלֶב וּבֹן־הַבָּקָר... ^{8a}
	וַיִּתֵּן לִפְנֵיהֶם... ^{8b}

^{2a}And he₁ (Abraham) lifted his₁ eyes (S1/N4)
^{2b}and saw₁ and behold, three men₂ (S1/N5)
^{2c}and he₁ saw \emptyset ₂ (S1/N1)
^{2d}and he₁ ran to meet them₂ (S1/N1)
^{2e}and he₁ bowed down to the ground (S1/--)
^{3a}and he₁ said to \emptyset ₂ (S1/N1)
^{5d}and they₂ said to \emptyset ₁, “Thus you do...” (S2/N2)
^{6a}and Abraham₁ hurried...to Sarah₃ (S2/N4)
^{6b}and he₁ said to \emptyset ₃, “Hurry, three...” (S1/N1)
^{7a}and to the herd Abraham₁ ran (S1/N4)
^{7b}and he₁ took a young calf, tender... (S1/N4)
^{7c}and he₁ gave \emptyset to the lad₄... (S1/N1/N4)
^{8a}and he₁ took curds and milk and the calf... (S1/N1+)
^{8b}and he₁ set \emptyset before them₂... (S1/N3)

¹⁰⁷ The verb **יצא** sometimes includes both a patient and an adjunct, i.e. X brought Y to Z (cf. Gen 8:16, 17, 19; 9:18; 11:31; 12:5; 15:5, 7; 17:6; 19:5, 17). For other tokens of this verb using two components, one of which is encoded using zero anaphora cf. Gen 15:14; 19:12, 14a, 16; 24:11, 13, 15, 53. Where the agent is the thing ‘going forth’, either the origination or the destination are often specified (cf. Gen 2:10; 10:11, 14; 15:4; 19:6, 8, 23; 24:5, 50, 63).

This passage illustrates well the use of zero anaphora to encode non-subjects in our corpus. In v. 2c we find ‘the three men’ elided as the object of a perception verb, in contrast to their clitic encoding on the verb in v. 2d and on a preposition in v. 8b. One also finds the addressees elided in vv. 3a, 5d and 6b since the participants are active and unambiguous.

On the basis of the data from our corpus, the use of zero anaphora is prototypically restricted to well-activated addressees, to objects of motion or perception verbs, and to non-human props. Use of clitic pronouns attached to verbs to encode non-subjects appears to be constrained both by the semantics of the verb (i.e. whether the specific role of the patient needs to be specified using a preposition) as well as cognitive status of the participant in the reader’s mental representation. If these constraints are not met, active non-subjects in context N1 are prototypically encoded using clitic pronouns suffixed to the object marker or a preposition.

4.3.2 Continuing Reference Following Quotative Frames: Contexts S2/N2

It is important to make a distinction between encoding following a narrative clause and encoding following a quotative frame, since the cognitive interpretation of minimal encoding in these contexts is *opposite*. Thus, while minimal reference following a narrative clause characteristically signals *same* subject as the preceding clause, minimal reference following quotative frames characteristically signals *switch* of speaker and addressee.¹⁰⁸ Consider, for example, the switches which occur between speaker and addressee encoded using only subject agreement for the speakers, and zero anaphora for the addressees, in Gen 18:27-31:

וַיַּעַן אַבְרָהָם וַיֹּאמֶר הִנֵּה־נָא...
 וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא אֲשַׁחִית...
 וַיִּסַּף עוֹד לְדַבֵּר אֵלָיו וַיֹּאמֶר אוּלַי...
 וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא אֶעֱשֶׂה...
 וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־נָא יְחֹר...
 וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא אֶעֱשֶׂה...
 וַיֹּאמֶר הִנֵּה־נָא...
 וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא אֲשַׁחִית...

^{27a} And Abraham₁ answered and said to \emptyset_2 , “Please...” (S2/N2)

^{28b} and \emptyset_2 said to \emptyset_1 , “I will not destroy...” (S2/N2)

^{29a} And \emptyset_1 spoke to him₂ yet again and said... (S2/N2)

^{29b} And \emptyset_2 said to \emptyset_1 , “I will not do it...” (S2/N2)

^{30a} And \emptyset_1 said to \emptyset_2 , “Do not be angry...” (S2/N2)

^{30b} And \emptyset_2 said to \emptyset_1 , “I will not do it...” (S2/N2)

^{31a} And \emptyset_1 said to \emptyset_2 , “Now behold...” (S2/N2)

^{31b} And \emptyset_2 said to \emptyset_1 , “I will not do it...” (S2/N2)

This text is representative of closed conversations between two participants found in our corpus. The default interpretation of minimal reference is *switch* of speaker and addressee following quotative

¹⁰⁸ E.g. Gen 14:20b; 15:6, 8a, 9a, 10a; 16:8b, 13a; 18:5b, 9b, 10a, 28b, 29a, 29b, 30a, 30b, 31a, 31b, 32a, 32b; 19:2b, 3a, 9a, 9b, 21a; 21:30a; 22:1c, 2a, 7b, 7c, 11b, 12a; 24:24a, 33b, 34a, 56a, 57a, 58c, 59a, 66a.

frames. A full NP is usually required in order to counter this expectation.¹⁰⁹ It should also be noted that complex quotative frames are encoded as if they are analyzed as a single unit, as in Gen 18:29a above. Though there are two minimally-referenced verbs in the frame, the switch is not processed until following the reported speech (cf. Miller 2003:158ff).

In the transition from reported speech back to narrative, the S2 cognitive expectation of *switch* between speaker and hearer continues in the narrative clause which follows the final speech. Consider Gen 14:18-20, where Abraham interacts with Melchizedek. Abraham is the addressee of the final speech in v. 19, and is thus understood as the agent of the following narrative clause in v. 20b.

וּמֶלְכִי־צֶדֶק מֶלֶךְ שָׁלֵם הוֹצִיא לֶחֶם וַיֵּין
וְהוּא כֹהֵן לְאֵל עֵלְיוֹן:
וַיְבָרְכֵהוּ וַיֹּאמֶר...
וַיִּתֵּן־לוֹ מֵעֵשֶׂר מִכֹּל:

^{18a} And Melchizedek₁, king of Salem, brought bread...

^{18b} He₁ (was) a priest of God Most High,

¹⁹ and he₁ blessed him₂ and he₁ said...

^{20b} and he₂ gave him₁ a tenth of everything.

Based on the cognitive expectation of *role switch* in the clause following a quotative frame, readers are able to process the shift of agents in v. 20b from Abraham to Melchizedek, though it is morphologically ambiguous.¹¹⁰ Thus, the default processing of subject agreement encoding in the narrative clause following a quotative frame is *switch* of speaker and hearer, even though the clause could be construed as part of the narrative proper. Similarly, the default processing of subject agreement encoding of an initial quotative frame is *continuity* of agent, since the processing is based upon the genre of the preceding clause.

Zero anaphora is not the only encoding option for context N2. Use of clitic pronouns to encode addressees in non-initial quotative frames is frequently attested in Biblical Hebrew narrative. Addressees can be encoded using either ל or לָךְ plus pronominal suffixes in contexts where explicit reference to the addressee is either needed or desired.¹¹¹ Based on Nariyama's (2000) claims regarding the processing of zero anaphora as indicating a higher degree of continuity than pronominal reference, it seems reasonable to infer that the meaningful difference between encoding addressees

¹⁰⁹ E.g. Gen 15:2a, 3a; 16:9a, 10a, 11a; 17:9a, 15a. As usual, departures from this 'rule' can be achieved under certain circumstances, cf. Gen 15:5b-c; 19:9a-b; 21:6-7. In the 15:5a-c, a command to count the stars is given, and the second quotative frame seems to imply that a pause was made in the speech, as though for Abram to look up. In the latter two instances (19:9a-b; 21:6-7), what Berlin (1983:37ff) refers to as 'inner' speech occurs, where the participant speaks to himself; the quotative frame which follows the inner speech introduces a speech to a specific addressee.

¹¹⁰ For other examples of minimally encoded S2 switches at the transition from a reported speech to narrative, cf. Gen 12:7b; 14:20; 15:6, 10; 16:13; 19:3, 16; 24:59, 65b.

¹¹¹ For quotative frames in our corpus encoding the addressee using a clitic pronoun attached to a preposition, cf. Gen 15:4, 5b, 7a, 9a; 16:9a, 10a, 11a; 17:1c, 3b; 18:9a, 29a; 19:5a, 18a, 21a; 20:3b, 6a, 9b; 22:1b; 23:5, 8a, 14; 24:5, 6, 24a, 25a, 56a, 58a, 60a.

with zero anaphora compared to prepositions with clitic pronouns is to *increase* the continuity of the dialogue, especially if the speakers are minimally encoded as well.

4.3.3 Change of Role Following Narrative Clauses: Contexts S3/N3

Contexts S3 and N3 describe role switches among currently active participants, ones that are currently ‘in focus’ in the clause (cf. Gundel et al. 1993:278). This switch of roles can be due either to the agent or patient switching roles from the previous clause in open contexts, i.e. where more than two participants are on stage, or due to needing to specify a single member of a group. In either case the use of lexical NPs is prototypically required in open contexts in order to make such switches unambiguously. Let us first consider an example of participants switching roles, as in Gen 11:27:

תָּרַח הוֹלִיד אֶת־אַבְרָם אֶת־נְחוֹר וְאֶת־הָרָן
וְהָרָן הוֹלִיד אֶת־לוֹט:

^{27b}Terah fathered Abram, Nahor and Haran.

^{27c}And Haran fathered Lot.

Haran is first introduced as a patient in v. 27b, but then becomes the agent of v. 27c. Had the writer used minimal encoding in v. 27c, the reader would most likely have construed the agent of the clause to still be Terah (i.e. context S1). Since there is more than one 3MS patient in v. 27b, it would be very difficult for the reader to correctly discern which one of the patients is the intended agent of v. 27c if the reader were to have guessed that this clause is speaking about one of Terah’s sons and not Terah. Thus in contexts with more than one potential referent, use of a lexical NP is required in order to avoid ambiguity.¹¹²

Another example illustrating the need for use of a lexical NP in context S3 due to an open context is found in Gen 13:11c-12.

וַיִּפְרְדּוּ אִישׁ מֵעַל אָחִיו: ^{11c}
אַבְרָם יָשָׁב בְּאֶרֶץ־כְּנָעַן וְלוֹט יָשָׁב בְּעָרֵי הַכְּפָר וַיֵּאָהֵל עַד־סְדֹם: ¹²

^{11c}And they separated each from his brother.

¹²Abram dwelt in the land of Canaan, and Lot dwelt in the cities of the valley, and he pitched his tent near Sodom.

In v. 11c both Abraham and Lot function reflexively as agents and patients to describe their separation from each other. Without the use of a lexical NP in vv. 12a or 12b it is unclear which one of the two participants is the intended agent. The writer uses referential PoDs to achieve a marked switch of subjects from Abraham to Lot. Use of these constructions serves to pragmatically highlight the contrast between the two participants’ choices. The same semantic information could have been communicated using default constituent order.

Switch of roles can also be due to one member of a group becoming the single agent or patient. Gen 19:33 is a representative example of this situation in context S3:

¹¹² For other N3 switches in open contexts cf. Gen 11:30; 12:4b, 18; 14:21; 15:1, 10d, 13a; 16:4a; 19:5a, 10b, 29, 31, 33c; 20:2c, 3a; 21:12a, 29a; 22:1, 7a, 13e, 15, 20; 23:2c; 24:1b, 30b, 60a, 61d, 64b; 25:11a.

וַתִּשְׁקֵן אֶת־אֲבִיהֶן...
וַתָּבֵא הַבְּכִירָה
וַתִּשְׁכַּב אֶת־אֲבִיהָ...

^{33a} *And they (Lot's daughters) made their father drink (S1/N4)*

^{33b} *and the firstborn came (S3/Ø)*

^{33c} *and she lay with her father (S1/N1)*

The two daughters of Lot were encoded separately in v. 31, but became a single plural agent in v. 33a. Relexicalization is necessary in v. 33b in order to specify which one of the two daughters is the intended referent of the 3FS verb. Thus, while individuals may be combined into a plural entity using minimal encoding (e.g. Gen 19:33a), the separation of an individual from a group necessitates the use of a lexical NP.

In open contexts, i.e. where the reader is not able to clearly infer the intended referent of the anaphor, a lexical NP is expected. The lack of a clearly inferable referent can result from more than two participants interacting together, more than one participant initiating (i.e. there are switches in initiators), or when one member of a group of participants needs to be specified. Default encoding of participants in such open contexts is relexicalization. The use of a lexical NP accomplishes the cognitive task of identifying the intended referent from among the currently active candidates, and should not be construed as reactivation from inactivity. Based on the Q- and I-principles mentioned in §2.5.4, the expected default expression to be used for relexicalization is the most informative and morphologically simplex option available, prototypically the participant's default referring expression. The addition of any anchoring expression in context S3/N3 will thus be construed as marked.

4.3.4 Reactivation of Semi-Active Participants: Contexts S4/N4

Contexts S4 and N4 are the classifications for participants that are relexicalized because the participant was not involved in the preceding clause. Participants in this context are considered to be semi-active or accessible, but not currently active. The reader has these participants stored in their peripheral memory due to their previous mention in the discourse, due to the activation of a schema, or due to the reader's world knowledge. The cognitive process accomplished in reactivation from context S4/N4 is moving the reader from *knowing* about the referent to *thinking* about the referent. Reactivation requires a lexical NP, most typically the participant's default referring expression. The participant's anchoring relation is, by definition, accessible for semi-active participants (cf. §2.2.5).

The difference between contexts S3/N3 and S4/N4 is that the former classifies role switches among participants that are 'in focus' (Gundel et al. 1993:278); viz. that they were involved implicitly or explicitly in the preceding clause. Contexts S4 and N4 cover the shift from a reader *knowing about* the participant to *thinking about* the participant as the center of attention as discussed in §2.2.5 (cf. Lambrecht 1994:269-270). Participants in this context have lapsed into semi-activity due to lack

of mention in the discourse. The need for the distinction between -3 and -4 will be discussed in 4.4.1.2 below. Let us now consider some examples of S4/N4 contexts from our corpus.

Gen 13:7-10 provide several examples of prototypical S4/N4 encoding:

וַיְהִי־רִיב בֵּין רֹעֵי מִקְנֵה־אַבְרָם וּבֵין רֹעֵי מִקְנֵה־לוֹט
וַהֲכַנְעֲנִי וְהַפְרֹזִי אֹז יֵשֵׁב בְּאַרְצָן:
וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָם אֶל־לוֹט...
וַיִּשְׂא־לוֹט אֶת־עֵינָיו...

^{7a}And a dispute arose between Abram's shepherds and between Lot's shepherds (--/N4)

^{7b}and the Canaanites and the Perizzites then lived in the land, (S4/N4)

^{8a}And Abram said to Lot... (S4/N4)

^{10a}And Lot lifted up his eyes... (S3/N4)

Abraham and Lot were active as the compound agent of the verbs in 13:6. There is a switch in v. 7a to two inferentially-accessible collective participants: *Abram's shepherds* and *Lot's shepherds*. The reader is able to activate them based on the anchoring information, but these entities were certainly not in the reader's focus prior to their mention here. Mention of the two groups of shepherds is followed in v. 7b by a switch to the textually-accessible *Canaanites*. The *Canaanites* have not been mentioned since Gen 12:6, and are thus not in focus. The reader is familiar with them based on the preceding discourse, but is not currently *thinking* about them prior to their mention here. Thus, focus has switched from the collective *Abram and Lot* in v. 6 to several other participants in v. 7. As the reported speech begins in v. 8a, relexicalization is necessary not only to bring Abraham and Lot back into focus, but also to delineate speaker and addressee roles. Contexts S4 and N4 are contexts where participants need to be reactivated to the forefront of the reader's mental representation from some semi-active state.

Another example of S4/N4 activation from semi-activity is found in Gen 14:10.

וַעֲמַק הַשְּׂדִים בְּאֵרֹת בְּאֵרֹת חֲמֹר ^{10a}
וַיִּנְסוּ מִלְּדֹד־סֹדֶם וַעֲמֹרָה וַיִּפְלוּ־שָׁמָּה ^{10b}
וְהַנִּשְׁאָרִים הָרָה גָּסוּ ^{10c}

^{10a}And the valley of Siddim was full of pits of bitumen. (S3/N4)

^{10b}And the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah fled, (S4/--)

^{10c}And the survivors fled to the hills. (S4/N4).

The verses leading up to v. 10 set the scene for the battle described. The kings of Sodom and Gomorrah are last mentioned in v. 8, as is the valley of Siddim. Verse 9 lists the other group of kings, as well as a summary statement of the forces arrayed. The 'valley of Siddim' is restored to the reader's center of attention through relexicalization in v. 10a, switching roles from non-subject to subject. The comment of this clause introduces 'pits of bitumen', a referent which has not been previously mentioned but is ostensibly accessible from the reader's world knowledge. Following this clause, the 'kings of Sodom and Gomorrah' are reactivated from semi-activity, since several other participants have come and gone from the reader's attention since their last mention in v. 8. According to our cognitive framework, these participants remain in the reader's peripheral memory in

a semi-active state, but relexicalization is required to move the reader from *knowing* about them to *thinking* about them. The ‘*survivors*’, on the other hand, are deemed accessible based on the schema that is evoked from the description of the battle. Both the agents and patient of v. 10c are activated from semi-activity based on the fact that nothing in the previous clause would have brought them into the reader’s focus of attention.

To summarize our claims about contexts S4 and N4, a referent in this context is accessible to the reader either through world knowledge, schemata, or the preceding discourse.¹¹³ The cognitive process achieved in this context is moving the reader from *knowing* about the referent in question to *thinking* about it, what Gundel et al. (1993) refer to as being ‘in focus’. Reactivation requires use of a lexical NP due to the fact that the referent was not involved in the preceding clause, and thus the reader is tasked with selecting the correct participant from all those in his or her peripheral memory, not just those currently in focus. Based on the referent’s status as semi-active, the anchoring relation of the participant remains semi-active as well, and thus does not need to be specified. Therefore use of discourse anchors in context S4 and N4 will be construed as marked, intended to accomplish some marked purpose.

4.3.5 Reactivation of Inactive Participants: Contexts S5/N5

As noted in §2.2.4, a participant’s activation potential decays over time until it is finally stored only in long-term memory. The process of reactivation from inactivity, for both subjects and non-subjects, requires not only relexicalization, but also the reestablishment of the participant’s anchoring relation to the discourse. It was also noted that the rate of decay is inversely proportional to the participant’s saliency.¹¹⁴ In other words, the more salient the participant is to the discourse, the longer it will remain semi-active and accessible before slipping into inactivity. In this section we will compare the noticeable differences in rates of decay among participants, based on the ‘referential distance’ to the last mention of the participant (cf. Givón 1983a:13). The principles established in

¹¹³ For other examples of relexicalization in context S4 cf. Gen 12:4b, 6b, 7a, 14a, 15a, 16a, 17a; 13:5a, 6a, 7b, 8a, 13. For other examples of relexicalization of context N4 cf. Gen 12:5a, 5b, 8a, 8b, 8c, 10b, 11b, 15b, 17a, 18a, 20b; 13:2, 3, 4b, 5a, 7a, 8a, 10b, 12c, 14a, 18c, 18d.

¹¹⁴ Persistence is also a factor in the rate of decay, but closely related to saliency. Saliency is difficult to establish apart from active involvement of the participant in the discourse. Compare the reactivations of *Lot* and *Mephibosheth* after approximately the same amount of inactivity.

Lot figures fairly prominently in the narratives of Gen 12-14, and is last mentioned in 14:16. When he is reactivated 106 verses later in 19:1, only his primary referring expression is utilized, indicating that the writer judges the referent to still be semi-active and accessible to the reader.

Mephibosheth is first introduced using a two-step process of predication and identification in 2 Sam 4:4, and then is not mentioned again for 108 verses. However, *Mephibosheth*’s reactivation in 9:6 includes ‘*the son of Jonathan the son of Saul*’, ostensibly to reestablish his anchoring relation. Admittedly one cannot quantify activation status based on verse counts. But this contrast is illustrative of the correlation which we argue exists between the participant’s past salience and persistence and the apparent differences in activation states as reflected in the differences in referential encoding. There may be other factors, such as the compositional history of the text, which contribute to these differences.

this section will form the basis for describing the marked use of redundant discourse anchors for thematic highlighting in Chapter 6.

In order to illustrate the process of deactivation and its relation to saliency, let us consider the stages of encoding used for *Sarai*. She is first introduced in Gen 11:29a-b, anchored as Abraham's wife. In Gen 12 she functions largely as a prop or minor participant. She does not speak or take action, but instead is acted upon. She is not mentioned in Gen 13 other than in the list of items that Abraham brought up from Egypt found in v. 1. She is not referred to again until Gen 16:1, where she is reactivated as '*Sarai, the wife of Abram*' using a referential PoD, which we analyze as context S5. In Gen 16, Sarah acts as an initiator, interacting with Abraham as a major participant. She is mentioned in Gen 16:9 and 17:17 in reported speech, but is not mentioned in narrative proper again until 18:6. The reactivation of Sarah in 18:6 uses only a bare proper name without any anchoring information, which we construe as indicating that the writer/editor deems her to be semi-active based on the use of an unanchored NP. Next, she plays a minor role early in Gen 21, last appearing in the narrative in 21:9, and in a reported speech in 21:12. The next mention of her is to report her death in Gen 23:1. Here, she is again reactivated without the use of a discourse anchor.

Some noteworthy inferences can be drawn from the encoding decisions made by the writer/editor for Sarah. First, Sarah is reactivated using an anchoring relation after only a span of about 10 verses (i.e. 11:27→12:5). This occurs shortly after her initial activation to the discourse, before she is well established in the reader's mental representation. One finds this to be true of other minor participants such as *Phicol*, the captain of Abimelech's army.¹¹⁵ He is only mentioned twice in the corpus: in Gen 21:22 where he is initially introduced, and in 21:32b where he is reactivated using both a discourse anchor and default referring expression. We would argue that the use of anchoring expressions with both mentions of *Phicol* is due to the fact that he never plays a salient enough role in the narrative to become well-established. His lack of persistence in and salience to the narrative directly impact the participant's activation status.

Rebekah is another example of a minor participant that lapses into inactivity. She is first introduced to the discourse in a genealogy in Gen 22:23; however she is not mentioned again until Gen 24. When she is reactivated in Gen 24:15, the writer/editor uses a two-part anchoring expression. Inclusion of anchoring information at Rebekah's reactivation reflects the writer/editor's judgment that the participant may have lapsed into inactivity in the reader's mental representation. In order to avoid possible ambiguity, the writer supplies the anchoring information. The reactivation in 24:15 is thus default S5 encoding due to the fact that Rebekah has not yet been firmly established in the discourse.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Revell who observes that pronominal reference is reserved for more thematic participants. He also notes that compound designations (i.e. anchored referring expressions) are associated with introduction of a participant 80% of the time in his corpus (1996:79).

A second inference is that the more established a participant becomes in a reader's mental representation, the longer it appears to remain semi-active, allowing for reactivation without the use of a discourse anchor (i.e., context S4/N4). A participant can become established either through playing a salient role in the discourse (e.g. Sarah in Gen 16), or by virtue of its persistence in the discourse. For instance, *Abimelech* becomes established fairly quickly due to his interaction as a major participant with Abraham in Gen 20. Twenty two verses later, he is reactivated in 21:22 without the use of an anchor. The same is true of *Lot*. He is introduced just after Abraham in Gen 11, is merely a prop in chapter 12, but plays a major role in Gen 13. When *Lot* is reactivated in Gen 14:12, anchoring information is included, but syntactically separated from directly modifying his referring expression:

וַיִּקְחוּ אֶת־לוֹט וְאֶת־רְכָשׁוֹ בְּנֶגְדֵי אַבְרָם
וַיֵּלְכוּ
וְהוּא יֹשֵׁב בְּסֹדֹם:

^{12a} *And they took Lot and his goods, the son of the brother of Abram (S1/N4)*

^{12b} *and they went (S1/Ø)*

^{12c} *and he (Lot) was living in Sodom (S3/N4)*

It seems reasonable to construe the additional information describing *Lot* in the verse as being pragmatically motivated for thematic reasons, based on the fact that the anchoring information *does not* directly modify *Lot* as one would have expected for reactivation from inactivity, and based on the short referential distance to the last reference to *Lot*. Such pragmatic uses of anchoring expressions will be covered in more detail in Chapter 6.

To summarize, the cognitive task of contexts S5/N5 is to both identify the intended referent and to re-establish its relation to the discourse in the reader's mental representation. Thus the default encoding for this context is the use of a lexical NP to identify the participant, and the re-establishment of an anchoring relation of the participant to the discourse.

4.4 *Apparent Departures from Expected Encoding Norms*

4.4.1 *Relative Saliency of Participants in Contexts S1/N1 and S3/N3*

In §4.3.3, it was claimed that the default encoding expectation in contexts S3 and N3 is relexicalization using the participant's default referring expression. However, one frequently finds switches of role in this context of Biblical Hebrew narrative using minimal reference. One also observes what appears to be S1/N1 encoding used at times where intervening material concerning other participants separates a minimally encoded clause from its antecedent, theoretically 'breaking' the minimal reference chain. This section will review the typological factors discussed in §2.4 which can provide an explanation for these phenomena of apparently underencoding participants. It will be demonstrated that these apparent exceptions can be reasonably accounted for using secondary default principles. We begin with the issue of relative saliency and 'skipping' less salient participants in context S1/N1.

Section 2.4.3 mentioned Fox’s conclusions regarding the effect of ‘off-line’ material on anaphora resolution in popular English narratives (1987a:164-165). She claimed that “a long gap between mentions of a referent does not necessarily trigger the use of a full NP for the second mention; if the gap does not introduce another character’s plans or actions, but is, rather, concerned with something off the event-line, for example, like describing surrounding scenery or a general truth, then it will not ‘induce’ the use of a full NP” (ibid:163). Based on her data, Fox concluded that the primary factor determining whether events could be ‘skipped over’ with respect to participant reference is whether or not a shift in initiator had occurred, a shift to another participant’s plans or actions.

In light of this principle, consider the encoding observed in Gen 21:29-32a:

וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְיִמֶלֶךְ אֶל-אַבְרָהָם...²⁹
 וַיֹּאמֶר...³⁰
 עַל-כֵּן קָרָא לְמָקוֹם הַהוּא בְּאֵר שָׁבַע^{31a}
 כִּי שָׁם נִשְׁבְּעוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם:^{31b}
 וַיַּכְרְתוּ בְרִית בֵּבְאֵר שָׁבַע³²

²⁹And Abimelech₁ said to Abraham₂... (S3/N3)

³⁰And he₂ said to Ø₁... (S2/N2)

^{31a}On account of this he called the name of the place Beersheba, (S1/N4 or Gen/N4)

^{31b}for there the two of them swore an oath. (S1+/N4)

³²And they made a covenant in Beersheba (S1/N4)

In this example, Abimelech is recovered as one of the 3MS participants for the plural verb of v. 31b. He is last explicitly encoded as the agent of v. 29, and implicitly encoded using zero anaphora as the addressee of v. 30. Abimelech is not mentioned in v. 31a, and the subject of the verb is construed by some as referring to a generic participant rather than Abraham.¹¹⁶ However in v. 31bff, Abraham and Abimelech are referred to using minimal encoding even though at least one of them was not active in the preceding clause. However, Abraham and Abimelech are the only reasonable candidates for being the referents of the plural verbs of vv. 31b and 32.

This example illustrates the kind of pragmatics at work in Biblical Hebrew, where the writer/editor expects the reader to be able to recover the most salient participant(s) last mentioned in order to resolve certain anaphoric references. Such a process is consistent with Fox’s observations regarding ‘skipping’ over non-events which do not involve another participant’s plans or actions. The offline comments that Fox is describing are those which do not advance the storyline of the narrative but instead fill in background information. Based on the data from our corpus, most of these offline comments are located *at the end* of development units¹¹⁷ and thus are prototypically followed by

¹¹⁶ JPS, NIV, NJB, and NRSV all translate the clause using a passive verb in order to render the agent as a generic reference to someone other than Abraham.

¹¹⁷ Chapter 5 will describe the use of overencoding in contexts S1/S2 as a processing device to break the narrative into what have been called ‘development units’ (DUs) by Levinsohn (2000b). Notionally, a development unit represents either a segmentation of the text in contexts with continuity of action, participants and location; or segmentation due to a change in at least one of these three factors.

lexical reference to some participant.¹¹⁸ Alternatively in a few instances, the background comments provide the introductory exposition *at the beginning* of a development unit and the participant persists in the following clause in context S1.¹¹⁹ Based on the typological evidence, we propose that the latter group represents the default encoding pattern for this context. Just as we noted in §4.3.1 that one does not find extended chains of S1 minimal references due to the use of relexicalization in our corpus to delineate new development units, so also here we must factor this phenomenon into our account of offline comments. At face value, the statistical evidence supporting relexicalization being required following offline comments would argue against our proposed default principles. Without a typologically-informed understanding of relexicalization, default encoding principles based on statistical evidence alone could quite possibly misconstrue non-default encoding as default in this case. This issue will be discussed in more detail in chapter 5.

Another example of apparently skipping over non-events is found in Gen 24:30-31.

וַיְהִי | פָּרָאת אֶת־הַנְּזֻם וְאֶת־הַצְּמִידִים עַל־יָדָיו אַחֲתוֹ וּכְשָׁמְעוֹ אֶת־דְּבָרֵי רַבְּקָה אַחֲתוֹ לֵאמֹר כֹּה־דָבַר...
 וַיָּבֹא אֶל־הָאִישׁ
 וַהֲגָה עֹמֵד עַל־הַגְּמְלִים עַל־הָעֵין:
 וַיֹּאמֶר בּוֹא...

^{30a} *And it came about when \emptyset_1 [Laban] saw the rings and bracelets on the hands of his₁ sister, and when he₁ heard the words of Rebekah his₁ sister saying, "Thus he₂ said to me..."* (S1/N4)

^{30b} *he₁ came to the man₂ (S1/N3)*

^{30c} *And behold, \emptyset_2 was standing by the camels by the spring. (S3/N4)*

^{31a} *And \emptyset_1 said to \emptyset_2 , "Come..." (S4/N3)*

‘*Laban*’ is introduced in vv. 29a-b, followed by a statement that he ran out to meet the man (i.e., Abraham’s servant) at the spring in v. 29c. Verse 30 recounts the more specific process by which Laban went to the man at the spring. In the midst of this description is a verbless clause using zero anaphora for the subject, the only such token in our corpus. We find an N3→S3 switch of participants from v. 30b to v. 30c without using any morphological marker to encode the subject. This is followed by a switch from ‘*the man/servant*’ in v. 30c back to ‘*Laban*’ in v. 31a again using minimal reference.

The writer/editor is able to make use of such encoding by virtue of the fact that readers appear to make a cognitive distinction between participants based on saliency, tending to keep the initiating participants in focus in spite of potentially intervening distractions, comparable to what Fox (1987a) has noted in other languages. Thus, the reader is able to inferentially determine that the zero anaphora in v. 30c is referring to Abraham’s servant, a task made easier in light of the content of v. 29c stating he was standing by the spring. Therefore, we analyze the infrequent skipping of participants, as illustrated by Gen 21:31b and 24:30c above, as a secondary default principle for

¹¹⁸ Cf. Gen 12:6b→7a; 13:7b→8a, 13→14; 14:10a→10b; 15:12b→13a; 16:1c→2a; 16:16→17:1; 17:24→25→26; 18:10b-11→12a, 16c→17a, 22b→23a; 19:1b→1c; 21:5→6; 23:2b→2c, 10a→10b, 19b→20a; 24:21→22.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Gen 13:1→2; 18:1b→2a; 24:10c→10d.

context S1/N1. Writers are able to maintain minimal reference in context S1/N1 as long as the clauses which interrupt the reference chain are not of sufficient length or saliency to distract the reader from the primary participant(s). Very few tokens of skipping over less salient participants and maintaining S1 minimal encoding are found in our corpus, due to the fact that most off-line or background comments tend to fall at the boundaries of development units.

There are numerous instances where a background comment is made about a participant, and it is relexicalized in the very next clause even though it is context S1.¹²⁰ It would seem reasonable to infer that such offline comments might serve a structuring role within the discourse. Dooley and Levinsohn note that development markers in Inga are used to “separate the preceding background material from the following new developments (foreground material)” (2001:94). Longacre makes reference to the use of non-event material as a common means of slowing the pace of the narrative just prior to the peak (1985:90). In light of the evidence regarding the use of and encoding around offline or non-event comments from other languages, we will resist the urge to follow the statistical evidence that suggests relexicalization after these comments is the norm, and that minimal encoding is the anomaly. On the contrary, to posit that the minimal encoding tokens represent a secondary default principle is indeed a more elegant description of the data than the alternative of claiming the minimal encoding as somehow marked.

A second context in which participants appear to be underencoded is switch of roles in context S3/N3 without relexicalization. From a theoretical point of view, speakers should be able to utilize minimal encoding for role switches as long as some morphological distinction remains to disambiguate them, e.g. gender, number, etc. (cf. Givón’s discussion of potential interference, 1983a:14). Changes using minimal encoding where a morphological distinction exists account for roughly 24% of the S3/N3 switches in our corpus.¹²¹ However, we also found switches of participants accomplished using minimal reference in contexts where *no morphological distinction exists*, roughly 13% of the switches.¹²² This raises the question of whether morphological difference is really the meaningful distinction allowing these N3→S3 switches, or whether another factor is involved.¹²³

In the S3 discourse contexts we have described thus far, we have proposed that a lexical NP is required in order for active participants to unambiguously achieve role switches. The common characteristic of these situations is the fact that there is more than one possible participant that might be the intended referent: either there are more than two participants on stage, or there are only two

¹²⁰ Cf. Gen 12:4c→5a; 14:13d→14a; 16:16→17:1; 18:22→23; 19:1b→1c; 23:1→2, 10a→10b; 24:15→16, 22→22, 29b→c, 62b→63a.

¹²¹ For tokens where a masculine/feminine distinction is exploited for an unambiguous null switch, cf. Gen 19:33d, 35d, 37c, 38c; 21:14e, 19b; 21:14e, 19b; 23:2b; 24:18b, 67a, 67c, 67d; 25:1c. For tokens where a singular/plural distinction is exploited, cf. Gen 18:8d; 19:3b, 3d, 3f, 16a; 21:33.

¹²² For tokens of N3→S3 role changes from our corpus using minimal encoding in the absence of morphological distinctions, cf. Gen 18:1b; 19:11b; 21:20b; 24:30d, 31a, 32b, 33b; 25:3a, 3b.

¹²³ Cf. Talstra (1997:98f) for comments on the difficulty his database faced in tracking changes of participants in what appear to be S3/N3 switches.

and the semantics of the context do not make it clear that a switch in roles has occurred. Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:97-98) use the terms ‘closed’ and ‘open’ to distinguish between reported speech contexts where a minimally encoded switch may occur versus those where it may not occur. The ‘closed’ context allows for unambiguous role switches due to the limited number of anaphoric options available to the reader.

We find a similar type of minimally encoded switch of participant roles in our corpus, most typically involving a change from context $Nx \rightarrow S3$, where the patient of the preceding clause becomes the agent of the following clause. The common characteristic of these minimally encoded role switches was the narrow number of possible referents available to resolve the anaphor. There was either a clear initiator interacting with a minor participant or prop, or alternatively the semantics of the verb clearly create the expectation of a change in the participant’s role. Due to the relatively small number of instances where such minimally encoded switches are observed in comparison to the much larger number of contexts where such encoding could have potentially been used but was not, we have chosen to describe these minimally encoded role switches as reflecting a secondary default encoding principle. Let us now consider several examples of this kind of encoding.

One of the primary discourse contexts where $Nx \rightarrow S3$ switches are regularly observed in our corpus is in naming sequences, the two-step process of predicating the existence of a participant in one clause and then assigning a referring expression in the next. As examples of a minimally-encoded switch during a two-step activation sequence, consider the following:

Gen 16:1

וְשָׂרַי אֵשֶׁת אַבְרָם לֹא יָלְדָה לוֹ וְלֵאָה שִׁפְחָה מִצְרִית וְשָׂמָה הָגָר:

And Sarai₁, Abram’s wife (S5), had not born children. She₁ (S1) had an Egyptian handmaid₂ (INT) and her₂ (S3) name was Hagar.

1 Sam 9:2a

וְלִוְיָהוּא בֶן וְשָׂמוּ שְׂאוּל בְּחֹר וְטוֹב...

And he₁ [Kish] (S1) had a son₂ (INT) and his₂ (S3) name was Saul, young and handsome...

1 Sam 17:12a

וְדָוִד בֶּן-אִישׁ אֶפְרַתִּי הָיָה מִבֵּית לָחֶם יְהוּדָה וְשָׂמוּ יֵשׁוּי...

And David₁ (S4) was the son of this Ephraimite₂ (N4) from Bethlehem in Judah, and his₂ (S3) name was Jesse.

Here we observe $Nx \rightarrow S3$ switches achieved rather unambiguously based on the cognitive expectations of the context. In each of the tokens, the introduction of a participant in the first clause, immediately followed by the assigning of a name,¹²⁴ requires the reader to pragmatically bootstrap the switch based on the expectation that the name is being assigned to the patient from the previous

¹²⁴ Other naming examples exhibiting minimally encoded switches are Gen 4:17; 24:29; 29:16; and Ruth 2:1, however a morphological distinction exists there.

clause. These examples illustrate how the Biblical Hebrew writers appear to rely upon the semantic expectations of the naming process to guide the reader in resolving the anaphor.

We not only observe minimally encoded S3/N3 switches in the context of naming, but also closed contexts where inferences drawn from the semantic content of the verbs lead the reader to conclude that a switch of roles has occurred. Consider the following changes achieved using minimal encoding in Gen 16:6-7.

וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָם אֶל־שָׂרַי הֲנִי שֹׁפְחָתְךָ בְיָדְךָ עֲשִׂי־לִי הַטּוֹב בְּעֵינַיִךְ ^{6a}
 וְתַעֲנֵנִי שָׂרַי ^{6b}
 וְתִבְרַח מִפְּנֵיהָ: ^{6c}
 וַיִּמְצָאָהּ מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה עַל־עַיִן הַמַּיִם בַּמִּדְבָּר ^{7a}

^{6a}And Abram (S2) said to Sarai₁ (N2), “Behold your handmaid₂ is in your hand, do to her what is good in your eyes.”

^{6b}And Sarai₁ (S2) afflicted her₂ (N3),

^{6c}And she₂ (S3) fled from her₁ (N3).

^{7a}The angel of the LORD (S4) found her₂ (N3) by the well of water in the wilderness...

In the narrative of Gen 16, Sarah is the primary initiator, Abraham largely responds to her, and Hagar functions largely as a prop, an important yet non-initiating participant. Hagar is able to be unambiguously referred to in v. 6b as the patient using a clitic pronoun since one of the two possible 3FS participants has already been identified as the agent of the clause, and based on the cognitive expectations established in the reported speech of v. 6a that Hagar is in Sarah’s power. Thus the reader is rather easily able to determine the recipient of Sarah’s affliction both by process of elimination and the expectations of the discourse context. Verse 6c continues to rely on these factors by achieving an S3/N3 switch of participants using minimal encoding for both agent and patient. A logical reaction to affliction is to flee from it; therefore it would be counterintuitive to expect Sarah to flee under the circumstances. Thus the reader is able to infer that Hagar has fled from Sarah.

Yet another S3→N3 switch is achieved in v. 7a by Hagar shifting from being the agent of v. 6c to being the patient of v. 7a. Once again inferences from the discourse context are relied upon to resolve the anaphoric reference to the 3FS participant. Based on the assumption that it is indeed Hagar that has fled from Sarah, it follows that Hagar would be the one found by the well, not Sarah. Any potential confusion that may have resulted from these minimally encoded switches is removed by the angel of the LORD addressing Hagar, not Sarah, in his speech of v. 8.

To summarize the encoding observed in our corpus in context S3/N3, minimally encoded switches are indeed attested, but only in *closed* contexts, i.e. where there is a clear initiator, or where inferences drawn from the semantics of the verb remove possible confusion about the switch of roles. In the vast majority of these cases of minimally encoded switches, we find a major participant is interacting with a minor one, where the reader is able to rather easily draw inferences regarding resolution of the anaphoric references. Though some of these minimally encoded switches do open the door for a limited degree of ambiguity, it is prototypically resolved within a clause or two through

the use of a lexical NP, as noted in Gen 16:8a above.¹²⁵ Thus in closed contexts with a clearly defined initiator, role switches are observed using minimal encoding only 13% of the time without a morphological distinction to guide the reader and roughly 24% of the time with a morphological distinction.

The descriptions of contexts S3 and N3 are intended to cover prototypically open contexts, i.e. where the reader is not able to clearly infer the intended referent of the anaphor. The lack of a clearly inferable referent can result from more than two participants interacting together, more than one participant initiating (i.e. there are switches in initiators), or when one member of a group of participants needs to be specified.¹²⁶ Default encoding of participants in such open contexts is relexicalization. The use of a lexical NP accomplishes the cognitive task of identifying the intended referent from among the currently active possibilities, and should not be construed as reactivation from inactivity. Based on the Q- and I-principles mentioned in §2.5.4, the expected referring expression to be used in such contexts is the most informative and morphologically simplex option available, viz. the default referring expression. The addition of any anchoring information in context S3/N3 will thus be construed as overspecified and thus pragmatically marked.

As stated in §4.4.1, there is a demonstrable cross-linguistic distinction made in many languages between major and minor participants, which is reflected in the encoding of participants.¹²⁷ In contexts where there is an established initiator, Biblical Hebrew appears to allow role switches between participants in certain S3/N3 contexts, even though such switches are morphologically ambiguous. Readers cognitively track the more salient participant as either the initiator of action or the protagonist of the narrative, based on the semantics of the context.¹²⁸ Such a claim is bolstered by

¹²⁵ For a stark exception to this, cf. Exod 4:24 and who YHWH was trying to kill. The ambiguity of this passage appears to be either a case of intentional ambiguity, or alternatively corruption of the text.

¹²⁶ There seem to be essentially competing interests at work in contexts S3 and N3. We have noted in §2.4.3 that discourses are typically broken into smaller ‘development units’ (i.e. chunks) based on their structural organization. We also noted several claims that Biblical Hebrew narrative utilizes overencoding of active participants to signal the beginning of a new development. Contexts such as a switch of initiators would be logical candidates for beginning a new development, i.e. relexicalizing an active participant. This raises the question: Is relexicalization indeed the default encoding for context -3, or is minimal encoding the default which is obscured by the frequent relexicalization of active participants at the beginning of new development units? Based on the data analyzed from our corpus, there are not sufficient grounds to support the latter option of minimal encoding as default for S3/N3. There are too few instances of underencoding without a morphological distinction to merit describing -3 default encoding as anything other than relexicalization. Furthermore, the cross-linguistic data support our description of the minimal encoding observed in this context as being possible due to the constraints of the closed context.

¹²⁷ Cf. Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:120) who state that many languages have distinct means of introducing major participants, such as the indefinite determiner ‘this’ or ‘a certain’. Cf. Hopper and Thompson (1984:719).

¹²⁸ Cf. Dooley and Levinsohn’s discussion of VIPs, or ‘Very Important Participants’ (2001:119-124). They have found that languages tend to under encode the single, central participant in a narrative. We have not found this to be the case in our corpus, but preliminary work in Exodus 1-12 betrays an apparent underencoding of Moses at some points. However, overencoding of participants for processing or pragmatic purposes could theoretically offset this VIP underencoding in Biblical Hebrew narrative. More data would need to be analyzed to provide clarification of this issue. Revell appears to observe VIP-like underencoding stating, “This second style [i.e. underencoding, SER] dominates where the narrator concentrates on a single character, as in the stories of Samson, Elijah, and Elisha” (1996:65n). These may be examples of Levinsohn’s VIP strategy. Examples of

the literature cited in 4.4.1. Additionally, Nariyama (2000) has claimed that minimal encoding (zero anaphora in the case of Japanese) should be construed as an indication of ‘+continuity’, ostensibly as a corollary to the use redundant relexicalization as an indicator of ‘-continuity’, viz. segmentation of the text into development units (cf. Chapter 5). Nariyama’s claim would suggest a possible rationale for underencoding some S3/N3 switches to build greater continuity even at the risk of creating ambiguity. Only a handful of these switches between major and minor participants are accomplished using minimal encoding, and 2/3 of these underencoded changes from our corpus manifest some kind of morphological distinction.

4.4.2 The Requirements of Information Structure and Other Syntactic Constructions

Default encoding values are not only impacted by the relative saliency of participants, but also by the syntactic constraints of Biblical Hebrew. Minimal encoding values for participants in our corpus prototypically consist of bound morphological forms. Thus, a writer is unable to prepose or postpose such forms to pragmatically structure the information of the utterance due to the constraints of bound pronominal forms. This section will elaborate on the changes to default encoding that result from utilizing various pragmatic constructions in a context where minimal encoding is expected, beginning with information structure.

As stated in §2.3, Biblical Hebrew utilizes changes in constituent order to pragmatically mark constituents. In order to prepose a constituent, an independent morphological form must be used, since subject agreement is inseparable from finite verbs. Thus, the minimal morphological form available for preposing in Biblical Hebrew is the independent pronoun. We stated in §2.3.3 that PoDs “provide a marked, pragmatic means of highlighting discontinuity”. Since PoDs are typically used in discontinuous contexts,¹²⁹ we have only one instance of a referential PoD in narrative proper¹³⁰ using a movable pronominal form in our corpus: Gen 14:3:

potentially ambiguous encoding cited by Revell are: Jdg 15:19 ‘he drank, 2 Kgs 1:5 ‘to him’; 2 Kgs 1:11, 13 ‘he (sent) again’; 2 Kgs 4:31 ‘to meet him’; 2 Kgs 4:36 ‘he called’. Cf. also 1 Sam 4:18 ‘He fell’; 13:2 ‘he sent’; 1 Kgs 22:19 ‘he said’; 1 Sam 1:19 ‘they got up’; 1:25 ‘they sacrificed’; 26:12 ‘all of them’; 26:13 ‘between them’; and 1 Sam 10:21-23 with plural verbs.

¹²⁹ Cf. Levinsohn’s (2000a:12-13) discussion of what he calls PoDs by renewal, whereby an additional statement may be made about an active participant. PoDs by renewal are a means of adding prominence to that comment.

¹³⁰ For examples of the use of movable pronominal forms to indicate use of marked information structures in reported speeches, cf. Gen 12:12 and 17:9a:

וְהָיָה כִּי־יִרְאוּ אֶתְךָ הַמִּצְרַיִם וְאָמְרוּ אֲשֶׁתוֹ זֹאת וְהָרְגוּ אֹתִי וְאַתָּה יְחִיִּי:

^{12:12} *And it will happen when the Egyptians see you, they will say, “His wife this is”. They will kill me, but you they will let live.*

וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים אֶל־אַבְרָהָם וְאַתָּה אֶת־בְּרִיתִי תִשְׁמֹר

^{17:9a} *And God said to Abraham, “You my covenant shall keep.”*

In both of these examples, the independent pronoun is semantically redundant, but required in order to indicate a switch in the order of constituents from the default order.

כָּל־אֱלֹהֵי חִבְרוֹן אֶל־עֵמֶק הַשְּׂדִימִים הוּא יָם הַמֶּלַח:

All of these joined together in the valley of Siddim, which is the Sea of Salt.

The referential PoD in v. 3 is utilized to summarize the five kings introduced as patients in v. 2, and to switch to them as agents of v. 3. This switch is clarified in 14:4, which states the five kings served Chedorlaomer twelve years, and is encoded using default encoding for context S1.

The majority of referential PoDs in the narrative proper of our corpus either provide a marked introduction of a minor participant,¹³¹ or a marked switch to an active participant.¹³² Thus full NPs are the most common morphological form observed for referential PoDs in our corpus based on the encoding requirements of the discourse contexts in which they occur. Gen 13:12-14 provides a prototypical display of the use of marked switches of participants using PoDs.

אֲבְרָם יָשָׁב בְּאֶרֶץ־כְּנָעַן
וְלוֹט יָשָׁב בְּעָרֵי הַפְּזָר
וַיֵּאָהֵל עַד־סְדֹם:
וְאֲנָשֵׁי סְדֹם רָעִים וְחַטָּאִים...
וַיְהוָה אָמַר אֶל־אֲבְרָם...

^{12a} *Abram lived in the land of Canaan. (S3)*

^{12b} *And Lot lived in the cities of the valley (S4)*

^{12c} *and he moved his tent as far as Sodom. (S1)*

¹³ *and the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners... (S4)*

^{14a} *and the LORD said to Abram... (S4)*

This quotation comes from the end of the pericope where Abraham and Lot separate from one another. Verse 11c recounts the state of affairs, ‘each man separated from his relative’, and thus relexicalization is required to identify which participant is the agent of v. 12a. The referential PoDs provide clear switches of agents, and add the overlay of contrast between the participants;¹³³ the referential PoD introducing YHWH provides another marked switch.¹³⁴

To summarize, while some of the encoding observed in context S1 appears to undermine our claims regarding default encoding expectations outlined in §4.3.1, these departures can be accounted for by recalling the syntactic constraints of information structure, and the need for a movable morphological member. Furthermore, the use of referential PoDs to create a pragmatically marked discontinuity also explains the fairly rare use of personal pronouns in these constructions. Referential PoDs are predominately used in Biblical Hebrew narrative for marked introductions of minor participants, or for marked switches among participants, i.e., contexts which are inherently discontinuous.

Another factor affecting minimum encoding is the transition from singular to compound agents or patients and the creation of dislocation constructions. Biblical Hebrew has several syntactic

¹³¹ Cf. Gen 14:10 (‘the survivors’), 18 (‘Melchizedek’); and 19:4a (‘the men of Sodom’).

¹³² Cf. Gen 12:16a; 17:26b; 19:11a; 25:3b.

¹³³ Cf. Floor 2004:78.

¹³⁴ Cf. discussion of overencoding of participants for the purpose of cataphoric highlighting in chapter 6 below. Von Rad (1972) comments regarding v. 14, “Here the narrative as a whole (vs. 1-17) reaches its climax.”

constructions which necessitate use of non-default encoding for active participants. The first is the use of a compound subject wherein one of the subjects is already active. The second is what has traditionally been referred to as *pendens constructions*, or more recently as left and right dislocations. These constructions are used to either activate or reactivate accessible participants. Van der Merwe et al. state, “A dislocation construction consists of a grammatical element, isolated to the left or the right of the CLAUSE (the dislocated CONSTITUENT), and a main clause containing an element (the RESUMPTIVE) that refers to the dislocated constituent” (2000:357). It is beyond the scope of our study to provide a thorough treatment of dislocation constructions, and so would refer the reader to Creason (1993) and Michel (1997a, 1997b). These compound and dislocation constructions do impinge upon our default principles for encoding participants similarly to information structure in that they offer apparent evidence contradicting our claims regarding default encoding values unless the syntactic constraints of the constructions are taken into account.

The left dislocation construction is generally used in our corpus to activate an accessible participant in a single step so that the dislocated constituent may serve as a topic of the nuclear clause. Left dislocations are only attested in the reported speeches of our corpus and thus are technically outside the scope of our study. We provide an example to illustrate the encoding constraint added to a clause when a left dislocation construction is used. Consider its use to activate Eliezer in the speech of Gen 15:2b:

וְאֵנֹכִי הוֹלֵךְ עֲרִירִי וּבְנֵי-מִשְׁקַב בֵּיתִי הוּא דַמְשֶׁק אֱלִיעֶזֶר:

I am going childless, and the son of the acquisition of my house, he is the Damascene Eliezer.

Eliezer has not been mentioned in the discourse before, yet is accessible based on the description provided. The underlined phrase serves to activate the referent ‘the son of acquisition of my house’ without identifying who it is. The nuclear clause provides the answer to the identity of this referent using an argument focus construction. The resumption of the dislocated phrase is the pronominal element הוּא, which anaphorically ‘resumes’ the dislocated topic in the main clause. The other attested tokens from the speeches of our corpus follow a similar pattern, activating an accessible topic in order to make a comment about it in the nuclear clause.¹³⁵

Right dislocation and compound subject constructions also manifest what at first glance appears to be non-default encoding, and are attested in the narrative portion of our corpus. From the standpoint of participant reference, these constructions are prototypically used to update the participants that are currently ‘onstage’ in contexts where only one has been in the spotlight.¹³⁶ These constructions require use of movable morphological markers to encode the arguments such as independent personal pronouns (IPPs) and lexical NPs to encode the active participants rather than

¹³⁵ Cf. Gen 14:24, 15:2b, 4b; 17:12b, 14a; 23:11a, 15a; 24:7a, 43b.

¹³⁶ Cf. Gen 13:1a; 14:5; 17:9. For examples from Genesis outside of our corpus, cf. Gen 7:7, 13(-14); 8:18; 33:1c; 35:6; 38:12d; 50:14, 22.

simple subject agreement. Consider the use of IPPs in the following examples of right dislocations, indicated by the highlighted text:

Gen 14:15

וַיַּחַלֵּק עֲלֵיהֶם | לַיְלָה הוּא וְעַבְדָּיו וַיִּכֶם וַיִּרְדְּפֵם עַד־חֹזֶה...

^{14:15} *And he divided against them at night, he and his servants, and he struck them and pursued them as far as Hobah...*

Verse 14 informs the reader that when Abraham heard of Lot's capture by the Canaanite kings, he gathered 318 of his trained men and pursued the kings as far as Dan. The right dislocation construction functions to inform the reader that Abraham still has his servants with him, even though the verbs of vv. 14-15 are singular rather than plural, likely to maintain the center of attention on Abraham as opposed to the whole group of men.

Genesis 19:30 utilizes both a right dislocation and a compound subject in the same clause to reiterate Lot's daughters just prior to a shift in their discourse role from props to initiating participants.

Gen 19:30

וַיַּעַל לֹט מִצּוֹעַר וַיָּשָׁב בְּהָר וּשְׁתֵי בָנָתָיו עִמּוֹ כִּי יָרָא לְשֵׁבֶת בְּצוֹעַר וַיָּשָׁב בְּמַעְרָה הוּא וּשְׁתֵי בָנָתָיו:

^{19:30} *And Lot went up from Zoar and he lived in the hills, and his two daughters with him; for he was afraid to live in Zoar. And he lived in a cave, he and his two daughters.*

Up to this point in the story of Lot's rescue from Sodom, his family members have functioned as props and not as major participants. The very next chunk of the narrative recounts how Lot's daughters dupe him into impregnating them, and thus it is very important for the reader to understand that the daughters remain in Lot's company even though the spotlight has been on him alone. This example shows two different means of accomplishing the reiteration of multiple participants. The first is to use a right dislocation that specifies that his daughters are 'with him'. The second is to use a compound subject to reiterate that both Lot and his daughters lived in the cave, even though a singular form of the verb was used in both instances. Both the compound subject with a singular verb and the right dislocation require the use of an additional pronominal form to refer to an active participant in order to achieve the syntactical construction.

Another example of a compound subject involving an active participant is found in Gen 24:54.

Gen 24:54

וַיֵּאכְלוּ וַיִּישָׁתוּ הוּא וְהָאֲנָשִׁים אֲשֶׁר־עִמּוֹ וַיִּלְינוּ וַיִּקְוּמוּ בַבֶּקֶר...

^{24:54} *And they ate and drank, he and the men who were with him, and they spent the night and they arose in the morning...*

In this final example, Abraham's servant is the agent of the clauses in v. 53. He continues in the role of agent in v. 54 with the men that came with him being added to the agent role (i.e. context 'S1+'). The fact that Abraham's servant is continuing in the S1 context accounts for the use of the pronoun,

the need to add others to the agent role accounts for the lexical NP modified by the restrictive relative clause. It is interesting to note that the writer places this compound subject *after* the second verb וַיִּשְׂתֵּי rather than after the first. By delaying the specification of the second agent referent until after the second verb, the pragmatic effect is to compound the verbs into one complex clause of eating and drinking, forcing the subject to play what Andersen (1994) refers to as ‘retroactive double duty’.¹³⁷ This example illustrates the use of an IPP in context ‘S1+’ in order to specify that other participants besides the one already active are being added to the agent role.

These examples have illustrated the impact that adding participants to the agent role can have in regard to the default encoding requirements of active participants. An important point needs to be made regarding compound subjects, viz. the use of singular versus plural verbs and continuing reference. In the case of right dislocations and compound subjects, use of a singular verb both in the initial clause and those that follow allow the writer to update who else is on stage besides the active participant *while maintaining the spotlight on a single, salient individual*. We know this based on the fact that in passages such as Gen 14:15a where a singular verb is used to encode Abraham and the dislocated agents, the writer continues to use a singular verb in vv. 15bff without ambiguity about who the agent is. No relexicalization is required to specify that Abraham continues as the agent.

However, if the single agent that is compounded with others is the subject of a *plural* verb and continues in the plural in subsequent clauses, relexicalization is required to return to a single participant. Levinsohn notes that while participants can be joined together into a plural subject using minimal encoding, the reverse is not true (2000a:139). Based on the provisos outlined §4.3.4 and §4.4.1, switching back to an initial individual would be analyzed as context S3 and therefore will prototypically necessitate the use of a lexical NP to disambiguate which member of the group is the intended referent.¹³⁸ Thus, the mention of primary and secondary referents using a singular verb, whether as a compound subject or in a right dislocation construction, seems to serve the discourse function of updating the reader’s mental representation and ensuring that all of the intended participants remain mentally on stage, all the while maintaining attention on a salient primary participant. Return to a single participant following the use of a plural verb for continued reference to a compound subject, should be construed as context S3 and thus follow the encoding patterns described for this context.

¹³⁷ One finds similar pragmatic compounding in the case of the collocation וַתַּהַר וַתֵּלֶד ‘and she conceived and bore...’ In Gen 21:2, the subject referent of both verbs is only specified following the second verb which we analyze as context S3. The accenting by the Masoretes would tend to confirm such a reading.

¹³⁸ E.g. in Gen 42:35b, which states that Joseph’s brothers and their father are afraid when they see the money in the mouth of the sacks, both verbs in the clause are plural using a plural verb. Jacob has been added to the ‘group’ of his sons, therefore we construe the relexicalization of Jacob in v. 36 as default S3 encoding to return to Jacob as the sole agent. In the case of Gen 24:54, we would also construe the resumption of Abraham’s servant as the sole agent in Gen 24:54d as S3, however due to the fact that ‘the men with him’ are simply a prop and the servant is the salient initiator, the writer is able to use minimal encoding based on the criteria described in §4.4.1.

Even though left and right dislocations serve very different discourse purposes, the encoding constraints required by these syntactic constructions are similar, viz. a movable pronominal element is prototypically used to resume the dislocated constituent within the nuclear clause either as a referential PoD¹³⁹ or in the default pronominal position immediately following the predicate.¹⁴⁰ Creating a compound subject involving an already active participant also requires a departure from expected minimal encoding in context S1. The point to be made here is that dislocation constructions and certain compound subjects represent yet another discourse situation which at first glance appears to contradict our description of default encoding. Once the syntactical constraints of these constructions are taken into account, their encoding can be accounted for by secondary default encoding principles for active participants.

4.5 Conclusion

In this chapter we have defined the various encoding contexts found in Biblical Hebrew narrative, as well as the default encoding forms expected in each. In contexts S1/N1 and S2/N2 where participants are active, cognitive expectations allow for simple subject agreement to be used for encoding participants. Contexts S3/N3 and S4/N4 require use of a lexical NP in order to counter the S1 or S2 cognitive expectation associated with minimal encoding. Context S5/N5 requires the use of both a lexical NP to identify the participant as well as the specification of an anchoring relation to guide the reader in how to relate the participant to the discourse. We have also discussed the morphological constraints the use of certain syntactic constructions place on the default reference to active participants, viz. a movable morphological form is needed for referential PoDs, for preposing of focal constituents, for compounding of certain subjects, as well as for the creation of dislocation constructions. These encoding values are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. Summary of Default Encoding Values for Narrative Contexts

	Discourse Context	Cognitive Task	Default Encoding
INT	Initial introduction of a brand new participant.	Introducing and anchoring the participant in the reader's mental representation of the discourse, and assigning a primary referring expression.	Lexical NP + Anchoring relation
S1/N1	Continuing reference to active participants following a clause in narrative proper, i.e. continuity of agent and patient roles.	Indicating continuity of agent or patient in same roles as the preceding narrative clause.	Minimal Encoding

¹³⁹ Cf. Gen 14:24; 15:4; 17:12-13; 24:7.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Gen 15:2; 23:11; 23:15; 24:43; 37:30 (2x).

S2/N2	Continuing reference to active participants following a quotative frame, i.e. role change of speaker and hearer.	Indicating switch of roles for speaker or hearer from the preceding quotative frame.	Minimal Encoding
S3/N3	Continuing reference involving role change following a clause in narrative proper, i.e. the disambiguation of active participants	Differentiating a referent that was active in the preceding narrative clause following a change in roles.	Lexical NP
S4/N4	Reactivation of semi-active participants not involved in the previous clause.	Moving the reader from <i>knowing</i> about to <i>thinking</i> about a referent that is either accessible or recently active in the discourse.	Lexical NP
S5/N5	Reactivation of inactive participants from the discourse register	Identifying the intended referent as well as re-establishing its relation to the discourse in the reader's mental representation.	Lexical NP + Anchoring relation

Now that we have defined the various encoding contexts found in our corpus, and described the default encoding expected for each, we have a useful canon in place against which to both identify and describe non-default encoding observed in our corpus. Our canon describes the tasks that are accomplished in each discourse context. The objective of this dissertation is to describe the encoding of participants within our corpus as completely as possible. Establishing default encoding values provides a framework that offers a reasonable explanation for the majority of encoding data from our corpus. However, a number of tokens observed in our corpus utilize more encoding than is semantically required. Based on the theoretical framework we have established in Chapter 2, we construe this overencoding as marked, i.e. as communicating the presence of some linguistic feature that use of default encoding would not have communicated.

The remaining chapters will utilize the description of default encoding established in this chapter as the basis for describing the marked functions of participant reference. Based on this understanding, we will describe the marked encodings found in each discourse context as intending to communicate or mark some function other than that communicated by default encoding. We will begin our consideration of marked overencoding with those tokens which are used to accomplish the processing function of participant reference in Chapter 5, followed in Chapter 6 by the consideration of overencoding used to accomplish discourse-pragmatic functions.

5. Marked Encoding of Subjects—The Processing Function

We stated at the end of Chapter 4 that our description of default encoding of participants in Biblical Hebrew narrative is able to account for a large portion of the attested encoding data from our corpus. However, a number of overencoded tokens remain unaccounted for based on default encoding expectations. In §2.4.3 we note the use of overencoding participants in many languages to segment the discourse into chunks. This segmentation facilitates the cognitive processing of the text by readers. It is our contention that a portion of the remaining, overencoded data can be accounted for as serving a processing function. Previous research has preliminarily shown that some overencoding of participants indeed achieves a processing function in Biblical Hebrew narrative (cf. §3.5). Our attention will focus on the overencoding of participants using redundant lexical NPs in subject contexts where minimal encoding is expected. It will be shown that many of these redundant NPs function as pragmatic markers to guide the reader in the segmentation of the discourse into discrete development units for easier cognitive processing of the text. We will begin our discussion by reviewing our theoretical frame of reference for construing such overencoding of participants in narrative contexts as pragmatically segmenting the text. Next, we will briefly review the work of Heimerdinger (1999) and Levinsohn (2000b) on the subject before turning to the data from our corpus.

The main body of the chapter will discuss redundant encoding of participants both following narrative proper (Context S1) and following quotative frames (Context S2). We will first cover the overencoding of participants in context S1, where minimal reference is expected (§5.1). Next, consideration will be given to relexicalization of participants in S3 contexts where switches are made between major and minor participants or where a clear morphological distinction exists (e.g., masculine/feminine, singular/plural, cf. §5.2). Finally, we will describe the use of redundant relexicalization in context S2 (§5.3). Consideration will be given to various Bible translations and how they represent these redundant NPs. These varied representations seem to offer tacit corroboration that such overencoding is prototypically perceived by readers as signaling a new development.

It is necessary to recall several points made in Chapter 2 in order to develop the theoretical framework for this chapter. First, recall Givón's 'Iconicity Principle' which states: "The more disruptive, surprising, discontinuous or hard to process a topic is, the more coding material must be assigned to it" (1983a:18). Writers or speakers prototypically provide more participant reference encoding in discontinuous or difficult stretches of discourse in order to assure proper tracking of participants.

Second, recall Dooley and Levinsohn's (2001:112) three purposes of participant reference from §2.4.1: semantic, processing, and discourse pragmatic. Evidence was presented in §2.4.3 that

participant reference is indeed used in many languages to segment discourse, enabling hearers to better process texts and to formulate accurate mental representations.¹⁴¹

Third, recall that Dooley and Levinsohn's three functions of participant reference were formulated into an entailment hierarchy of participant reference resolution based upon Grice (1981), Levinson (1985), and Huang (2000), proposed in §2.5.4 and repeated here for convenience sake.

(26) Entailment hierarchy for cognitive processing of marked referring expressions

Semantic → Processing → Pragmatic

These principles provide the theoretical framework for our proposal that many of the redundant NPs observed in Contexts S1 and S2 in our corpus can be reasonably explained as linguistic markers of new developments in the discourse. These *development markers*¹⁴² pragmatically serve to segment the text into what we shall call 'development units' (DUs) which segment the discourse into manageable cognitive chunks for the reader to process.

Research in the areas of psychology and cognitive linguistics has confirmed that hearers in many languages cognitively associate redundant NPs with the marking of a new mental segment of the discourse (cf. Andersen et al. 1983; Gordon et al. 1993; Vonk et al. 1992; van Vliet 2002). While a redundant NP still serves a semantic function, the fact that it reflects an 'optional' overencoding leads the reader to assume some marked function is intended *other* than the expected semantic one. The cognitive research supports the view that *processing* is most likely the next hierarchical option for interpreting overencoded references to participants. With our framework in place, we will now briefly review the conclusions reached by Heimerdinger (1999) and Levinsohn (2000b) regarding the use of participant reference as a processing tool in Biblical Hebrew narrative.

5.1 Studies of the Processing Function in Biblical Hebrew

Heimerdinger and Levinsohn each conducted an analysis of participant reference in Gen 22. Heimerdinger's goal was to apply Tomlin's (1987) model for tracing topicality of participants. He ran into difficulties in his analysis, however. First, he gives no consideration to the use of zero anaphora to encode active patients (cf. §4.3.1), skewing the numeric topicality values he seeks to establish for each participant. Second, his model is unable to account for the repeated use of redundant NPs to refer to 'Abraham', the most topical participant; this is based on the fact that his model asserts that the most topical participant tends to be encoded using minimal forms. He states,

¹⁴¹ Cf. Fox (1987a, 1987b) for evidence from English regarding the use of redundant NPs to signal the beginning of new 'discourse units'. Cf. Stirling (2001:14-20) and Huang (2000:293) for typological affirmation of Fox's findings from switch reference languages whereby speakers use DS markers in SS contexts to mark new development units analogous to the use of redundant NPs in look-back strategy languages such as English or Biblical Hebrew.

¹⁴² A developmental marker "constrains the material with which it is associated to be interpreted as a new step or development in the author's story or argument" (Levinsohn 2000a:293).

“This [redundant encoding, SER] seems to go against the principle [of using minimal forms, SER] mentioned above as throughout the story *Abraham* is the main participant on stage and so is highly accessible. It could be argued that these clauses are episode initial: they start a new scene or open a new burst of closely related actions and so they function as reaffirming the topic for a new episode. But this explanation is not satisfactory in the light of what can be observed in other stories” (1999:124).

One of the other stories Heimerdinger cites as a counter-example is 1 Kgs 22:52-2 Kgs 1:18. He observes that Ahaziah is minimally encoded even though a number of other participants are involved in the passage. Heimerdinger comments, “In spite of these factors which normally encourage a stronger linguistic coding of the referent, all the twelve narrative verbs in the story with the participant *Ahaziah* as S[ubject] use the clitic pronoun. This is in stark contrast with Gen 22. The main participant *Abraham* is strongly attended to and is quite accessible and so should not require strong activation by massive coding. But this is in fact what happens” (1999:125). Following the analysis of Jacob Licht, Heimerdinger concludes that the underencoding of Ahaziah must be intended to highlight to Elijah and his prophecy in 1 Kgs 1. A few comments are in order.

In the case of Gen 22, Abraham is the sole initiator in the context, and as a result is agent of the majority of the clauses. In such a context of relative continuity, redundant NPs are the most economical linguistic means available to segment the text. There are essentially no natural breaks, such as those associated with switches in initiators. The situation in 1 Kgs 22:52-2 Kgs 1:18 is radically different. First of all, both Ahaziah and Elijah alternate as initiators.¹⁴³ Based on the fact that Elijah plays a much more salient role in these books than Ahaziah, one would expect that *he* would be the participant that would be under encoded. Based on the encoding data, we would follow Levinsohn (2002) in proposing that Ahaziah is functioning as a local VIP in the context; if this is true, it makes perfect sense to under encode him as a means of countering the expectation that this story is about Elijah.¹⁴⁴ Elijah is indeed significantly involved in the story. However, the pragmatics of the encoding indicate that the writer has chosen to place the spotlight on *Ahaziah*, not Elijah. Secondly, in evaluating the encoding used to refer to Ahaziah, only two clauses are flagrantly underencoded, 2 Kgs 1:11a and 13a. We would suggest that this flaunting of the encoding minimums is intended to highlight that Ahaziah is clearly the under-encoded VIP, not Elijah. Default encoding is used to encode Elijah throughout this passage.

¹⁴³ Cf. 1 Kgs 22:45; 2 Kgs 1:2, 5b-9a, 11a-b, 13a-b, where Ahaziah is the primary initiator, compared to 2 Kgs 1:4b, 10, 12, 15b-16, where Elijah is the initiator.

¹⁴⁴ Levinsohn (2002) comments “Heimerdinger’s claim that more encoding implies more salience goes against the long-recognized finding that references to the *VIP* (the most salient topical participant in a narrative) tend to be *less* than for other participants. This point has been made by a number of authors, including Perrin (1978:110), Marchese (1984) and, for references to Jesus in the Gospels, Levinsohn (2000a:143-45). See also the absence of overt reference to King Ahaziah in 2 Kings 1:2-17 (discussed on pp. 124-25), which is entirely consistent with Ahaziah being the ‘main topical participant’ of a passage in the book of Kings!”

In the end, Heimerdinger’s account of these two sample passages does more to undermine his argument rather than to confirm it. On the one hand, his intuitive conclusion regarding the redundant NPs functioning as development markers in Gen 22 fits well with cross-linguistic data, yet he rejects this conclusion as counter-intuitive. On the other hand, he rejects his principle of ‘the most salient participant is underencoded’ in the case of Ahaziah even though there are two flagrant violations of the encoding norms; he opts instead for a proposal more consistent with his claims regarding Gen 22. Let us now move on to consider Levinsohn’s (2000b) account of the Gen 22 data.

Levinsohn, working from a cross-linguistic framework, compares the ratio of NPs used in Biblical Hebrew narrative to encode participants to the numbers found in Koine Greek and Tyap (2000b:4-5). He states, “Typically, languages refer to active participants with NPs when the subject remains the same in two contexts: to mark the beginning of a narrative unit and to highlight a speech or action” (ibid:1). On the one hand, both Tyap and Koine Greek utilize intersentential conjunctions or particles to mark developments, while Biblical Hebrew uses neither. On the other hand, Levinsohn found that Biblical Hebrew evidences a much higher rate of relexicalization in context S1 than either Tyap or Koine Greek.¹⁴⁵ He then proposes that relexicalization in context S1 functions as a marker of new developments in Biblical Hebrew, and analyzes Gen 22 to test this hypothesis. In doing so, he is able to account for the redundant NP references to *Abraham* which had undermined Heimerdinger’s model, and he demonstrates that the proposed development units are comparable to those found in Tyap and Koine Greek.

Levinsohn concludes by making an important point: not every redundant NP in context S1/S2 is meant to function only as a development marker. Such NPs are *also* used pragmatically for highlighting purposes. He notes that most highlighted events or speeches also represent a new development in the narrative. This idea that NPs intended for highlighting also have the effect of marking a development is consistent with our entailment scheme of anaphora resolution (cf. §2.5.4). Similarly, Longacre has described narrative ‘peaks’ as ‘zones of turbulence’, where the pace of narration often increases due to an increase in the ratio of verbs to non-verbs (1985:96-97). One might also view the shortening of development units (i.e., increasing their frequency by marking them more frequently) as having the pragmatic effect of ‘quickenning’ the perceived flow of the discourse.

¹⁴⁵ Table 1: NPs in context S1 in Hebrew, Tyap, and Greek (Levinsohn 2000b:5)

<u>Language</u>	<u>Total Clauses</u>	<u>in Context S1</u>	<u>NPs in S1</u>	<u>% NPs in S1</u>
Hebrew	45	26	6	23%
Tyap	42	34	2	6%
Greek	17/26*	15/24*	0	0%

*The first figure for Greek indicates the number of independent clauses in the passage. The second figure includes participial clauses.

In light of Levinsohn's hypothesis, and the corroborative cross-linguistic data, we will proceed to analyze the redundant S1/S2 NPs in our corpus to determine whether the phenomenon observed in Gen 22 is indeed used to mark developments elsewhere.

5.2 Demarcating the Development Unit Following Narrative Clauses

We will begin our discussion of the processing function with an overview of the hierarchical nature of discourse. We will also discuss the kinds of natural discontinuities which would influence a reader to create a new segment in their mental representation of the discourse. Next, discussion of overencoding participants to accomplish a processing function is presented for contexts S1 (cf. §5.2.2) and S3 (cf. §5.2.3) in narrative. This will be followed by discussion of overencoding in contexts S2 (cf. §5.3.1) and S1 (§5.3.2) following quotative frames.

Consideration will be given to how various Bible versions represent the overencoded NPs. The varied ways the translators render these redundant NPs offers tacit corroboration that the encoding is prototypically perceived by readers as signaling a new development. The linguistic options utilized for representing the overencoded NPs in translation are: use of asyndeton to represent the Hebrew coordinating conjunction *waw*; use of an English or Old Greek (LXX) development marker; or representation of the redundant NP as if it were a naturally discontinuous element such as a referential PoD.

The use of asyndeton in English to translate *waw* represents the decision *not* to explicitly link the clause in question with the one that precedes it. Asyndeton is the most common means of coordinating clauses in English, and is unmarked for development. Thus the use of asyndeton to translate the *wayyiqtol* represents the decision *not* to compound the clauses coordinated by *waw* in Biblical Hebrew. Both English and LXX have markers to explicitly signal a new development. In English, the use of adverbs such as *then*, *so* or *thus* are the primary means of explicitly marking development. Similarly, Koine Greek uses the conjunction $\delta\epsilon$ to explicitly mark developments instead of the coordinating conjunction $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (cf. Levinsohn 2000a). We will construe the use of asyndeton by English translators as indicating a lower level of discontinuity than that represented by the use of adverbial development markers.

5.2.1 Hierarchical Nature of Discourse and Natural Discontinuities

Many scholars have noted that discourse is not simply a linear series of connected clauses, but evinces a hierarchical organization.¹⁴⁶ As stated in §2.4.1, readers/hearers cannot retain an infinite stream of information, but need to break it into chunks in order to effectively process it (Paivio and Begg 1981:176). Givón (1984:245) postulates four different kinds of unities that

¹⁴⁶ Cf. Chafe (1980, 1987); Prince (1980); Clancy (1980); Anderson et al. (1983); Givón (1984:245); Tomlin (1987); Fox (1987a, 1987b); Garrod et al. (1988); Gordon et al. (1993); Talstra (1997:94ff); Levinsohn (2000); Bolkestein (2000); Dooley and Levinsohn (2001).

contribute to the thematic structure of discourse. The four have been reframed by Levinsohn (2000a:3), and are summarized in Table 6.

Table 6. Dimensions of Continuity and Discontinuity in Narrative

Dimension	Continuity	Discontinuity
Place	Same place or (for motion) continuous change	Discrete changes of place
Time	Events separated by at most only small forward gaps	Large forward gaps or events out of order
Participants	Same cast or gradual changes of cast	Discrete changes of cast
Action	All material of the same type: event, non-event, reported conversation, etc.; Events are in sequence	Change from one type of material to another and/or the event concerned is NOT the next in sequence

Givón states, “The four unities—or continuities—are more likely to be maintained *within* any particular discourse unit than *across* its boundary with another unit” (1984:245). Thus, changes in place, time, participants or action will *naturally* lead the reader to sense a discontinuity in a narrative. The discontinuity, in turn, leads the reader to segment the discourse. Furthermore, Givón claims that the number of discontinuities observed in a given context is directly proportional to the discourse level of the discontinuity in the overall hierarchy of the discourse. In other words, a single discontinuity might indicate a break at a lower level of discourse, while three or more would likely indicate a higher-level discourse boundary.

We do not view each dimension as equally salient when it comes to the segmentation of a text. For instance, changes in time or place can be achieved without much disruption if the clausal adjuncts containing this information are placed in their default position as close to the end of the clause as possible. Conversely, this same information is regularly used to signal a discontinuity when preposed as a PoD. Similarly, changes in participants can be achieved without causing much discontinuity. The introduction of new participants in the comment of a sentence (e.g. the introduction of ‘*Sarai*’ and ‘*Milcah*’ in Gen 11:29a-b) is much less disruptive than as the subject of a presentational verb (e.g. ‘*the fugitive*’ in Gen 14:13a).¹⁴⁷ We would propose that the latter switch is represented in most translations as a new development due to the *change in initiators*, and not simply due to a change of participants. Similarly, a switch of agents using a referential PoD is by definition more disruptive than using default constituent order. Thus, the issue of relative continuity and discontinuity is much more complex than simply whether some kind of change has occurred or not.

It is helpful at this point to outline a taxonomy of discourse units, and to correlate it to the dimensions of continuity and discontinuity outlined in Givón’s table above. Our goal here is simply

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Appendix 1 for a catalog of the participants from our corpus and the activation process utilized to activate them.

to develop a nomenclature of terminology in order to discuss hierarchy in narrative *as it relates to participant reference*.

Table 7. Taxonomy of Discourse Units in Narrative

Clause < Development unit < Episode < Thematic Unit < Discourse

Based on this taxonomy, a discourse is made up of thematic units.¹⁴⁸ The formal markers of this level of discourse will be discussed in §5.4, but we consider a new thematic unit to begin with three or more discontinuities from Table 7. Thematic units are made up of episodes, in the sense that Longacre (2003:24ff) uses the term. The episode may be just a portion of a thematic unit, or the entirety of a brief thematic unit. Development units are the building blocks of episodes, and are comparable to Longacre's 'paragraph'. Finally, clauses are the lowest level of building block we will be concerned with. It is this unit from which all of the other levels are built.

We have noted that not all changes of parameters are equally discontinuous. There appears to be a difference in salience depending upon whether a default or marked information structure is used. Changing the primary initiator of action (i.e. from one major participant to another) is more disruptive compared to simply changing patients or changing from a major to a minor participant as the agent (cf. §4.4.1). Thus, we would supplement Givón's simple claim that the number of discontinuities found in a context is the *primary* basis for determining the hierarchical level at which a reader cognitively segments a text. One must also factor in the *qualitative* differences between achieving the change using a default versus a marked construction. The relative salience of the participant's role in the context must also be taken into account.

Development units:

Based on our claim that redundant NPs in contexts S1/S2 are intended to direct the reader to begin a new development in their mental representation, a change in action would not necessarily be sufficient to trigger a new development. We have several instances in our corpus where minimal reference in context S1 is maintained across the transition from narrative to reported speech, as in Gen 15:6a→7a; 16:7→8; 17:17b→17c. Similarly, we find minimal reference used in context S2 at the margin between reported speech and narrative, as in Gen 12:7b→7c; 14:19b→19c; 15:9→10a; 16:11-12→13. However as one compares how the versions have construed these transitions, some follow the MT encoding and some do not. In the majority of cases, these minimally encoded S1 and S2 transitions between narrative and RS in Biblical Hebrew are rendered in the versions using full NPs

¹⁴⁸ This term is based on Dooley and Levinsohn's (2001:37) 'thematic grouping' of clauses, and comparable to Longacre's (2003:206ff) macro-level unit referred to as a 'discourse'. Based on formal marking using participant reference and other devices found in Biblical Hebrew, we have chosen to modify the latter term to 'unit' from 'grouping'. Examples of thematic units/discourses from *Joseph* (Longacre 2003:206ff) are Gen 37:2c-36 and 40:1-23.

for the agents/speakers, or using other development markers, ostensibly based on natural discontinuity.¹⁴⁹ Contrast these minimally encoded examples with the use of relexicalization in the same discourse context (e.g. Gen 16:5; 18:23; 20:15; 22:5). On the basis that relexicalization is *not* consistently found at such transitions in action in Biblical Hebrew, it would appear that discontinuity and development are separate parameters, even though both end up segmenting the text.

Consideration also needs to be given to encoding after *wayehi* clauses which establish a new temporal frame of reference. The clause of Gen 12:11 is good example of this. Note that all of the English versions render this clause as a temporal PoD either by use of imperfective aspect (e.g., NRSV renders “When he was about to enter Egypt...”) or through a literal rendering of *wayehi* (NKJ uses “And it came to pass...”). The LXX uses the development marker with ἐγένετο. The MT does *not* relexicalize the agent, while LXX and NLT *do* relexicalize. According to Givón, such a temporal frame represents a discontinuity in one of the dimensions, naturally creating a segment. Similar minimal encoding is also found in Gen 14:4b; 34:30, and 52 in context S1. These minimally encoded examples can be contrasted with clear S1 cases of relexicalization following a temporal PoD in Gen 22:4, 20; 24:22-23. These examples provide contrastive minimal pairs. The pairs demonstrate that a temporal expression which establishes a new frame of reference evidences both minimal encoding and relexicalization following it. As in the case of transitions in action above, it seems reasonable to infer that the creation of new developments is pragmatic, with the writer/editor having discretion in signaling new DUs. This is comparable to the discretion a writer has to use marked versus default switches of time, place and participants using information structure. Based on these tokens, it is reasonable to infer that discontinuity and development are separate parameters in Biblical Hebrew, even though both serve to segment the text.

The point to be made here is that in contexts of relative natural continuity, writers can pragmatically determine whether to create a new development unit or not based on how they conceive of or want to portray the discourse. Although according to Givón changes in time and action represent a discontinuity, we find meaningful variation in whether these discrete changes are also marked through relexicalization or not. The biblical writer/editor sometimes uses development markers at transitions in time or action, marking that the development which follows is distinct from the one that precedes; in other cases these transitions are encoded as a single development. Such compositional decisions are of exegetical significance for those studying the text, as we shall see below.

¹⁴⁹ Gen 15:6a→7a: NET and NLT relexicalize, NJB, NKJ, NLT and LXX include development marker (DM); Gen 16:7→8: NLT relexicalizes, none include DM; Gen 17:17b→17c: none include DM; Gen 12:7b→7c: NJB, NKJ render וַיְהִי as a PoD, NAS, NET, NIV, NRS include DM; 14:18→19: none include DM; 15:9→10a: NET, NIV, NLT relexicalize, NAS, NET, NKJ, NLT, and LXX include DM; 16:11-12→13: NET, NJB, NLT and LXX relexicalize, NAS, NET, NKJ, NLT, NRS include DM.

Regarding the beginning of a new episode, changing at least two parameters appears to be sufficient based on Longacre's segmentation scheme. Again, the presence of marked constructions to encode changes serves to pragmatically 'inflate' the level of discontinuity. Finally, the thematic unit would likely have three or more natural discontinuities, or two discontinuities with at least one using a marked information structure. This level of the hierarchy will be dealt with in §5.4.

5.2.2 Processing Function of Overencoding in Context S1

Based on our discussion of continuity and discontinuity above, we construe the redundant relexicalization of a participant in context S1 as a pragmatic device whereby a writer/editor can pragmatically signal the beginning of a new unit where one would not otherwise naturally exist on the basis of discontinuity. This new 'chunk' represents what the writer conceives of as the next *development* in the discourse, related to what precedes but still distinct. In other words, if we are reading about a participant that is doing a consistent type of action without dramatic changes in time or place, readers will construe the string of clauses as continuous until a discontinuous element occurs. If the writer desires to segment a text in a context of *natural* continuity, he or she has the option to overencode participants in order to generate what is interpreted by the reader as segmentation, and thus trigger the reader to begin a new cognitive unit at the chosen place in the discourse. It is important to distinguish between what *signals* the development unit and the development unit *itself*. The redundant relexicalization is construed as discontinuous, however a development is *not* a discontinuity, but instead is simply the next stage or segment of the discourse in a context of relative continuity.

In analyzing our corpus, we have identified approximately 550 main narrative clauses.¹⁵⁰ Based on the identifying features of the redundant use of relexicalization for active participants and switches in initiators discussed above, and, we have identified 181 development units.¹⁵¹ Based on these data, the development units in our corpus average approximately 3.05 clauses in length. Let us

¹⁵⁰ This tally does not include embedded reported-speech clauses, which we analyze as complements of the quotative frame. The tally also does not include subordinate clauses such as temporal PoDs.

¹⁵¹ Below are what we construe to be DUs on the basis of overencoding, or alternatively on the basis of a switch of initiators. The asterisk (*) symbol indicates a token which could be construed another way:

S1 relexicalization (46x): 12:4c, 5a, 9a, 10a-b; 13:4b, 11a, 11b; 16:5, 16a; 17:22a-b, 24; 18:7a, 11a, 12a, 23a, 33a; 19:1c, 29a-b, 30c; 20:2, 15a; 21:1b, 4a, 5a, 17b*, 19a, 25a, 34a; 22:4a, 5a, 6a, 10a, 13d, 14; 23:2b, 3a, 10b, 16b; 24:10a, 22a-b, 29c, 53a, 63a; 25:6a, 7a, 8a.

S2 relexicalization (46x): 12:4a; 13:10a, 18a; 14:22a; 15:2, 4a; 16:2b, 6a, 6b, 9a; 17:3a, 17, 19; 18:6a, 22a, 26a, 27a; 19:6a, 14a, 18; 20:4a, 6a, 8a, 11a, 14a; 21:11a, 14a, 24a, 27a; 22:3a, 8a, 13a, 19a; 23:5, 7, 12, 14, 16; 24:5a, 6a, 9a, 26a, 32a, 52a, 55a*, 61a.

S1 mid-speech relexicalization (9x): 12:20a; 15:3; 16:10a, 11a; 17:9, 15, 18; 18:20a; 20:10a.

S3 relexicalization (30x): 16:6, 15c; 13:1a, 2; 14:14a; 16:2a, 15a, 15b; 17:23; 18:10b, 16a, 17a; 19:16b, 31a, 34a, 36; 21:1a, 2a, 3a, 29a; 22:7a, 9b; 23:19a; 24:1a, 2a, 17a, 28a, 61d, 67a*; 25:11b.

S4 change in initiators (51x): 12:1a, 7a, 17a; 13:5, 8a, 14a; 14:5a, 10b, 13a, 17a, 18a, 21a; 15:1a-b, 17a-b; 16:1, 7a; 17:1a, 3b; 18:1a, 13a; 19:1a, 4, 10a, 12a, 15, 24a, 27a, 38a; 20:1; 3, 9a, 17a; 21:9a, 12a, 17a, 20a, 22a; 22:1a, 11a, 15a; 23:1a, 2c; 24:1b, 15a; 24:62a, 64a, 66a; 25:1a, 5a, 9a, 11a.

now consider some tokens of overencoding in context S1 which pragmatically create a new development, beginning with Gen 12:5-10. The redundant encodings are shaded in gray.

וַיֵּלֶךְ אַבְרָם כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר אֵלָיו יְהוָה ^{4a}
וַיֵּלֶךְ אִתּוֹ לוֹט ^{4b}
וְאַבְרָם בְּנִיחָמֶשׁ שָׁנִים... ^{4c}
וַיִּקַּח אַבְרָם אֶת־שָׂרַי אִשְׁתּוֹ וְאֶת־לוֹט... ^{5a}
וַיֵּצְאוּ לָלֶכֶת אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן ^{5b}
וַיָּבֹאוּ אֶרֶץ כְּנָעַן: ^{5c}
וַיַּעֲבֹר אַבְרָם בְּאֶרֶץ... ^{6a}
וְהַכְּנַעֲנִי אָז בְּאֶרֶץ: ^{6b}
וַיֵּרָא יְהוָה אֶל־אַבְרָם ^{7a}
וַיֹּאמֶר לְזָרְעֶךָ אֲתָן... ^{7b}
וַיִּבֶן שָׁם מִזְבֵּחַ לַיהוָה... ^{7c}
וַיַּעֲתֶק מִשָּׁם הַהָרָה... ^{8a}
וַיֵּט אָהֳלָה... ^{8b}
וַיִּבְנֶה שָׁם מִזְבֵּחַ לַיהוָה ^{8c}
וַיִּקְרָא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה: ^{8d}
וַיִּסַּע אַבְרָם הַלּוֹךְ וְנִסְוֶע... ^{9a}
וַיְהִי רָעַב בְּאֶרֶץ וַיֵּרֵד אַבְרָם מִצְרַיִם... ^{10a}

- ^{4a} And Abram (S2) went as YHWH commanded
^{4b} And Lot (S4) went with him
^{4c} And Abram (S3) was 75 years old...
^{5a} And Abram (S1) took his wife Sarai and Lot
^{5b} And Ø went forth to go to the land of Canaan
^{5c} And Ø (S1+) came to the land of Canaan
^{6a} And Abram (S3) passed through the land
^{6b} And the Canaanite (S4) was then in the land.
^{7a} And YHWH (S4) appeared to Abram
^{7b} And Ø (S1) said, "To your seed I will give..."
^{7c} And Ø (S2) built there an altar to YHWH...
^{8a} And Ø (S1) moved from there to the hills...
^{8b} And Ø (S1) pitched his tent...
^{8c} And Ø (S1) built there an altar to YHWH...
^{8d} And Ø (S1) called on the name of YHWH.
^{9a} And Abram (S1) journeyed by stages...
^{10a} And there came a famine in the land, and Abram (S1) went down to Egypt

Verse 4 records the transition from YHWH's speech commanding Abraham to go to Canaan. The relexicalization of both the previous addressee and speaker in v. 4a marks the transition from reported speech to narrative proper as an explicit development. Contrast this with a comparable transition in v. 7c grammaticalized without relexicalization. This transition from command to the report of its implementation is intentionally segmented, as well as highlighted. All seven English translations consulted represent this redundant NP with the development marker 'so'.¹⁵² We find another redundant relexicalization at the transition from the introductory exposition in v. 4 to the recounting of Abraham's trip to Canaan in v. 5, explicitly marking the beginning of a new development unit for the reader.¹⁵³

The transition between vv. 9 and 10 is viewed by commentators as marking a new major unit.¹⁵⁴ As we will see in our discussion of thematic units, the writer/editor of Genesis appears to mark these higher-level discourse boundaries in naturally-continuous contexts by closing the one unit with subject relexicalization, and using marked constructions such as referential or temporal PoDs plus relexicalization to mark the beginning of the next unit. For example, Gen 15:1 preposes an adverbial adjunct to indicate that an unspecified amount of time has passed, yet the other parameters of the story have ostensibly remained constant. Gen 16:1 uses a referential PoD for a marked reactivation of Sarah, but the other continuity dimensions remain unspecified. In Gen 17:1, the time is updated through what we construe as a temporal PoD which both updates Abraham's age and relexicalizes him in context S1 *immediately following* a statement about his age in 16:16 which utilizes S1 relexicalization. Gen 21:1 contains a referential PoD to reactivate YHWH which is followed by relexicalization of both agent and patient in context S1/N1 in v. 2. Gen 22:1 utilizes both a *wayehi* temporal clause followed by a referential PoD, which is preceded in 21:34 by S1 relexicalization. We propose that the pragmatic effect of these redundant relexicalizations is to signal a new segment that would not otherwise naturally exist, directing the reader to create a new segment in their mental representation. We have argued elsewhere (Runge 2006) that the purpose of multiplying the use of pragmatic segmentation devices (e.g. relexicalization, temporal and referential PoDs) in a string, exemplified best in Gen 21:34-22:1, serves to signal a higher-level segmentation in the discourse in a context of natural continuity.

Let us now consider Levinsohn's work in Gen 21:33-22:14, and the 9 redundant NPs he identifies in context S1. The first S1 NP occurs at 21:34, which we construe as closing the preceding thematic unit, comparable to Gen 12:9a noted above.¹⁵⁵ Relexicalization also occurs at the transitions

¹⁵² English translations consulted are the JPS 'Tanakh' (JPS), New American Standard Version (NAS), New English Translation (NET), New International Version (NIV), New King James Version (NKJ), New Revised Standard Version (NRSV), and the New Living Translation (NLT).

¹⁵³ 'Then' in NKJ, asyndeton in NAS, NIV, NLT, NRSV.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Allen (2002:257), Alter (1996:50-51), Waltke (2001:210), Walton (2001:58), and the Masoretes.

¹⁵⁵ LXX and NET represent the NP using development markers, while NKJ, NRSV, NET and NLT explicitly mark a development at 21:33a instead.

between reported speech and narrative proper in vv. 3a, 5a, 6a, 13a and 14a; as well as to explicitly mark a DU in a potentially discontinuous context immediately following a temporal PoD in v. 4a. Finally, redundant NPs are used, most likely for highlighting purposes, in v. 8a where Abraham declares that God will provide the lamb, and in v. 10a to encode Abraham stretching out his hand to take the knife to slay his son. Taking into consideration the natural discontinuities of S4 reactivations (e.g. ‘God’ in the referential PoD of 22:1, ‘the angel of YHWH’ in vv. 11 and 15) and changes in initiators, the pericope averages a new segment every 2.7 clauses, similar to our average for the corpus even after the highlighting NPs are removed (i.e., every 3.4 clauses).

5.2.3 Processing Function of Overencoding in Context S3

We noted in §4.4.1 that S3/N3 switches are attested using minimal reference in contexts either where other factors disambiguate the participants (e.g. morphological distinction or semantics of the verb), or where differences in salience clearly identify one participant as the expected initiator. Thus, we proposed that these minimal reference switches in context S3/N3 be considered a secondary default encoding principle. Interestingly, we have found S3 relexicalization in comparable discourse contexts to the overencoding in context S1 described above. In other words, in these S3 contexts where switch could conceivably be unambiguously achieved based on a distinction of morphology or relative salience, relexicalization appears to be utilized to signal a new development comparable to context S1. While caution must be exercised in claiming ‘overencoding’ in a context where relexicalization has been claimed to be the default, relexicalization in such contexts supports our thesis of using overencoding to mark new developments. Consider the following examples where such encoding is observed.

In Gen 14:13b, Abraham is alerted by ‘the survivor’ that Lot has been captured, which is followed by several verbless clauses.

וַיָּבֵא הַפְּלִיט ^{13a}
 וַיִּגְדַּל לְאַבְרָם הָעֵבֶרִי ^{13b}
 וְהוּא שָׁכַן בְּאֵלֵי מַמְרֵא הָאֱמֹרִי אָחִי אֶשְׁכֹּל וְאָחִי עֲנֹר ^{13c}
 וְהֵם בְּעָלֵי בְרִית־אַבְרָם: ^{13d}
 וַיִּשְׁמַע אַבְרָם... ^{14a}

^{13a} And the survivor (S4) came

^{13b} and Ø (S1) told Abram the Hebrew

^{13c} and he (S3) was dwelling by the oaks of Mamre the Amorite, brother of Eshcol and brother of Aner

^{13d} and they (S3) had a covenant with Abram

^{14a} And Abram (S3) heard...

The clause in v. 13c is construed as S3, switching from the survivor to Abraham as the agent, yet an IPP is used. Another minimally-referenced S3 change occurs in v. 13d, where the patients ‘Eshcol’ ‘Aner’ and ‘Mamre’ from v. 13c become the agents of the verbless clause of v. 13d, also using an

IPP. Verse 14a marks a return to the development of the narrative from the background comments, and has a lexical 3MS subject.

Based on Abraham's salience in the narrative, the minimally-referenced switch to him as agent in v. 13b, and the fact that he is the only 3MS referent active in v. 13d, it seems reasonable to expect that minimal reference could have been used in v. 14a. Furthermore, the semantics of the verb 'heard' serve to resume the action preceding the verbless clauses, viz. Abraham *being told*. The transition from non-event to event is implicitly discontinuous, and we would propose that the use of the NP to encode Abraham in v. 14a functions to make the discontinuity explicit. The English translations render this S3 switch as a temporal PoD,¹⁵⁶ while the LXX includes a development marker. One finds a similar situation in the S3/N3 switch in Gen 24:61d, where gender distinguishes 'Abram's servant' from 'Rebekah'. While minimal reference would likely be sufficiently unambiguous, relexicalization could reasonably be construed as marking a new development. Five of the seven English translations include the developmental marker 'so' to link vv. 61c and 61d.¹⁵⁷

5.2.4 Demarcating the Thematic Unit

We noted above that the more discontinuities one observes in a context, the higher the level of the break in the discourse (cf. Givón 1984:245). We also postulated a taxonomy to describe the levels of discourse, one of which was the thematic unit. In most cases in our corpus, the Masoretic *parashiyot* accents are attested at what we construe as thematic unit boundaries (cf. Runge 2006). A thematic unit represents a rather significant break in the discourse, either a significant change in the participants, or in the geographical or temporal setting of the participants. These changes at thematic boundaries typically involve more than simply an introduction or a switch. They often involve a 'tidying up' of details from the previous thematic unit, or involve an exit of participants from the 'stage' in preparation for new ones.

The transition from Gen 21:1-21 to 21:22-34 provides a good example of tidying at the close of a thematic unit. The former narrative concerns the expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael from Abraham's camp. After the Angel of the LORD's speech, the narrative provides several clauses describing Ishmael's situation in vv. 20-21. Verse 20 states that the God was with 'the lad', relexicalizing the object even though he was the patient in the previous clause. The center of attention shifts from Hagar to Ishmael, in that she is now pronominally linked to him rather than vice versa (i.e. 'his mother' in v. 21b versus 'the son of Hagar' in v. 9 above). The use of *wayehi* to introduce v. 20 does more to establish an ongoing state of affairs rather than simply recounting events.¹⁵⁸ Verses 20-21 provide something of an epilogue for the preceding thematic unit, stating that

¹⁵⁶ Cf. NAS, JPS, NET, NIV, NJB, NLT, NRSV and NKJ. NKJ precedes the PoD with the developmental marker 'now'.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. NAS, NET, NIV, NKJ, NLT. NRSV uses "thus."

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Van der Merwe et al. (2000:331-32).

Ishmael grew up, lived in the wilderness, was an archer, and was given an Egyptian wife by his mother.

Another such example is found at the close of Gen 21 following the establishment of the covenant between Abraham and Abimelech. Verse 32a reiterates the statement in v. 27 that a covenant has been made, followed in v. 32b-c by the statement that Abimelech and Phicol arise and return to the land of the Philistines. Verse 33 returns to Abraham using minimal reference,¹⁵⁹ stating that he planted a tamarisk tree, called on the name of the LORD, and sojourned in the land of the Philistines for many days. This temporal statement of v. 33c sets up an ongoing state of affairs. The next unit begins with a preposed temporal statement to describe a generic period of time, ostensibly to signal the beginning of the next major unit.

To summarize, the identification of thematic unit boundaries in naturally discontinuous contexts is rather straightforward based on concrete changes of participants, time, location, and/or action. The identification of thematic unit boundaries in more naturally continuous contexts is much more difficult to objectively identify. Thus, what we are proposing is that if a writer wants to begin a new *thematic* unit in a context that would otherwise be viewed as simply a new *development* unit, there is evidence that other linguistic segmentation conventions are utilized to disambiguate such transitions. If this proposal is true, then participant reference plays a role not only in demarcating development units, but also in demarcating higher-level thematic units in our corpus where natural continuity exists.¹⁶⁰

The examples of thematic boundaries we have just describe have entailed a clustering of pragmatically marked constructions at margins of the *petucha* ('open') and *setuma* ('closed') paragraph markers in BHS. We have argued elsewhere (Runge 2006) that there is a correlation between the placement of these accents and the clustering of discontinuity markers in our corpus. These constructions include: points of departure, which are a marked means of encoding changes of time, place or participants; development units, created by relexicalizing subject participants in contexts where a NP is unnecessary; and pragmatic highlighting, achieved by overencoding agents and/or patients in contexts where minimal encoding is expected.¹⁶¹ At Masoretic paragraph margins that did *not* evince use of marked constructions, we noted the presence of *natural* discontinuities in

¹⁵⁹ The use of minimal encoding here is not accounted for either by the primary or secondary default encoding rules in that the anaphoric resolution of Abraham reaches back three clauses to v. 32a. Even then, Abraham was indexed using 3MP minimal encoding on the verb. The editors of BHS propose emendation of lexicalizing Abraham based on evidence from LXX, the Latin Vulgate and Samaritan Pentateuch. It could also be construed as a case of VIP encoding, however based on the relexicalization found in v. 34 such an explanation is tenuous.

¹⁶⁰ Comparable use of marked participant reference in combination with tidying or PoDs at some thematic boundaries is attested in our test corpus of Exodus 1-12, e.g. the use of relexicalization in 2:24-25 followed by a referential PoD in 3:1. Cf. the repetition of 'just as YHWH said' followed by a switch to YHWH as initiator in the following clause in Exod 7: 6-8, 13-14; 8:11-12; 9:35-10:1. Note also the use of relexicalized or syntactically-marked constructions in Exod 10:19-21; 11:9-12:1, 42-43.

¹⁶¹ Other examples of such clustering at *parashiyot* boundaries in our corpus are Gen 12:10; 15:1; 16:1; 17:1; 21:1; 22:1, 20; 24:1.

most cases, e.g. a genealogy or other disjunctive background information *before* the paragraph marker, and/or major changes of participants or situation *following* the marker (e.g. Gen 14:1; 21:22; 23:1). It is significant to note this possible higher level use of participant reference, since it could aid form-critical or theme-oriented studies by providing analysts with additional formal markers to track in making judgments about pericope boundaries. We will now consider some of the tokens to illustrate the phenomenon.

The corpus with Abraham as the central participant begins in Gen 12:1. The *setuma* paragraph marker at the end of 11:32 is preceded by a summary temporal statement about Terah's longevity, which is immediately followed by a relexicalized S1 DU. Chapter 12 begins with a change in action from narrative to reported speech. The speaker is a new participant (YHWH) last referred to in 11:9. The addressee of the speech (Abraham) functioned as a prop in the previous thematic unit, and has not been explicitly referred to in five clauses.

The summary temporal statement, the DU, the change in action from narrative to reported speech and the change in initiator from Terah to YHWH represent significant discontinuities both formally and naturally, and one which the Masoretes ostensibly recognized. It is noteworthy that, while the shift to YHWH as initiator and to reported speech from narrative represent natural discontinuities, these two would likely only have been construed as marking a new development in and of themselves. It would appear that the writer/editor has pragmatically chosen to utilize two other segmentation devices in order to unambiguously signal a higher-level break in the text. Verse 32 could have communicated the same information in stating "And Terah (S3) died in Haran when he was 205 years old," without relexicalization in the second clause.

One finds DUs before the paragraph marker in contexts where there is greater natural continuity. PoDs and relexicalization are attested following the marker. In each of these cases, the PoD establishes a new state of affairs as a cognitive frame of reference for what follows. For example at the *parashiyyot* boundary following Gen 12:9, the summarizing statement regarding Abraham's moving by stages toward the Negev utilizes relexicalization to create a closing DU. The *wayehi* clause of v. 10 establishes a new state of affairs to help the reader understand Abraham's movement to Egypt.¹⁶² In Gen 16:16, the unit closes by stating that Abraham was 86 years old when Ishmael was born, utilizing relexicalization. The new section begins with the new temporal frame וַיְהִי אֲבָרָם בְּזֶה־הַשָּׁעִים שָׁנָה וַתֵּשַׁע שָׁנָה "When Abraham was 99 years old..." utilizing the concluding information from the preceding unit to establish an explicit change of temporal reference. Gen 21:34 uses relexicalization in a generic summary statement that Abraham sojourned in the land of the Philistines 'many days' to close the unit. Gen 22 opens with a non-specific temporal *wayehi* clause (וַיְהִי אַחֲרֵי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה) "And it came about after these things..." to establish a new temporal frame of reference for the thematic unit which follows, comparable in function to those observed in Gen 12:10

¹⁶² NAS, NET and NRSV render the clauses, "(Now) there was a famine in the land, so Abram went down..."

and 17:1. The same technique is used again at the transition of the unit ending at 22:19. In each of these instances, we observe a clustering of devices which individually indicate a minor segmentation of the text, but which we propose are functioning collectively to signify a higher level discourse segmentation of the Abraham narrative of Gen 12-25. These transitions are not formulaic like the *toledoth* statements observed elsewhere in Genesis. Nonetheless, there is a discernable pattern of relexicalization at the end of these units, followed by establishing a new temporal frame or state of affairs using syntactically disparate *wayehi* clauses to accomplish the same functional task.

At other Masoretic paragraph margins, one finds only referential PoDs in combination with some pragmatic encoding to achieve a marked reintroduction of a participant at the beginning of the unit (cf. Gen 16:1; 21:1; 24:1). In contexts where more natural discontinuity exists due to changes in (initiating) participants or situation, the writer begins the units with temporal clauses (e.g. Gen 14:1; 21:22) or preposed adjuncts (e.g. 15:1). The placement of this temporal information has the function of establishing a new temporal frame of reference for the unit which follows using disparate syntactical constructions to accomplish a common discourse function. Alternatively, genealogies are used to create a more noticeable break in the discourse (cf. Gen 20:1, 23:1). The paragraph marker in Gen 17:27 signals the pericope's conclusion using verbless background comments in vv. 24-25, and what we construe as tail-head linkage¹⁶³ in vv. 26-27,¹⁶⁴ to tidy up the details of the story. The reader has already been informed that Abraham's entire household was circumcised in v. 23. Therefore, the point to be made in vv. 26-27 is that Abraham did these things on the very same day he was given the command; on the very same day he was circumcised, all the rest of his household was as well.

The discussion in Runge (2006) correlating the clusters of marked participant encoding with Masoretic paragraph markers provides important confirmation for associating the processing function of participant reference with higher-level discourse segmentation in Biblical Hebrew. It is unclear exactly what criteria the Masoretes considered in segmenting the Hebrew text, but the correlation of marked participant reference in combination with other pragmatic constructions in contexts where natural continuity exists suggests that participant reference may have been a factor in their decision-making process. Further work using a larger corpus is necessary to corroborate our findings.

¹⁶³ Dooley and Levinsohn define tail-head linkage as "the repetition in a subordinate clause, at the beginning (the 'head') of a new sentence, of at least the main verb of the previous sentence (the 'tail') as in '... he arrived at the house. When he arrived at the house, he saw a snake'" (2001:12). For a more extended discussion of tail-head linkage cf. Thompson & Longacre 1985:209–13.

¹⁶⁴ We construe vv. 26-27 as a single complex clause, with the segment of v. 26 before the *atnach* accent functioning as a temporal frame for the balance of the clause. Thus we would translate the verses,

"On the very same day that Abraham was circumcised,^{Temp} Ishmael, his son and all the men of his household...^{Ref} were circumcised with him.

Alternatively, v. 26 could be analyzed independently of v. 27, with the temporal adjunct functioning as a PoD, followed by a marked switch of topic in the next clause to "(Ishmael his son) and all the men in his household." We believe the NP "Ishmael his son" is better construed as part of the clause in v. 27 than as a right dislocation in v. 26, although it is with great hesitation that we question the Masoretic division of the verse. Cf. comments made in §4.4.2.

However, it seems plausible that participant reference plays a role in text segmentation at levels of the discourse hierarchy other than the development unit.

5.3 *Demarcating the Development Unit Following Quotative Frames*

We will now move from considering the use of overencoding in narrative proper to its processing role following initial quotative frames. We noted in §4.3.2 that after an initial quotative frame, the default interpretation of minimal reference is *switch* of roles by the speaker and addressee in the following clause. However, one frequently finds such N2→S2 switches encoded using lexical NPs. Furthermore, one also finds speeches of a single speaker interrupted by the insertion of redundant quotative frames into the speech. Consideration will first be given to relexicalization in context S2 in §5.3.1, and then turn to the insertion of redundant quotative frames in context S1 in §5.3.2.

5.3.1 **Processing Function of Overencoding in Context S2**

Relexicalization of N2→S2 switches is found rather frequently in Biblical Hebrew, and 46 times in our corpus.¹⁶⁵ Several such tokens are used to segment the dialogue between YHWH and Abraham in Gen 15. The dialogue is initiated in v. 1 with the phrase *הָיָה דְבַר-יְהוָה אֶל-אַבְרָם בְּמַחְזָה* “the word of YHWH came to Abraham in a vision saying...” Abraham’s response in v. 2 is framed using relexicalization and thereby creating a DU.

Dooley and Levinsohn comment that such encoding in reported speeches is often associated with ‘countering moves’ whereby one participant tries to redirect the conversation from where the other participant intended. “In languages that use a developmental marker, this marker is likely to be used in connection with a change of direction in a reported conversation. It is normal, also, for a noun to refer to the speaker of such a speech, even when a pronoun would be expected” (Dooley and Levinsohn 2001:101). Essentially, a countering move entails one participant attempting to ‘take the initiative’ away from another.

In the case of Gen 15:2, Abraham’s reply essentially questions how YHWH’s promise could come true since Abraham has no heir. His reply is best construed as a counter to YHWH’s declaration, especially based on how early in the dialogue it falls. Based on our entailment scheme of anaphora resolution, overencoding to pragmatically signal a countering move concurrently has the effect of signaling a new development. Countering moves and other pragmatic encoding of speakers and addressees will be covered in more detail in Chapter 6.

Another example of the pragmatic creation of a new development unit in context S2 is found in 15:4. Here YHWH responds to Abraham’s counter, and his speech is introduced by a near verbatim repetition of the original quotative frame from v. 1: ... *וְהִנֵּה דְבַר-יְהוָה אֵלָיו לֵאמֹר* ‘And behold,

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Gen 12:4a; 13:10a, 18a; 14:22a; 15:2a, 4a; 16:2b, 6a, 6b, 9a; 17:3a, 17a, 19a; 18:6a, , 22a, 26a, 27a; 19:6a, 14a, 18a; 20:4a, 6a, 8a, 11a, 14a; 21:11a, 14a, 24a, 27a; 22:3a, 8a, 13a, 19a; 23:5a, 7a, 12a, 14a, 16a; 24:5a, 6a, 9a, 26a, 32a, 52a, 55a, 61a.

the word of YHWH was to him saying...” We would construe the insertion of *this* quotative frame, in contrast to a simple וַיֹּאמֶר “and he said...” as having a much stronger disjunctive effect. The frame utilized resumptively reaches back to the original frame as if to restart the dialogue. Such an explanation would also explain the presence of the discourse particle *hinneh* to further focus attention on the speech that follows (cf. *BHRG* §44.3). There is no other segmentation of either the dialogue or Abraham’s response to it in v. 10, evincing a pragmatic choice to closely link YHWH’s second proclamation with Abraham’s obedient actions.

Another good example of segmentation using S2 relexicalization within a series of quotative frames is found in Gen 18:23-32, where Abraham intercedes with YHWH on behalf of Sodom. Abraham initiates the dialogue with YHWH in v. 23 by asking if YHWH would spare the destruction of a city on account of 50 righteous people. This first speech is marked using S1 relexicalization. YHWH’s reply is framed using relexicalization as well, saying he would spare the city on the basis of 50. Abraham presses the issue further in the speech of v. 27, which is highlighted based both on the use of a complex quotative frame (Miller 2003:204) and the use of relexicalization in context S2. As noted above in Gen 15, overencoding the speaker in the quotative frame has the pragmatic effect of highlighting the speech which follows, and signaling a countering move by Abraham.

וַיִּגַשׁ אַבְרָהָם וַיֹּאמֶר הֲאֵף תִּסָּפֶה...^{23a}
וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אִם־אֶמְצָא בְּסֹדֹם...^{26a}
וַיַּעַן אַבְרָהָם וַיֹּאמֶר הִנְהִינָא הוֹאֲלֹתִי לְדַבֵּר...^{27a}
וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא אֲשַׁחִית אִם־אֶמְצָא שָׁם...^{28a}
וַיִּסֹּף עוֹד לְדַבֵּר אֵלָיו וַיֹּאמֶר אוּלַי יִמְצְאוּ...^{29a}
וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא אֶעֱשֶׂה בְּעָבוּר הָאַרְבָּעִים:^{29b}
וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־יָא יָחַר לְאֲדֹנָי...^{30a}
וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא אֶעֱשֶׂה אִם־אֶמְצָא שָׁם שְׁלֹשִׁים:^{30b}
וַיֹּאמֶר הִנְהִינָא הוֹאֲלֹתִי לְדַבֵּר...^{31a}
וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא אֲשַׁחִית בְּעָבוּר הָעֶשְׂרִים:^{31b}
וַיֹּאמֶר אֶל־יָא יָחַר לְאֲדֹנָי...^{32a}
וַיֹּאמֶר לֹא אֲשַׁחִית בְּעָבוּר הָעֶשְׂרֶה:^{32b}
וַיֵּלֶךְ יְהוָה כְּאִשֶּׁר כָּלָה לְדַבֵּר אֶל־אַבְרָהָם
וַאֲבָרָהָם שָׁב לְמִקְוֹ:^{33b}

- ^{23a} And Abraham (S1) drew near and said, “Will you sweep...”
^{26a} And YHWH (S2) said, “If I find in Sodom...”
^{27a} And Abraham (S2) answered and said, “Behold, I ventured...”
^{28b} And Ø (S2) said, “I will not destroy if I find there...”
^{29a} And Ø (S2) spoke to him yet again and said, “Perhaps you...”
^{29b} And Ø (S2) said, “I will not act on account of forty...”
^{30a} And Ø said (S2), “Please let my Lord not be angry...”
^{30b} And Ø said (S2), “I will not act if I find there thirty.”
^{31a} And Ø said (S2), “Behold, I ventured to speak...”
^{31b} And Ø said (S2), “I will not destroy on account of twenty.”
^{32a} And Ø said (S2), “Please let my Lord not be angry...”
^{32b} And Ø said (S2), “I will not destroy on account of ten.”
^{33a} And YHWH went (S1) when he finished speaking to Abraham
^{33b} And Abraham (S3) returned to his place.

In stark contrast to the initial exchanges of the dialogue (vv. 23a-27a), eight of the next nine turns are encoded using simple וַיֹּאמֶר frames, while all nine use minimal encoding. The pragmatic effect of overencoding the initial frames is to segment each turn into separate development units, and possibly also to cataphorically highlight the following speech. On the other hand, the conversational turns recorded in vv. 28b-32 use simple quotative frames with minimal reference, maintaining continuity and binding these turns together into a single development unit.¹⁶⁶

Another context where S2 DUs are found is the transition from reported speech back to narrative proper. Following a quotative frame, the cognitive expectation of minimal encoding is that the addressee of the preceding frame will become the agent in the following narrative clause. The data from our corpus support this typological principle, even at the transition from reported speech back to narrative proper (cf. §4.3.2). Thus, relexicalization is only required in context S1, where the speaker continues as the agent in the clause following the quotative frame (e.g. Gen 12:20; 18:7, 20a; 20:10a), or in context S3/4 where another participant besides the addressee becomes the agent (e.g. Gen 14:21a; 18:10b). For instance when Abraham and Lot separate in Gen 13, Abraham asks Lot to choose a place for himself in v. 8. Verse 10 states, $\text{וַיִּשָׂא-לֹט אֶת-עֵינָיו וַיִּרְא}$, “And Lot lifted his eyes and looked...” The pragmatic effect of relexicalizing *Lot* is to segment the request for Lot to choose a place to live from the report of his *doing* it.¹⁶⁷ While it may seem that the transition from reported speech to narrative proper naturally creates a new segment, there are only nine instances in our corpus where it is not explicitly marked as such using relexicalization.¹⁶⁸

Based on the cross-linguistic data, we affirm that construing minimal encoding in context S2 as default is in fact the most accurate description of the grammar at work in Biblical Hebrew, even though statistics would argue otherwise. Of the 85 total S2 tokens in our corpus, 39 exhibit minimal encoding while 46 tokens exhibit relexicalization. Of the S2 tokens found at the transition back to narrative, only nine are minimally encoded while 30 exhibit relexicalization.¹⁶⁹ Andrews’ (1990:136ff) chapter “Myths about Markedness” highlights the problems associated with relying uncritically upon statistical frequency and not critically examining what the various options accomplish. “The purpose of markedness theory is to explain properties of meaning that are invariant, not to justify a system based upon statistical frequency, which by definition, is a context-specific phenomenon” (ibid:137). Based on the cross-linguistic evidence and that found in our

¹⁶⁶ In contrast, NAS, NET, NIV, NKJ and NRSV add the development markers ‘then’ or ‘finally’ to vv. 30a and 32a, ostensibly due to the awkwardness in English of such a long series of conversational turns without segmentation. LXX follows BHS, only segmenting at vv. 22b, 26a, and 33a, but *not* at v. 27a.

¹⁶⁷ NAS, NIV and NKJ render the conjunction at v. 8 as ‘so’, NRSV uses ‘then’, NET uses asyndeton, NJB and NLT render it ‘accordingly’ and ‘finally’, respectively. LXX uses the development particle *de*.

¹⁶⁸ For examples of minimally encoded S2 transitions back to narrative proper following a quotative frame, cf. Gen 12:7c; 14:20b; 15:6a, 10a; 16:13a; 19:3a; 22:8b; 24:59a, 65c.

¹⁶⁹ The S2 tokens using minimal encoding at the transition back to narrative are Gen 12:7a; 14:20; 15:6, 10; 16:13; 19:3, 16. The S2 tokens which relexicalize at the transition back to narrative are Gen 12:4a; 13:10, 18; 16:2, 6; 17:3, 17; 18:6, 22; 19:6, 14; 20:4, 8, 14; 21:11, 14, 27; 22:3, 13, 19; 23:7, 12, 16; 24:9, 26, 32, 52, 59, 61, 65

corpus, we would argue that minimal encoding in context S2 is indeed default, viz. the encoding which does not mark the presence or absence of a new development. Such a description is most consistent with the use of minimal encoding elsewhere in Biblical Hebrew narrative, viz. context S1. The 7 minimally encoded tokens which transition back to narrative can be more easily accounted for as default as compared to claiming the relexicalized tokens to represent default encoding. In other words, our account would explain the 30 tokens which exhibit relexicalization in the transition back to narrative as pragmatically marked for the presence of a new development unit. Explaining the seven minimally encoded tokens as somehow marked would be a much more tenuous endeavor.

Thus, we conclude that these S2 transitions to narrative which exhibit minimal encoding do so purposefully to avoid the creation of a new development and to maintain tight thematic connection between the preceding speech and the action which follows it within a single development (cf. Nariyama 2000). Conversely, we conclude that the many relexicalized S2 transitions from RS to narrative are more appropriately construed as explicitly marking a new development. Now that we have seen the use of overspecification in context S2, let us consider the overencoded tokens from context S1.

5.3.2 Processing Function of Overencoding in Context S1: Redundant Quotative Frames

We observe in our corpus the use of redundant quotative frames in context S1 which reorient the reader to the speaker. These redundant frames are used even though the speaker has not changed.¹⁷⁰ Thus while the encoding of the participant in the frame is semantically required to counter the expectation of minimal encoding (i.e. *switch* of speaker and hearer), the *quotative frame itself* is semantically redundant. We would propose that these mid-speech quotative frames have the pragmatic effect of segmenting the speech into smaller chunks. These potentially smaller chunks would have remained implicit or unmarked in the absence of a redundant quotative frame.

In light of the apparent segmenting effect of these redundant quotative frames, we would argue that they serve as a means of explicitly marking the beginning of a new development within a single reported speech. Thus development units in context S1 following quotative frames are not triggered by overencoding of the participant, but *by the presence of the redundant frame* since there is no semantic reason to interrupt the same speaker's speech. We shall refer to this phenomenon '*mid-speech reorienting*'. Both speaker *and* addressee are relexicalized in many of the tokens of mid-speech reorienting.¹⁷¹ Such overencoding is associated with cataphoric highlighting of the following speech by Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:99-101), and will be discussed in §6.4. Our present interest in these redundant quotative frames is their pragmatic effect of segmenting the speech into development units, which we shall now illustrate.

¹⁷⁰ E.g. Gen 12:20a; 15:3; 16:10a, 11a; 17:9, 15, 18; 18:20a; 20:10a.

¹⁷¹ Cf. Gen 17:9a; 15a; 20:10a.

In Gen 20:9, Abimelech summons Abraham to confront Abraham's lie regarding his wife's true identity. The initial quotative frame is context S3/N4, and uses a complex frame. In v. 10, Abimelech's speech is broken up by a quotative frame (context S1/N1) with relexicalization of both participants. The speech ends up being broken into two parts, v. 9 and v. 10. The first part focuses on the king asking Abraham what the king has done to him to elicit such malevolent treatment. The second part of the speech asks whether Abraham sees the impact his lie has had on the king and his people. By adding the redundant frame in v. 10, the speech is effectively broken into two logical parts, pragmatically delaying the second part of the speech. In essence, the writer/editor is 'reorienting' the reader to the dialogue, and providing dramatic buildup (cf. Longacre 1985) for the speech following the intervening frame.

The use of mid-speech reorienting to segment long speeches into logical chunks is most frequently observed in our corpus in divine speeches.¹⁷² Consider Gen 16:9-11, for example. In the pericope, Hagar has fled from Sarah and sought refuge in the wilderness. Verse 7 reports that the angel of YHWH finds her and begins speaking in v. 8a. Following Hagar's response in v. 8b, the angel's speech is broken into three segments by the use two mid-speech quotative frames. The switch from Hagar to the angel as speaker in v. 9 requires nothing more than minimal reference, especially due to the morphological distinction between the two participants. Nonetheless, this frame uses a full NP for the angel, as do the mid-speech reorienting frames in vv. 10 and 11. There is no intervening speech from Hagar; the frames simply function to segment the speech.

In the first segment of the speech the angel commands Hagar to return to her mistress and to submit to her. The second segment of speech describes how numerous Hagar's offspring will become. The third segment announces that she will bear a son, and provides a description of what he will be like. This third segment is the longest and most dramatic, in that the naming of Hagar's son is based on the fact that YHWH has heard Hagar's affliction. The development units demarcated by the mid-speech quotative frames have the pragmatic effect of segmenting the speech, organizing it based on the content. While eliminating the mid-speech frames would not have changed the *content* of the angel's speech to Hagar, it would have significantly affected the speech's *dramatic impact*.

One finds mid-speech reorienting providing dramatic buildup in other significant speeches of our corpus, such as YHWH's speech to Abraham about circumcision in 17:3b-15. The first development unit of vv. 3b-8 concerns YHWH making Abraham into a great nation, and the gift of Canaan as an inheritance for them. The second development unit of vv. 9-14 announces that YHWH is making a covenant with Abraham, with circumcision being the sign of that covenant for all of Abraham's descendants. The final development unit begins in v. 15, and concerns Sarah's role as the

¹⁷² For examples of reorienting within divine speeches, cf. Gen 16:10, 11; 17:9, 15, 18a; 18:20a; Exod 3:6, 14b, 15a; 4:6a; 6:2; 7:19; 8:1 (MT); 24:1; 30:11, 17, 22, 34; 31:1, 12; 32:9; 33:20, 21; 34:1, 27; Lev 4:1; 6:1, 8, 19, 24; 7:22, 28; 8:1. For examples of mid-speech reorienting in human speech cf. Gen 17:18a; 20:10a; 21:7; Exod 35:4.

mother of nations and kings. Once again, the segmentation of the speech falls at natural thematic boundaries, with each of the frames relexicalizing both speaker and addressee.

5.4 The Pragmatics of Overspecification: Signal a DU or not?

It is important to note the pragmatic decisions involved in relexicalizing a participant, even when relexicalization is semantically required. In closed contexts, where only two participants (including collective groups) are interacting, S3/N3 switches between agent and patient only require *one* of the participants to be relexicalized in order to avoid ambiguity. If only one of the two is relexicalized, the general preference seems to be to relexicalize the agent rather than the patient. In terms of processing, it is our contention that switching initiators by lexicalizing the agent or speaker is sufficient in most cases to potentially constitute a new development in the text.¹⁷³ In light of the fact that in many contexts only one participant needs to be lexicalized in order to disambiguate the participants' roles, the biblical writer has the option of signaling a new DU or not based on whether the agent or patient is relexicalized. Let us now consider the contexts where the *patient* is relexicalized instead of the *agent*, in contrast to the apparent norm.

Genesis 15 contains an important dialogue between Abraham and YHWH where He establishes a covenant with Abraham. YHWH is the primary initiator and speaker. A series of minimally-referenced S2/N2 turns in the dialogue occurs in vv.7-9, followed by a return to narrative proper where Abraham prepares the animal parts as commanded by YHWH in the speech. Next, a deep sleep falls on Abraham in v. 12. There has been no reference to YHWH since v. 9, though He is the only other actant in this closed context. The report about Abraham's sleep is followed by a quotative frame in v. 13 which we construe to be context S3/N3. However the speaker YHWH is encoded using minimal reference, while the addressee (Abraham) is relexicalized. Based on the established principles of anaphora resolution, readers would most likely construe the minimal reference in this context as context S1, and thereby understand Abraham to be the speaker in v. 13. Thus, relexicalization of either the speaker or the addressee is semantically required in order to disambiguate the participants' roles.

Relexicalizing YHWH in this context would inevitably be construed as an explicit switch of initiators, i.e. as marking a new development. In contrast, relexicalizing only Abraham as the addressee unambiguously achieves the S3/N3 switch while maintaining continuity with respect to development. Interestingly, most English translations chose to depart from BHS by both relexicalizing YHWH and inserting a DM.¹⁷⁴ LXX follows our interpretation of BHS, without relexicalization or DM. We propose that the choice to relexicalize the *addressee* rather than the *speaker* represents a pragmatic choice to maintain as much continuity as possible. The pragmatic

¹⁷³ Cf. Gen 16:6, 15c; 13:1a, 2; 14:14a; 16:2a, 15a, 15b; 17:23; 18:10b, 16a, 17a; 19:16b, 31a, 34a, 36; 21:1a, 2a, 3a, 29a; 22:7a, 9b; 23:19a; 24:1a, 2a, 17a, 28a, 61d, 67a*; 25:11b.

¹⁷⁴ NAS, NET, NIV, NJB, NLT, and NRS insert a full NP for the speaker. NET, NIV, NJB, NKJ, NLT and NRS insert a DM.

effect is to avoid unnecessarily triggering segmentation in a potentially discontinuous stretch of discourse through relexicalizing the patient rather than the agent.

Another such instance of relexicalizing only the patient occurs in an *open* context with *three* participants as opposed to the closed context of Gen 15 above. Genesis 20 recounts the story of Abraham sojourning in Gerar, and lying to Abimelech about Sarah's relation to Abraham. Abimelech summons Abraham in v. 9 to confront him about his treacherous lie. We have already noted how Abimelech's initial speech is segmented using a mid-speech quotative frame at v. 10. Abraham's reply in v. 11 is overspecified, as is the account of Abimelech giving Abraham gifts in v. 14a, which is followed by two minimally-referenced verbs in vv. 14b-c. Verse 15 is an S1 quotative frame, with Abimelech relexicalized, marking the speech that follows as a separate development from the previous speech and gift giving. Finally in v. 16, Abimelech switches from addressing Abraham to addressing Sarah. This switch is encoded by lexicalizing *only* the new addressee, and using minimal reference for the speaker.

The default encoding in context S1/N4 in reported speech that is expected is relexicalizing both the speaker and addressee. The S1 speaker is relexicalized to counter the expectation of a minimally encoded quotative frame, viz. switch of speaker and addressee. The lexicalization of the addressee is semantically required to (re)activate the participant. However, in v. 16 we find the frame *וַלְשָׁרָה אָמַר* "and to Sarah \emptyset said..." where the speaker is left unspecified, and the new addressee is activated using a referential PoD. The same encoding and syntactical strategy is also observed in Gen 3:16 and 17 to ensure that YHWH God's pronouncements to the serpent, the woman and Adam all remain within the same development unit. The same approach is also utilized in Gen 4:4b-5a to ensure that YHWH's reaction to the offerings of Able and Cain remain within the same DU.

To summarize, we would argue that the pragmatic effect of *not* relexicalizing the speaker is to avoid creating a new development unit, while at the same time disambiguating speaker and hearer. Such a view is completely consistent with the claim above regarding mid-speech reorienting. Thus, in S1/N4 contexts (e.g. Gen 12:20) where lexicalization of both the speaker and the addressee appears to be the norm in our corpus, we construe the use of minimal reference to the speaker as intended to maintain the continuity between the two speeches, even at the slight risk of introducing some ambiguity regarding the speaker's identity.

It could be argued that changing addressees represents sufficient natural discontinuity that readers would construe it as a new development. However, the fact that the writer has the choice between minimal reference and relexicalization for encoding the speaker assigns meaning to the encoding chosen. Consider the switch of addressees found in Gen 12:20, in context S1.

וַיִּצַו עָלָיו פַּרְעֹה אֲנָשִׁים...

"And Pharaoh commanded the men concerning him..."

The semantics of the context would likely have been sufficient to unambiguously encode the speaker using minimal reference in this frame, considering Abraham's passive role in the context. However, the writer relexicalizes the speaker, in contrast to the minimally encoded S1/N4 tokens discussed above. This encoding decision has the pragmatic effect of representing the change from confronting Abraham to deporting him as separate developments. The same principle holds true for the mid-speech reorienting of Gen 17:9 and 15, where both speaker and addressee are relexicalized. Simply relexicalizing the addressee of these frames would have sufficiently disambiguated who was speaking, based on the closed context. It is important to recognize the full range of encoding options available in a context in order to fully appreciate what the writer/editor has chosen *to do* as well as what *not to do*. While relexicalization is required in context S3/N3 and S1/N1, there are differing pragmatic effects depending on which participant's role is lexicalized. Other tokens which exemplify this departure from the norm of relexicalizing the agent are Gen 19:9c; 20:16; 21:29.

5.5 Conclusion

In this chapter we considered a portion of the overencoding data which could not be accounted for by our default encoding principles outlined in Chapter 4 above. Based on cross-linguistic evidence and principles of cognitive processing, we have proposed that the use of overencoded subject NPs functions as a processing device in Biblical Hebrew narrative to guide the reader in how to segment the text in their mental representation. We demonstrated the use of overencoding to demarcate new developments in contexts of natural continuity, as well its use in conjunction with other formal markers of discontinuity to demarcate higher-level discourse divisions, viz. thematic units. Finally, we described the pragmatic choice available in many instances wherein the writer need only lexicalize one participant in order to disambiguate role changes. This choice implies a meaning. In closed contexts, we construe the choice to lexicalize the agent as the choice to create a new development. This conclusion is consistent with the overall proposal being put forward regarding the use of redundant NPs to segment the text.

While the use of overencoding for cognitive processing is able to account for many of the non-default encoding tokens from our corpus, there is still overencoding data which remain to be explained, particularly the redundant relexicalization of both agent and patient. We noted Levinsohn's observation that overencoding is also used for pragmatic purposes, to highlight a following speech or event (2000b:1). Furthermore, we have only considered *pronominal* versus *nominal* encoding so far, with no attention to the use of complex referring expressions (e.g. *Sarai*, *Abram's wife*) with active participants. Having considered the processing function of overencoding, we will next consider the use of overencoding involving both simple and complex NPs for pragmatic purposes in Chapter 6.

6. Marked Encoding of Participants-Thematic and Cataphoric Highlighting

6.1 Introduction: Theoretical Frame of Reference

In the previous chapter, one of the pragmatic effects of overencoding an active subject in Biblical Hebrew narrative was examined, viz. to mark new developments in the discourse in contexts of relative continuity. The segmentation of the text helps the reader process the discourse. However, based on our description thus far, two other types of overencoding remain unaccounted for. The first type involves the use of marked *lexical* encoding of participants (i.e. use of a lexical NP where a pronominal element would suffice). The second type involves the marked *semantic* encoding of participants through the pragmatic use of non-default referring expressions.

The marked use of referring expressions prototypically involves either the substitution of a non-default expression for a participant's primary referring expression, or the supplementation of the primary referring expression with anchoring or other thematically-salient information. We shall maintain a distinction between these two phenomena by referring to lexical overencoding as simply 'marked encoding' or 'overencoding', while the semantic manipulation of referring expressions will be grouped under the rubric of 'marked expressions' or 'overspecification' of the participant. The former concerns the distinction between pronominal versus lexical forms while the latter concerns the distinction between default versus marked referring expressions. We will begin our description of these remaining overencoded and overspecified tokens of with a discussion of prominence and the cognitive processing of prominence markers.

6.1.1 Pragmatic Resolution of Marked Encoding and Marked Expressions

We begin by recalling Huang's (2000) revised, neo-Gricean pragmatic scheme of anaphora resolution. Grice's principles were developed to describe unspoken implicatures observed in English conversations. They were later revised by Stephen C. Levinson (1987, 1991, 1995), who demonstrated that the revised principles are much more pervasively active in language in general, and are not merely principles restricted to English conversation. Huang revised Levinson's (1987, 1991, 1995) neo-Gricean principles into a cross-linguistic, pragmatic account of anaphora resolution, and confirmed that these pragmatic principles indeed apply much more universally than previously thought. He further argued that anaphora resolution is processed and resolved using a complementary system of pragmatic principles, even though it is syntactically constrained. Huang demonstrated that these principles are able to describe anaphora resolution procedures in incredibly diverse languages

and systems of reference.¹⁷⁵ Based upon Huang's findings, we will adapt his theoretical framework into a pragmatic description of anaphora resolution for the Biblical Hebrew narrative of our corpus.

The I-principle:

The I-principle states, "‘Say as little as necessary’, i.e. produce the minimal linguistic information sufficient to achieve your communicational ends (bearing the Q-principle in mind)" (Huang 2000:207). We would rephrase this principle to describe default participant reference encoding as ‘utilize the minimal level of encoding necessary to avoid ambiguity’.

According to Huang's ‘general pattern of anaphora’¹⁷⁶ and his ‘semantic content hierarchy’,¹⁷⁷ the reader assumes that the most reduced anaphoric form will be utilized to encode active participants. In the case of clitic pronouns encoding subjects of finite verbs in Biblical Hebrew, the reader assumes ‘same subject’ (SS) in narrative, or ‘different subject’ (DS) following quotative frames. Similarly, verbal arguments encoded as clitic pronouns or zero anaphora, are processed as coreferent with the corresponding arguments of the preceding clause in context N1, or with the previous speaker in context N2.¹⁷⁸ Thus in Huang's model, the I-principle establishes the expectation that the most semantically and morphologically simple form will be used to encode active participants. However, if the reader encounters encoding not accounted for by the I-principle, then the Q-principle comes into play.

The Q-principle:

The Q-principle states, "Do not provide a statement which is informationally weaker than your knowledge of the world allows, unless providing a stronger statement would contravene the I-principle" (ibid:207). Rephrasing this principle for resolution of overencoding would render, ‘utilize the most referentially-informative expression available in order to avoid ambiguity’. If the reader notices other-than-minimal encoding,¹⁷⁹ the Q-principle states that the reader will process this higher

¹⁷⁵ "What I have been arguing is that syntax interacts with pragmatics to determine many of the anaphoric processes that are thought to be at the very heart of grammar. If this is the case, then a large portion of linguistic explanation concerning anaphora which is currently sought in grammatical terms may need to be shifted to pragmatics, hence the interaction and division of labour between syntax and pragmatics. This interface and division of labour between syntax and pragmatics may be summarized in a Kantian slogan: "pragmatics without syntax is empty; syntax without pragmatics is blind" (Huang 1994:259). What pragmatics does here is to provide a set of complementary, explanatory principles that constrains the interpretation or production of an utterance whose linguistic representation has already been antecedently cognized" (Huang 2000:213).

¹⁷⁶ Huang's general pattern of anaphora: "reduced, semantically general anaphoric expressions tend to favour locally coreferential interpretations; full, semantically specific anaphoric expressions tend to favour locally non-coreferential interpretations" (ibid:214).

¹⁷⁷ Huang's semantic content hierarchy: "The inherent semantic content of the lexical NPs tends to be semantically more specific than that of a pronoun and the inherent semantic content of a pronoun, than that of a zero anaphor," viz. Lexical NPs > pronouns > zero anaphors" (ibid:215).

¹⁷⁸ Cf. §4.4.1 for provisos regarding role-changes being indicated in the semantics of the verb, etc.

¹⁷⁹ Minimum encoding for subjects of Biblical Hebrew finite verbs is a clitic pronoun, while non-finite verbal or verbless clauses require independent personal pronouns for subjects (We find only one instance of zero anaphora of the subject/agent, viz. Gen 24:30d, and therefore do not consider this sufficient evidence to overturn

level of encoding as semantically necessary based on the constraints of the context. Contexts which require more than minimal encoding for active participants include: marked, syntactic constructions,¹⁸⁰ or disambiguation.¹⁸¹

The M-principle:

The M-principle states, “Do not use a prolix, obscure or marked expression without reason” (ibid:208). Huang explains that if a speaker uses a marked expression *M*, a pragmatic choice has been made *not* to use an unmarked expression *U*, and the I-implicatures associated with it.

6.1.2 Prominence

Scholars have long noted that discourse is more than a linear series of connected events, but is instead organized into a hierarchical framework.¹⁸² Within this hierarchy, not every event or participant is equally salient; certain elements will have more prominence than others. Longacre makes this point by saying, “Discourse without prominence would be like pointing to a piece of black cardboard and insisting that it was a picture of black camels crossing black sands at midnight” (1985:83).

Callow defines prominence as “any device whatever which gives certain events, participants, or objects more significance than others in the same context” (1974:50). We do not conceive of prominence as an inherent quality of a constituent. Rather, prominence judgments are determined by evaluating the markedness of the constituent *relative to other comparable discourse elements*. We would argue that prominence and emphasis have been poorly defined concepts largely due to scholars vaguely describing, or inaccurately describing, the baseline default against which the so-called emphatic element stands out. Prominence is inseparably connected to reader-expectations, thus it is crucial that scholars precisely identify not just the marked form, but also the normative pattern against which the particular form is relatively more prominent. Relative prominence can be assigned in one of two ways, either *naturally* or *pragmatically*.

the claims of Givón (1983a) and Fox (1983) that subject agreement is required in Biblical Hebrew. Minimum encoding for objects is either zero anaphora or clitic pronouns, cf. Chapter 4.

¹⁸⁰ Cf. §4.4.2. Biblical Hebrew utilizes syntactic constructions which involve constituent movement, e.g. referential PoDs (i.e. topicalization), marked focal constituents, and a left- or right-dislocation. Therefore, the creation of such a marked construction necessitates the use of an independent, movable morphological form such as an independent personal pronoun, a demonstrative pronoun, or a lexical NP.

¹⁸¹ More-than-minimum encoding is necessary at times to disambiguate active referents, either due to a switch in roles or participants, or due to the semantics of a particular verb (cf. §4.3). For an example of the latter, consider: ‘Bill₁ gave it to Bob₂ and he_{1/2} left’. The subject in the second clause could be construed as either referring to Bill, based on pronominal encoding indicating ‘same subject’ in narrative, or possibly as referring to Bob based on the expectations associated with the semantics of ‘giving’, viz. a possible role change between agent and patient in the following clause. Though a clause may manifest morphological overencoding, the Q-principle guides the reader to process it as semantically necessary in the context, and *not* as pragmatically marked.

¹⁸² E.g. Callow (1974), Grimes (1977), Chafe (1981), Givón (1983a), Tomlin (1987), Fox (1987), Talstra (1997).

Natural Prominence

Let us consider an example of natural prominence. Foley and Van Valin (1984:371) have noted that the semantics of certain verb types tend to convey more naturally prominent information than others, depending on the genre of the discourse. Verbs of achievement and accomplishment will tend to be used in clauses which communicate the *mainline* events of a narrative, while stative verbs tend to be used in clauses which communicate *background* information.¹⁸³ Since narrative is event driven, the mainline events will have more natural prominence than the background information, though the relative prominence of these verb types would be very different in an expository genre, which is *not* event-driven.

Pragmatically-Marked Prominence

In contrast to *natural* prominence, *pragmatic* prominence is intentionally assigned by the writer or speaker through the use of a marker of some kind. We shall say that these markers *highlight* the element, assigning it prominence it would not otherwise naturally have received. A number of pragmatic markers have been identified and described in Biblical Hebrew which highlight an element as relatively more prominent than other elements in the same context. Van der Merwe et al. describe several Biblical Hebrew adverbs as ‘focus particles’ based on the fact that “they place a particular focus on the entity or clause that follows them” (2000:311-317). The focus particle pragmatically assigns prominence to the constituent that it would not otherwise have received, based on the fact that they are essentially optional. These particles include *אֵל*, *אֵלֶּה*, *סָפֵּא*, *גַּם*, *בְּלִזְתִּי*, and *כִּי*. Another example of a pragmatic prominence marker is what Van der Merwe et al. describe as a ‘discourse marker’ such as *הֵן* and *הִנֵּה* (ibid:328-333). A discourse marker “often draws attention to the contents of the succeeding sentence(s), affording that sentence(s) greater prominence within its larger context” (ibid:59). Follingstad states, “*Hinneh* draws attention to a proposition indicating it is important or salient in the given context... [It] indicates the presence of counterexpected, counterdesired, or overlooked presuppositions” (1995:22). The use of such particles in Biblical Hebrew is one of the means of *pragmatically* adding prominence to a clause or phrase that it would not otherwise *naturally* have received apart from the use of the particle.

To summarize our discussion thus far, *natural* prominence refers to the significance one discourse constituent has relative to comparable alternatives available in a given context. *Marked* prominence refers to prominence which is *pragmatically* assigned to a constituent by the speaker/writer via some sort of marker, such as focus particles, discourse markers such as *hinneh*, or marked information structures. The pragmatic marker assigns prominence to the constituent that it would not otherwise naturally have received.

¹⁸³ This illustration is taken from Levinsohn’s (2000a:172-73) introduction of ‘backgrounding of sentences’ using verbal aspect in NT Greek.

6.1.3 Pragmatically-Marked Prominence and Cognitive Processing

The terms *prominence*, *highlighting*, and *emphasis* are at times used synonymously, and are at times used carelessly. What exactly does highlighting entail? How is highlighting cognitively processed? In order to answer these questions we will revisit our original theoretical framework, recalling the concepts of markedness, mental representations, and Huang's revised neo-Gricean pragmatic implicatures,¹⁸⁴ in order to formulate an explanation. In doing so, we will utilize available empirical research as a means of cognitively accounting for the mental processing of highlighting in discourse.

Recall from §2.2.1 the claim of Lambrecht (1994:43) that as readers read a text, they are building mental representations of the information communicated in the discourse. One component of that building process involves *recognizing* and *tracking* patterns. As discourse is processed, readers develop expectations based upon established patterns. Some of these patterns are inherent in the language itself, others are unique to the genre of the specific discourse. For instance, our Chapter 4 was dedicated to describing the default patterns of participant reference observed in the narrative of Gen 12-25. Some of these patterns are based on the morphology of Biblical Hebrew, e.g. the need to include subject pronouns with non-finite verb forms since these verbs do not grammaticalize subject agreement like finite verb forms. Other patterns are more genre-related, e.g. the difference in how minimal encoding of subjects is construed following a quotative frame compared to following a clause in narrative proper: the former is construed as *switch* of speaker and addressee, the latter is construed as *continuity of subject*.

Recognition of such patterns, we argue, creates certain expectations within the reader that the writer or the discourse will follow the established pattern. When a reader discovers something that counters this expectation, the unexpected item stands out. In other words, it is construed as *marked* based on the norm or expectation which has been established. Thus, marking can occur in a grammatical sense: this was described regarding the overencoding of active participants in Chapter 5. These redundant NPs are cognitively processed as marking the presence of some non-default feature by virtue of the fact that the reader's expectation that active participants be minimally encoded is countered by the presence of a NP. A large number of empirical and descriptive studies have claimed that such overencoding is processed in various languages as a marker of discontinuity.¹⁸⁵ Similarly,

¹⁸⁴ For an application of neo-Gricean principles to a diverse body of both Western and non-Western languages, cf. Gundel et al. (1993) on the topic of referentiality, and Huang (2000) on the topic of anaphora resolution. Such cross-linguistic evidence argues for construing these principles more as describing human language processing than describing Western conversational inferences, as some might argue.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Paivio and Begg (1981) on the cognitive need to break discourse into manageable 'chunks' for processing. For studies of this phenomenon, cf. Linde (1979), Downing (1980), Givón (1983a), (1983b), Anderson et al. (1983), Tomlin (1987), Fox (1987a), (1987b), Garrod and Sanford (1988), Sanford et al. (1988), Vonk et al. (1992), Gordon et al. (1993), regarding English; cf. Bolkestein (2000) regarding Latin; cf. Fox (1983), Revell (1996), and Levinsohn (2000b) regarding Biblical Hebrew; cf. Clancy (1980) regarding Japanese and English; cf. Maibaum (1978) regarding Jirel; cf. Nariyama (2000) and (2001) regarding Japanese; cf. Perrin (1978) regarding Mambila; cf. Toba (1978) regarding Khaling; van Vliet (2002) regarding Dutch; cf. Li and

deviation from default syntactic norms are what mark points of departure, preposed focal constituents, and dislocation constructions, as accomplishing some task other than what the default syntax would accomplish.

Expectations can also be formulated based upon the specific content of the discourse itself. For instance in the genealogy of Gen 5, each individual epitaph ends with the statement, “and he died”, thus establishing an expectation that this pattern will be followed. This is indeed the case until v. 24, where we find an additional comment about Enoch in lieu of a death report.

We argue that these kinds of departures from established or expected norms described above illustrate the very nature of prominence. Callow defines prominence as “any device whatever which gives certain events, participants, or objects more significance than others in the same context” (1974:50). So on the one hand, markedness concerns the means by which a feature is signaled to be present or not. On the other hand, prominence concerns the response to the marked feature. Markedness concerns *recognition*, prominence concerns *response*.

Readers appear to assign meaning to the disruption of patterns, assuming that it is both intentional and designed to add significance to the item in question. Literary scholars have observed this phenomenon in describing how breaks in repeated patterns in Biblical Hebrew are processed.¹⁸⁶ From a cognitive standpoint, Sperber and Wilson’s (2002) relevance theory would argue that this phenomenon results from the human desire to make sense of one’s environment, and is not simply a Western, cultural quirk. Whatever framework one chooses to describe it, there appears to be a pervasive and consistent quest by readers to process and understand. One aspect of this processing is reconciling departures from expected or established norms, whatever they might be. A common response is assigning significance or intentionality to the anomaly (i.e. the M-principle). We argue that this human tendency to assign significance to departures from the expected norms is what underpins the concept of linguistic prominence, and we construe this to be a cognitive process. Thus, we understand the phenomenon of linguistic prominence to be directly related to *pattern recognition*. Departures from the perceived norms are assigned significance, based upon the principles of relevance theory, poetics, and Gricean pragmatics.

One very significant implication of prominence must be noted: *prominence will only be perceived to the extent that the pattern on which it is based is perceived*. Some view the use of the terms ‘prominent’ and ‘emphasized’ in Biblical Studies as being virtually meaningless. Unfortunately, this criticism is usually justified. The apparent root of this problem is that scholars have claimed something is emphatic or prominent *without clearly and accurately defining the underlying pattern* which makes it stand out in the first place. This is certainly the case with the so-called ‘emphatic personal pronoun’ in Biblical Hebrew. Scholars were rightly recognizing that the

Thompson (1979), Pu (1995), and Tao (1996) regarding Chinese; cf. Stirling (2001) regarding comparable marking in Austronesian switch-reference languages.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Alter (1982), Berlin (1983), Sternberg (1985), and Bar-Efrat (1987).

presence of the personal pronoun seemed to achieve pragmatic effects that minimal reference did *not* achieve.¹⁸⁷ However, this description is flawed in several ways. First, minimal reference is not a widely-attested option with non-finite verb forms, and therefore the pattern needs to be limited to presence of the IPP with finite verbs. Second, Lambrecht (1994) has delineated **two** different rationales for using an explicit pronoun in a pro-drop language like Biblical Hebrew: for establishing an explicit cognitive frame of reference (e.g. a referential PoD), or for assigning emphatic prominence (i.e. focus). Muraoka and others were indeed recognizing *something* associated with personal pronouns, but due to the fact that they did not adequately describe the underlying pattern, their overall account of emphatic pronouns is flawed.¹⁸⁸

In light of the preceding discussion, we would propose that prominence can only be described to the extent that the pattern underlying the prominent element is properly delineated and described. Therefore, we will draw heavily upon the norms established in the preceding chapters as the primary basis for describing the pragmatic effects achieved by marked encoding of participants.

Let us now consider the two primary functions of the marked use of participant reference for pragmatic highlighting in Biblical Hebrew narrative. We propose two kinds of pragmatic encoding related to prominence, each serving a different function. The first method utilizes a change to the participant's referring expression (even temporarily) from the established norm. The second method of pragmatic highlighting utilizes overencoding above and beyond what is needed to signal a new development. The meaningful distinction between the two methods is the locus of the prominence. Table 8 contains our working definitions.

Table 8. Kinds of Pragmatic Highlighting utilizing Participant Reference

<p><i>Thematic highlighting:</i> Assigns added prominence to information that is crucial to understanding the interpretive point of the story. Thematic highlighting places the spotlight on the <i>added information itself</i>.</p> <p><i>Cataphoric highlighting:</i> Cataphorically adds prominence to surprising or important developments. Cataphoric highlighting places the spotlight on <i>a following speech or event</i>, not on the added information itself.</p>

Callow (1974:50) urges analysts to make a distinction between the device by which prominence is signaled, and the domain over which the prominence extends. In the case of thematic highlighting, the encoded information itself is highlighted, and thus the scope is rather limited. Bar-Efrat makes the point that only in rare cases do biblical characters receive a detailed physical description (1989:48). When a description *is* given it is because it is somehow salient for the story that follows. For instance the fact that Esau is hairy (Gen 25:25), that Sarah is beautiful (Gen 12:11), that Leah's eyes were weak and that Rebekah was beautiful (Gen 29:17) is not just provided for color, but to set the stage for some later part of the plot where the information is crucial for understanding

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Muraoka (1985:47ff), Davidson (1902, §1, §103, §104c), Fox (1983:223), Joüon-Muraoka (1996, §146a)

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Davidson (1902, §1, §103, §104c), Fox (1983:223), Joüon-Muraoka (1996, §146a)

the point of the story (ibid:48-53, cf. Berlin 1983:34-37). Thematic highlighting, as we will illustrate in §6.2, is one of the means available for (re)iterating this salient information, often at the point it is most salient.

On the other hand, cataphoric highlighting, as we conceive of it, is something analogous to a linguistic ‘speed bump’, slowing the reader down just prior to a salient speech or event. The majority of cataphoric highlighting tokens we have identified in our corpus relate to reported speeches. The use of thematic highlighting in Genesis 12-25 will be described first (§6.2), then attention given to the pragmatic effects associated with it (§6.3).

6.2 *Thematic Highlighting*

Callow introduces participant reference stating, “A common way of referring to a known participant is by his role, whether this be his family relationship (‘the father,’ ‘the firstborn’), his nationality (‘the Hebrew’), his social position (‘the visitor’), his official position (‘the ruler’), or whatever is appropriate in the context” (1974:34). Her final point is key to understanding referring expressions—‘**whatever is appropriate in the context**’. Prototypically, an active or semi-active participant’s discourse role is redundantly reasserted either *to indicate a change in the role* or *to update the role when it becomes particularly salient*. We have observed two different means from our corpus of thematically highlighting information, listed below:

- a) Switching referring expressions: substituting an alternate referring expression for a referent’s primary referring expression, e.g. referring to Sarah as הַאִשָּׁה ‘the woman’ in Gen 12:14 and 15d while Abraham is lying about her relation to him;
- b) Supplementing referring expressions: adding anchoring or other thematic information to the referring expression of an active or semi-active participant, e.g. the addition of anchoring expressions to *every* participant in Gen 16:3:

וּתְלָח שָׂרַי אִשְׁת־אַבְרָם אֶת־הַגֵּר הַמִּצְרִית שִׁפְחָתָהּ... וַתֵּתֶן אֹתָהּ לְאַבְרָם אִשָּׁה לּוֹ לְאִשָּׁה:

‘And Sarai, Abram’s wife, took Hagar, her Egyptian handmaid...and gave her to Abram, her husband, as a wife’;

Each of these devices will be considered in turn. We will begin with a discussion of the empirical data available, provide an account of its use in our corpus, and then conclude the section by discussing the pragmatic effects that we propose these devices achieve.

6.2.1 *Switching from Primary Referring Expressions*

Several psycholinguistic experiments were conducted that investigated the use of proper names as referring expressions. The goal was to describe their usage in conversational English. Discourse-established referring expressions were found to be more accessible than alternate referring expressions, and shown to significantly facilitate anaphora resolution. Sanford et al (1988:51-54) argue that “proper-named characters are more ‘referentially accessible’ than role-described

characters” such as those referred to using epithets. Barr and Keysar (2002:391) found that listeners more quickly identified referents when established referring expressions were used, than when alternative NPs were used. McDonald and Shaibe (2002:356) reached similar conclusions, claiming that proper names are construed as more accessible than simple NPs, confirming the findings of Gundel et al. (1993).

Regarding reader or listener expectations about the continued use of established referring expressions, Barr and Keysar found that “listeners expected speakers to adhere to precedents even in contexts where it would lead to referential overspecification” (2002:391). In other words, sustained use of discourse-established referring expressions¹⁸⁹ was expected by listeners, and their use resulted in faster anaphora resolution. These findings are consistent with the expectations outlined in the Q- and I-principles: to be as specific as possible, and to be as brief as possible. Such evidence suggests that these pragmatic principles have more to do with the way humans process language than with one language’s conversational idiosyncrasies.

Downing’s (1996) study of listener preferences also reached conclusions consistent with Barr and Keysar. Downing determined that listeners preferred the use of established proper names over epithets, noting that underspecifying a participant when a more informative referring expression was available was often viewed as unacceptable.¹⁹⁰ “In contexts where full lexical recognitionals are called for, names often seem to be preferred over the sorts of forms that could be used, such as definite common noun phrases” (ibid:109). Again, these findings are consistent with the neo-Gricean principles that speakers use the briefest form and be as informative as possible.

These studies demonstrate a clear preference (and perhaps expectation) in English that established referring expressions be maintained throughout a discourse. Based on the consistency of these findings with the neo-Gricean principles, and based on the data from our corpus that default referring expressions are not often changed, it is reasonable to analyze switches of referring expressions in order to determine if there is a pragmatic motivation, especially where the substituted expression is less informative than the default.

To begin with, consider a compelling example from outside our corpus: the switching of referring expressions for ‘Saul’ in the narrative proper of 1 Samuel.¹⁹¹ Saul’s proper name is used

¹⁸⁹ The referring expressions used were not all proper names, but represented mutually agreed-upon reduced designations. For instance, one of the objects in the experiment was a piece of paper folded in the shape of a V and placed upside down. It was referred to by the experimenter as ‘the tent’.

¹⁹⁰ “As Grice pointed out some twenty years ago, the information that my wife is having an affair is likely to be much more valuable to me than the information that some woman is having an affair. In fact, the use of recognitionals is so much the norm that a speaker who fails to use one when possible can be charged with a violation of Grice’s maxim of quantity (Grice 1975), if not outright deception (Prince 1981)” (Downing 1996:107-108). One finds a comparable exploitation of the maxim of quantity (i.e. the Q-principle) in 2 Sam 12, as Nathan confronts King David. Nathan refers to David in the parable as ‘the rich man’, disguising the actual referent until the parable has been completely told.

¹⁹¹ This example was presented as part of a paper delivered to the Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Section at the 2005 SBL Annual meeting in Philadelphia, PA.

258x, only once with ‘*son of Kish*’ as a redundant anchor.¹⁹² Interestingly, the expression ‘*king*’ is only substituted for ‘*Saul*’ fourteen times; it is added as an appositive once. The one occurrence of ‘*King Saul*’ occurs in 1 Sam 18:6, describing the scene of the women coming out to greet King Saul and David after the death of Goliath, singing the refrain that begins Saul’s paranoia: ‘Saul has slain his thousands, and David his ten-thousands’.

Even more interesting are the places where the writer/editor substitutes the expression ‘*king*’ for ‘*Saul*’: four times in the aftermath of David’s victory over Goliath (as Saul becomes increasingly paranoid of David),¹⁹³ twice in 1 Sam 20:24, 25 (where David avoids a feast after Saul twice attempts to pin him to the wall with a spear), seven times surrounding Doeg the Edomite’s agreement to slay the priests of Nob for aiding David,¹⁹⁴ and once in 1 Sam 28:13 to describe the medium’s realization that she has been conjuring for the ‘*king*.’

Thus, it is noteworthy that the writer/editor refers to Saul as ‘*king/King Saul*’ only in instances where his actions seem improper (cf. Revell 1996:18). Sternberg notes that “a biblical epithet serves at least two functions, one bearing directly on the character it qualifies and the other bearing indirectly on the plot where he figures as agent or patient” (1985:337-38). Sternberg follows this statement with an extensive discussion about how information about the participant plays a thematic role in the shaping and interpretation of biblical narrative (ibid:338-41). We would argue that the selective usage of various referring expressions gives reason to argue that inclusion and exclusion of redundant anchors is intentional and pragmatically motivated. In the case of selectively calling Saul ‘*king*’, the writer/editor is able to highlight higher-level discourse themes, viz. comparing Saul’s worthiness to be king with David’s worthiness.

We now present some passages from our corpus that illustrate the pragmatic switching of referring expressions. We begin by discussing the switches observed in the pericope of Abraham and Sarah sojourning in Egypt recounted in Gen 12:10-20. On the way to Egypt, Abraham asks Sarah, his wife, to say that she is really his sister. Sarah ostensibly agrees, but her true relation is eventually revealed to Pharaoh by YHWH in v. 17. Note that while Abraham’s deception is being played out in vv. 14-16, Sarah is only referred to pronominally or as הַאִשָּׁה ‘*the woman*’. Her proper name, or any referring expression that relates her to Abraham, is conspicuously avoided. However, after Pharaoh discovers the truth, the same term אִשָּׁה occurs 4x, but each time as an anchored expression, once to Pharaoh and 3x to Abraham. Again, the proper name ‘*Sarai*’ appears to be avoided except in 12:17 at the point where the deception ends; it is not used again until Gen 16:1.

Thus, we find that the deception narrative is bracketed at both ends with reference to Sarah as *Abram’s wife*. We construe the reference אִשָּׁתוֹ in vv. 11 and 17 as overspecified, based on the

¹⁹² Cf. 1 Sam 10:21.

¹⁹³ Cf. 1 Sam 17:56; 18:26, 27(2x).

¹⁹⁴ Cf. 1 Sam 22:11(2x), 14, 16, 17(2x), 18.

fact that her anchoring relation was just reaffirmed in 12:5 using the same designation. This overspecification in vv. 11 and 17 seems to be thematically motivated, highlighting the very relation that Abraham has attempted to hide. We construe the repetition of an anchored form of $\eta\psi\aleph$ in vv. 17, 20b and 13:1 as further evidence that the switching and overspecification observed in the context is intended as thematic highlighting. Had the writer simply maintained the use of unanchored proper names, Sarah's relation to Abraham would not have received explicit mention. Due to this relation's salience to the interpretation of the story, the writer/editor masterfully mixes repetition and omission to coincide with the knowledge of the story's participants. It is interesting to note that the same technique is used in the parallel sojourn in Gerar (cf. 'Sarah his wife' in Gen 20:2, compared to 'Sarah' (v. 2b), 'the woman' in YHWH's speech, and then back to 'Sarah his wife' in v. 14).

Another interesting switch is found in Gen 14. 'Bera, king of Sodom' is introduced along with a number of other kings in 14:2. Though proper names are assigned to these kings at their initial activation, their use is not maintained in the narrative.¹⁹⁵ At the end of the pericope, the king of Sodom comes out to greet Abraham after his safe return. 'Melchizedek, king of Salem' is introduced at this point; he too comes out to greet Abraham. While the Bera was assigned a proper name at his activation, only the epithet 'king of Sodom' is used for subsequent reference to him (cf. vv. 10, 17, 21 and 22). As noted above, a proper name is typically the preferred referring expression if one is available, yet 'Bera' is not utilized. Based on the thematic significance of Abraham's interaction with Melchizedek (cf. Pss 110:4; Heb 4-6), use of the less-specific expression 'king of Sodom' is construed here as thematically motivated to assign greater prominence to the king that *is* referred to using a proper name, viz. Melchizedek.¹⁹⁶ We noted previously that participants with proper names tend to play more salient roles than those referred to by epithets (cf. Sanford et al. 1988:44, 55; de Regt 1999:3-4). It cannot be argued in this context that 'Bera' would be a more specific expression since the designation is only used once. However, it is plausible that the *avoidance* of a proper name for the king of Sodom is thematically motivated to background the king of Sodom. Furthermore, the additional thematic information assigned to Melchizedek, combined with the marked information structure used to introduce him, also function to render Melchizedek relatively more prominent than the king of Sodom.

Another instance of switching referring expressions is found in Gen 14 in reference to 'Lot'. Lot figures fairly prominently in the preceding narrative of Gen 13, where he separates from Abraham and moves near Sodom. Lot is first referred to in Gen 14:12 as לוֹט בֶּן־אֲחָי 'Lot, his nephew', thus explicitly anchoring him to Abraham. In light of Lot's salience in the preceding chapter, we interpret the anchoring information in v. 12 as redundant and therefore marked in order to

¹⁹⁵ In contrast the proper name of the *conquering* king 'Chedorlaomer' is maintained in the narrative (cf. vv. 5, 9 and 17).

¹⁹⁶ The fact that Melchizedek is also introduced using a referential PoD with the second anchoring relation $\text{בְּהֵן לְאֵל עֲלֵיֶן}$ also adds prominence to this participant.

thematically highlight his relation to Abraham. Such a view is reinforced by the participial phrase at the end of v. 12, וְהָיָא יֹשֵׁב בְּסֹדֹם, ‘and he (was) living in Sodom’. Lot’s captivity is the salient element linking the content of Gen 14 to the larger Abraham narrative. These marked references to Lot via supplemental anchoring expressions, highlight this thematic connection for the reader. When Abraham is informed of Lot’s capture in v. 14, the expression אֶחָיו is substituted for Lot’s proper name. This switch has two effects: thematically highlighting Lot’s relation to Abraham, and downplaying his role by use of an epithet, comparable to what was observed with Sarah in Gen 12 and the king of Sodom in Gen 14. It is noteworthy that Lot is referred to using a proper name throughout Gen 13, where he acts as a major participant, further corroborating the thematic motivation for switching to an epithet here in 14:14.

Lot’s proper name is switched for an epithet again in Gen 19 in the narrative recounting the incestuous conception of his sons. Lot plays a central role for much of Gen 19, as YHWH’s angels usher Lot and his family out of Sodom before its destruction. However, as the narrative transitions from the family’s rescue to the incestuous relations, we observe several shifts of reference. First, Lot’s daughters switch from being referred to *collectively* to being referred to *individually* (cf. v. 31). Second, rather than the daughters being anchored to Lot (cf. v. 30), Lot is anchored to his daughters (cf. ‘*their father*’, v. 33). There are several pragmatic effects related to these switches. First, the switch in anchoring corresponds with the transition in the narrative where the daughters, rather than Lot, become the primary initiators. At the same time, Lot becomes a prop. Second, switching from the default proper name to an anchored epithet adds thematic prominence to Lot’s salient relation as ‘father’ in this narrative, a relation that would not have received added prominence without use of a marked referring expression. In light of the incestuous relations recounted in vv. 33-36, thematically highlighting this relation makes perfect sense. Such a view is confirmed by the largely redundant summary statement of v. 36: וַתְּהַרְיֶינָּ שְׁתֵּי בָנוֹתֶינָּ לֹט מֵאָבִיהֶן, ‘and the two daughters of Lot conceived by their father’, plainly identifying Lot, ‘their father’ as the sire of the children. There are numerous other examples of what we construe as the pragmatically motivated switching of referring expressions found in our corpus.¹⁹⁷

In reviewing these examples, several pragmatic effects have been identified. First, switching from a proper name to an anchored epithet (e.g. ‘*their father*’ as in 19:33) allows the writer/editor to

¹⁹⁷ E.g. Gen 16:4c (‘her mistress’ from ‘Sarai’ in 16:1); 19:1 (‘the two angels’ from ‘the men’ in 18:22, then back to ‘the men’ in 19:10a, and back to ‘angels’ again in 19:15, back in v. 16b); 21:8a (‘the child’ from ‘Isaac’, switches back in v. 8c.); 21:9 (‘the son of Hagar the Egyptian which she had born to Abraham’ rather than ‘Ishmael’. Ishmael is called (ostensibly) ‘his son’ in 21:11, but then shifts to ‘the child’, also in vv. 14c and 15c; then God hears ‘the lad’ contra expectation of hearing Hagar, in vv. 17, 20); 21:21b (‘his mother’ from ‘Hagar’ in vv. 14c, 17b); 22:10b (‘his son’ for ‘Isaac’); 23:12a (‘before *the people of the land*’ versus ‘sons of Heth’ in v. 10; also in v. 13a); 23:10a (‘his master’ for ‘Abraham’); 24:21, 22b, 26a, 29c, 30b, 30c, 32a, etc. (‘the man’ from ‘the servant’ previously, vv. 9a, 10a, 17a); 24:15 (‘the young woman’ from ‘Rebekah’ in v. 15); 24:30a (‘his sister’ from ‘Rebekah’ in v. 29a); 24:52a, 53a (‘the servant of Abraham’... ‘the servant’, from ‘the man’ in v. 32a); 24:53b (‘Rebekah’ from ‘the young woman’ in v. 15); 24:53c, 55a (‘her brother’ from ‘Laban’ in v. 29c); 24:67e (‘his mother’ from ‘Sarah’ in v. 67a).

reiterate a locally-salient anchoring relation; the use of bare proper names require a reader to access the participant's anchoring relation from his or her mental representation. Prototypically the anchoring relation used is the most thematically salient in the context, leading us to infer that the reiteration of the anchoring information indicates its thematic salience to the narrative. Second, the changes made to the anchoring relations indicated a switch in the referential center of attention from Lot to his daughters, corresponding with the change in the daughters' role from props to primary initiators. While they were referred to as '*the older*' and '*the younger*', they at the same time remained *unanchored* to another participant. The writer could have easily called them '*his older*' for instance, yet did not. This tendency of unanchored participants to play prominent, initiating roles is observed elsewhere in our corpus.¹⁹⁸

6.2.2 Supplementing Referring Expressions with Additional Anchoring Information

Consideration will now be given to the addition of thematically salient information to a participant's primary referring expression. Most typically the supplementation involves the repetition of the participant's anchoring information in a context where he or she is semi-active. By definition, the anchoring information of semi-active participants is cognitively accessible. From a cognitive standpoint, we would propose that readers interpret such information as marked based on the Q-principle's expectation that speakers not say more than is necessary. We will begin by considering the supplementation of referring expressions with anchoring information, followed briefly by a discussion of the use of demonstratives with referring expressions.

Genesis 14 contains several examples of supplementation which are consistent with our discussion of thematic highlighting above. In v. 13 when Abraham is notified by '*the fugitive*' that Lot has been captured, the writer adds the designation הָעֵבֶרִי '*the Hebrew*'. This is the first use of the term in the Hebrew Bible, and it is not used again until Gen 39:14 and 17, where Potiphar's wife uses it to describe Joseph in reported speeches. Here in Gen 14:13 however, it does not occur in reported speech but in *narrative*, having been assigned by the writer/editor. From a poetics perspective, the pragmatic effect is to infer that the narrative point of view represents the perspective of either the fugitive or perhaps just a generic Canaanite observer, rather than that of an omniscient Israelite observer. This is the first time since the death of Haran that Abraham is presented as though he were *not* the central figure of the discourse. This shift in PoV has largely been analyzed for its source-critical implications without consideration being given to the literary effect it achieves.¹⁹⁹

¹⁹⁸ Recall the use of Lot's proper name in Gen 13 where he plays a prominent role, compared to use of epithets in Gen 14, where he is essentially a prop. Cf. the switch in anchoring relations for 'Abraham/his master' and 'the/his servant' in Gen 24.

¹⁹⁹ Speiser notes the rather odd intrusion to the narrative the use of the term 'the Hebrew' renders, since the term "is not applied elsewhere in the Bible to Israelites, except by outsiders (e.g. [Gen] xxxix 14), or for self-identification to foreigners ([Gen] xl 15, xliii 32). Hence the fact that the author himself refers here to Abraham as a Hebrew is strong presumptive evidence that the document did not originate with Israelites" (Speiser 1964:103). Both Speiser and von Rad (1972:179) construe the use of the term 'Hebrew' as a remnant from an

Point of view (PoV) is an important literary tool in Biblical Hebrew narrative.²⁰⁰ We see here how manipulation of referring expressions is utilized to achieve various effects. Recall the earlier discussion about switching designations for ‘*Sarai*’ to ‘*the woman*’. In terms of PoV, it is as though the reader is ‘viewing’ the story from the Egyptians’ standpoint, since it is *they* who would view Sarah as only a woman, and not as Abraham’s wife. Similarly, the addition of the term **הָעֵבֶרִי** in Gen 14:13 achieves a similar effect. Van Hoek notes “that the subject of a clause is typically, or at least frequently, construed as the ‘viewer’ of the material in the clause” (1997:201). In other words, van Hoek suggests that readers of third person narrative tend to cognitively process the information through the main character’s PoV, instead of through the narrator’s PoV. We tend to forget that the information flow is being shaped and structured by a third party, viz. the writer/editor. We are only explicitly reminded of this fact at such times that the narrator’s PoV is explicitly expressed or encoded.²⁰¹ We would regard Gen 14:13 as an example of where the writer/editor has chosen to rather overtly disclose the point of view from which the story is being narrated, but the switch is highly appropriate given the nature of the content of Gen 14.

By v. 14 of Gen 14 we note that the narrative PoV has shifted back to an Abraham-centered perspective based on the use of 3MS pronominal suffixes to anchor participants to Abraham. In 16b, we note the compound designation **לוֹט אָחִיו** ‘*Lot, his brother*’ is used to both highlight the thematically salient familial link, as well as to indicate that Abraham is once again the narrative’s referential center based on the fact that the other participants are anchored to him.²⁰² This designation is further highlighted using information structure, being preposed for marked focus.

Supplementation of referring expressions is also extensively utilized in Genesis 16, the narrative which recounts Sarah giving Hagar to Abraham as a wife. What is interesting to note is that while Sarah ostensibly changes Hagar’s salient relation from ‘handmaid’ to ‘Abraham’s wife’, the writer/editor *never* refers to Hagar as anything but a handmaid. It is as though he is countering what is being communicated via the narrative’s content by reiterating her anchoring relation as ‘handmaid’. Sarah is reactivated in v. 1, most probably from inactivity,²⁰³ using the compound designation **שָׂרַי אִשְׁת־אַבְרָם** ‘*Sarai, Abram’s wife*’. In v. 2, both Abraham and Sarah are referenced using bare proper names, and Hagar is introduced in v. 1. Thus, all participants have been successfully reactivated by the end of v. 2, and therefore should not need further anchoring information. However, the writer manages to add an anchoring expression to *all three* participants in the course of v. 3:

וּתְלָח שָׂרַי אִשְׁת־אַבְרָם אֶת־הָגָר הַמִּצְרִית שִׁפְחָתָהּ... וַתִּתֵּן אֹתָהּ לְאַבְרָם אִשָּׁה לּוֹ לְאִשָּׁה:

earlier source. Waltke (2001) only considers the possible meaning of the term and not its potential literary impact.

²⁰⁰ Cf. Berlin (1983:43-82) for further discussion of PoV in Biblical Hebrew narrative.

²⁰¹ For an alternative analysis of PoV, cf. van Wolde’s (1997:31f) discussion of ‘perspective’.

²⁰² Cf. **אָחִיו** ‘his brother’, **חֲנִיכָיו** ‘his trained men’ and **בֵּיתוֹ** ‘his house’ in v. 14, **וְעַבְדָּיו** ‘and his servants’ in v. 15 as further confirmation of this shift.

²⁰³ Sarai was last mentioned in 13:1 using the designation ‘*Abram’s wife*’.

'And Sarai, Abram's wife, took Hagar, her Egyptian handmaid...and gave her to Abram, her husband, (to be) to him as a wife.'

In YHWH's speech to Abraham in Gen 15, no details are provided to him about exactly how he will gain an heir. Sarah decides, based on her claim that YHWH has closed her womb, to give her handmaid to Abraham as a second wife. Hagar is clearly semi-active after v. 2, so the reiteration of her anchoring relation in v. 3 is reasonably construed as marked. Based on Abraham's speech in Gen 24 commissioning his servant to find a wife for Isaac *from among Abram's relatives*, we can also reasonably infer that Hagar's *nationality* is also thematically salient.

Furthermore, the repetition of the husband and wife roles also highlights salient information, in light of the pericope's content. Specifically, the interaction of these discourse roles comes into play in vv. 4-5. Here, Sarah reacts against Hagar's treatment of her as an equal wife, despite the fact that the same term is used to describe their relation to Abraham. The situation becomes comic as Sarah blames everything on Abraham, when the entire scheme was Sarah's idea from the beginning. Even though Sarah has taken steps to change Hagar's role from *'handmaid'* to *'wife'*, she later rejects this change. From the narrator's PoV, we find a similar dismissal of the role change in that Hagar is *never* referred to as Abraham's wife by the narrator. The Angel of YHWH also avoids referring to Hagar as *'Abram's wife'*, but instead seems to reaffirm her role as *'Sarai's handmaid'*, a role which she also acknowledges.²⁰⁴

The highlighting of Hagar as a non-wife is incredibly salient to the balance of the Abraham narratives, as it relates closely to the fact that Ishmael is *not* the heir that YHWH has promised. In 16:15b, the relative clause אֲשֶׁר־יָלְדָהּ הַגֵּר 'whom Hagar bore' is used to anchor Ishmael, highlighting his connection to Hagar as opposed to Sarah. Though Ishmael may be Abraham's son (cf. highlighting via supplementation in 17:25 and 26b), Hagar is not Abraham's wife. It is through Sarah that the promised son will come (cf. Gen 18:10ff).

If we move ahead to Gen 21 where the promise to Sarah is fulfilled, we observe supplemental anchoring information added to thematically highlight Isaac's birth. This information also provides a contrast with the themes highlighted in Gen 16. Verse 2 reports that Sarah conceived and bore a son to Abraham at the time God had appointed. The following verse relates Abraham's naming of his son. Based on the context, Isaac is the only son that is discourse active, even though Abraham has two sons. Furthermore, the semantic relationship between the verbs of vv. 2-3 is such that minimal encoding could be used for both agent and patient in v. 3, as role change from Sarah in v. 2 to Abraham in v. 3 as agent is both anticipated and morphologically unambiguous. In spite of these factors, reference to Abraham's son is heavily supplemented with הַגֵּוֹלְדִי לּוֹ אֲשֶׁר־יָלְדָהּ־לּוֹ שָׂרָה 'the one born to him, whom Sarah had born to him'. The thematic highlighting of this son's relation to Sarah, and the syntax used to encode it, closely parallel that used to highlight Ishmael's connection to Hagar

²⁰⁴ Cf. v. 8 שָׂרָה שְׂפָחַת שָׂרַי 'Hagar, Sarai's handmaid' and v. 9 שָׂרַי גְּבוּרָתִי 'my mistress Sarai'; v. 9 גְּבוּרָתְךָ 'your mistress'.

in 16:15b. Both also utilize end focus to highlight the proper names the sons are given.²⁰⁵ Abraham's promised son is also thematically highlighted in vv. 4 and 5 by the addition of בְּנֵוֹן 'his son' in a context where Isaac is unquestionably semi-active, if not 'in focus'²⁰⁶ based on the N1 context.

Numerous examples of adding thematic prominence to salient relations are found in Gen 22. Isaac's relationship to Abraham is highly salient in this chapter, and is thematically highlighted using many supplemented referring expressions. YHWH's speech emphasizes this relation while at the same time delaying the disclosure of Isaac's name in 22:2²⁰⁷ (קַח-נָא אֶת-יְחִידָךָ אֲשֶׁר-אֶלְבָּבְתָּ אֶת-יִצְחָק). The technique used here is similar to that pointed out in 16:15 and 21:3 above. אֶת-בְּנֵךָ ('your son') unambiguously identifies Isaac, anchors him to Abraham, and highlights the familial relation by switching from the preferred proper name 'Isaac' to an epithet. Isaac is redundantly anchored to Abraham through supplementation three times,²⁰⁸ and twice through substitution.²⁰⁹ The substitution coincides with thematically critical points of the discourse: raising the knife to slay 'his son', and to describe the substitution of the ram for 'his son'. Abraham's relation to Isaac is also thematically highlighted both by substitution in Isaac's speech (v. 7b), and through supplementation in the quotative frame which introduces it (v. 7a). One could also construe the supplement in the quotative frame as indicating a switch in initiators, based on the nature of Isaac's question. Many other examples of thematic highlighting using supplementation could be cited from our corpus, but the examples discussed here are representative.²¹⁰

Now let us consider the addition of demonstrative pronouns to referring expressions. Levinsohn (2003:1) states that demonstrative pronouns are used as substitute referring expressions in many languages to differentiate thematic topics from athematic ones, with the near demonstrative being used for thematic topics, and the far demonstrative being used for athematic topics. However, a

²⁰⁵ Compare the syntax and semantic of the two accounts:
 16:15 וַתֵּלֶד הַגֵּר לְאַבְרָהָם בֶּן וַיִּקְרָא אַבְרָהָם שְׁם-בְנֵוֹן אֲשֶׁר-יָלְדָהּ הַגֵּר שְׁמֵעָאֵל:
 21:3 וַיִּקְרָא אַבְרָהָם אֶת-שְׁם-בְנֵוֹן הַנּוֹלְדֵ-לּוֹ אֲשֶׁר-יָלְדָהּ-לּוֹ שְׁרָה יִצְחָק:

²⁰⁶ Cf. Gundel et al. (1993:278).

²⁰⁷ Two more similarly redundant references are made in the speeches of vv. 12 and 16, and using redundant vocatives in vv. 7 and 8.

²⁰⁸ Cf. vv. 3, 6, and 9.

²⁰⁹ Cf. vv. 10, 13.

²¹⁰ Other examples of supplemented referring expressions from our corpus include Gen 12:11 ('his wife'), and 20:2a, 14c, 18 ('his wife', 'Abram's wife' in v. 18) where Abraham is lying about Sarah's relation to him; 13:5 ('the one traveling with him') to highlight Lot's presence with Abraham just before conflict forces them to separate; 14:12a, 12c ('Abram's nephew...living in Sodom') to highlight Lot's familial relation to Abram, which is Abram's motivation to rescue him; 19:25 (the description of all that was destroyed emphasizes comprehensiveness, but is implicit in 'those cities'); 22:9 ('the place *that God had said to him*', contrasts with the more simplex phrase 'the place' used in v. 4b above); 22:14a ('the name of the place *that one*'); 23:7 ('to the people of the land, to the sons of Heth' where 'sons of Heth' was used in preceding clause); 23:10b ('in the ears of the sons of Heth, *to all the ones entering the city gate*'); 23:16b ('the money *which he had spoken in the ears of the sons of Heth, four hundred shekels of silver*', where money was readily accessible from the reported speech of v. 15); 23:19a ('his wife'); 24:9a (Abraham *his master*', cf. vv. 10a, 10c, etc); 24:30b ('Rebekah *his sister*', the anchored epithet 'his sister' is used in v. 30a); 24:59a ('Rebekah *their sister*'); 24:59a ('the servant of Abraham', switches back to 'the servant' in v. 61d, 65a, 65b, 66a); 24:67a ('Sarah *his mother*').

different pragmatic effect is obtained when demonstratives are *added* to proper names instead of substituted. Downing (1996:133) describes this effect as a means of the speaker *distancing* himself from the particular referent.²¹¹ The pragmatic effect is achieved ostensibly by the reader/hearer construing *this ProperName* as what is described by Gundel et al. (1993:276) as a ‘referential indefinite (e.g. ‘*this guy walks into a bar...*’). The referential *this* can be used in English to introduce generic participants and is comparable to use of the idiom *איש אֶחָד*, usually rendered ‘*a certain man*’ in Biblical Hebrew. We claimed in §4.2 that this collocation is Biblical Hebrew’s manifestation of the ‘referential’ level of encoding (cf. Gundel et al. 1993), indicating that the referent is identifiable to the speaker, but not to the hearer. The latter must infer the referent’s existence.

We note a use of *this ProperName* found in Exod 32:1 and 23 that achieves a comparable pragmatic effect of distancing as described by Downing (1996:133). Exodus 32 recounts the creation of the golden calf as Aaron and the Israelites’ response to Moses’ 40 day absence from the camp. As the people ask Aaron to make a god for them in v. 1, and their request is supported by the statement *לֹא יָדַעְנוּ מַה־הָיָה לּוֹ בִּיְיָהוָה | מֹשֶׁה הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר הֵעֲלֵנוּ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרָיִם* ‘*for this Moses, the man who brought us up from the land of Egypt, we don’t know what has happened to him.*’ From a linguistic point of view, it is as though the people are literally *reactivating* Moses, as though implying that they do not expect Aaron to remember who ‘*this guy*’ is. The reactivation is accomplished using both a referential indefinite idiom, followed by an appositional anchor ‘*the man who brought us up...*’ The pragmatic effect is nearly identical to that achieved in English cited from Downing (1996:133), viz. the people distancing themselves from Moses, and implying much the same for Aaron. Aaron uses the same phrasing when responding to Moses in v. 23. Addition of the near demonstrative to a *simple* NP achieves the thematic marking described by Levinsohn,²¹² and thus the distancing effect seems restricted to use with *proper* NPs. However, reconsideration may need to be given to such uses as *זָאת מִדְּכָם* ‘*this trampling*’ or *הָעָם הַזֶּה* ‘*this people*’ in Isaiah 1:12 and 6:9-10, respectively. The latter could be construed as a distancing alternative to ‘*my people*’.

6.3 Pragmatic Effects of Thematic Highlighting

This section will summarize the pragmatic effects achieved through the use of thematic highlighting which have been mentioned so far. Callow states that one must not only identify the

²¹¹ She states, “First, it constitutes an avoidance of the simple proper name [the Q-principle]. Since bare proper names, as we have seen, are co-recognitionals, the use of *Hart* [i.e. a character in her corpus] here would suggest that speaker B considers Hart to be a member of both his own territory of information and that of speaker A. By avoiding the bare name, B cancels these implicatures. Secondly, common noun phrases involving *this* are usable in various sorts of situations where the speaker wishes to project either his/her own or his/her interlocutor’s lack of familiarity with the referent in question. Such NP’s constitute a common method of introducing referents which are thought to be unknown to the addressee but are destined to play an important role in the upcoming text...; these NP’s involve the form that Gundel et al. (1993) term the ‘indefinite this’. ... But in choosing the *this-N-ProperName* alternative, he is also offering to speaker A the possibility of being included in the group that eschews identification with Hart” (1996:133).

²¹² E.g. Gen 12:7; 15:7, 18 (‘*this land*’); 15:5 (‘*this one will not be your heir*’); 17:21 (‘*this season*’).

marker of prominence, but also the *domain over which it extends* (cf. 1974:50), and thus we will delineate the domain based on the various effects observed in our corpus.

6.3.1 Reorienting the Participant to the Discourse

We stated in §4.2 that when a participant is introduced to a discourse, it is assigned both a referring expression and some kind of discourse relation which anchors it in the reader's mental representation, based on Givón (1992). This anchoring relation becomes the reader's primary means of relating the participant to the discourse, and remains so until discourse information directs the reader to do otherwise. One of the pragmatic effects of reiterating anchoring relations for (semi-) active participants is to cognitively reaffirm or re-anchor the participant to the discourse. This re-anchoring takes two forms: reaffirming the participant's current discourse relation, or switching to an alternative, more salient discourse relation as the primary basis for relating the participant to the discourse. We view participant reorientation to be more global in domain than local, in that it either restructures or reaffirms the reader's mental representation of the participant.

Reaffirming the Anchoring Relation

When an anchoring relation is redundantly restated *without change* from that which is cognitively instantiated, the repetition is nonetheless considered marked and assigns prominence to the relation. Biblical Hebrew writers often reiterate a relation where it is thematically salient to the discourse, either locally or globally. Such reiteration can be achieved using both means of thematic highlighting mentioned above: substitution and supplementation. Let us consider some examples.

Substitution and supplementation utilizing familial relations serve to make sure that readers have the most salient relation in the forefront of their mental representation. Repetition of this information makes sure that these relations are the primary basis used to ground the participant to the discourse. Lot's relation to Abraham is highlighted through supplementation in Gen 14:12 (*'Abram's nephew...living in Sodom'*), and through substitution in 14:16b (*'his relative'*). This usage is presumably intended to highlight the obligation Abraham has to rescue his relative. Familial anchors were shown to be thematically salient in Gen 16 and 22 as well. Heavy use of supplementation in both chapters ensures that the reader has what the writer deems is the most salient anchoring relation in mind. In the case of Gen 16, the supplementation affirms that even though ostensibly the participants have changed Hagar's salient relation to the discourse from 'handmaid' to 'Abraham's wife', the writer/editor does nothing to affirm such a change. In fact he appears to *counter* it by repeatedly anchoring Hagar to Sarah as her handmaid. In Gen 22, the supplementations of *'father'* and *'son'* ensure that it is read as a story about a father and son, a theme which would not have received nearly as much prominence had only bare proper names been utilized.

There are many other examples of how supplementation and substitution are used to highlight anchoring relations.²¹³ One of the pragmatic effects of such encoding is to add prominence to the anchoring relation since it is either redundant, or represents a change from the default referring expression. This constrains the reader to ground the participant to the discourse using the highlighted relation. However, highlighting the information is not the only effect achieved by supplementation and substitution.

Changing the Anchoring Relation

A second pragmatic effect achieved by the marked use of anchoring relations is to change the primary anchoring relation of a participant, effectively reorienting the reader to the participant based on the thematic salience of the new discourse relation. Gen 21 contains a number of such changes. The complicating action of the pericope, which precipitates the expulsion of Hagar and Ishmael from Abraham's camp, is Sarah seeing Ishmael mocking Isaac. However rather than using a proper name to designate Ishmael in v. 9, the writer/editor states that Sarah sees אֶת־בְּנוֹהֶגֶר הַמִּצְרַיִת אֲשֶׁר־יָלְדָה לְאַבְרָהָם 'the son of Hagar the Egyptian, whom she bore to Abraham'. This designation highlights both Ishmael's non-Israelite roots, and only indirectly relates him to Abraham. Gen 17 was the last pericope where Ishmael was referred to. Each of the three references to him there utilize a proper name + 'his son', explicitly anchoring Ishmael to Abraham. Thus prior to Gen 21:9, the most familiar relation for anchoring Ishmael to the discourse is as 'Abraham's son'. Gen 21:9 not only portrays Ishmael ostensibly from Sarah's PoV, but also is likely construed by readers as the most salient relation for this context. Such a view is reinforced by Sarah's subsequent demand that Abraham evict Hagar and 'her son'.

Another relation is posited in v. 11, which recounts Abraham's response to Sarah's demand. There, Abraham refers to Ishmael as 'his son', an expression reflecting Abraham's PoV as he is troubled about sending Hagar and 'his son' away. This relation is short-lived, as references to Ishmael switch in God's speech, with the writer/editor using הַנָּעַר 'the lad' in vv. 12, 17 (2x), 18, 19, and 20, with the exception of בְּנוֹהֶאֱמָה 'son of the maid' in v. 13. Such encoding is consistent with God's PoV supporting Sarah's demand that the two leave. The writer/editor maintains this impersonal reference through the use of הַיָּלֵד 'the boy' in vv. 14, 15, and in the RS of v. 16. Thus, we observe one participant designated using four different appellations in a single chapter, none of which are a proper name! Only the reference in v. 11 associates Ishmael with Abraham. The other references either link him to Hagar, or omit any type of link to another participant (e.g. 'boy' or

²¹³ Cf. 19:30c ('he and his two daughters' mentioned in a right dislocation repeated from v. 30a instead of 3MP minimal encoding); 19:33a, 35a (switch to 'their/her father' from 'Lot' in 19:30); 20:2a (supplements 'his wife' to 'Sarah'); 21:3 ('the one born to him, which Sarai had born to him' is redundant from previous line); 21:4, 5 (adds 'his son'); 22:3c ('his son' in a detached object phrase; cf. vv. 6b, 9d (10b)); 22:7a (substitutes 'his father' for 'Abraham'); 22:10b (substitutes 'his son' for 'Isaac'); 24:30a (switch to 'his sister' from 'Rebekah' in v. 29a).

'lad'). Each designation has a slightly different discourse relation, and we observed that the particular relations used match the PoV of the participants.

Other examples of changing the participant's anchoring relation include supplementing Abraham's proper name with '*the Hebrew*' in Gen 14:13b, switching from the designation '*the sons of Heth*' to '*the people of the land*' in Gen 23:12a, and switches from '*the servant of Abraham*' or '*the servant*' in Gen 24:1-17 to '*the man*' in vv. 21-32. After the man identifies himself as Abraham's servant in v. 34, the writer/editor reverts back to calling him '*Abraham's servant*' (cf. v. 52ff) in the narrative proper. A comparable switch is made in the reference to Rebekah in the same chapter from a proper name in v. 15 to '*the young woman*' in vv. 16 and 28, and back again to a proper name in v. 29ff. We would propose that the purpose of these switches is more closely associated with PoV effects than with re-designating the participant. Nonetheless the departure from or supplementation of the default referring expression inevitably adds prominence to the new designation that it would not otherwise have received had the expected encoding norms been followed.

6.3.2 Indicating Center of Attention within the Discourse

Another pragmatic effect associated with redundant use of anchoring expressions is to indicate the center of attention²¹⁴ within the discourse, particularly where a switch in the central anchoring participant is involved. Prototypically in a narrative one participant is perceived to be the central participant, which we referred to as the *center of reference or attention* (cf. §2.4.1). One explicit means of indicating the center of attention is by anchoring the secondary participants to one central participant, i.e. the referential center. If participants are only referred to using bare proper names, determinations about the narrative's center of attention are limited to the reader's interpretation of the narrative content. However, use of a referring expression which includes an anchoring relation will explicitly indicate the current center of attention. Thus, either substitution or supplementation can be used to accomplish this. Shifts in center of attention usually coincide with switches in initiating roles among participants. The domain of such switches is rather local, based upon maintenance of the participant as the referential center.

We pointed out in §6.2.1 that the anchoring relations in Gen 19 switch from Lot's daughters being anchored to him (cf. vv. 8-32), to Lot being anchored to his daughters as '*their/her father*' (cf. vv. 33 (2x), 35, and 36). In the first part of Gen 19, Lot and the angels are the primary initiators, with Lot's daughters functioning largely as props. In the latter part of the chapter, the daughters take the initiative to get their father drunk in order to have him impregnate them. The switches in anchoring relations and center of attention coincide with a switch from Lot as the primary initiator of the narrative to the older and younger daughters as primary initiators.

²¹⁴ For an introduction and application of 'centering theory', cf. Gordon et al. (1993), and Walker et al. 1998).

One finds another such shift in Gen 24 between Abraham and his servant as Abraham commissions the servant to find a wife for Isaac. The servant is anchored to Abraham initially in v. 2, but the pronominal suffix is dropped in subsequent references (cf. vv. 5, 9ff). However at the point that the servant promises to fulfill the task in v. 9, notice the supplemented or substituted reference to Abraham as '*his master*' (cf. vv. 9 and 10 (2x)). Again, note that the switch in anchoring relations coincides with the switch in primary initiators.

Another example observed in Gen 24 is Rebekah's relation to Laban. Laban is initially anchored to the discourse as Rebekah's brother in v. 29a, and subsequently referred to using only a bare proper name in vv. 29b and 32. However, at the point that Laban rushes out to meet the servant at the well Rebekah's anchoring relation switches, evidenced by substitution to '*his sister*' in v. 30a and by supplementation in v. 30b ('*Rebekah, his sister*'). Clearly these are redundant anchoring references.

A final compelling example from outside of our corpus is found in Gen 3. The woman (i.e. Eve) was last referred to in 2:25 in the statement "The man and his wife were both naked and not ashamed", where she was anchored to Adam. When she is first referred to in Gen 3 she is simply indexed as '*the woman*' without an explicit anchor. When Adam enters the picture in 3:6, he is referred to as '*her husband*'. We would propose that the shift in anchoring is meant to highlight that the woman is currently the initiator, not Adam. At the point that the two hear the sound of the LORD God in the garden in v. 8, the writer/editor indexes them as '*the man and his wife*', a switch back to the original anchoring relations. We conclude that the motivation for the pragmatic use of anchoring information is to make the switch in initiators explicit: e.g. from Abraham to the servant, and from Rebekah to Laban, from Adam to the woman and back to Adam. We do not claim that all such switches are meant to indicate a switch in initiators; it is simply an attested pragmatic effect in certain discourse contexts.

6.3.3 Indicating the Narrator's Point of Reference

The majority of switches and supplementations of anchoring expressions can be adequately accounted for as reorienting the participant to the discourse, or as indicating changes in the center of attention. There are still other examples which fall outside the realm of these explanations, however. Many of the remaining tokens can be explained as explicitly indicating a change in the narrator's point of view. There is a meaningful difference between center of attention/reference and PoV. Using the analogy of a camera, the 'center of attention' describes *who* or *what* the camera lens is focused on, whereas PoV²¹⁵ describes *where* the camera is, the *vantage point* from which the scene is viewed. Prototypically in third person narrative the story is processed from the main participant's

²¹⁵ Cf. Berlin (1983), who uses the camera illustration to describe point of view.

PoV, as discussed in §6.2.1.²¹⁶ This phenomenon is most commonly associated with deictic references, but is often overlooked in its more subtle manifestations as PoV. For instance in Gen 11:31 we find the statement:

וַיִּקַּח תֵּרַח אֶת־אַבְרָם... וַיֵּצְאוּ אִתָּם מֵאוּר כַּשְׁדִּים לְלֶכֶת אֶרְצָה כְּנָעַן וַיָּבֹאוּ עַד־חָרָן וַיֵּשְׁבוּ שָׁם

‘And Terah took Abram... and they went out with them from Ur of the Chaldeans to go to the land of Canaan and they came as far as Haran and they settled there.’

One would expect that if the writer/narrator were portraying himself as embedded with the participants, the near deictic ‘*here*’ would be used to describe where they settled, as opposed to the ‘*there*’. It is as though things are being described from the vantage point of Canaan at this point, waiting for the participants to arrive. On the other hand, YHWH’s commands to Abraham in 12:1ff are given (quite appropriately) from Abraham’s standpoint in Haran, viewing Canaan as being at a distance. Finally, the use of בּוֹא in v. 5, usually rendered as ‘*came*’ rather than ‘*went*’,²¹⁷ indicates yet another deictic shift to *within* Canaan.²¹⁸

In comparable ways we observe occasions in the corpus where the writer/editor shifts his PoV or vantage point from being a part of the assembled participants to being an outsider. This idea was proposed in the discussion of Gen 12:14 and 15, where switching references from ‘*Sarai*’ to ‘*the woman*’ indicated that the writer/editor was portraying things from the Egyptians’ PoV. This apparent shift lasts only as long as Abraham’s deception. We then find her referred to only as ‘*his wife*’ until Gen 16. A similar shift is observed as the fugitive of Gen 14:13b informs ‘*Abram, the Hebrew*’ of Lot’s capture. Based on the limited use of this term it is difficult to understand how it could be construed as reorienting Abraham to the discourse. The primary effect in this context is to indicate that the frame of reference for Gen 14:1ff is the Canaanite world around Abraham, rather than Abraham’s personal perspective. The fact that Chedorlaomer functions as the center of reference in 14:1-12 further supports the appropriateness of Abraham’s reintroduction in v. 13, since he is not the current referential center. However, we notice a return to Abraham as the center of reference as he begins the rescue of Lot in 14:14.

Two other switches of reference point from our corpus deserve mention. The first is found in a rather awkward clause in Gen 16:4d, and is rendered in JPS as “^{4a}And he went in unto Hagar, ^{4b}and she conceived; ^{4c}and when she saw that she had conceived^{Temp}, ^{4d}her mistress was despised in her

²¹⁶ Cf. Van Hoek notes “that the subject of a clause is typically, or at least frequently, construed as the ‘viewer’ of the material in the clause” (1997:201). For a similar claim established on the basis of poetics cf. Sternberg (1985:130).

²¹⁷ E.g. JPS, NASB, NKJ, NRSV, and LXX. Other versions render it externally as ‘arrived there’ (cf. NJB, NIV), or ‘arrived in Canaan’ (cf. NLT).

²¹⁸ Levinsohn outlines the often overlooked deictics of verbs of motion that vary from language to language. He claims, “although the Greek verbs ἔρχομαι and πορεύομαι are not always used in the same way as English ‘come’ and ‘go’, they nevertheless denote motion with respect to some point of reference or ‘deictic center’” (2001:13). One would expect these principles to be at work in Biblical Hebrew as well, even though it is not reflected in most lexicons.

eyes.” Most English translations represent v. 4c as a temporal PoD.²¹⁹ The repetition of the content of verse 4b in v. 4c creates what Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:105) refer to as ‘tail-head linkage’²²⁰ which slows down the narrative and adds prominence to what immediately follows in the main clause. We construe the grammar and the referring expression as an effort to change the point of reference from that of Sarah to that of Hagar; otherwise it is difficult to rationalize the change of referring expression for Sarah. By using the suffixes and the anchored referring expression, Sarah is able to be prominently referenced without removing Hagar from the center of attention.²²¹

The last example from our corpus is found in Gen 18-19. This passage contains a clear switch in the narrator’s PoV which is achieved using participant reference. Specifically, there are switches of reference for ‘the men/angels’ who accompany YHWH during his visit to Abraham in Gen 18, and who eventually rescue Lot in Gen 19. Gen 18:1 states that YHWH visited Abraham, yet the visitors are described as three men. Eventually in 18:16 and 22 YHWH sends the two men off to Sodom. This sets the stage for Abraham to intercede for the city and for Lot. When the men are mentioned again in 19:1, their referring expression is switched to ‘*the two angels*’. The fact that they are introduced here using a definite NP leads the reader to construe these participants as co-referent with the two men sent by YHWH to Sodom. This change of reference creates a knowledge gap, in that now *the reader* knows the two are divine beings, while Lot *does not* know.²²² The two are referred to by both the narrator²²³ and participants²²⁴ as human ‘*men*’ until shortly after they reveal a supernatural power by blinding the men of Sodom (cf. v. 15). Thus, we would argue that the initial reference to ‘*angels*’ in v. 1 is intended to inform the reader of their true identity. Reference to these participants as humans presents the story from Lot’s PoV, whereby he is ‘entertaining angels unaware’. This maintenance of reference based on participants’ knowledge is also consistent with switches of referring expressions observed in Gen 12 and 20 concerning ‘*Sarah*’ versus the ‘*woman*’.

6.3.4 Conclusions Regarding Thematic Highlighting

Context is crucial in determining which pragmatic effects are achieved by the use of marked participant encodings. In the case of a phrase such as, ‘*Jethro, Moses’ father-in-law*’, any of the pragmatic effects previously mentioned are possible: (re)iteration of the participant’s role, (re)iteration of the center of attention, or changes in point of view. A process of elimination may be used in isolating the most plausible effect(s) achieved in the context. For instance, if the center of attention remains static on one participant in the discourse, it is unlikely that affirming the center of

²¹⁹ Cf. NASB, JPS, NET, NIV, NJB, NKJ, NLT, NRSV.

²²⁰ Cf. Dooley and Levinsohn’s discussion on the use of tail-head linkage as a pre-climax highlighting device (2001:105).

²²¹ Cf. Foley and Van Valin (1984) for a discussion about the similar use of passive constructions to maintain attention on one participant, even though he/she is not the agent.

²²² For a description of the use of gapping from the standpoint of poetics in Biblical Hebrew narrative, cf. Sternberg (1985:183ff).

²²³ Cf. 19:10 and 12.

²²⁴ Cf. 19:2, 5, and 8.

attention is the intention. Highlighting the thematic role or relation is likely the more salient pragmatic effect. However, in a context such as Gen 27 which makes *eight* discrete switches in center of attention, the switching function is likely as salient as the highlighting of roles, and perhaps more so. ‘Switching’ centers of reference appears to be a much more localized device, compared to the domain of thematically highlighting a role. Point of view effects are largely determined by consistency of referential center as determined by the referring expressions. As observed in Gen 12 and 14, it was the *lack* of an anchoring relation to other participants that indicated the switch of reference. More will be said about these issues in our application of these principles to Gen 27 in the Chapter 7.

6.4 *Cataphoric Highlighting*

6.4.1 Introduction

Section 6.1.2 provided an introduction to the idea of ‘prominence’, and proposed a cognitive account of how elements are judged and processed as prominent by readers. Section 6.2 described the use of prominence in Biblical Hebrew narrative to thematically highlight information. In these cases, default lexical encoding was either substituted or supplemented. It was argued that such encoding pragmatically draws attention to *the non-default information*. The use of default lexical NPs used where minimal encoding is expected has so far only been attributed to the processing function (cf. Chapter 5). However, cognitive processing cannot account for all of the overencoding data observed in our corpus. The remaining tokens fall into two categories.

First, there are instances where active agents and patients are *both* overencoded in a clause, especially in quotative frames. This encoding exceeds the requirements for signaling a new development (e.g. Gen 14:22).²²⁵ Second, there are instances where the overencoding of participants in context S1 is found in *consecutive* clauses (e.g. Gen 13:11a-b), ostensibly dividing the clauses into two distinct developments. How are these two kinds of tokens to be analyzed? Are they *marked* developments, given more prominence than normal due to the presence of additional encoding?

Levinsohn claims that there are two reasons for overencoding participants in certain discourse contexts, based upon Givón’s (1983a) iconicity principle:

1. “to mark the beginning of a narrative unit (because, in Givón’s terms, there is a discontinuity); or
2. to highlight the action or speech concerned (often, because it is disruptive or surprising)” (2000b:4).

Huang (2000:230) reaches similar conclusions, stating that “contrastiveness or being contrary to expectation” is an effect associated with use of marked forms.

²²⁵ Overencoding for processing appears to be restricted to the overencoding of agents, based on the conclusions reached by most empirical cognitive studies cited above. Preliminary data from our corpora give some reason to conclude that overencoding in certain N- contexts may be used to disambiguate whether some context S3 or S4 transitions should be read as a new developments or not (cf. Levinsohn 2000b:9, and his analysis of Gen 4:6).

One discourse context that is often pragmatically marked according to Longacre (1996:132) is what he refers to as a ‘countering move’ in reported speech, whereby one participant’s speech either counters the goals or objectives of the other, or simply initiates a new direction in the dialogue. Dooley and Levinsohn cite several attested means of grammaticalizing countering moves: “In Koiné Greek, for instance, the verb *apokrínomai*, which is usually glossed ‘answer’, typically signals a change of direction in a reported conversation... In languages that use a developmental marker, this marker is likely to be used in connection with a change of direction in a reported conversation. It is normal, also, for a noun to refer to the speaker of such a speech, even when a pronoun would otherwise be expected” (2001:100-101).

Thus, even though a reader may be able to determine from the *content* of a speech that it represents a shift in direction compared to that of the preceding speech, many languages add *pragmatic markers* to highlight such a shift using development or other pragmatically assigned markers. Levinsohn (2000a:140ff) has found the highlighting function of overencoding used not just in countering moves, but more generally to *cataphorically highlight* a following speech or event. In other words, the overencoding of participants can be used to pragmatically add prominence to a following speech or event that it would not naturally have had without the marked encoding. Levinsohn applied these principles to Koine Greek (2000a:140ff), and found that overencoding is regularly utilized as a cataphoric marker to highlight a following speech or event, *not* the participant that has been overencoded. De Regt (1999:60-62) reaches similar conclusions regarding the series of relexicalizations in Ruth (2:20-22) and in the Joseph narratives (Gen 42:6-9), as does Perrin (1978:110-111), with both observing that use of such overencoding occurs just before the climax of the narrative.²²⁶

It was argued in §2.5.4 that Huang’s revised neo-Gricean pragmatic scheme, combined with Dooley and Levinsohn’s three functions of participant reference,²²⁷ appear to form a cognitive processing scheme whereby lower level functions are entailed in those above them, repeated below:

(27) Entailment Hierarchy for Cognitive Processing of Marked Referring Expressions

Semantic → Processing → Pragmatic

In other words, when a reader encounters a redundant NP, the expression still plays a semantic role. However, based on its redundancy it is construed as serving some other pragmatic function than simple disambiguation. The overencoded tokens are interpreted as such based on their departure from the established discourse patterns (cf. the theoretical frame of reference discussed in §6.1). Cognitive

²²⁶ “Like Judg 3:20-22 and, e.g., Gen 25:34a and 29:10-12 (‘Jacob’), Ruth 2:20-22 seems to serve as a climactic point in the text, indicated by the repetition of full references to participants. Such a peak potentially brings about a crucial change in the course of events. In general, devices of repetition often mark a peak, ‘i.e., various devices are used to insure that the peak does not “go by too fast”’ (De Regt 1999:61, citing Longacre 1989:349).

²²⁷ These functions are semantic, processing, and discourse-pragmatic.

research has demonstrated that overencoding of active participants is first construed as marking a new segment. The overencoding guides the reader to chunk the text in their mental representation. Based on the claims of Levinsohn (2000a) and Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:100-101), we are postulating that overencoding which exceeds the discourse-established patterns to mark new developments moves the reader to the next level of the anaphora resolution scheme—pragmatic highlighting. We would further argue that such lexical overencoding functions to cataphorically highlight a following event or speech by creating a marked development unit, something on the order of a ‘pragmatic speed bump’ to slow readers down and get their attention. Longacre’s (1996:132) claim regarding countering moves appears to be a specific application of this more general principle of cataphoric highlighting.

The number of tokens in the corpus of Gen 12-25 which utilize cataphoric highlighting is rather limited. Most are observed in quotative frames in contexts where there is a shift in initiators within the dialogue. A few are found just before a thematically salient event, which is consistent with Dooley and Levinsohn’s description. We first observed the marking of countering moves and cataphoric highlighting through repeated S1 lexicalization in our test corpus of Exod 1-12. This corpus includes many more contexts where participants resist the initiative of another. Only a few comparable situations are found in the Genesis corpus: Abraham’s refusal to accept booty from the king of Sodom in Gen 14:22, Abraham’s rejection of responsibility for Hagar in 16:6; and Abraham’s continuing reduction in the number of righteous necessary for a city to be spared in 18:27, 29.²²⁸ Several examples will be presented which illustrate the cataphoric highlighting of a following speech or event. Two tokens are taken from the Exodus test corpus. We begin with cataphoric highlighting in context S1.

6.4.2 Cataphoric Highlighting in Narrative

In Exodus 2:23b-25, just prior to YHWH’s revelation of Himself to Moses, there are a series of statements describing YHWH’s awareness and concern for Israel in response to their outcry:

וַיֹּאנְחוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִן־הָעֲבֹדָה וַיִּזְעֻקוּ וַתַּעַל שׁוֹעֲתָם אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים מִן־הָעֲבֹדָה׃²³
 וַיִּשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים אֶת־נַאֲקָתָם וַיִּזְכֹּר אֱלֹהִים אֶת־בְּרִיתוֹ אֶת־אַבְרָהָם...²⁴
 וַיֵּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֵּדַע אֱלֹהִים׃²⁵

²³And the sons of Israel (S4) groaned from the labor and cried out and their cry (S3) went up to God (N4) from the labor.

²⁴And God (S3) heard their cry (N3), and God (S1) remembered his covenant (N4) with Abraham...

²⁵And God (S1) saw the sons of Israel (N3), and God (S1) knew.

Verse 23 introduces the entities that will switch roles in v. 24: the sons of Israel, their cry, and God. Based on the semantics of ‘their cry went up to God’, the expectation is that ‘God’ would be the agent hearing ‘the cry’ in v. 24, a simple S3/N3 role switch disambiguated by the fact that God is the only animate participant. Certainly only the subject needs to be relexicalized to disambiguate the switch.

²²⁸ A complex quotative frame is used in both instances, without lexicalizing the addressee.

We are proposing that the string of S1 relexicalizations in vv. 24-25, in addition to simply segmenting the text, are most likely processed by readers as intending some other marked implicature that minimal encoding would not have achieved. We claim this implicature is the cataphoric highlighting of God coming down to do something about all that He has heard and seen (cf. Exod 3ff). Also note the relexicalization of ‘sons of Israel’ in v. 25a, in a context where they are the only salient 3MP referent, based on the pronominal suffixes used in v. 24a. In contrast in v. 25b, the complement of what God knew is elided, leaving it to the reader to supply an antecedent. This passage illustrates not only the effective use of cataphoric highlighting, but also the Biblical Hebrew writer/editor’s literary capabilities.

We find a similar example of S1 relexicalization in Gen 13:10ff used to highlight Lot’s decision to choose Sodom rather than Canaan, in response to Abraham’s offer.

וַיִּשָׂא לֹט אֶת־עֵינָיו וַיֵּרָא אֶת־כָּל־כְּבַר הַיַּרְדֵּן כִּי כָלָה מִשְׁקָהּ לִפְנֵי | שַׁחַת יְהוָה אֶת־סְדֹם וְאֶת־עַמֹּרָה
כְּגַן־יְהוָה כְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם בְּאֵבֶה צָעַר:
וַיִּבְחַר־לוֹ לֹט אֶת כָּל־כְּבַר הַיַּרְדֵּן וַיֵּסֶע לֹט מִקְדָּם...

¹⁰And **Lot** (S2) lifted his eyes and saw (S1) all of the Jordan valley, that all of it was well-watered before God destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, like YHWH’s garden, like the land of Egypt as you go to Zoar.

¹¹And **Lot** (S1) chose for himself all the Jordan valley and **Lot** (S1) set out eastward...

The relexicalization in v. 10 is construed as overencoded, serving to segment Lot’s response to Abraham’s speech. A large amount of thematically salient information is presented in the subordinate clauses of v. 10, far beyond what is necessary for disambiguation, but exactly the kind of encoding one might expect for thematically highlighting the valley.²²⁹ Longacre notes that such thematic background information is often placed just prior to a climax as a means of delaying resolution and building up the suspense in a narrative (1985:86). The inclusion of this information in Gen 13 is also highly salient for understanding the events in the very next chapter. The twofold relexicalization in v. 11, while serving to segment the text, goes beyond what is reasonably expected and attested elsewhere in our corpus. Thus the encoding can be reasonably understood as explicitly adding prominence to information which is salient to the discourse. This marked encoding is also found in the context of corroborative highlighting markers, viz. the thematically-salient off-line information.²³⁰

²²⁹ Levinsohn (1992) claims that postposed *as-* and *when-* clauses are used in English to convey information that is at least as salient as that in the main clause. Heimerdinger (1999:94ff) makes similar claims regarding the salience of so-called ‘off-line’ material in Biblical Hebrew narrative.

²³⁰ For other examples of the insertion of redundant, thematically-salient off-line information, cf. Gen 14:17 (the description of Chedorlaomer); 19:4 (description of men of Sodom); 19:29 (reference to Lot living in the cities which were destroyed); 21:1, 2 (the ‘just as the LORD said’ statements; cf. Exod 7:10; 9:12, 35; 12:28, 50); 21:3 (the specification of Sarah as the birth mother); 22:3, 9 (description of the place as ‘where God had told him’); 23:13 (reiteration of the bystanders who were listening); 23:19, 20; 25:9-10 (description of which cave was used as a burial place).

6.4.3 Cataphoric Highlighting in Quotative Frames

The previously described examples from Exod 2 and Gen 13 illustrate the use of cataphoric highlighting in context S1, but comparable highlighting is frequently observed in context S2 as well. Consider Moses' first audience with Pharaoh to obtain the freedom of the Israelites, recorded in Exod 5:1-6

¹ וְאַחֲרַיִם בָּאוּ מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֶל־פַּרְעֹה כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה... שְׁלַח אֶת־עַמִּי...
² וַיֹּאמֶר פַּרְעֹה מִי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר אֲשַׁמַּע בְּקוֹלוֹ לְשַׁלַּח אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל...
³ וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֱלֹהֵי הָעִבְרָיִם נִקְרָא עָלֵינוּ נִלְכֶה נָא דֶרֶךְ שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים...
⁴ וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם לְמֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן תִּפְרָעוּ אֶת־הָעָם מִמַּעֲשָׂיו...
⁵ וַיֹּאמֶר פַּרְעֹה הֲזֹרְבִים עִתָּה עִם הָאָרֶץ וְהִשְׁבַּתְתֶּם אֹתָם מִסְבְּלֹתָם:

¹And afterward Moses and Aaron (S3) came and said to Pharaoh (N4), “Thus says YHWH, ‘Let my people go...’”

²And Pharaoh (S2) said (to Ø), “Who is YHWH that I should obey his voice to let Israel go...”

³And Ø (S2) said (to Ø), “The God of the Hebrews met with us. Let us go three days journey...”

⁴And the King of Egypt (S2) said (to them) (N2), “Why, Moses and Aaron, do you cause to refrain...”

⁵And Pharaoh (S1) said (to Ø), “Look, many now are the people of the land, and you want them to...”

The relexicalization of Pharaoh's reply in v. 2 appears to be a simple development marker, eliding the addressees. He has not yet rejected Moses and Aaron's proposal, but the frame introducing Pharaoh's question is segmented to mark it as a distinct development from what precedes. The frame introducing Moses and Aaron's reply in v. 3 uses minimal encoding for both speaker and addressee, while the frames of v. 4-5 seem to mark a shift. Both relexicalize the speaker, and the former explicitly encodes the addressee.²³¹ This view is bolstered by the mid-speech reorienting in v. 5, which not only segments the Pharaoh's speech into two parts, but also adds prominence to the latter portion that use of only a single quotative frame to introduce the speech would not have achieved. Notice also the switch of referring expression from 'Pharaoh' to 'king of Egypt', a move to ensure that the reader is processing this struggle between YHWH/Moses and Pharaoh as more than just interpersonal; the future welfare of Egypt is at stake based on its king's decisions.

Another token of overencoding a countering move is found in Gen 14:22, where Abraham rejects the king of Sodom's offer of booty.

וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָם אֶל־מֶלֶךְ סֹדֶם הֲרִימְתִּי יָדִי אֶל־יְהוָה...

And Abram (S2) said to the king of Sodom (N2), “I have raised my hand to YHWH...”

The speech between the king of Sodom and Abraham is initiated in v. 21, where the king offers the goods Abraham has recovered to him as a reward. Abraham rejects this offer outright. His rejection

²³¹ As noted in §4.4.1, Nariyama (2000) argues that zero anaphora is used cross-linguistically as the unmarked signal of continuity. A great many non-initial quotative frames elide the addressee using zero anaphora, which would have the pragmatic effect of signaling ‘+continuity’ according to Nariyama's view. Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that the explicit pronominal mention of the addressee has the pragmatic effect indicating some degree of discontinuity with the preceding conversational turn, especially based on the fact that both vv. 2 and 3 elide the addressee using zero anaphora.

coincides with the overencoding of both speaker and hearer in a context where minimal encoding is default for both. We would propose that the pragmatic effect of this degree of overencoding is to add prominence to Abraham’s reply that it would not otherwise have had. This is what Longacre (1996) refers to as a countering move. Not only does the encoding serve to segment Abraham’s reply as a distinct development, it also adds prominence to it due to the overencoding of the addressee. Thus the use of overencoding here complements the content of the speech which follows.

One final example of the overencoding of an active speaker and hearer in a quotative frame is found in Gen 16:6. This verse recounts Abraham’s reply to Sarah’s complaint about Hagar disrespecting her. Sarah goes so far as to blame the problem on Abraham. Based on the discourse context, Sarah’s complaint seems out of place in that it was her idea for Abraham to approach Hagar in the first place. Abraham’s reply is encoded as if it is a countering move, yet he does nothing but acquiesce to his wife’s complaint:

...וַתֹּאמֶר שָׂרַי אֶל-אַבְרָם הֲמָסִי עָלֶיךָ...⁶ וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָם אֶל-שָׂרַי...⁵

⁵ And *Sarai* (S1) said to *Abram* (N4), “My wrong is on you...” ⁶ and *Abram* (S2) said to *Sarai* (N2)...

Commentators seem to expect some courageous decision from Abraham here, especially in light of the Ancient Near Eastern legal precedents.²³² Waltke states, “Like Eve, Sarah now shifts the blame, and like Adam, Abraham shrugs off responsibility. Abraham alone has the judicial authority to effect a change and up to now has not acted to protect their marriage” (2001:252).²³³ Von Rad goes further stating, “But what happens—Sarah’s outbursts of anger, Abraham’s surrender of Hagar to Sarah’s reprisal—is *in the narrator’s opinion disagreeable*” (1972:192, italics mine). Von Rad does not elaborate on the textual evidence which leads him to this opinion. We would construe the overencoded quotative frame introducing Abraham’s response as adding prominence to the speech which follows. The overencoding seems to anticipate a countering move, as noted by the commentators; surprisingly, it is never delivered.

6.4.4 Conclusions Regarding Cataphoric Highlighting

Based on the tokens presented both from our primary corpus and from our test corpus of Exodus 1-15, we conclude that the repeated relexicalization in S1, as well as the relexicalization of both speaker and addressee in context S2/N2, is intended to create some pragmatic effect other than simply indicating a new development. Based on the discourse context of each token, the location of the overencoding was either near or at a point of highest tension in the story. We do not claim that such overencoding is *required* to grammaticalize a countering or surprising move in a reported speech. However, it clearly represents an option to pragmatically add prominence to a speech by utilizing encoding in excess of that necessary to signal a new development. Similarly, the repeated

²³² Cf. Walton (2001:447f) for a thorough discussion on this issue.

²³³ Ross (1996:320) characterizes Abraham’s actions as a “surrendering agreement”.

relexicalization in S1 serves to segment each clause into its own new development unit, with the pragmatic effect of adding prominence to each clause. This prominence would not have been present if the clauses had been minimally encoded within a single, unified development unit. Viewing this kind of overencoding through the lens of the pragmatic processing of anaphora, and informed by cross-linguistic principles, our theoretical frame of reference is able to provide a reasonable account of the remaining body of marked encoding from our corpus.

6.5 Conclusion

This chapter has provided an account of the remaining group of overencoded tokens from our corpus, encoding which exceeded the cross-linguistic and empirical expectations to indicate a new development. It was postulated that encoding in excess of that required to indicate a new development is construed by readers as accomplishing some pragmatic effect other than processing. This framework is based on the cross-linguistic functions of participant reference postulated by Dooley and Levinsohn (2001), and informed by the revised Neo-Gricean principles which we demonstrated are attested in diverse languages. The proposed pragmatic effect of such overencoded development units is to cataphorically highlight a salient speech or event which follows. It was noted that empirical studies of anaphora have largely focused on differentiating the processing of pronominal versus nominal reference to active agents/subjects, and has not extended to overencoded lexical forms or the overencoding of patients. Therefore this framework relies upon firmly established cognitive and pragmatic principles, as well as usage attested in other languages.

The application of this theoretical framework to the remaining overencoded tokens from our corpus resulted in distinguishing two distinct functions of overencoding in addition to marking development units. The functions can be differentiated by the kind of encoding involved. On the one hand, the substitution or supplementation of referring expressions has the pragmatic effect of *thematically highlighting* the added information itself. On the other hand, overencoding both the agent and the patient, or consecutively overencoding the agent, has the pragmatic effect of *cataphorically highlighting* a following speech or event. Our conclusions are summarized in the following definitions.

Thematic highlighting: Assigns added prominence to **information** that is crucial to understanding the interpretive point of the story. Thematic highlighting places the spotlight on the *added information* itself.

Cataphoric highlighting: Cataphorically adds prominence to surprising or important **developments**. Cataphoric highlighting places the spotlight on a following speech or event, *not* on the added information itself.

Based on the analysis of the thematic highlighting tokens, several possible pragmatic effects were noted depending on the discourse context. First, thematic highlighting can have the pragmatic effect of reorienting an active or semi-active participant to the discourse based on the anchoring relation specified by the writer/editor. Second, thematic highlighting can explicitly indicate the

referential center, which prototypically coincides with the current center of attention/initiating participant. Finally, thematic highlighting can also serve to indicate shifts in PoV, the vantage point from which the narrative is being recounted. In the case of cataphoric highlighting, the primary pragmatic effect is to add prominence to a following speech or event by creating a marked segment which serves to ‘slow down’ the pace of the narrative.

Our study began by highlighting the need for a typologically informed, empirical account of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew narrative, based on the gaps left from previous studies in Chapters 2 and 3. The default encoding constraints and default forms for the various discourse contexts were described in Chapter 4. This default description served as the baseline for both isolating and describing marked forms of participant encoding. In the process, it was noted that the corpus exhibited overencoding of participants in contexts where minimal forms are expected. Chapter 5 described the use of redundant lexical NP references to active participants as Biblical Hebrew’s means of segmenting a narrative into distinct developments in contexts of relative continuity. This current chapter has provided a description of the remaining overencoded data as either thematic highlighting or cataphoric highlighting.

Thus far our model has only been applied to our corpus one layer at a time, viz. default encoding, marked encoding for processing and marked encoding for discourse-pragmatic functions. With our account of participant reference completed, the next chapter is devoted to a unified analysis of Gen 27 in order to demonstrate how the pieces fit together, as well how the pragmatic use of participant reference complements and interacts with the use of other discourse conventions.

7. A Discourse-Functional Account of Participant Reference in Genesis 27

The last six chapters of this study have outlined a theoretical and methodological framework and applied it to a corpus in order to propose a preliminary linguistic description of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew narrative. The theoretical frame of reference is grounded in both a functional understanding of discourse grammar and cognitive linguistics. The discourse-functional component has allowed us to describe the non-formal, discourse-related factors which influence the encoding of participants. The cognitive component has allowed us to propose a theoretical framework to describe the human-processing factors which influence both the encoding of participants, and the processing of that encoding by readers. Finally, the framework was informed by cross-linguistic principles in order to ensure that the proposed description of participant reference is consistent with the functions and effects associated with participant reference attested in other languages.

Up to this point, examples have been presented and conclusions have been drawn from our primary corpus of Gen 12-25 and our test corpus of Exod 1-12. Though our methodological approach has been described, it has not been demonstrated to the reader through an extended application to a single passage. This chapter provides an analysis of the participant reference encoding found in Gen 27, based on the tagged analysis of the Hebrew text in Appendix 2. The goal in this chapter is to provide a summary, reviewing each of the aspects of participant reference presented previously through application to Gen 27. We will begin with the activation of the participants, describing the probable status of the first-time reader's mental representation of the discourse as they begin reading the chapter, and then trace the development of that representation. Then, we will discuss the continued reference to active participants, followed by the use of marked encoding to segment the text for easier processing. Finally, we will discuss the uses of marked encoding for pragmatic highlighting. Our goal is not simply to provide a unified account of the referential encoding observed in Gen 27, but to demonstrate the contributions our insights make to both the exegesis and translation of this passage.

7.1 *Participant Activation*

Genesis 27 recounts the story of Jacob stealing Isaac's blessing intended for Esau, with help from Rebekah. All four of the participants have been introduced into the discourse prior to this chapter. Isaac was formally introduced into the narrative in Gen 21:2-3 using a two-step process of predicating his existence in one clause, and then assigning a name in the next clause. Due to the thematic significance of Isaac's birth to the discourse, these verses are heavily overencoded for cataphoric highlighting, as described in §6.4. Rebekah is first introduced to the narrative in Gen 22:23 via a genealogical report. She then becomes an active participant in Gen 24:15ff, reactivated using a highlighted participial clause, and anchored by an overspecified relative clause.

Jacob and Esau are both generically introduced into the discourse in 25:22 as ‘*the children*’. They are then individually named in 25:25-26 in a two-part introduction of predication and naming. In this initial narrative, Jacob is anchored to Esau as ‘*his brother*’ in v. 26. The birth narrative is followed by contrasting characterizations of the two brothers in 25:27-28. Comments are made about both their personal preferences and their parents’ preferences. After this, a brief pericope recounts how Esau sells his birthright to Jacob (25:29-34). Gen 26 closes with the report that Esau married from the daughters of Heth (v. 34), stating that they caused ‘*bitterness to Isaac and to Rebekah*’ in v. 35.

Due to the mention of Isaac, Rebekah and Esau in the last verse before Gen 27, we construe all of the participants as clearly being semi-active with the possible exception of Jacob, who was last mentioned in 25:34. Although all are semi-active, consideration must be given to the most probable anchoring relation of each. In terms of salient anchoring relations, Isaac was the primary center of attention in Gen 26 based on his interaction with Abimelech. Therefore Jacob and Esau are likely viewed as ‘*Isaac’s sons*’, and Rebekah as ‘*Isaac’s wife*’, as their most salient anchoring relation. At the beginning of Gen 27, we construe all four participants as active due to the fact that none have recently been explicitly anchored to one another. Very little thematic highlighting is observed in Gen 25-26;²³⁴ no explicit anchoring relations are highlighted.

7.2 Default Encoding for Continuing Reference to Participants

7.2.1 Default Patterns for Contexts S1, N1, S2, and N2

The writer/editor follows the default norms for continuing reference to active participants described in §4.3. In context S1, we observe the regular use of clitic pronouns with finite verbs,²³⁵ and the use of IPP with non-finite verbs²³⁶ as expected. Default minimum encoding is also utilized for both agent and patient in context S1/N1.²³⁷ In context S2/N2 we regularly observe subjects minimally encoded using clitic pronouns, and the addressee either elided or pronominally encoded.²³⁸ There are also a number of overencoded tokens in these contexts, but the proposed default encoding values for the various contexts are confirmed by the data from Gen 27. The remaining overencoded tokens will be discussed below.

7.2.2 Default Patterns for Contexts S3, N3, S4 and N4

Default encoding in the -3 and -4 contexts is a lexical NP, in most cases. A number of role switches in Gen 27 are encoded using lexical NPs based on the semantic needs of the context (cf.

²³⁴ Cf. ‘*his wife*’ in Gen 25:21d, 26:7a and 8b. Cf. ‘*his brother*’ in 25:26a.

²³⁵ Cf. vv. 1b, 1c, 14b, 14c, 15c, 16, 17, 18b, etc.

²³⁶ Non-finite verbs are not found in the narrative proper of the pericope. Cf. vv. 8b and 33b for examples within reported speech.

²³⁷ Cf. vv. 23b, 27b, and 27d for Cl/Ø encoding. Cf. vv. 27b, 27c, 39b, 42b, for Cl/Cl encoding.

²³⁸ Cf. vv. 2a, 18c, 20b, 24b, 25a, 27a, 32b, 35a, and 36a for examples of S2/N2 encoded as Cl/Ø. For switches encoded as Cl/Cl, cf. vv. 1c, 25b, 42c.

§4.3.4). Default lexical encoding in context -3/-4 is observed at several points in Gen 27. For instance, v. 5a states that Rebekah heard what Isaac told Esau, and v. 5b reports that Esau went out to the field to hunt. Though it is fairly clear from the preceding discourse that Esau is expected to go to the field and not Isaac, the use of the lexical NP quickly eliminates any ambiguity. The report in Gen 27:38b that Esau lifts up his voice and weeps is followed in v. 39a by a quotative frame with Isaac as speaker. Given the context, a reader might construe vv. 38b-39a as a complex quotative frame if default lexical encoding were not included in v. 39a. Thus, use of a lexical NP is necessary to unambiguously grammaticalize the switch of participants, with Isaac as the new speaker.

There are also switches of participants in context -3 using minimal encoding where a lexical NP might be expected. Recall that the meaningful distinction between -3 and -4 is that the former refers to contexts where the participant was involved in a different role in the preceding clause, while in the latter context the participant in question was not involved at all in the preceding clause. The participant is construed as more accessible in context -3 than in -4. This allows for minimal encoding to be used unambiguously in context -3 in place of lexical NPs in certain discourse contexts (cf. §4.4.1). The first context allowing minimally-encoded -3 switches is where a morphological distinction exists between the agent and patient, such as gender or number.²³⁹ The second discourse context is where the semantic expectations are such that the reader is able to discern the switch unambiguously.²⁴⁰ We noted that the use of minimal encoding in such contexts introduces the potential for ambiguity. However, based on the claims of Nariyama (2000), we have proposed that a pragmatic effect of such under-encoding is to foster greater continuity than would have resulted from the use of lexical encoding (cf. §4.4.1).

Having said this, Gen 27 manifests a significant number of role switches using minimal encoding in context S3/N3 where no morphological distinction exists, but where the semantic expectations of the context provide clarity. These tokens are consistent with those S3/N3 switches observed in our corpus under similar discourse contexts.²⁴¹ Most of these tokens are found in vv. 22-27 just prior to the climax of the story where Isaac is verifying Jacob's identity. Based on the claims of Nariyama (2000) regarding zero anaphora as the unmarked sign of '+continuity', it is reasonable to infer that the writer is seeking to avoid unnecessary segmentation of the text in this context through utilizing such underspecified switches of participants. The first instance is found in v. 22b, just after marking a new development unit where both agent and patient are relexicalized in S2/N2 (v. 22a). Jacob draws near to '*Isaac his father*' in v. 22a, followed by the clauses וַיִּמְשְׁרוּ וַיִּאֱמָר 'and \emptyset felt him and \emptyset said...' The reader learned from the reported speech of v. 21 that Isaac intends to touch Jacob, and based on the fact that both Jacob and Isaac are alternating as initiators it does not seem

²³⁹ E.g. Gen 14:13c and 13d; 16:4a, 4b, 6c; 18:1b, 10c; 19:3b, 3d, 3f, 11b, 33d, 35d, 37c; 20:17c; 21:14e; 24:16c.

²⁴⁰ E.g. Gen 15:6; 18:7c, 8a, 8d; 21:20b, 33a; 23:2b; 24:30d.

²⁴¹ E.g. Gen 16:1, 7a; 21:33a; 24:31a, 32b; 1 Sam 9:2a; 17:12a.

unreasonable to expect the use of lexical NPs for at least one of the participants. Perhaps preserving vv. 22-25 as a single development unit outweighed the risk of causing ambiguity. Based on the encoding utilized in this development, the use of minimal encoding has the pragmatic effect of facilitating the flow of the narrative.

The narrative continues on using only minimal encoding in context S1 in vv. 22c-24a, four clauses in all. The switches of speaker and hearer (context S2/N2) in vv. 24b and 25a are encoded using CI/Ø, while the S2/N2 switch indicating the return to narrative proper in v. 25b is encoded using CI/CI. In vv. 25c-e, we find three more S3/N3 switches encoded without the use of lexical NPs, but the semantics of the context make the changes somewhat predictable: '*He₁ brought Ø₃ near to him₂ and he₂ ate Ø₃, and he₁ brought wine₄ to him₂ and he₂ drank Ø₄.*' Thus from vv. 22-26, we observe 11 main clauses encoded without a single lexical NP for the participants. The pragmatic effect of this encoding, we would argue, is to build as tight a unity as possible in these verses, even at the risk of creating some ambiguity in vv. 22b and 25c-e. The DU beginning in v. 22 uses encoding consistent with cataphoric highlighting discussed in §6.4.2, while the encoding which marks the end of this development unit at v. 26 exhibits both relexicalization and a complex quotative frame to highlight the speech which follows.

The next development unit from vv. 26-29 also manifests the use of minimally encoded clauses. It is brought to an end by another pragmatically marked temporal clause which recounts Jacob's exit just as Esau returns from hunting. This clause forms a contrasting enclisio in comparison to the minimal encoding within the unit. Such alternation suggests an intentional use of minimal and overencoding to shape both the organization and perceived flow of the narrative.

7.3 *Marked Encoding for Discourse Processing*

There are 17 discrete development units marked using overencoding in either context S1 or S2.²⁴² They will be discussed tokens based on their context, beginning with those found in narrative proper.

7.3.1 *Discourse Processing in Narrative Proper*

The overencoding of agents in vv. 15a, 26a, and 30a is construed as intended to signal the beginning of new development units within the narrative proper. The first DU coincides with a switch in initiators from Jacob to Rebekah, and is highly marked through the use of both switches of referring expressions and supplementation of reference (cf. §7.4). This verse also recounts the first major stage of Rebekah's plan, viz. clothing Jacob to look and smell like Esau. The second development unit is marked in an initial quotative frame in v. 26 encoded using NP/CI in context S1/N1, immediately following Isaac's completion of the meal that Jacob and Rebekah have prepared

²⁴² Cf. Gen 27:11a, 13a, 14d, 15a, 19a, 20a, 21a, 22a, 26a, 32a, 33a, 34a, 37a, 38a, 41a, 41b; 28:1.

for him. Verses 22-25 recount Isaac's initial questioning of Jacob's identity, while vv. 26ff recount the second round of questioning, eventually resulting in Jacob receiving the first-born's blessing.

The third development unit in v. 30 is highlighted in several ways. First, we construe vv. 30a-b to be a compound temporal PoD using two *wayehi* clauses. This PoD is most likely intended to highlight just how close the two brothers came to meeting each other. This is followed in v. 30c by a marked switch from Jacob to Esau using a referential PoD.²⁴³ This development unit given additional prominence through the use of two thematically-highlighted referring expressions in vv. 30b and 30c which will be discussed further in §7.4. The first two developments are marked in contexts of natural continuity (viz. S1/N4 and S1/N1, respectively). We already have noted the unification of vv. 22-25 and 26-29 into individual DUs through the use of minimal encoding. One consequence of these two stretches using minimal encoding (even in context S3/N3) is that the overencoding of vv. 26 and 30 stands out all the more in the context, unambiguously segmenting the text. Regarding the final narrative DU in v. 30, the three consecutive PoDs create a significant discontinuity in their own right. This discontinuity is further increased through the S1/N1 relexicalization of both agent and patient in v. 30a. We noted in §4.3.2 that in context S1/N1 following a quotative frame the lexicalization of one of the two participants²⁴⁴ is needed to counter the cognitive expectation of switching roles that would typify minimal encoding in such a context. Instead we find both participants relexicalized, leading us to construe the added encoding material as a further evidence to segment the text.

So far, we have primarily considered the pragmatic segmentation of the text through the use of redundant NPs. Multiplying the number of participant switches in a given context as an alternative means of segmentation has not been discussed. The encoding of the transition from the introductory exposition to the initial events provides a concise illustration of segmentation of a text through structuring information rather than through relexicalization. Verses 2-4 recount Isaac's commission to Esau to go out and hunt in order to prepare a pre-blessing meal. Prototypically we would expect to find a report of obedience in v. 5 following the command (e.g. Gen 22:3), something on the order of '*and Esau arose and went to the field...*' Instead we find this:

וְרֵבֶקָה שֹׁמְעַת בְּדִבְרֵי יִצְחָק אֶל-עֵשָׂו בְּנֵוֹ וַיֵּלֶךְ עֵשָׂו הַשָּׂדֶה ...

And Rebekah (S4) was listening to the words of Isaac to Esau his son, and Esau (S3) went to the field...

The writer has placed the comment about Rebekah listening between the command and the report. Based on observations from our corpus, the switch to Rebekah as agent is sufficiently discontinuous

²⁴³ Cf. Gen 19:4 and 22:1 for similar uses of temporal PoD + a referential PoD to both update the reference time as well as make a marked switch of participants at the beginning of a new development unit.

²⁴⁴ Cf. Gen 16:10, 11; 17:9, 15; 18:33a; for other tokens of S1/N1 overencoding following a reported speech. Cf. Gen 12:20; 19:9c; 20:16a for examples of S1 encoding following a reported speech where only one of the participants is lexicalized. Cf. 24:18b-c, 25a, and 58a for S1/N1 tokens with a morphological distinction that does not relexicalize either participant following a quotative frame.

to be viewed as a distinct development. Furthermore, the patients of the participial clause are both redundantly relexicalized. The statement could have easily been rendered, ‘*Now Rebekah was listening to his words...*’ and the reader would have understood the words of Isaac to Esau were the intended anaphor. Instead, both Isaac (N3) and Esau (N1) relexicalized, with Esau’s reference being thematically marked by the addition of the appositive ‘*his son*’. Such overencoding, in combination with the switch from Esau to Rebekah back to Esau, all contribute to the discontinuity of this clause within the overall flow of the narrative. Use of a non-finite verbal form further marks v. 5a as discontinuous with the flow of finite verbs, marking it as off-line information.

We are not arguing here for critically emending the text, but instead are observing the effect of what appears to be a thoughtful structuring of the narrative to control the information flow. The switch to Rebekah in a non-finite clause breaks the flow, and necessitates the relexicalization of Esau in v. 5b in order to *return* to the natural flow. After Esau goes to the field, Rebekah calls Jacob in v. 6 to tell him of her plan. She is introduced using a referential PoD. Again, the narrative could have much more efficiently and continuously reported Esau’s departure for the field immediately following the command of v. 4, and only then switched to Rebekah. Instead, there is a switch to Rebekah in v. 5a, then back to Esau in v. 5b, then back again to Rebekah in v. 6a. LXX marks each of these three switches with the particle *de*, ostensibly marking new developments. These verses illustrate the use of default encoding constraints to create discontinuity by pragmatically ordering the narrative to create three discontinuous switches, comparable to the pragmatic effects of the overencoded narrative developments of 27:15, 26 and 30.

Attention to participant reference not only informs our understanding the exegetical significance of overencoding. It is also informs the exegetical interpretation of how the writer/editor has shaped the flow of the content itself to accomplish certain communicative goals. The pragmatic effect of inserting the comment about Rebekah hearing between the command and report is to create a significant disjunction as Esau departs. Three natural discontinuities were created where there potentially only need have been one. We notice a similar insertion of such disjunctive off-line comments elsewhere in our corpus (cf. Gen 13:7b; 14:9b-10a, 13c-d; 15:12b; 16:1b-c; 18:16c; 19:1b; 23:10a; 24:29a-b, 63c). In ways parallel to Esau’s departure in v. 5b, we find Esau’s return from the field grammaticalized using a number of disjunctive indicators in v. 30, as mentioned above. Thus, understanding the default encoding constraints not only gives readers insight for discerning *marked* encodings, but can also help readers appreciate the kind of impact that the pragmatic ordering of events and information can have on the natural continuity or discontinuity of a passage.

7.3.2 Discourse Processing in Quotative Frames

There are twelve clauses in Gen 27 where overencoding in either context S2 or S1 is used to create a new development either within or immediately following reported speeches.²⁴⁵ Each will be discussed in turn in order to explain how overencoding in these contexts contributes to the overall discourse. Most of these quotative frames are overencoded for cataphoric highlighting as well (cf. §6.4.3 above), but discussion of these issues will be reserved for §7.5.1. Waltke (2001:376-382) breaks the pericope rather naturally into several parts: Isaac’s instructions to Esau (vv. 1-4), Rebekah’s instructions to Jacob (vv. 5-17), Isaac blindly blessing Jacob (vv. 18-29), Isaac giving Esau an “antiblessing” (vv. 30-40), and Rebekah arrangement of Jacob’s flight (vv. 41-46). All but the first scene utilize marked quotative frames to segment the dialogue.

The scene where Rebekah instructs Jacob (vv. 6-13) contains two developments which are signaled in quotative frames. The new developments coincide with switches of initiator within the reported speech. The initial speech in v. 6 encodes Rebekah as speaker using a referential PoD and a complex *lemor* quotative frame. In this speech, Rebekah informs Jacob of Isaac’s commission to Esau, and of her plan for Jacob to pose as Esau in order to obtain the blessing. The quotative frame which introduces Jacob’s response overencodes both speaker and addressee, which is characteristic of countering moves (cf. §6.4.3). From the content of Jacob’s speech it is clear that he disagrees with the plan, claiming it will result in a curse rather than a blessing. Jacob is explicitly anchored to Rebekah in the frame of v. 6. The frame introducing his reply in v. 11 is not only morphologically overencoded, but also contains a supplemented referring expression explicitly anchoring Rebekah to Jacob.

The quotative frame in v. 13 introducing Rebekah’s rebuttal of Jacob’s protest is also overencoded. In contrast with v. 11 though, only the speaker is relexicalized; the addressee is pronominally encoded. We construe the overencoding in v. 13 as simply marking a new development; it is not sufficiently overencoded to mark a switch back to Rebekah as the primary initiator. The thematic substitution of אָמַן for רַב־קָהָה provides further confirmation that Jacob remains the current center of reference and is best construed as the primary initiator. Jacob ostensibly agrees to the plan since he makes no reply. The report of his going and getting the required ingredients in v. 14 following the speech utilizes minimal encoding, linking these events to Rebekah’s speech as a single development. It was noted in §5.3.1 that 30 of the 39 S2 transitions back to narrative proper utilize relexicalization to segment the reported speech from the narrative which follows through the creation of a new development.²⁴⁶ Thus, the pragmatic effect of not relexicalizing ‘Jacob’ in v.14 is to preserve the cohesion of Rebekah’s command with Jacob’s obedient response through the use of minimal encoding. Somewhat surprisingly, there are no indications of discontinuity to break the

²⁴⁵ Cf. Gen 27:11, 13, 19, 20, 21, 22, 32, 33, 37, 38, 41a, 46a.

²⁴⁶ For examples of minimally encoded S2 transitions back to narrative proper following a quotative frame, cf. Gen 12:7c; 14:20b; 15:6a, 10a; 16:13a; 19:3a; 22:8b; 24:59a, 65c.

narrative transition from Rebekah's preparations ending in v. 17 and Jacob's presentation of the food to Isaac in v. 18; minimal encoding is used throughout.

In vv. 18-29, some of the speeches in Isaac's interview with Jacob also manifest overencoding which closely corresponds with the content of the speeches. The scene opens with Isaac being anchored to Jacob (cf. אָבִי *'his father'* in v. 18a). Jacob's response in v. 19 to the question *'Who are you, my son?'* from v. 18c is heavily marked, relexicalizing both the speaker and addressee. Both interlocutors are well established, and Jacob's reply is particularly salient. The relexicalization of v. 18c is comparable to cataphoric highlighting observed elsewhere in our corpus.²⁴⁷ Simply signaling a new development would only necessitate relexicalization of the speaker; Jacob is not countering²⁴⁸ anything Isaac has yet said. Based on the thematic salience of Jacob's speech to what follows, it seems reasonable to construe the overencoding as cataphorically highlighting Jacob's deceptive reply.

Isaac's reply in v. 20a also relexicalizes both speaker and addressee. We construe the overencoding as signaling a countering move by Isaac based on the content of the speech. Isaac questions how it is that 'Esau' could have successfully hunted so quickly, referring to the addressee rather mysteriously as *'my son'*. This initial speech of Isaac counters the premise that the interlocutor is Esau based on the improbability of the quick return. The quotative frame introducing Jacob's reply in v. 20b minimally encodes speaker and addressee using a clitic pronoun and zero anaphora, respectively. Minimal encoding here ensures that Jacob's reply is processed within the same development unit as Isaac's question. From a pragmatic standpoint, it is portrayed as though Jacob is not attempting to overtly counter Isaac's question regarding the veracity of Jacob's story. Jacob's claim that his success is attributable to YHWH's intervention is unmarked with respect to participant reference.

The next overencoded quotative frame occurs in v. 21, where Isaac asks *'his son'* to draw near so he can feel and verify the addressee's true identity. Though the content of the speech does not explicitly counter anything Jacob has said, it represents a continued refusal by Isaac to accept Jacob's claim that he is indeed Esau. Isaac has not explicitly rejected the claim, but his speech in v. 21 certainly appears to insinuate as much. Isaac's response seems to thinly veil what he is really thinking. Thus the relexicalization of both speaker and addressee in v. 21 serves two purposes. First, it signals the next salient development of the interview. Second, it cataphorically highlights the content of Isaac's speech. Isaac's request for Jacob to draw near exposes the very vulnerability which Jacob raised when he countered his mother's proposal in v. 12, viz. that Esau is hairy and he is not.

²⁴⁷ Cf. Gen 17:9, 15, 18; 19:29; 20:10.

²⁴⁸ The overencoding associated with countering moves in a speech also functions to highlight the speech that follows, not the frame itself. Thus, the result is the same whether the intention is specifically countering or more generally cataphoric highlighting.

Jacob's response recorded in v. 22 is context S2/N2, where minimal encoding is expected. Instead there is another instance of relexicalizing both speaker and hearer, further segmenting the narrative flow through the creation of a DU. We noted the minimally encoded S3 switch of agent and patient in v. 22b (cf. §7.3.1), which is followed by a minimally encoded quotative frame introducing Isaac's response to touching Jacob. It would appear that Jacob has succeeded in deceiving Isaac at this point based on the default encoding. This view is confirmed by both the content of Isaac's statement in v. 22c that 'the hands are the hands of Esau', and by the writer/editor's statement in v. 23a that Isaac did not recognize Jacob. Even though Isaac still has some reservations, he seemingly acquiesces to Jacob's plan. The use of default encoding here also renders vv. 22-25 as a single development unit, which entails four conversational turns and a description of Isaac's consumption of the meal.

The narrative following v. 22a moves forward swiftly in comparison to vv. 20-22; the participants and verbal arguments alike are minimally encoded until the quotative frame of v. 26a. Based in the statement of v. 23b ('and he blessed him') and the fact that Isaac has eaten the requested meal, it would seem that all is well for Jacob and his plan. However, the speech introduced in v. 26a presents yet another obstacle to be overcome. The quotative frame relexicalizes the speaker using a compound expression '*Isaac his father*', and encodes the addressee using a clitic pronoun. This relexicalization is construed as simply marking a new development. The complex referring expression thematically highlights the current center of attention/initiator, viz. Jacob. Though Isaac asks Jacob to come forward and kiss him, his request does not appear to represent a serious challenge to Jacob's objectives. Only Isaac's referring expression is marked. Verses 27a-c recount the fulfillment of the expectations established in the preceding speech and exhibit minimal encoding. The pragmatic effect of this encoding is to quickly move the story forward to the next major event, the return of Esau in v. 30.

We have already commented on the three-fold use of PoDs in v. 30. We only add that both Isaac and Esau are explicitly anchored to Jacob, presumably indicating that he remains the primary initiator even as he exits the scene. After Esau's reactivation in v. 30c, only the addressee of v. 31c exhibits relexicalization (context S1/N1). This encoding thematically highlights both the new referential center of attention and the thematically salient familial ties through the use of a substitute referring expression '*his father*' (cf. vv. 31b and 31c). The meal that Esau prepares is explicitly compared to that of Jacob through the use of *gam* + minimal encoding in v. 31a. On the basis of participant reference, vv. 30-32 form one continuous unit. Von Rad comments, "The entrance and words of the unsuspecting Esau are represented with considerable restraint" (1975:278). We construe his comment as referring to the lack of prominence markers or segmentation in this portion of the narrative.

Default encoding gives way to marked encoding in the quotative frame of v. 32a introducing Isaac's discovery that he has been deceived. The speaker of this frame is relexicalized using the

compound expression ‘*Isaac, his father*’, and the addressee is explicitly mentioned using a clitic pronoun. The amount of encoding is consistent with simply marking a new development, and does not compare to where Isaac and Jacob are countering each other’s objectives. However, note that prominence is assigned to this verse using devices other than participant reference:

וַיִּחַרְדּוּ יִצְחָק תְּרַדָּה גְדֹלָה עַד־מְאֹד

And Isaac trembled a great tremble to a great extent(?)...

Von Rad notes, “The narrator described the old man’s shock by a superlative that we seldom hear from him in a narrative from Genesis” (1972:278). Esau’s reply is framed using minimal encoding of Cl/Ø in v. 32b.

The next marked frame is found in v. 34 introducing Esau’s response to learning that Jacob has stolen his blessing. The frame is highlighted using both tail-head linkage in the form of a temporal PoD, and by what may be construed as a complex quotative frame.²⁴⁹ The PoD contains S2 relexicalization, and the quotative frame of v. 34b relexicalizes the addressee using a thematically marked expression in context N1. The resulting pragmatic effect is to break up Esau’s interaction with Isaac into two separate segments.²⁵⁰ The verbal exchanges of vv. 35-36 are minimally encoded, as Esau realizes that Jacob has once again gotten the better of him. Esau’s speech of v. 36 uses the discourse marker וְהִנֵּה to highlight the current state of affairs. The term וְהִנֵּה was described in §6.1.1 as a prominence marker that “draws attention to a proposition indicating it is important or salient in the given context... [It] indicates the presence of counterexpected, counterdesired, or overlooked presuppositions” (Follingstad 1995:22).

Isaac’s pronouncement in v. 37 is introduced using both a complex quotative frame and relexicalization of both speaker and addressee. Miller comments that “the use of ענה in a multiple-verb frame thus seems to signal the most salient or important response in the conversation” (2003:321). The speech unequivocally states that the best of everything has already been allocated to Jacob. Esau’s speech introduced in v. 38 appears to be a countering move, both in terms of encoding and content. He questions whether Isaac only has one blessing and again implores his father to bless him. A comment follows in v. 38b in which Esau lifts his voice again and weeps, encoded using a lexical NP in context S1. Though this clause uses default encoding to specify that Esau is the one crying, the placement of the clause breaks up the flow of the dialogue by separating Esau’s plea for a blessing from Isaac’s response in v. 39.²⁵¹ The creation of a new segment results since Isaac’s reply to Esau’s question is now context S3 instead of S2, requiring relexicalization. The comment about

²⁴⁹ Miller (2003:434) notes that based on the extensive description that is given Esau’s cry, the clause may grammaticalize two communicative events (i.e. a cry and a speech) rather than a single marked event.

²⁵⁰ Cf. Gen 17:3 where Abraham’s reaction to God’s speech by falling to the ground necessitates the insertion of an additional quotative frame to continue the dialogue; also the temporal PoD that breaks up the description of Laban going to meet Abraham’s servant from the servant coming to Laban’s house in Gen 24:30.

²⁵¹ Cf. the use of the same technique in vv. 5-6, noted earlier in §7.3.1 above.

Esau's weeping seems to function more as a summarizing device for what precedes, serving more to summarize the current state of affairs rather than to simply create a new development.²⁵²

The quotative frame used in v. 39 is similar to that of v. 37, though the encoding is slightly different in distribution and form. The speaker is encoded using a thematically-marked compound expression in a complex quotative frame; the addressee is only pronominally encoded. The content of this speech is significant, and the information established in v. 38b sets the stage for the encoding of the frame to be viewed more as cataphoric highlighting than as countering. Isaac is not so much denying his son's request as he is delivering what Waltke (2001) refers to as an 'antiblessing'. The encoding and effect of v. 41 is parallel to that of v. 38b, serving to summarize the state of affairs. Simply stating that '*Esau hated Jacob*' would have been sufficient. Instead the cause of the hatred is specified by both a prepositional phrase and a relative clause which modifies it. The consecutive relexicalizations of Esau in vv. 41a (S2) and 41b (S1) represent the last pragmatic segmentation of Esau's interaction with Isaac. They serve to highlight Esau's reaction by separating his resulting hatred from his planned response into two distinct developments.²⁵³ The use in v. 42a of the generic frame '*and it was reported*' avoids the creation of a discontinuity. The effect is to closely link Rebekah's response to Esau's by reactivating her less conspicuously in the comment of v. 42a.²⁵⁴

Chapter 28 begins with the final pragmatically marked development unit, an overencoded S2/N4 switch from Rebekah's speech to Isaac's speech. The absence of a Masoretic *parashiyyot* marker at this transition fits very well with the referential encoding data, whereby the story seems to continue unfolding across the chapter boundary.

From a processing standpoint, each of these relexicalized quotative frames noted in vv. 19, 20, 21, and 22, figuratively slow the progress of Jacob towards his end goal of obtaining the blessing. Each relexicalized frame grammatically instantiates the obstruction which is observed in the content of the speech itself. Had the same dialogue been introduced using a series of minimally encoded *וַיֹּאמֶר* frames, the resulting pragmatic effect would have been strikingly different.²⁵⁵ The same would hold for the marked encoding used to frame Esau's dialogue with Isaac. The marked encoding was shown to coincide with either countering moves and/or highly salient portions of the dialogue. We also observed its use in conjunction with other highlighting devices, which we will now consider.

²⁵² Cf. Gen 15:5; Ruth 1:9b, 14a for similar uses of a medial narrative summary statement to segment a dialogue.

²⁵³ Cf. Gen 13:10, 11 for comparable segmentation of Lot's surveying the land from his decision to choose Sodom, or 20:14, 15 where Abimelech's restitution to Abraham and Sarah is segmented from his parting speech to them.

²⁵⁴ Cf. Gen 22:20 for a comparable use of generic quotative frames. It is the message that is salient, not the messenger. The use of an undisclosed speaker maintains attention on the main participant(s).

²⁵⁵ Compare the perceivable difference in the pace of the dialogue in Gen 15:6-10; 18:28b-32b; 24:56-59 which use minimal encoding, to the pace of Gen 15:1-4; 16:5-6, 7-12; 27:19-22; where nearly each conversational turn utilizes relexicalization.

7.4 *Marked Encoding for Thematic Highlighting*

Up to this point in the chapter we have only made passing reference to the use of marked encoding for pragmatic highlighting in Gen 27. In light of the amount of pragmatic encoding observed, we will organize our discussion based upon the pragmatic effects of the marked encodings, rather than the kinds of encodings. As noted in Chapter 6, different encoding devices can be used to achieve similar pragmatic effects. For continuity sake, it seems best to track one pragmatic effect at a time through the pericope, even though this will necessarily entail discussion of several encoding devices at once. We will begin our discussion of thematic highlighting in Gen 27 by looking at its various functions: marking switches in center of attention, expressing points of view, and highlighting salient discourse relations.

7.4.1 **Center of Attention**

There are eight discrete switches in center of attention explicitly identified in Gen 27. These switches coincide with switches of initiators in the narrative itself.²⁵⁶ Each switch is made explicit either through substitution of an anchoring epithet for a proper name, or through the supplementation of relational anchoring information on a proper name. Isaac was the center of reference in Gen 26, the participant to whom the others were anchored (cf. 26:7, 8). However most of that chapter uses only bare proper names to encode the participants. Though Gen 26 closes with the report of Esau taking wives from the Hittites, it is not made explicit that he is the center of reference at this point.

Genesis 27:1 opens by removing all doubt about the center of reference by explicitly anchoring Esau to Isaac in vv. 1b and 5, as Isaac is giving him instructions to go out and hunt down a meal. The writer/editor could have continued encoding the participants using only bare proper names, or alternatively anchored Isaac to Esau. However, the well-known themes of ‘older vs. younger’ and favoritism will be played out largely through the pragmatic use of referring expressions. It was noted in §7.3.1 how the report of Rebekah hearing Isaac’s commission to Esau created a natural discontinuity at v. 5. In spite of this, we note that Isaac remains the center of attention even though Rebekah is mentioned. This is made clear from Esau’s encoding in v. 5b using the compound expression ‘*Esau, his son*’. The writer could have just as easily switched the anchoring relation to make Rebekah the referential center. Alternatively, bare proper names could have been used, leaving the situation implicit. Instead, Isaac remains the referential center until Esau departs for the field in v. 5b.

Rebekah becomes the next explicit center of reference in v. 6a by reactivating Jacob as ‘*her son*’. This switch coincides with Rebekah taking the initiative to call Jacob and inform him about Isaac’s intentions for Esau. We commented in §7.3.2 that the overencoding in v. 11 is construed as a countering move on the part of Jacob reflecting his disagreement with his mother’s plan. This quotative frame not only relexicalizes both speaker and addressee, but it also includes a supplemental

²⁵⁶ Cf. Gen 27:6, 11, 15, 18, 20, 22, 31, 42.

anchoring relation for Rebekah, *'his mother'*. Including this appositive explicitly indicates a shift in the center of reference, again coinciding with the switch in initiators. Jacob is explicitly affirmed as the referential center when he begins to implement the plan to deceive Isaac through the repeated reference to Rebekah as *'his mother'* in vv. 13a, 14c, and 14d.

Verses 15-17 recount the most crucial details of the deception. Jacob's objection to his mother's plan was based on the fear that Isaac would determine Jacob's true identity if he were to touch Jacob. Rebekah counters this objection essentially by telling him not to worry about it, but she does not disclose how she intends to remedy the issue. She remains anchored to Jacob as she prepares the meal (vv. 14c-14d). However, at the point that the writer/editor begins to recount the implementation of her plan in v. 15, there is an explicit switch *back* to Rebekah as the center of reference. Rebekah takes the clothes of *'Esau her older son'* and clothes *'Jacob her younger son'* with them. This switch is affirmed in v. 17 through the report that she places the food and bread she has made in the hand of *'Jacob her son'* in context N1, in contrast to the preceding pronominal encoding used in v. 16 to refer to Jacob.

Starting at v. 18a, the writer/editor encodes Jacob as the next referential center by stating that he came to *'his father'*. This substitution of the anchored epithet for the proper name *'Isaac'* is maintained through v. 19. In verse 19, Jacob makes the bold claim that he is "Esau, your firstborn" in response to Isaac's question about his identity. The quotative frame of v. 20 masterfully grammaticalizes the situation by stating וַיֹּאמֶר יַצְחָק אֶל-בְּנוֹ *'And Isaac said to his son'*. The encoding used here accomplishes several things. First, as noted above, the relexicalization of both participants is construed as intended for cataphoric highlighting. Second, the use of an anchoring expression in the encoding explicitly changes the center of reference to Isaac. This change coincides with his countering of Jacob's claim. Finally, encoding Jacob using the anchored epithet *'his son'* avoids assigning him a specific identity, as if to portray the situation from Isaac's point of view wherein he is not exactly sure *which* son he is talking to.

At several points in the narrative Isaac appears to be unsure whether or not to accept Jacob's claim to be Esau. It is noteworthy that in these contexts the writer/editor uses only bare proper names as referring expressions, without any anchoring information to explicitly mark the current center of attention. Verse 20b uses minimal encoding, v. 21a uses the bare proper names of both participants for cataphoric highlighting, avoiding explicit disclosure of whether another shift of initiators has occurred. Verse 22, which recounts Isaac's acquiescing to Jacob, is heavily overencoded. Part of that overencoding is the supplemented anchoring expression *'his father'*. The lack of specification in vv. 20b-21 matches the suspense the reader experiences in waiting to see if Isaac will indeed fall for Jacob's deception. It is only at the point that Isaac begins to follow Jacob's instructions that the switch of referential center is made explicit. Jacob remains the center of reference for the balance of his interview, as indicated by the use of the anchoring expression *'his father'* in vv. 22a, 26a, and 30b, and the anchoring of Esau to Jacob as *'his brother'* in v. 30c.

Following Jacob’s exit described in v. 30, Esau becomes the next referential center in the narrative. It is interesting to note that the writer/editor does not explicitly mark him as center of attention until he actually brings the meal to ‘his father’ in v. 31c; his entrance alone is not sufficient to cause the writer/editor to mark a switch (cf. v. 30c). Isaac continues to be anchored to Esau as ‘his father’ using supplementation in v. 39a, and through substitution for a proper name in vv. 34a, 34b, and 38a. Esau’s interview with Isaac ends with him expressing the desire to kill his brother. Word of this threat reaches Rebekah, who then becomes the next center of reference.

Rebekah is introduced in v. 42 using a bare proper name, and is explicitly identified as center of reference through two expressions in this verse. She hears the words of עֵשָׂו בְּנֵהּ הַגָּדֹל ‘Esau her older son’ and calls for יַעֲקֹב בְּנֵהּ הַקָּטָן ‘Jacob her younger son’. Once again, the switch of reference coincides with the switch in initiators from Esau to Rebekah. She encourages Jacob to flee to Haran, and then encourages Isaac to send Jacob to find a wife from outside of Canaan. Isaac follows her advice, sending Jacob off in Gen 28:1. Note that once again the writer/editor does not explicitly mark a switch of discourse center to either Jacob or Isaac at this point, but instead leaves the issue implicit through the use of bare proper names.

The evidence from Gen 27 is consistent with the conclusions drawn from our corpus data—that relationally-anchored referring expressions can be used to explicitly mark pragmatic switches in the center of reference. These switches have also been shown to coincide with switches in the primary initiator of the discourse, or alternatively to correspond with the current most-salient participant.

Table 9. Explicitly-Marked Switches of Initiator in Genesis 27

<p><i>Isaac in vv. 1-5a → Rebekah in vv. 5a-10 → Jacob in vv. 11-14 → Rebekah in vv. 15-17</i></p> <p><i>Jacob in vv. 18-19 → Isaac in vv. 20-21 → Jacob in vv. 22-30</i></p> <p><i>Esau in vv. 31b-41 → Rebekah in vv. 42-46 → Isaac in 28:1</i></p>

It was also proposed that in the stretches of the discourse where bare proper names were used the center of attention was left *implicit* (at times apparently on purpose) in order to heighten the suspense.²⁵⁷ In light of the near absence of anchoring expressions in Gen 25-26, it seems reasonable to infer that the departure from the default preference for bare proper names in Gen 27 is pragmatically motivated. Now that we have discussed the use of marked encoding to indicate (and switch) the current referential center of the discourse, we will consider its use to achieve different point of view effects.

²⁵⁷ The creation of similar ambiguity was noted in Gen 12 and 20 through avoidance of anchoring Sarah to Abraham while he was lying about her true relation to him. Similarly in 1 Sam 28, Saul is only referred to by the writer/narrator using a proper name while he disguises his identity from the medium at En-Dor. When she discovers his true identity in v. 12, the writer/editor switches to the expression ‘king’ to refer to Saul in v. 13.

7.4.2 Point of View

Section 6.3.3 noted that various devices are available to explicitly disclose the PoV from which a story is being told. This is especially true regarding the deictics of verbs of motion (cf. Levinsohn 2001). The numerous switches in the center of reference were shown to coincide with changes in the primary initiator of the narrative. Generally speaking, it appears that the center of reference and the deictic center for the narrative's PoV are usually the same. For example, in the first scene of 27:1-5 where Isaac commissions Esau, Isaac is both the deictic and referential center. Esau is anchored to him and the deictics of the verbs of motion use Isaac as the reference point (i.e. 'going out' hunting 'in order to bring' savory foods to his father cf. v. 5b). However, as we compare the deictics of the verbs of motion with the various centers of reference, it becomes clear that the deictic center does not always mirror the numerous switches of referential center observed in this chapter.

It was noted in §7.4.1 that Rebekah becomes the primary initiator in vv. 6ff, until the point that Jacob counters her in v. 11. Rebekah remains explicitly anchored to Jacob until v. 15. However, within the span of vv. 11-15 where Jacob is the referential center, he 'goes' (אָלַהּ) in v. 14a to gather the things needed for the ruse, and he 'brings' (בֹּא) them to 'his mother' in v. 14c. Another example of dissonance between referential center and deictic center is observed in vv. 18-30. The scene begins with Jacob as the referential center, yet the verbs of motion key on Isaac as the deictic center. In fact, Isaac remains the deictic center for motion verbs through v. 41:

- Jacob 'comes' (בֹּא) to 'his father' in v. 18a (as opposed to אָלַהּ);
- Jacob 'comes near' (שָׁגַר) to 'Jacob, his father' in v. 22 (as opposed to אָצֵר);
- Jacob 'brings' (בֹּא) wine to Ø (Isaac) in v. 25d (as opposed to הָקֵר);
- Esau 'his brother' 'comes' (בֹּא) from his hunting in v. 30c;²⁵⁸
- Esau 'brings Ø or comes' (בֹּא) to 'his father' in v. 31b (as opposed to הָקֵר or אָלַהּ).

In light of these data, it appears that what we have described as the referential center is indeed a separate parameter from the deictic center or PoV. Thus, while there is often overlap between the two, each parameter must be considered independently. This conclusion is consistent with the data observed in our corpus (cf. §6.3.3), e.g. Gen 12:5b-c. Here Abraham was the center of reference while he was in Haran. However, Canaan is explicitly made the deictic center for the verbs of motion of v. 5: he 'went out to go' (אָצֵר אָלַהּ) to Canaan, and finally 'came' (בֹּא) there. Further work is needed to systematically examine the consistency of deictic reference with respect to verbs which manifest a deictic orientation. However, this preliminary analysis demonstrates a consistency of deictic reference in our corpus and Gen 27. The data support the conclusion that referential center and deictic center are distinct parameters.

²⁵⁸ It is unclear whether Isaac or Jacob is the actual deictic center of this verb, but the deictics are nonetheless consistent with the proposed center of the other verbs in the context.

7.4.3 Thematic Highlighting of Salient Discourse Relations

In §6.2 we presented two different means of thematically highlighting salient information in the discourse through the pragmatic use of referring expressions. These means are:

- *supplementing* a semi-active participant's primary referring expression with additional anchoring information about the participant; and
- *switching* from a participant's primary referring expression to a secondary expression, (e.g. an epithet).

The use of these means in Gen 27 will be described, as well as the pragmatic effects achieved by each.

Of the various commentaries on this passage, only Waltke (2001) gives serious attention to the thematic use of referring expressions. Wenham (1994) makes several observations on the issue, but is not systematic in his treatment. In contrast, many of the commentators make pragmatic use of referring expressions *in their commentary* on Gen 27, using both substitution and supplementation, yet *they neglect to describe its use* by the biblical writer in the text. Sailhamer (1990), (1992), von Rad (1972), Fokkelman (2004), and Ross (1987) make no comments about the pragmatic use of referring expressions, yet *each* regularly utilizes this convention to enhance their commentary.²⁵⁹

For example, Sailhamer (1992:190-91) uses the expressions “the disheartened father Isaac”, “Isaac, his father”, “the rejected son Esau”, and “his brother Esau”, to refer to the participants. This contrasts with his use of bare proper names to refer to the same participants both before and after the marked expressions. Ostensibly Sailhamer's use of such expressions is intended to highlight the participant's salient relation to the narrative's referential center, yet he does not mention the use of this convention in the biblical text. Similarly, von Rad states, “The blind old man feels himself near death; therefore he wants to give his favorite son the paternal blessing...” (1972:276).²⁶⁰

Thus all of the commentators demonstrate their tacit awareness of the convention through their use of it in their commentary, yet not to the point that they comment on its use in the biblical text. Such usage bears out our contention in §6.1.3 that marked prominence will only be recognized to the extent that the *pattern underlying the usage* is recognized. Wenham (1994) and Waltke (2001) represent the exceptions to this, in that both make limited reference to the use of this convention besides making use of it in their texts.²⁶¹

²⁵⁹ Speiser (1964), Kidner (1967), Davidson (1979) and Walton (2001) primarily use bare proper names in their comments, yet each make a few switches to what we are calling marked forms.

²⁶⁰ Cf. comparable pragmatic usage of referring expressions in Wenham (1994:204-208), and Ross (1987:478-79).

²⁶¹ Although Wenham makes several comments about the pragmatic use of referring expressions, they represent much more of an interpretation than an objective or systematic understanding of the underlying issues. He first states, “Conversely, that Isaac fails to mention to Jacob that Bethuel and Laban are related to him as well as to Rebekah surely reflects the fact that Jacob is her son, while Esau is his (28:1-2)” (1994:204). It seems quite natural to us to choose the closest relative available to anchor these participants to, rather than assuming that the speaker must be the center of reference. One observes a similar Biblical Hebrew convention of referring to “YHWH your God” as opposed to “my God”. Wenham's point may indeed be valid, but we do not grant that it is as obvious as he has made it out to be. Wenham later states regarding 27:17, “The narrator says ‘his father,’

In the chapters leading up to Gen 27, bare proper names are the most prevalent kind referring expressions used to relexicalize semi-active participants in narrative proper. There are only seven tokens of substitution in Gen 25-26,²⁶² and 14 tokens of supplementation,²⁶³ two of which are found in *toledoth* frames and are likely stylistically motivated.²⁶⁴ Of the tokens remaining: three add prominence to ‘son(s)’ in the death account of Abraham;²⁶⁵ four more add prominence to Isaac’s ‘father’ in reference to strife over the wells Abraham had dug;²⁶⁶ two add prominence to Hagar’s anchoring relations;²⁶⁷ and the final four tokens add thematic prominence to Rebekah’s relation to Isaac as ‘his wife’ both where Isaac prays for her fertility and where he lies about her relation to him while sojourning in Gerar.²⁶⁸ Thus, bare proper names tend to be the primary referring expression for semi-active participants,²⁶⁹ and that the departures are consistent both with our description above and the apparent communicative intent in the context. In contrast to the seven substitution tokens of Gen 25-26, there are eleven tokens in Gen 27.²⁷⁰ In contrast to the fourteen tokens of supplementation in Gen 25-26, there are sixteen tokens in Gen 27.²⁷¹ Five of these sixteen include thematically salient modifiers in addition to specifying an anchoring relation. Let us now consider the data from Gen 27.

Supplementation of Referring Expressions

Genesis 27 contains sixteen supplemented referring expressions, five of which include thematically salient modifiers.²⁷² Section 6.3 described several pragmatic effects of supplementing primary referring expressions with anchoring information. These effects are:

- reorienting the reader to the participant based on the anchoring information;
- indicating changes in the center of reference which were often found to correlate with the current initiator; and
- indicating changes in the writer/editor’s point of view, the perspective from which the narrative is being recounted.

rather than ‘her husband’ or ‘Isaac,’ to remind us of the rift in the family that has led Rebekah to act in this way” (1994:208). Based on the fact that Jacob is the established center of reference at this point, a switch to ‘her husband’ is highly unlikely in the context. However, the use of the epithet in lieu of a proper name is indeed noteworthy. His comments regarding the family rift would seem much more appropriately applied to the ‘his son’/‘her son’ distinction in 27:5a and 6a, where bare proper names would be expected.

²⁶² Cf. Gen 25:21; 26:7, 13a, 15 (2x), 18 (2x).

²⁶³ Cf. Gen 25:6b, 9a, 10b, 11a, 12a (3x), 19, 20 (2x), 21b; 26:8a, 15, 18.

²⁶⁴ Cf. Gen 25:12, 19. Genesis 28-29 evince comparable numbers of marked tokens for thematic highlighting, four tokens of substitution, and nine tokens of supplementation in the narrative proper.

²⁶⁵ Cf. Gen 25:6, 9, 11.

²⁶⁶ Cf. Gen 26:15 (2x), 18 (2x).

²⁶⁷ Cf. Gen 25:12 (2x).

²⁶⁸ Cf. Gen 25:21 (2x); 26:7, 8.

²⁶⁹ Cf. 111 uses of proper names in the narrative proper of Gen 25-26, excluding names within anchoring expressions and genealogies, or 145 inclusive of genealogies’.

²⁷⁰ Cf. Gen 27:13a, 14c, 14d, 18a, 19a, 20a, 31b, 31c, 34a, 38a, 41a for substitutions in narrative proper.

²⁷¹ Cf. Gen 27:1a, 5a, 6a, 11a, , 17a, 22a, 23a, 26a, 30b, 30c, 32a, 39a for tokens of simple anchoring expressions, and Gen 27:1a, 15a, 15b 42a, 42b for tokens modified by thematically-salient adjectives.

²⁷² Cf. Gen 27:1a, 5a, 6a, 11a, 17a, 22a, 23a, 26a, 30b, 30c, 32a, 39a for tokens with simple anchoring expressions, and Gen 27:15a, 15b 42a, 42b for tokens modified by thematically-salient adjectives.

In the initial scene where Isaac commissions Esau, the latter's referring expression is supplemented with בְּנֵי הַגֵּדֹל 'his older son.' This supplemental phrase adds prominence to several relations. First, anchoring Esau to Isaac makes explicit that Isaac is the referential center at this point. One would likely have construed him as the primary initiator based on his speech alone, yet the anchoring expression adds prominence by making this explicit. Second, the addition of the familial relation also adds prominence to the relation that it would not otherwise have received. Isaac was no less Esau's father in Gen 26:34-35, yet the writer ostensibly reiterates the relation due to its impending salience. Finally, specifying that Esau is 'the older' adds prominence to his relation to his twin brother. Esau's familial relations as 'brother' and 'son' are highlighted six times in the narrative proper of the pericope;²⁷³ half of them include the comparative modifier 'older'. Such usage is completely consistent with the broader theme of the story, viz. the younger supplanting the older as the son of blessing.

The next supplemented expression is found at the transition from Isaac's commissioning of Esau to Rebekah's call to Jacob in vv. 5a and 6a. Rebekah hears the words that Isaac has spoken to Esau 'his son', and in response she summons Jacob 'her son'. Waltke comments that use of such expressions is intended to highlight the rift in the family associated with the favoritism mentioned in 25:28 (2001:374). Waltke's comment may indeed be accurate, but such a view must also account for the anchoring of Esau to Rebekah in 27:15 and 42, or alternatively of Jacob to Isaac in 27:20. The expressions used in vv. 5-6 explicitly highlight the two initiators at the transition between scenes by anchoring the son to the *initiating parent* of the scene. Use of these marked expressions in the context adds prominence to the overspecified relation, and to explicitly indicate the switches of center of attention observed elsewhere in this chapter.²⁷⁴ Use of a bare proper name for Rebekah in the immediate context further supports this view.

The next supplemented referring expression is found in v. 11. The center of reference switches from Rebekah to Jacob through the addition of the appositive 'his mother' to her proper name. It is found in the quotative frame that introduces Jacob's countering move to Rebekah's plan. Jacob remains the referential center until v. 15. Evidence that substantiates this view include both switching from a bare proper name to a relational epithet for Rebekah ('his mother') in vv. 13a, 14c, and 14d, and switching back to a proper name for Rebekah in v. 15a. Furthermore, both sons are anchored to her using supplemented referring expressions in v. 15 (cf. 'her older son' in v. 15a, and 'her younger son' in v. 15b). Thus, there is consistency in the writer/editor's use of referential centers to explicitly communicate switches at salient points in the narrative that coincide with

²⁷³ Cf. vv. 1a, 5a, 15a, 23a, 30c, and 42a

²⁷⁴ For other examples of switches in initiator coinciding with explicit switches in the anchoring relations of participants from one another, cf. the anchoring of Lot versus his daughters in 19:8-32 compared to 19:33-35; or the anchoring of Abraham versus his servant in 24:1-2 compared to 24:9-10ff; or the anchoring of Rebekah versus Laban in 24:29-30a compared to 24:30b.

changes in primary initiator (cf. Table 9). Rebekah remains the center of reference only while she is introducing her plan to Jacob. Jacob remains the referential center only until he has gathered the required ingredients and brought them to ‘*his mother*’ (cf. vv. 14c-14d). Rebekah then remains the center only until the meal has been prepared and placed in ‘*her son’s*’ hands (cf. v. 17).

Another supplementation of note is found in v. 17, viz. the relative clause *אֲשֶׁר עָשְׂתָהּ* (‘*which she had made*’) to describe the food that Rebekah had prepared. It is quite clear from the preceding context that Rebekah had prepared the meal and that Jacob was merely delivering it. The reiteration of this information adds prominence to the fact that although Jacob is pretending to be Esau, he does nothing to fulfill his father’s commission other than to carry it. Wenham mentions this issue as evidence of how little Jacob has invested in the venture (1994:208). True or not, the repetition adds prominence to Rebekah’s role preparing the meal in contrast to Jacob. Jacob’s role will in turn be contrasted with Esau’s actions of faithfully fulfilling all aspects of his father’s commission, including preparation of the meal.

The next supplementation of a referring expression is found in v. 22, immediately following several switches of reference for both Jacob and Isaac: *וַיִּגַּשׁ יַעֲקֹב אֶל־יִצְחָק אָבִיו* ‘*And Jacob drew near to Isaac his father.*’ As stated above, Jacob is the referential center in vv. 18-19, as verified by the encoding of Isaac as ‘*his father*’ in both vv. 18a and 19a. Verses 21-22 both relexicalize agent and patient in context S2/N2, where minimal encoding is expected. We will discuss this overencoding in §7.5.1. To summarize, Isaac is specified as the referential center in v. 20a through substitution of the ‘*his son*’ for ‘*Jacob*’, followed by a minimally encoded quotative frame to introduce Jacob’s reply to Isaac’s question. Isaac’s request in v. 21 relexicalizes speaker and addressee using bare proper names, without explicitly identifying the referential center. Verse 22 introduces and describes Isaac’s request that Jacob come near. This is one of several suspenseful points in the narrative where the first-time reader has reason to doubt that Jacob’s ruse will succeed. The repetition of ‘*his father*’ to explicitly encode the patient accomplishes two pragmatic effects. First, it adds further prominence to Isaac’s role as ‘*father*’ as opposed to any other relation that might possibly be in the reader’s mental representation.²⁷⁵ Second, it explicitly identifies the current referential center. The use of bare proper names in v. 21 leaves the referential center unspecified, raising the possibility that Isaac remains the center of reference as Jacob draws near. The use of the supplemented expression in v. 22 removes this possibility, making it clear that Jacob is the new referential center.

The familial theme is also highlighted in the next supplemented token found in v. 23, which highlights Esau’s relation to Jacob. The verse states that Isaac did not recognize Jacob since his

²⁷⁵ Although Isaac could have been anchored as Sarah or Abraham’s son, Ishmael’s brother, or Rebekah’s husband, Isaac’s most salient relation in this context is his role as father. Such a view is supported by Sperber and Wilson’s (2002:281) ‘Cognitive Principle of Relevance’. This principle states that selection of this particular relation is based on its being most relevant in the context, compared to the alternatives, and that repetition is somehow relevant to understanding the discourse which follows.

hands were like the hands of *'Esau his brother'*. This token immediately follows Isaac's declaration—using only bare proper names—that he recognized the voice as that of Jacob, yet the hands were like those of Esau. Inclusion of the supplemented anchoring expression reinforces Jacob as the referential center in a context where one might have expected a switch to Isaac. The supplemented expression thematically highlights Esau's relation as brother, reminding the reader that Jacob is not only deceiving his father, but is also defrauding his own brother.

The supplemented referring expressions discussed thus far have referred to patients and not agents. Thus the correlation of the referential center as the primary initiator follows quite naturally since they are prototypically the agent of the particular clause. However, v. 26 is the first of several tokens where the thematically marked expression refers to the *agent*, and not the *patient*.²⁷⁶ This verse follows Isaac's command that Jacob bring him the prepared meal. It is also the quotative frame which introduces yet another test on Isaac's part to verify his son's true identity. In light of the content which follows, it seems as though Isaac's final request is more a formality than a serious test; thus the anchoring of Isaac to Jacob in v. 26 is quite consistent with the content of the narrative. Although Isaac is the one making requests, Jacob appears to have overcome all obstacles that have arisen to this point, and is well on his way to achieving his desired goals.

Two more supplemented expressions are found in v. 30, the verse which recounts just how close Esau comes to catching Jacob in the act of stealing his blessing. The verse is composed of three clauses. The first two clauses establish temporal frames of reference for the final clause. The first clause encodes both agent and patient using bare proper names. We construe this as slightly overencoded based on the S1/N1 context. Relexicalization of only one participant would have disambiguated the transition. Thus the encoding is likely intended to mark a new development. The second clause switches agent and patient roles from 30a, and supplements Isaac's expression once again with the appositive *'his father'* in contrast to the bare proper name of the preceding clause. The third clause of the verse adds prominence to the reactivation of Esau using both a referential PoD and a supplemented referring expression anchoring him to Jacob. The effect of the overencoding is to reaffirm Jacob as the referential center even as he is departing and Esau is returning. A second effect is to again thematically highlight the salient discourse relations of *'father'* and *'brother'*. Esau becomes the new referential center in v. 31b; however attention remains on Jacob until he is completely off stage.

Two supplemented referring expressions are used to anchor Isaac to Esau in vv. 32a and 39a, and in both instances Isaac is the grammatical agent of the clause. These supplemented references, in concert with only two references to Isaac using bare proper names, credibly indicate that Esau is the

²⁷⁶ For supplemented referring expressions used in the agent role, cf. 27:26a, 30c, 32a, and 39a. For substituted referring expressions used for agents, cf. 16:4; 27:14d. Cf. Exod 18, where Jethro is referred to using supplemented and substituted referring expressions using the relation *'Moses' father-in-law'* in both the agent and patient role.

center of attention in this scene.²⁷⁷ The two bare proper names are used in contexts that we construe as cataphoric highlighting, adding prominence both to Isaac's great shaking in v. 33a, and to Isaac's final rebuff of Esau in v. 37 that nothing of value is left to bless him with. The spotlight remains focused on Esau, building up to his final response in v. 41 of deciding to kill his brother. The thematic highlighting of Isaac's relation to Esau as '*father*' may also serve to reiterate the theme of favoritism from 25:28. However, any conclusions drawn must be tempered against the comparable anchoring Isaac to Jacob in vv. 18-26.

The final supplemented referring tokens are found in vv. 42a and 42b, and both are thematically loaded. Just as in v. 15a above, Jacob and Esau are each related to Rebekah as '*her son*', and contrasted with one another by the use of the modifiers '*older*' and '*younger*'. The use of these expressions in vv. 15 and 42 forms an enclisio around the execution of Jacob's deception and its aftermath. They thematically highlight the paradox of 'the younger' supplanting 'the older'. The supplementation makes explicit one final switch of referential center from Esau to Rebekah. This coincides with her orchestration of Jacob's hasty departure into exile to escape Esau's wrath. The first verses of Gen 28 use only bare proper names, thus it is unclear whether there is an implicit switch to a new referential center, or whether Rebekah maintains in this role. Whatever the case, Rebekah is the clear initiator both in terms of narrative content and pragmatic anchoring. Thus the narrative is brought full circle from her initial plan to steal the blessing to her final plan to preserve the blessing by sending Jacob away.

This section discussed the two primary effects of pragmatically supplementing expressions referring to (semi-)active participants: explicitly indicating the current referential center of attention, and adding thematic prominence to the information in the supplemented expression. It has also shown that these marked tokens coordinate well with the content of the narrative, explicitly highlighting themes and switches in initiators which are implicitly present in the narrative. The next section will describe the instances of pragmatically substituting thematically significant referring expressions for bare proper names found in Gen 27.

Switches of Referring Expressions

As noted above, Gen 27 contains eleven tokens where an alternative referring expression (e.g. an epithet) is substituted for a participant's primary referring expression, prototypically a bare proper name. We proposed in §6.3 that such substitutions can achieve several different pragmatic effects, depending on the kind of expression used. Substituted expressions which do not specify an anchoring relation add thematic prominence to the expression used, or are used to indicate a switch in the PoV

²⁷⁷ Compare the use of bare proper name for Isaac in vv. 33a and 37a, with the substitution of an anchored epithet in vv. 31b, 31c, 34a, 34b, 38a, and 41a, i.e. a total of eight marked relexicalizations.

from which the narrative is being recounted.²⁷⁸ It was proposed that substituted referring expressions which specify an anchoring relation can have a dual effect. First, such usage makes explicit the current referential center based on who the participant is anchored to. Second, it has the pragmatic effect of cognitively reorienting the participant to the discourse, with the marked expression specifying the participant's most salient anchoring relation.²⁷⁹

The first clustering of substituted referring expressions in Gen 27 occurs immediately following Jacob's objection to Rebekah's plan in v. 11. Prior to this verse, Rebekah is the center of attention with Jacob encoded as the addressee in v. 6 using the supplemented referring expression 'her son'. The quotative frame at v. 11 introduces Jacob's protest. It encodes the addressee as 'Rebekah, his mother', indicating a shift in the referential center as noted above. This shift is explicitly reaffirmed via the substitution of the epithet 'his mother' for the default expression 'Rebekah' in vv. 13a, 14c and 14d. The tokens in 13a and 14d are used to specify the subject/agent of the clause. The remaining nine tokens of substitution in Gen 27 involve non-subject roles. Of the approximately 25 explicit switches of reference from a proper name to an epithet observed in our Genesis corpus, only *one* occurs in the subject/agent role where the participant performs an action,²⁸⁰ the other tokens are subjects of passive, stative or speech verbs.²⁸¹

This apparent pattern of reserving substituted epithets for non-agent roles is consistent with de Regt's observation that participants referred to using epithets tend to be minor participants compared to those assigned proper names (1999:4). Thus, in addition to thematically highlighting the participant's anchoring relation, the use of a substitute expression may also have the pragmatic effect of *backgrounding* the participant relative to the main participant, casting them as more of a minor

²⁷⁸ The non-relational anchors described in §4.2.2 are *generic* geographical or genealogical anchoring expressions (e.g. 'a young man from Bethlehem in Judah, who was a Levite' in Jdg. 17:7; 'Hirah the Adullamite' in Gen 38:12); or *titular* anchors (e.g. 'Jethro the priest of Midian' in Exo. 18:1; 'Melchizedek the king of Salem' in Gen 14:18).

²⁷⁹ Cf. the description of the marked use of familial anchoring expressions in Gen 14, 16, and 22 in §6.3.1.

²⁸⁰ Cf. 'his mother' taking a wife for Ishmael in Gen 21:21b.

²⁸¹ E.g. Gen 12:14, 15d ('the woman' from 'Sarai'); 12:20b, 13:1 ('his wife' from 'Sarai' in vv. 5, 11); 14:14a ('his brother' from 'Lot' in 14:12); 14:17a ('king of Sodom' from 'Bera' in 14:2); 16:4c ('her mistress' from 'Sarai' in 16:1); 19:1 ('the two angels' from 'the men' in 18:22, back to 'the men' in 19:10a, and back to 'angels' again in 19:15, then back to 'men' in 19:16b); 19:33a, 35a ('their/her father' from 'Lot' in 19:30); 19:36 ('the two daughters of Lot' became pregnant by *their father*' represents several changes from 'Lot', 'firstborn' and 'younger' in 19:30 and 19:34, respectively); 21:8a ('the child' from 'Isaac', switches back in 8c.); 21:9 ('the son of Hagar the Egyptian which she had born to Abraham' rather than 'Ishmael'. Ishmael is called (ostensibly) 'his son' in 21:11, but then shifts to 'the child' as in v. 8a; in vv. 14c and 15c God hears 'the lad' in v. 17, 20); 21:21b ('his mother' from 'Hagar' in vv. 14c, 17b); 22:10b ('his son' for 'Isaac'); 23:12a ('the people of the land' versus 'sons of Heth' in v. 10. Cf. same usage in v. 13a); 24:10a ('his master' for 'Abraham'); 24:21, 22b, 26a, 29c, 30b, 30c, 32a, etc. ('the man' from 'the servant' previously, vv. 9a, 10a, 17a); 24:16 ('the young woman' from 'Rebekah' in v. 15); 24:30a ('his sister' from 'Rebekah' in v. 29a); 24:52a, 53a ('the servant of Abraham...the servant', from 'the man' in v. 32a); 24:53b ('Rebekah' from 'the young woman' in v. 15); 24:53c, 55a ('her brother' from 'Laban' in v. 29c); 24:67e ('his mother' from 'Sarah' in v. 67a).

participant in the context.²⁸² Such an explanation would fit well with both the disproportionate use of substituted referring expressions in non-agent or passive grammatical roles, and also fits well with the present context of Gen 27. At the point that Rebekah again takes over an initiating role in v. 15, her referring expression is switched back to a bare proper name.

In this same context of vv. 11-18, Isaac is twice referred to using the substituted epithet '*his father*', although it is unclear what the writer/editor intends with the switch. Minimally, the epithet reaffirms that Jacob is the referential center and highlights Isaac's relation to Jacob, yet it seems there is more involved here. First, it is noteworthy that Isaac and Rebekah are never explicitly related to one another in this pericope. In contexts such as vv. 14d or 46, a spouse is typically either anchored to one of the children, or a bare proper name is used. Thus, the continuation of the referential center on Jacob through the end of v. 14 may be motivated as much by an avoidance of anchoring Isaac to Rebekah as it is by a desire to highlight Isaac's relation to Jacob. The former seems more plausible in the context.

Second, there is the possibility that the substitution of the epithet for Isaac's proper name is intended to frame him as more of a minor participant relative to those who are initiating action. Fokkelman makes an observation to this effect, yet does not disclose the evidence on which he bases this conclusion. He comments, "What a paradox: Isaac seems to be a subject in ch. 27, for it is he who sends off Esau, it is he who performs the solemn and awe-inspiring ceremonial of the blessing, but how helplessly he is the object of the manipulations" (2004:100-101).

The next group of substitutions is found in vv. 19a and 20a, both of which are morphologically overencoded quotative frames. As Jacob begins his interview with Isaac, the latter is lexicalized using the epithet '*his father*' in vv. 18a and 19a; the intervening quotative frames in vv. 18b-18c utilize minimal encoding for both speaker and addressee. The quotative frame of v. 20a, which introduces Isaac's countering response to Jacob's claim of v. 19, is both overencoded and entails a double substitution of referring expressions. Isaac is here encoded using a bare proper name while Jacob is encoded with the epithet '*his son*'. One might ask why a supplemented expression was not used for Jacob, since this level of encoding seems common for countering moves in this chapter. We would suggest that the answer to this question lies in the point of view effects of using merely an epithet. From the standpoint of the narrative storyline, Isaac is unsure at this point which of his two sons is in front of him. Encoding the addressee using the less-specific epithet could be intended to convey Isaac's point of view, viz. that he is unsure of which son is before him. It is quite reasonable then that a point-of-view shift is an additional pragmatic effect here in addition to simply highlighting the shift in referential center.

²⁸² Cf. Berlin's (1983:85-86) discussion of characters in the book of Ruth, where she notes that both Boaz's foreman and the *goel* function as agents in comparison to the main participants. They are 'faces without names'.

The final group of substituted referring expressions is found in the context of Esau's interview with Isaac in vv. 31-41. As was the case above, Isaac is encoded as '*his father*' at the beginning of Esau's interview with him (cf. vv. 31b-c). In contrast with the former interview with Jacob, there are no switches in the referential center in Esau's interview with Isaac. The only alternation observed in this section is the encoding of Isaac; default encoding is maintained for Esau, making him the only explicit referential center of the scene. Isaac is encoded twice using his proper name, once supplemented (v. 32a) and once bare (v. 33). The switch back to the epithet '*his father*' occurs in v. 34, which recounts Esau's reaction to the news that Jacob has taken his blessing. Besides affirming the referential center, the use of the epithet thematically highlights Esau's relationship to his father. Since Esau has obeyed his father in all things requested of him, the effect of highlighting it here is quite opposite from its use in the context of Jacob deceiving his father.

The encoding for Isaac reverts back to a bare proper name in the countering quotative frame of v. 37a. This frame is the most likely candidate for construing Isaac as becoming an initiator, yet the encoding does not make it explicit. The complex quotative frame, combined with the lexicalization of both speaker and addressee, lead us to conclude that it is marked. The switch from lexicalization with an epithet to a proper name is very much in keeping with a switch in initiators, yet the writer leaves the issue implicit by not including a supplemental anchoring expression for either participant. Esau's response in v. 38 to Isaac's counter makes the referential center explicit by reverting back to the epithet '*his father*' to encode Isaac as the addressee. Based on the content of Esau's pleading speech, the use of the epithet is likely intended to thematically highlight the relational intimacy of father and son in addition to clearly expressing the referential center.

Conclusions Regarding Thematic Highlighting

Genesis 27 was shown to evidence an unusually high number of switches in referential center, yet these switches were shown to closely coordinate with switches in initiator based on the narrative content itself. The relational anchoring expressions used for both supplementation and substitution in the chapter were also shown to highlight thematically salient relations, cognitively reorienting the reader to the participant based on the reiterated relation. The redundant use of familial anchoring expressions was also used by the writer/editor to effectively add prominence to salient relations at numerous points as the narrative unfolded in addition to their prototypical use at reactivation from inactivity (cf. §2.2.2, §4.2-4.3).

The substitution of epithets for default referring expressions in this chapter was shown to play a significant role in highlighting salient themes. This is in addition to functioning as an alternate means of explicitly specifying the current referential center. Substitution of an epithet was also shown to have a third pragmatic effect in v. 20, viz. marking a shift in PoV to that of Isaac, possibly reflecting in the referential encoding his skepticism over the real identity of the son speaking to him. The PoV effect achieved here is consistent with that noted in Gen 12:14-15 and Gen 24:26-32, where

the substitution of a more ambiguous epithet for a proper name was claimed to have reflected the Egyptian's and relatives' PoV in that neither knew the true identity (i.e. discourse relation) of the participant in question. Thus, while both supplementation and substitution using relational anchoring expressions can highlight thematic relations and indicate the center of reference, it is the lexical ambiguity of the substituted epithet that seems to enable the PoV effect. The PoV effect is therefore an effect associated only with substitution.

7.5 *Marked Encoding for Cataphoric Highlighting*

So far we have considered the use of overencoding in Gen 27 based on its processing function of participant reference to segment the text, as well as its thematic use to highlight the marked information added to or substituted in the referring expression. We will now consider those instances from Gen 27 where relexicalization occurs for both agent and patient in contexts S1/N1 or S2/N2. We argued in §5.2 that cognitive research associated the triggering of a new development unit predominately with overencoding of the agent, not the patient. Thus it was proposed in §6.1 and §6.4 that overencoding of both agent and patient must be intended to accomplish some function in addition to segmentation. Informed by cross-linguistic principles of pragmatics, analysis of comparable encoding from other languages, and the data and research from Biblical Hebrew itself, we argued that this level of overencoding has the pragmatic effect of cataphorically highlighting a following speech or event. Overencoding tokens from quotative frames will be considered first, followed by tokens from narrative proper.

7.5.1 *Cataphoric Highlighting in Quotative Frames*

Cataphoric highlighting is utilized to add prominence to speeches at three different points in the narrative—speeches which are thematically connected and particularly salient to the overall plot. The first highlighted speech is found in v. 11 where Jacob question's his mother's plan to steal the blessing. The quotative frame relexicalizes the speaker using a proper name, and the addressee using a supplemented referring expression discussed in §7.4. While we have already construed this frame as marked, we have not discussed the significance of the speech's content to the overall theme of the narrative. The objections Jacob makes to his mother's proposal explicitly outline the very elements that add suspense and interest to this pericope:

- the ways that Jacob and Esau physically differ,
- the possibility that Isaac may attempt to verify his identity, and
- the likely repercussion of this fraud being discovered.

Perhaps the reader recalls the apparent physical differences between Jacob and Esau last mentioned in 25:25, viz. that Esau was hairy like a garment. This assertion implies that Jacob was not so hairy, and it is only in the speech of 27:11 that the reader is explicitly informed that he is in fact קָלָף 'smooth'. The content of this speech provides a critical frame of reference for the reader to truly appreciate what is at stake if Jacob is discovered, and to understand the obstacles which must be overcome for the

plan to be successfully implemented. Verse 15, which specifically describes how the physical differences between the men will be masked, also evidences cataphoric highlighting and will be discussed in the next section.

Not only are the potential problems of Jacob and Rebekah's plan highlighted in the planning stage, they are also highlighted in the implementation stage through a series of overencoded quotative frames in vv. 19a, 20a, 21a. Each of these quotative frames relexicalizes both speaker and addressee in context S2/N2, with the addressee of vv. 19a and 20a encoded using a substituted epithet. The marked frame of v. 19a introduces Jacob's reply to Isaac's rather cryptic question, "Who are you, my son?" Jacob's response marks the beginning of his ploy to pass himself off as his brother. It contains a somewhat overspecified claim that he is '*Esau, your firstborn*,' followed by the claim that he has obediently fulfilled Isaac's commission to him. He closes the speech by requesting that Isaac arise and eat in order that he may bless Jacob.

Isaac's reply to Jacob's claim and request are countered by Isaac's speech introduced by the overencoded quotative frame of v. 20a. Based on our claims regarding cataphoric highlighting, the overencoding here has the pragmatic effect of adding prominence to the speech in which Isaac expresses his incredulity that 'Esau' could have possibly done all that was asked so quickly. The improbability of the timing is the first of several objections raised by Isaac. It also raises doubts about whether Jacob will be able to successfully pull off his plan. Jacob's rebuttal to Isaac's question is framed using a simplex quotative frame and minimal encoding.

Isaac's second query regarding his son's identity is introduced using another overencoded frame in v. 21a, in which Isaac asks his son to come forward so that he can feel him in order to verify whether he is really Esau or not. The use of the interrogative particle in the speech clearly represents Isaac's doubts and thus the rationale for this test of touching. The content of this highlighted speech reaches back to Jacob's highlighted speech of v. 11, heralding that his fear of Isaac possibly touching him has become a reality. The choice to highlight this speech is also consistent with the overall complication of the pericope, viz. will the plan succeed in the face of Isaac's skepticism? Verse 22a recounts Jacob's compliance with his father's request. It is appropriately highlighted using overencoding of both agent and patient in context S2/N2. Such overencoding is consistent with the cataphoric highlighting found in the quotative frames before it.

The final point in the narrative where speeches are cataphorically highlighted is in the midst of Esau's interview with Isaac in vv. 37 and 38. The first highlighted frame in v. 37a exhibits not only overencoding of speaker and addressee in context S2/N2, but also includes what Miller (2003:323) construes as a complex quotative frame.²⁸³ The frame introduces Isaac's reply to Esau's question whether Isaac has any blessing remaining to give him. The content of Isaac's speech

²⁸³ Regarding the complex frames of 27:37, 39 Miller comments, "Note that both utterances introduced with ענה in multiple-verb frames are dispreferred (B2, C2); that is, they represent a response in the second pair-part that the speaker of the first pair-part does not want" (2003:323).

removes any doubt for Esau that everything of value has already been allocated to Jacob. Thus Jacob's theft of the blessing has been absolute, with nothing positive remaining for Esau. The two pragmatic means used to add prominence to this speech are indicative of its thematic salience to the overall narrative. The quotative frame in v. 38 introducing Esau's response to v. 37 is the final overencoded frame in the pericope. The level of the encoding is consistent with a countering move, even though a simplex frame is used. The content of the speech itself is emotionally charged, and this emotion extends into the narrative clause of v. 38b which separates Esau's final plea from Isaac's attempt at a blessing. Surprisingly, the frame introducing the Isaac's blessing is highlighted using only a complex quotative frame; none of the participants are overencoded.

The overencoding observed of speaker and hearer in context S2/N2 in Gen 27 is comparable to those tokens discussed in §6.4.3.²⁸⁴ While the overencoding does indeed function to segment the text into development units, it is often found in contexts where one participant is countering the stated desires of another. As stated in §6.4.4, pragmatic overencoding is not required to specify a countering or surprising move in a reported speech, but is merely a pragmatic means of adding prominence to the speech that it would not otherwise naturally have had.

7.5.2 Cataphoric Highlighting in Narrative Proper

We will move now from considering the use of cataphoric highlighting in quotative frames to its use in narrative proper. In §6.4.4 we claimed that redundantly overencoding both the agent and patient in narrative has the pragmatic effect of cataphorically highlighting a following event (i.e. adding prominence that it would not otherwise have received using default encoding). The use of this pragmatic device in our corpus was shown to be consistent with observations regarding comparable use of overencoding in other languages (cf. Levinsohn 2000b:4; Dooley and Levinsohn 2001:100-101). The events discussed in §6.4.4 that we construed as being highlighted were found either near or at the peak of the narrative,²⁸⁵ or just before a surprising or unexpected event.²⁸⁶ We will now consider the five tokens of cataphoric highlighting observed in the narrative of Gen 27.

The first token is found in v. 15a, which recounts Rebekah taking the clothes of '*Esau her older son*' and clothing '*Jacob her younger son*' in v. 15b. In vv. 13-14, Rebekah is referred to using the epithet '*his mother*', as noted in §7.4. Even in v. 14d where Rebekah is the agent of the clause, the use of the epithet is maintained. As a result of the encoding choices in v. 14, the encoding of v. 15 represents relexicalization in context S1 since Rebekah remains the agent. The encoding also represents a switch back to the default referring expression '*Rebekah*,' which coincides with a switch in referential center evidenced by the marked anchoring expressions added to Esau and Jacob's proper names. We noted that the thematic highlighting added prominence both to the 'older/younger'

²⁸⁴ Cf. Gen 14:22; 16:6; Exod 5:1-6.

²⁸⁵ Cf. Gen 13:10ff.

²⁸⁶ Cf. Exod 2:23b-25.

theme, as well as to the switch of referential center by making it explicit. However, the overencoding of Rebekah in S1, in combination with the other overencoding mentioned, is construed here as serving to cataphorically highlight the event described as either being unexpected or highly salient to the discourse. For several reasons, we would say it is both.

The plan that Rebekah describes to Jacob in vv. 8-10 is very limited in detail, simply stating that Jacob should bring Rebekah's meal to Isaac. In response to Jacob's very practical concerns about the plan, Rebekah essentially tells him not to worry about it. This creates an information gap wherein the first-time reader is in the dark about exactly how Rebekah will overcome the practical problem posed by the physical differences between her sons. Therefore, the details concerning Jacob's disguise in v. 15 are absolutely critical to making the plan viable in the first place. In the second place, it adds suspense to Jacob's interview with Isaac as each of the elements mentioned in v. 15 are tested by Isaac. The use of both thematic and cataphoric highlighting to draw the reader's attention to this verse ensures that these significant details are not overlooked. The cataphoric highlighting slows the reader down, while the thematic highlighting provides an interpretive frame of older/younger and fraternal competition for processing the information. Neither cataphoric nor thematic highlighting is required here, yet the pragmatic choice to highlight the verse is appropriate based on the content, and consistent with the literary artistry evidenced in this chapter.

The second cataphoric highlighting token observed in Gen 27 has already been briefly discussed in §7.5.1—that of Jacob's response to draw near so that Isaac may feel him. We noted that this verse concludes a series of highlighted countering moves in vv. 19-21. This verse also represents the culmination of a continuing buildup of suspense, where the reader is left wondering whether Jacob will be successful or not. The second half of the verse, using default encoding, recounts Isaac's satisfaction that even though the voice is not right, he is convinced that it is Esau who is standing before him. The request in v. 26 for Jacob to again draw near, this time for a kiss, raises the suspense level again, but in the end it turns out to be a mere formality. Thus, the choice to cataphorically highlight v. 22a is construed here as a brilliant use of pragmatics to add more drama to an already suspenseful scene, slowing the reader's progress by overencoding the participants. The pragmatic overencoding of both agent and patient in vv. 19-22 marks each verse as a distinct development. In the case of v. 22 being narrative, the marked segmentation has the effect of highlighting the action recounted. Jacob is certainly bold, but the question is raised whether he is indeed bold enough to approach his father for the touch test. The highlighting places a spotlight on the answer to this question, and adds suspense in the process.

The final three tokens of cataphoric highlighting are found in Esau's interview with Isaac in vv. 34, 41a and 41b. It is noteworthy that the writer/editor does not chose to highlight the blessing

Jacob receives other than thematically overencoding Isaac,²⁸⁷ thus marking the quotative frame introducing the blessing as a new development. Verse 34 reports Esau's response to hearing that Jacob has surreptitiously stolen his blessing. The overencoding occurs in a temporal PoD which we construe to be tail-head linkage. The temporal frame explicitly establishes that the great and bitter cry which Esau cries is a direct result of hearing the news about the stolen blessing. The same content could have been communicated without a PoD, yet the pragmatic use of this framing device both creates a discontinuity to slow the narrative flow, and creates an explicit frame of reference that follows.²⁸⁸ We would propose that this tail-head linkage, in combination with the overencoding of agent and patient in context S2/N2, functions to pragmatically highlight the event which follows, viz. Esau's cry of frustration and demand that he too be blessed. An exchange follows between Esau and Isaac wherein Esau learns that there is no blessing left for him, it has all gone to Jacob. The overencoding of Esau's countering moves to Isaac's speeches in vv. 37 and 38 has already been noted in the section above. The encoding of the quotative frame introducing Isaac's anti-blessing is complex in contrast to the simple frame introducing the blessing pronounced on Jacob, and also utilizes a supplemented referring expression for Isaac.

Esau's reaction in v. 41 to the blessing utilizes back-to-back overencoded clauses comparable to the encoding observed in Gen 13:10b-11b; 19:29a-29b; and Exod 2:24-25. Verse 41a is construed as context S2/N4, and thus lexicalization is only required for the patient. There is a relative clause in the latter half of v. 41a which we construe as thematic rather than restrictive since the information is cognitively accessible. Since the information is readily available, it has the pragmatic effect of slowing down the narrative (cf. Longacre 1985:86, Dooley and Levinsohn 2001:54). Based on the required lexicalization of the patient, it is unclear whether cataphoric highlighting is intended, or whether it is simply signaling a new development. However, in light of the non-restrictive relative clause and the relexicalization in the following clause, it seems reasonable to construe v. 41a as cataphorically highlighted. Esau's hatred for Jacob, which is announced here and further spelled out in v. 41b, is the complicating action which moves the final portion of the narrative toward its conclusion, viz. Jacob fleeing into exile in Haran in order to escape Esau's wrath. Both the statement about Esau's wrath and the internal monologue that describes his intentions receive this highlighting. As in the case of highlighting the details regarding Jacob's disguise in v. 15, we observe the writer/editor adding prominence to the final crucial details of the pericope through the use of pragmatic overencoding. Rebekah's warning to Jacob and manipulation of Isaac are both minimally encoded, moving the narrative along quickly towards its conclusion.

²⁸⁷ Most commentators expounded the chapter as though the blessing itself is the high point of the pericope. Perhaps the blessing is indeed the high point based on its natural prominence. However, in contrast to the amount and frequency of overencoding which precedes it, the introduction of the blessing seems understated.

²⁸⁸ Cf. Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:54) who note that languages commonly slow down the story just prior to a climax through the introduction of background information or through the use of repetition such as tail-head linkage.

7.5.3 Conclusion

This survey of Gen 27 has demonstrated that both the pragmatic use of overencoding and the pragmatic effects achieved are consistent with our data and conclusions from our larger corpus of Gen 12-25. Our proposed principles for default encoding were able to provide an account of the data observed in the text, and its use was predominantly associated with unmarked portions of the narrative. We noted the regular use of overencoding in contexts of natural continuity as a means of pragmatically segmenting the text into distinct development units. This use of overencoding for segmentation was observed both in quotative frames and in narrative proper. We also noted that the segmentation we claimed to be present in BHS correlated well with that observed both in LXX and in English translations. Next we noted that the pragmatic substitution and supplementation of referring expressions accomplish various effects including changes in point of view, changes in center of attention, and thematically highlighting salient discourse relations. We noted that overspecification through the use of substitution or supplementation had different pragmatic effects from lexical overencoding of agent and patient where minimal encoding is expected. The former we classified as thematic highlighting, which pragmatically assigns added prominence to the encoding information itself. In contrast, overencoding agent and patient was construed as cataphorically highlighting an unexpected or particularly salient speech or event which follows.

8. Conclusion

This dissertation has provided a preliminary description of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew narrative. At the same time it has raised a number of significant issues that move beyond the stated objective of this dissertation. Some of these issues require the analysis of a much larger corpus than that utilized here. Other issues are simply ancillary topics which can build upon the conclusions of this study. This final chapter will compare our initial hypotheses with the conclusions reached (§8.1), and then will discuss the issues raised which will require further research (§8.2).

8.1 *Hypotheses and Research Results*

Our first hypothesis was that the use of participant reference attested in the Biblical Hebrew narrative of our corpus follows attested, cross-linguistic principles. These principles were hypothesized to be self-consistent, describable, and consistent with attested usage in other languages. We provided a description of both default and marked encoding in Biblical Hebrew narrative, and demonstrated that our description is able to provide a reasonable account of the encoding data from our corpus. It was also shown that the proposed descriptions are consistent with encoding patterns observed in other languages. They do not go against the expected norms suggested by cross-linguistic studies. Our cross-linguistic framework allows the conclusions reached here to be relevant for Bible translation work. It may also provide insight to a language worker's analysis of his or her target language by illustrating how different grammatical constructions can be used to accomplish various pragmatic effects.

We have also demonstrated that the encoding system described is self-consistent and unified. Some have questioned the ability to conduct linguistic studies on books such as Genesis due to their compositional history. Regardless of the literary pre-history of the corpus, we have shown that the attested encoding patterns form a self-consistent referential system. There was no clear stylistic evidence of starkly different patterns of reference which could be attributed to multiple sources.²⁸⁹

Our second hypothesis was based on the pragmatic principle that 'Choice implies meaning'. It stated that non-default encoding values would be construed as being pragmatically marked, and that these marked usages would also form a self-consistent, describable system, that is consistent with attested usage in other languages. We demonstrated that the marked encoding values could be divided into three meaningful groups, based on the type and amount of encoding. The use of redundant subject/agent NPs was shown to have the pragmatic effect of segmenting the text into distinct developments, which is comparable to usage in a variety of other languages. Our study also affirmed the preliminary findings of Andersen (1994) and Levinsohn (2000b). This use of overencoding for segmentation purposes is relevant not only to translators, but also to biblical scholars working in the area of unit delimitation.

²⁸⁹ For an overview of stylometrics, cf. Stamatatos et al. (2001).

We demonstrated that the use of anchoring expressions (either to substitute or supplement default referring expressions) is best construed as pragmatically motivated for the purpose of thematic highlighting, instead of resulting from stylistic variation. We demonstrated that the pragmatic usage coincided with salient shifts in referential center and shifts in themes. It was also shown that the overencoding of both agent and patient, or the consecutive overencoding of agents, could reasonably be construed as having the pragmatic effect of cataphorically highlighting a following speech or event. Such a view is consistent with usage attested in other languages. It was demonstrated that use of pragmatic highlighting in Biblical Hebrew often coincides with use of other prominence markers in the context. Thematic highlighting is relevant for both translation and exegesis. It will help translators understand the relative prominence of features in the source language for translation into the target language. It will help exegetes to more confidently expisit the text in light of the concrete data the overspecification represents.

Our third hypothesis stated that our description would provide a reasonable account for the data in our corpus. This description allowed us to understand the implications not only of the encoding used in a context, but also to understand the implications of possible alternative forms that were *not* used.

Our final hypothesis was that our description would be able to account for many of the issues left unresolved by past studies, and that it would make a positive contribution to the exegesis and translation of Biblical Hebrew narrative. The theoretical framework combined cognitive linguistics, and pragmatics with a functional, cross-linguistic approach to discourse. It was able to overcome the limitations identified in past studies during our literature review. The findings regarding PoV effects clarified the work of poetics scholars. It demonstrated that there is a meaningful distinction between deictic and referential centers, that these are related yet distinct phenomena.

8.2 Areas for Further Research

We will now describe the issues which require further investigation. This dissertation had several objectives which intentionally limited its scope. The primary objective was to describe default referential encoding patterns. These patterns provided a normative baseline against which to identify and describe departures from these patterns. We noted that misunderstanding default encoding constraints was a common problem with previous studies.

A corpus was selected which evidenced enough diversity to provide a reasonable representation of Biblical Hebrew narrative conventions, yet which was not so large as to preclude an exhaustive account of the data. Based on the research data from the field of cognitive linguistics, a greater focus was placed on the pragmatic encoding of agents than on patients. The use of participant reference for cognitive processing was almost exclusively associated with the overencoding of *agents* in the research literature. As a result, less attention was given to the pragmatic encoding of *patients* or *non-subjects* in this present study. Now that a preliminary description has been provided for

default and marked encodings, our goal in future research is to both expand the corpus of data under consideration as well as to expand the level of detail considered.

This study has revealed that participant reference encoding has implications for a number of disciplines relating to the Hebrew Bible. First, our findings demonstrate that the cognitive and morphological constraints of a context largely determine the minimum encoding needed. However, such factors have not been given ample consideration either by commentators²⁹⁰ or grammarians²⁹¹ in describing Biblical Hebrew referential encoding. Second, our conclusions regarding the use of overencoding as a means of text segmentation in contexts of natural continuity would provide insight to those studying the segmentation of Hebrew texts, such as the Pericope Project lead by Marjo Korpel (cf. 2000:1-50). The Masoretic accents *setuma* and *petucha* are predominantly used to segment the text of Genesis 12ff into larger pericopes rather than into paragraphs/development units,²⁹² thus other means are necessary for identifying this level of discourse segmentation. In light of the natural continuity observed in many of the pericopes in our corpus, consideration of overencoding and information structure could provide objective criteria for unit delimitation. Finally, the pragmatic use of participant reference was demonstrated to be only one of several devices used by Biblical Hebrew writers to add prominence to salient features of the discourse. Broader understanding of the pragmatic use of prominence markers would undoubtedly advance exegesis of Biblical Hebrew narrative. This study has also identified the following areas which require further research.

8.2.1 Pragmatic Encoding of Non-Agentive Information

One significant area of research remaining is to more completely describe the encoding of non-subjects, whether direct or indirect objects. Many of our conclusions have been based upon Givón's (1983a) Iconicity Principle, and upon Nariyama's (2000) extension of this principle in her claim that ellipsis is the unmarked representation of sameness. In light of these principles, research based upon a much more comprehensive corpus is needed to discern the meaningful differences among the various means of encoding non-subjects in Biblical Hebrew. We have already claimed that use of zero anaphora is often best construed as indicating greater continuity than representation of the non-subject using a minimal pronominal form. However, several options are available for the encoding of addressees and other non-subjects, and the meaningful difference between the options is

²⁹⁰ Recall the treatment of overencoding by commentators in Gen 27. The limited understanding of default encoding requirements likely lead to a failure to recognize marked encodings, especially in the case of those claiming close attention to the use of literary devices such as 'naming.'

²⁹¹ Much is said about what is possible regarding encoding, but systematic treatment of the various requirements, functions, or effects is lacking. Cf. to the treatment of personal pronouns in Muraoka (1985) and Joüon/Muraoka (1996), where the constraints of cognitive status and information structure are not recognized. The treatment in *BHRG* (esp. §36.1 and §47.1) reflects a marked difference, yet the topic of encoding requirements is peripheral to the topic at hand and thus is not thoroughly considered here either.

²⁹² For instances where these accents appear to function more at the paragraph rather than the pericope level, refer to the book of Judges.

unclear. Typically these options have been catalogued in terms of what is attested or possible; yet little explanation is offered regarding the rationale for using one option over another. The principle that ‘choice implies meaning’ calls us to a more rigorous standard in considering the issue. Let us first begin by considering the encoding of addressees, and then we shall move on to non-subjects in narrative proper.

Biblical Hebrew has several different means of encoding active addressees: zero anaphora, לְ+X, and לָאֵל+X, where X can either be a lexical NP or an independent personal pronoun.²⁹³ Consider the following minimal pair taken from Gen 27:26a and 32a:

וַיֹּאמֶר לְוִיצְחָק אָבִיו³² וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו וִיצְחָק אָבִיו²⁶

²⁶And said to him Isaac his father... ³²And said to him Isaac his father...

What is the meaningful difference between the encoding using לָאֵל and לְ? Of the 33 separate quotative frames found in Gen 27, only five²⁹⁴ utilize לְ to encode the addressee. Fourteen utilize zero anaphora, and the remaining fourteen utilize לָאֵל. If we only consider the simplex וַיֹּאמֶר/וַתֹּאמֶר tokens to ensure a proper comparison, these simplex frames represent 30 of the 33. Based on our theoretical presuppositions, these two encoding choices imply that some distinct meaning is associated with usage of each. Our preliminary observation is that לָאֵל is prototypically used early in a dialogue, especially if the physical proximity of the speaker and addressee has not been clearly established prior to the first quotative frame. After proximity has been established, we observe that use of either לְ or zero anaphora is common, with the latter signaling greater continuity. In contexts where mid-speech conversational turns are overencoded (e.g. countering moves) such as those observed in Gen 27, לָאֵל frequently is used. Is the use of the less-proximate preposition לָאֵל intended to indicate more discontinuity than the use of לְ, as though proximity were being re-established in the midst of the speech? Taking into consideration the proximity proviso and Nariyama’s (2000) findings regarding zero anaphora noted above, we would preliminarily suggest a descending scale of continuity for the use of these encoding options with standard וַיֹּאמֶר frames as follows:

Most Discontinuity לָאֵל → לְ → ∅ *Most Continuity*

It would appear that there is some meaningful variation in the use of the two prepositions, yet significant work remains in order to clarify the meaningful difference between these encoding options. Analysis of a much larger corpus is necessary in order to determine whether our proposal based on our Genesis corpus will withstand broader application.

²⁹³ Jouon/Muraoka describe the use of both prepositions to encode indirect objects in 2 Sam 12:4 as an “example illustrating the synonymy of the two prepositions” (1996:486). Cf. Miller (2003:333) Table 12; *BHRG* §39.3 and §39.11.

²⁹⁴ Cf. vv. 13a, 31c, 32a, 34b, and 37a.

The same kinds of questions remain to be answered for the overencoding of non-subjects in narrative proper as well. We noted that use of zero anaphora creates a greater sense of continuity than either pronominal or lexical encoding. However, what is the function of lexical overencoding in context N1 or N2 when the default referring expression is used? Consider the case of Gen 21:12, which we analyze as context S4/N1. We read in v. 11 that Sarah's demand to drive out Ishmael was very distressing 'in Abraham's eyes'. Verse 12 states, וַיֹּאמֶר אֱלֹהִים אֶל־אַבְרָהָם, 'And God said to Abraham', where Abraham is both in the same role as v. 11, and is the most accessible masculine referent that the new agent 'God' could be speaking to. The semantics of the clause would have been quite clear without lexicalizing the addressee.

Interestingly LXX, six versions and two commentators regard v. 12 as beginning a new development.²⁹⁵ We observe in similar contexts that overencoding of context N- could perhaps be construed as disambiguating whether the reactivation of an S4 subject is to be connected to the current development, or is intended to mark the beginning of a new development.²⁹⁶ Once again, this issue must be given much broader consideration in a larger corpus in order to determine whether or not our observations are simply coincidental.

One final area for consideration regarding non-subjects is to determine whether the presence or absence of the direct object marker אֶת/תּוֹ is pragmatically governed. Van der Merwe et al (2000:245-247) state that it marks definite direct objects of verbs, while indefinite objects remain unmarked. They also note that there are exceptions to this principle in that some definite objects *do not* have the marker, while some indefinite objects *do* take the marker. We find several such exceptions in Gen 19. First, the 'door' in v. 6b that is closed after Lot leaves the house is preposed, has the definite article, but lacks the object marker. In v. 9d, the same term דֶּלֶת again evinces the definite article, but not the object marker. In contrast to these tokens, in v. 10c the same word דֶּלֶת is again preposed, again has the definite article but *adds* the definite object marker. Is there a meaningful difference between these tokens, or is this simply 'stylistic variation'?

Similarly, we find variation in the use of the definite object marker with the naming of offspring. We observe in the naming sequence of Moab and Ben-Ammi in Gen 19:37b, 38b the absence of the object marker with the collocation וַתִּקְרָא שְׁמוֹ 'and she called his name...' The same is true of the announcement of Ishmael in 16:15b וַיִּקְרָא אַבְרָם שְׁם־בְּנֵו 'And Abram called his name...' In contrast with these, we find the announcement of Isaac's birth in Gen 21:3 includes the definite object marker: וַיִּקְרָא אַבְרָהָם אֶת־שְׁם־בְּנֵו 'and Abraham called (et) the name of his son...' Such minimal pairs of the same collocation lead us to argue that the apparent choice implies that some meaning is associated with it. Levinsohn has found that in some languages, "the article is sometimes omitted even though the referent is active and specific. The pragmatic effect of omitting the article is usually

²⁹⁵ Cf. Von Rad (1975), Waltke (2001), NAS, NET, NIV, NKJ, NRSV and NLT.

²⁹⁶ Cf. Gen 14:21a; 21:20; 22:19c; 23:2b; 24:59a.

related to prominence” (2006:§9.2.5). The principle Levinsohn describes may in fact be what is observed here in Biblical Hebrew. However this issue will require a much more thorough analysis in order to draw any specific conclusions.

8.2.2 The Synergistic Effect of Discourse Prominence Markers

One of the most significant tasks remaining is to delineate the specific distinctions between the various means of pragmatic highlighting observed in Biblical Hebrew. Miller (2003) has rightly claimed that complex quotative frames add prominence to an utterance, such as a countering move in a reported speech. We have argued that prominence can also be added using overencoding of agent and patient in contexts S1/N1 and S2/N2. Consider the following tokens from Gen 27 which form a minimal pair. Both are complex quotative frames, but only v. 39 relexicalizes both speaker and addressee:

וַיַּעַן יִצְחָק וַיֹּאמֶר לְעֵשָׂו³⁹
וַיַּעַן יִצְחָק אָבִיו וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו³⁷

³⁹And Isaac answered and said to Esau
³⁷And Isaac his father answered and said to him

Miller (2003) construes these both as countering moves on the basis of the speech content and the complex frame. We would construe v. 39 as a countering move on the basis of overencoding, yet Miller’s analysis of v. 37 is clearly valid. It seems as though multiple highlighting devices are in play here. Yet the question remains, what is the pragmatic effect achieved by the combination of highlighting features in v. 39? How does this effect compare to the default encoding of the complex quotative frame in v. 37? Is there a meaningful difference? Notice also the contrasting prepositions used to index the addressee, mentioned already in §8.2.1. This is another area where work remains to be done before such issues can be resolved.

Alternatively, consideration also must be given to overencoding both speaker and hearer in a simplex quotative frame as compared to a complex frame. Notice also the variation in prepositions used to index the addressee.

וַיֹּאמֶר עֵשָׂו אֶל-אָבִיו³⁸
וַיַּעַן יִצְחָק וַיֹּאמֶר לְעֵשָׂו³⁹

³⁸And Esau said to his father..
³⁹And Isaac answered and said to Esau

While the research into various means of highlighting has made significant advances in recent years, much more work remains to be done in order to clarify the exact nature and scope of the highlighting. Particular attention must be given to the apparent overlap of Miller’s conclusions with those made here regarding redundant overencoding of speaker and hearer. Cases such as Gen 18:27 and 29 are of particular interest, in that a complex frame is used in each, yet only Abraham (the speaker) is relexicalized. Our preliminary conclusions based on the encoding data from our corpus regarding these issues can be summarized as follows:

- complex quotative frame—cataphorically highlights following speech
- S2 relexicalization of speaker using default expression—marks new DU
- S2 relexicalization of speaker using marked expression—marks new DU and thematically highlights speaker

- S2/N2 relexicalization of speaker and hearer—marks new DU and highlights following speech, prototypically a countering move.

Another area of inquiry which remains is the marking of discontinuity in Biblical Hebrew. We have claimed that overencoding in contexts S1 and S2 is a pragmatic means of segmenting the text into distinct developments. Another option available in Biblical Hebrew for pragmatically creating a discontinuity is the use of marked information structure, especially points of departure. This raises the question, what is the meaningful difference between S1/S2 overencoding and a referential PoD in the same context? Does the latter have the pragmatic effect of segmentation, or does it simply achieve a marked switch of agent within the same development unit? What is the synergistic effect of combining PoDs with overencoding, as is often observed at the pericope boundaries of Genesis 12-25 (e.g. Gen 12:10 with a temporal PoD + S1 overencoding, compared to a referential PoD immediately followed by S1 overencoding in Gen 21:1)? Exactly how much discontinuity is required to trigger the beginning of a new development? Perhaps answers can be found in observing the Masoretic judgments on the matter based on the insertion of *setuma* and *petucha* accents. In books such as Judges, these markers are prototypically found more at the development unit level of the discourse. In Genesis, these markers appear at higher-level pericope or chapter boundaries.

8.2.3 Encoding in Non-Narrative Genres, including Reported Speech

Finally, in an effort to limit the scope of our study we only considered encoding data from narrative proper. We did not describe the usage in non-narrative genres, including reported speeches. The representation of speech by a writer introduces many more potential layers of constraints which shape and influence the usage observed: e.g., use of honorific expressions, vocatives, use of third-person expressions for first- or second-person participants, etc. It is generally accepted that narrative is one of the most basic genres of language. Our goal has been to lay a suitable foundation through the description of Biblical Hebrew narrative encoding in order to facilitate its description in other genres. Future description of participant reference in the context of reported speech will undoubtedly overlap with other genres which have similar characteristics, such as first-person psalms or prophetic oracles. It is our hope that this study will provide a heuristic basis for future research.

8.3 Conclusion

We have accomplished our stated objectives for this description of participant reference in Biblical Hebrew narrative. After a thorough survey of the current state of research into participant reference and anaphora in Biblical Hebrew and in linguistics, a cross-linguistic and pragmatically-informed theoretical frame of reference was established. Next, a description of default encoding constraints was outlined, informed by and summarizing the data from two separate corpuses: Exod 1-12 and Gen 12-25. Departures from these default norms were grouped based on the pragmatic effects achieved, and described in light of the cognitive and cross-linguistic data available. The first

pragmatic function described was the processing function: the use of seemingly redundant relexicalization of agents to break the discourse into distinct developments. Next we described the pragmatic use of referring expressions for the purpose of thematic highlighting. Finally, we described the practice of overencoding both agent and patient as a means to cataphorically highlight a following speech or event. Our descriptions are consistent with the linguistic principles and processing models established in Chapters 1-2. Finally, these descriptions were applied to a single pericope to demonstrate their efficacy and explanatory value for exposition of Biblical Hebrew narrative.

Appendix 1: Division of Participants by Activation Type

One-step

Participant	Anchoring Relation	Means of Activation	Reference	Participant Type
1) Terah	(Nahor Sr.'s son)	<i>Yalad</i> comment	Gen 11:24a	Minor
2) Abraham	(Terah's son)	<i>Yalad</i> comment	Gen 11:26b	Major
3) Nahor Jr.	(Terah's son)	<i>Yalad</i> comment	Gen 11:26b	Prop
4) Haran	(Terah's son)	<i>Yalad</i> comment	Gen 11:26b	Prop
5) Lot	(Haran's son)	<i>Yalad</i> comment	Gen 11:27c	Prop (12)/Minor (13-14) /Major (19)
6) YHWH	None	Accessible	Gen 2	Major
7) Canaanites	None	Accessible or Sentence focus	Gen 12:6b	Prop
8) Egyptians	None	Accessible	Gen 12:12a, 14a	Prop, they do not interact w/ Abraham
9) Pharaoh's officials	Pharaoh's	Accessible	Gen 12:15a	Prop, they do not interact w/ Abraham
10) Pharaoh	None	Comment of T/C As anchor in v. 15a	Gen 12:15a/b	Minor
11) Men	(Pharaoh's)	Comment of T/C	Gen 12:20a	Prop
12) The flesh	(Abraham's)	Comment of T/C	Gen 12:5d, 16b	Prop
13) Perezites	None	Accessible or Sentence focus	Gen 13:7b	Prop
14) Men of Sodom	of Sodom	Accessible	Gen 13:13	Prop (13)/Minor (19)
15) Amraphel	King of Shinar	Accessible	Gen 14:1	Prop, they never act w/o Cheddar
16) Arioch	King of Ellasar			
17) Tidal	King of Goiim			
18) Chedorlaomer	King of Elam	Accessible	Gen 14:1	Minor (14)
19) Bera	King of Sodom	Accessible	Gen 14:2	Minor/Foil (14)
20) Birsha	King of Gomorrah	Accessible	Gen 14:2	Prop (14), they never act alone.
21) Shinab	King of Admah			
22) Shemeber	King of Zeboiim			
23) ????	King of Bela/Zoar			
24) Rephaites	in Ashtoreth Karnaim	Comment of T/C	Gen 14:5b	Prop (14)
25) Zuzites	in Ham			
26) Emites	in Shaveh			
27) Horites	in hill country of Seir			

28) Amalekites	None	Comment of T/C	Gen 14:7c	Prop (14)
29) Amorites	in Tamar Hazazon			
30) The fugitive	Accessible	Presentational VoM	Gen 14:13a	Prop (14), needed to move plot forward.
31) Mamre	the Amorite the brother of Eshcol the brother of Aner	Comment of T/C	Gen 14:13c	Prop (14) more scenery than participant, perhaps debatable as to minor.
32) Eshcol	(brother of Mamre)	Implicit	Gen 14:13c	Prop (14), never agent of transitive verb.
33) Aner	(brother of Mamre)			
34) 318 trained men	Abraham's	Comment of T/C	Gen 14:14b	Prop (14), never act w/o Abraham.
35) Melchizedek	King of Salem Priest of God most high	Presentational VoM Referential PoD	Gen 14:18a	Minor (14), interacts with Abraham
36) Angel	of Yahweh	Accessible	Gen 16:7	Local VIP (16, 21)
37) Three men	None	Comment of T/C	Gen 18:2b	Prop (18), accompany YHWH
Two angels	None		Gen 19:1a	Minor (19) interact with Lot
38) Two daughters	of Lot	Simple predication Comment of T/C	Gen 19:8a (in RS) Gen 19:16b (in narr)	Prop (19) /Minor (19)
39) Older		Topic of T/C	Gen 19:31a	Local major (19)
40) Younger		Comment of T/C	Gen 19:31a	Minor (19)
41) Sons-in-law	of Lot	Comment of T/C PFC	Gen 19:12c (in RS)	Prop (19), simply respond to Lot
		Comment of T/C	Gen 19:14b (in narrative)	
42) Wife	of Lot	Comment of T/C Comment of T/C	Gen 19:15c (in RS) Gen 19:16b (in narr)	Prop (18), never interacts
43) Abimelech	King of Gerar	Accessible/VoM?	Gen 20:2c	Minor/Local VIP (20)
44) Servants	of Abimelech	Comment of T/C	Gen 20:8b	Prop (20), do not interact
45) Phicol	Captain of Abimelech's army	Compound topic with singular verb	Gen 21:22a	Prop (21), does not interact
46) Uz	Son of Nahor/Milcah	Comment of T/C	Gen 22:21	Prop (22), only in genealogy
47) Buz	Son of Nahor/Milcah			
48) Kemuel	Son of Nahor/Milcah Father of Aram			
49) Kesed	Sons of Nahor/Milcah	Comment of T/C	Gen 22:22	Prop (22), only in genealogy
50) Hazo				
51) Pildash				
52) Jidlaph				

53) Bethuel				Prop (22, 24 ²⁹⁷)
54) Rebekah	(daughter of Bethuel)	Comment of T/C	Gen 22:23a	Prop (22), Minor (24)
55) Sons of Heth	of Heth	Comment of T/C	Gen 23:3b	Minor (23), no initiating
56) Ephron	Son of Zohar the Hethite	Comment of T/C Topic of T/C	Gen 23:8c (in RS) Gen 23:a-b (in narr)	Minor (23) no persistence
57) Servant	of Abraham the oldest of his household the one in charge of all Abraham/s belongings	Comment of T/C	Gen 24:2a	Local VIP (24) only persistent in narr, however remained linked to Abraham or Isaac
58) A man	Generic	PoD	Gen 24:16c	Generic
59) Household	Rebekah's mother	Accessible	Gen 24:28b	Prop (24), patient only
60) Mother	Rebekah's	Accessible	Gen 24:28b/53c	Prop (24), patient only
61) Nurse	Rebekah's	Comment of T/C	Gen 24:59	Prop (24), becomes minor later.
62) Zimran	Sons of Keturah	Comment of T/C	Gen 25:2	Props (25), only mentioned in geneal.
63) Jokshan	(Sons of Abraham)			
64) Medan				
65) Midian				
66) Ishbak				
67) Shua				
68) Sheba	Son of Jokshan	Comment of T/C	Gen 25:3a	Props (25), only mentioned in geneal.
69) Dedan				
70) Asshurites	Sons of Dedan	Comment of T/C	Gen 25:3b	Props (25), only mentioned in geneal.
71) Letushites				
72) Leummites				
73) Ephah	Sons of Midian	Comment of T/C	Gen 25:4	Props (25), only mentioned in geneal.
74) Epher				
75) Hanoch				
76) Abida				
77) Eldaah				

Two-step

1) Sarah	Abraham's wife	Two-step	Gen 11:29a-b	Prop (12-15)/ Minor (18, 21)/Major (16)
----------	----------------	----------	--------------	---

²⁹⁷ Only acts as agent of one clause (speech frame), and is the second participant of compound verb ('*Laban and Bethuel said*').

2) Milcah	Nahor's wife Haran's daughter	Two-step	Gen 11:29a, c	Prop (11)/Minor (24)
3) Hagar	Egyptian Sarah's handmaid	Two step	Gen 16:1b-c	Prop (16), Minor (21) with Angel as local VIP?
4) Ishmael	son of Hagar/Abraham	Two step Two step	Gen 16:11b-c (in RS) Gen 16:15a-b (in narrative)	Prop (16) /Minor? (21)
5) Moab	son of First-born son of Lot father of Moabites	Two step	Gen 19:37a-b	Prop (19), does not interact
6) Ammon	son of the Younger son of Lot father of Ammonites	Two step	Gen 19:38a-b	Prop (19), does not interact
7) Isaac	Son of Sarah Son of Abraham	Two step	Gen 21:2-3	Prop (21), does not interact Minor (22), center of reference once
8) Laban	Rebekah's brother	Two-step	Gen 24:29a-b	Minor (24), becomes major later.
9) Keturah	Abraham's wife	Two-step	Gen 25:1a-b	Prop (25), only mentioned in geneal.

Appendix 2: Genesis 27

ThemeHigh **בְּנֵי הַגָּדֹל** ThemeHigh N4 | וַיִּקְרָא S1 וַיִּקְרָא Temp | וַיְהִי כִּי יָצָא S3 וַתִּבְהַיַּן עֵינָיו מֵרְאֵת Temp 1
 וַיֹּאמֶר S1 אֵלָיו N1 בְּנֵי
 וַיֹּאמֶר S2 אֵלָיו N2 הַגָּדֹל:
 וַיֹּאמֶר S2
 הִנֵּה־נָא זָקַנְתִּי לֹא יָדַעְתִּי יוֹם מוֹתִי:
 וְעַתָּה שֹׂאֲנָא כְלִיד תִּלְיָד וְקִשְׁתָּד וְצֹא הַשָּׂדֶה וְצוּדָה לִי (צִידָה) [צִיד]:
 וַעֲשֵׂה־לִּי מְטַעֲמִים כַּאֲשֶׁר אֶהְבֵּתִי וְהִבִּיאָה לִּי וְאָכְלָה בְּעִבּוֹר תִּבְרַכְךָ נַפְשִׁי בְּטָרִם אָמוֹת:
 וַרְבֵּקָה S4 שִׁמְעַת בְּדַבַּר יִצְחָק N3 אֶל־עֵשָׂו N1 **בְּנֵי** ThemeHigh:
 וַיֵּלֶךְ עֵשָׂו S3 הַשָּׂדֶה לְצוּד צִיד לְהִבְיֵא:
 וַרְבֵּקָה S6 אָמְרָה אֶל־יַעֲקֹב N4 **בְּנֵה** ThemeHigh לֵאמֹר Ref S3:
 הִנֵּה שִׁמְעַתִּי אֶת־אָבִיד מְדַבֵּר אֶל־עֵשָׂו אֶחָיד ThemeHigh לֵאמֹר:
 הִבִּיאָה לִּי צִיד וְעֲשֵׂה־לִּי מְטַעֲמִים וְאָכְלָה
 וְאֶבְרַכְכָּה לִפְנֵי יְהוָה לִפְנֵי מוֹתִי:
 וְעַתָּה בְּנֵי שִׁמְעַת בְּקוֹלִי לֵאשֶׁר אָנִי מַצּוּה אֶתְּךָ:
 לָךְ־נָא אֶל־הַצֹּאֵן וְקַח־לִּי מִשֶּׁם שְׁנֵי גְדֵי עִזִּים טְבִים
 וְאֶעֱשֶׂה אִתָּם מְטַעֲמִים לְאָבִיד כַּאֲשֶׁר אֶהֱבֵ:
 וְהִבֵּאתָ לְאָבִיד וְאָכַל בְּעִבּוֹר אֲשֶׁר יִבְרַכְךָ לִפְנֵי מוֹתִי:
 וַיֹּאמֶר S11 יַעֲקֹב S2 אֶל־רְבֵקָה N2 Relex **אָמוֹ** ThemeHigh:
 הֲזֵנִי עֵשָׂו אֶחָי ThemeHigh אִישׁ שְׁעוֹרֹאנְכִי אִישׁ חֶלֶק:
 אֹלִי יִמְשְׁנִי אֲבִי־הִייתִי בְּעֵינָיו כַּמִּתְעַתְּעוּהָבֵאתִי עָלַי קָלְלָה וְלֹא בִרְכָה:
 וְהִתְאַמֵּר S12 לֹא DU **אָמוֹ** N2 Relex S2 Changed:
 עָלַי קָלְלָתְךָ בְּנֵי
 אֵד שִׁמְעַת בְּקוֹלִי לָךְ קַח־לִּי:
 וַיֵּלֶךְ S14
 וַיִּקָּח S1
 וַיָּבֵא S1 לֵאמֹן Changed:
 וַתַּעֲשֶׂה אָמוֹ S3 מְטַעֲמִים כַּאֲשֶׁר אֶהֱבֵ אָבִיו: New name Relex S3
 וַתִּקַּח S1 רְבֵקָה S1 אֶת־בְּגָדֵי עֵשָׂו N4 **בְּנֵה הַגָּדֹל** ThemeHigh הַחֲמֹדֹת אֲשֶׁר אֶתָּה בְּבֵית
 וַתִּלְבַּשׁ S1 אֶת־יַעֲקֹב S1 **בְּנֵה הַקָּטָן** ThemeHigh:
 וְאֶת־עֶרְתַּ גְּדֵי הָעִזִּים Ref הַלְבִּישָׁה S1 עַל־יָדָיו וְעַל חֲלֻקַּת צְוּאַרָיו: Ref 16
 וַתִּתֵּן S1 אֶת־הַמְטַעֲמִים וְאֶת־הַלֶּחֶם אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂתָה בְּיַד יַעֲקֹב **בְּנֵה** ThemeHigh:
 וַיָּבֵא S3 אֶל־אָבִיו S1 וַיֹּאמֶר S1 אָבִי
 וַיֹּאמֶר S2 הַגָּדֹל מִי אַתָּה בְּנֵי:
 וַיֹּאמֶר S2 יַעֲקֹב S2 אֶל־אָבִיו N2 Relex:
 אָנֹכִי עֵשָׂו בְּכָרֶדְךָ ThemeHigh
 עֲשִׂיתִי כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ אֵלָי
 קוּם־נָא שָׁבָה וְאָכְלָה מִצִּידִי בְּעִבּוֹר תִּבְרַכְנִי נַפְשֶׁךָ:
 וַיֹּאמֶר S20 יִצְחָק S2 אֶל־בְּנָיו N2 Relex **אֶל־בְּנָיו** ThemeHigh מֵה־זֶה מֵהֵרַת לְמַצָּא **בְּנֵי** Changed:
 וַיֹּאמֶר S2 בֵּי הַקָּרָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ לִפְנֵי: S2
 וַיֹּאמֶר S21 יִצְחָק S2 אֶל־יַעֲקֹב N2 Relex **בְּנֵי** ThemeHigh הַאֲתָה זֶה בְּנֵי עֵשָׂו אֶס־לָא:
 וַיִּגַּשׁ S22 יַעֲקֹב S2 אֶל־יִצְחָק N2 Relex **אָבִיו** ThemeHigh:
 וַיִּמְשְׁחוּ S3
 וַיֹּאמֶר S1 הַקֵּל קוֹל יַעֲקֹב וְהִידָים יְדֵי עֵשָׂו:
 וְלֹא הִכִּירוּ S1 כִּי־הָיוּ יָדָיו כִּידֵי עֵשָׂו אָחָיו ThemeHigh שְׁעָרָתוֹ יִבְרַכְהוּ:
 וַיֹּאמֶר S1 אַתָּה זֶה בְּנֵי עֵשָׂו S1
 וַיֹּאמֶר S2 אָנִי: S2
 וַיֹּאמֶר S25 הַגִּשָּׂה לִּי וְאָכְלָה מִצִּידִי בְּנֵי לְמַעַן תִּבְרַכְךָ נַפְשִׁי S2

ויִגְשׁ־לוֹ; N2 S2
 ויאָכַל S3
 ויָבֵא S3 לוֹ יִזוּ
 וישָׁת: S3
 26 ויאָמַר DU אֵלָיו יִצְחָק Relex S1 אָבִיו ThemeHigh גִּשְׁה־נָּא ושָׁקָה לִי בְנִי: ThemeHigh
 27 ויִגְשׁ־ S2
 וישָׁק־לוֹ; S1 וירַח S3 אֶת־רִיחַ בְּגָדָיו
 ויִבְרַכְהוּ S1
 ויאָמַר S1
 רָאָה רִיחַ בְּנֵי כְרִיחַ שָׂדֵה אֲשֶׁר בְּרַכּוֹ יְהוָה:
 28 ויִתְּן־לֶדָּהּ הָאֱלֹהִים מִטֶּל הַשָּׁמַיִם ומִשְׁמַנֵּי הָאָרֶץ וְרֵב דָּגָן וְתִירֹשׁ:
 29 וַעֲבֹדֶד עַמִּים (וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ) [וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ] לֶדָּהּ לְאֲמִים
 הוּא גְבִיר לְאֹחִיָּה וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ לֶדָּהּ בְּנֵי אֲמָה
 אַרְרִיף אֲרוּר וּמְבָרְכִיף בְּרוּף:
 30 ויהִי Temp DU כַּאֲשֶׁר כִּלָּה יִצְחָק S1 לְבָרֶךְ אֶת־יַעֲקֹב Temp N1 Relex
 31 ויהִי Temp DU וַיִּהְיֶה אֵדָּהּ יֵצֵא יַעֲקֹב S3 מֵאֶת פְּנֵי יִצְחָק N3 Relex אָבִיו ThemeHigh Temp
 31 ויעֲשֶׂה גִם־הוּא S1 מִטַּעַמִּים
 ויָבֵא S1 לְאָבִיו Changed
 ויאָמַר S1 לְאָבִיו Relex יָקַם אָבִי ויאָכַל מִצֵּיד בְּנֹו בַעֲבוּר תְּבַרְכֵנִי נִפְשָׁה:
 32 ויאָמַר לוֹ Cataphoric ויִצְחָק N2 אָבִיו ThemeHigh מִי־אֶתָּה
 ויאָמַר S2 אֲנִי בְּנֶךָ ThemeHigh ThemeHigh בְּכִרְתָּ עֲשׂוֹ:
 33 ויַחֲרֹד DU יִצְחָק Relex S2 חֲרָדָה גְּדֹלָה עַד־מָאֵד וַיאָמַר S1
 מִי־אֲפֹאֵה הוּא הַצַּד־צִיד
 ויָבֵא לְיוֹאֲכֵל מְכַל בְּטָרָם תְּבוֹא
 וַאֲבָרְכָהוּ גִם־בְּרוּף יְהִיָּה:
 34 כַּשֵּׁמֶעַ עֲשׂוֹ Relex S2 אֶת־דְּבָרֵי אָבִיו Temp Changed N2 Relex וַיִּצְעַק S1 צַעֲקָה גְּדֹלָה וּמְרָה עַד־מָאֵד
 ויאָמַר S1 לְאָבִיו Changed Relex בְּרַכֵּנִי גִם־אֲנִי אָבִי: ThemeHigh
 35 ויאָמַר S2 בָּא אַחִיָּה בְּמִרְמָה וַיִּקַּח בְּרַכְתָּהּ:
 36 ויאָמַר S2
 הֲכִי קָרָא שְׁמוֹ יַעֲקֹב
 וַיַּעֲקֹבֵנִי זֶה פַעַמִּים
 אֶת־בְּכִרְתִּי לְקַח Ref
 וַהֲגִה עֲתָה Temp לְקַח בְּרַכְתִּי
 ויאָמַר S1 הֲלֹא־אֶצְלַתְּ לִי בְרַכָּה:
 37 ויִטַּעַן Cataphoric יִצְחָק Relex S2 וַיאָמַר S1 לְעֲשׂוֹ N2 Relex
 הֲנִי גְבִיר Foc שְׁמִתִּיו לְךָ
 וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲחִיוֹ Ref נָחִתִּי לוֹ לְעַבְדִּים Ref
 וְדָגַן־וְתִירֹשׁ Ref סִמְכִתִּיו וְלִכְהָ Ref אֲפֹאֵה מֵה אֲעֲשֶׂה בְנִי: ThemeHigh
 38 ויאָמַר Cataphoric עֲשׂוֹ Relex S2 אֶל־אָבִיו Changed N2 Relex הַבְּרַכָּה אֶתָּה הוּא־לְךָ אָבִי בְּרַכֵּנִי גִם־אֲנִי אָבִי
 וַיִּשָּׂא עֲשׂוֹ S1 קֶלֶד וַיִּבְדֶּךָ:
 39 ויִטַּעַן DU יִצְחָק S3 אָבִיו ThemeHigh וַיאָמַר S1 אֵלָיו
 הֲיִהָה מִשְׁמַנֵּי Ref הָאָרֶץ יְהִיָּה מוֹשְׁבֶדָּהּ ומִטֶּל הַשָּׁמַיִם מַעַל: 40 וְעַל־חֲרָבְךָ Ref תַּחֲיִהּ וְאֶת־אֲחִיָּהּ Ref תַּעֲבֹד
 וְהִיָּה־כַּאֲשֶׁר תִּרְיֹד Temp וּפְרִקְתָּ עָלָיו מַעַל צוֹאֲרָהּ:
 41 וַיִּשְׁטֹם DU עֲשׂוֹ Relex S2 אֶת־יַעֲקֹב עַל־הַבְּרַכָּה אֲשֶׁר בְּרַכּוֹ אָבִיו Changed N2 Relex
 ויאָמַר Cataphoric עֲשׂוֹ Relex S1 בְּלָבוֹ
 יִקְרְבוּ יְמֵי אָבִל אָבִי
 וַאֲהַרְגֶה אֶת־יַעֲקֹב אַחִי: ThemeHigh
 42 וַיִּגַּד DU לְרַבָּהָהּ אֶת־דְּבָרֵי עֲשׂוֹ ThemeHigh בְּנֵה הַגְּדֹל ThemeHigh

ותשלח^{S3} ותקרא^{S1} ליעקב^{N4} בנה הקטן^{ThemeHigh}
 ותאמר^{S1} אליו
 הנה עשו אחיך^{ThemeHigh} מתנחם לך להרגוך:
 ועתה בני^{ThemeHigh} שמע בקולי
 וקום ברחלך אל לבן אחי^{ThemeHigh} חרנה:
 וישבת עמו ימים אחדים עד אשר תשוב חמת אחיך^{ThemeHigh}:
 עד-שוב אף-אחיך^{ThemeHigh} ממך ושכח את אשר-עשית לו
 ושלחתי ולקחתיך משם
 למה אשבל גם-שניכם יום אחד:
 רבקה^{DU} אל-יצחק^{N4}
 קצתי בחיי מפני בנות חת
 אם-לקח-יעקב אשה מבנות-חת כאלה מבנות הארץ^{Cond} למה לי חיים:
 ויקרא יצחק^{Relex S2} אל-יעקב^{N4} ויברך^{S1} אתו^{N1}
 ויצוהו^{N1 S1} ויאמר^{N1 S1} לו^{N1 S1}
 לא-תקח אשה מבנות כנען:² קום לך פדנה ארם ביתה בתואל אבי אמך
 וקח-לך משם אשה מבנות לבן אחי אמך:³ ואל^{Ref Ref} שדלי יברך אתך
 ויפרך וירבך
 והיית לקהל עמים:
 ויתן-לך את-ברכת אברהם לך ולזרעך אתך לרשתך את-ארץ מגוריך⁴
 אשר-נתן אלהים לאברהם:
 וישלח יצחק^{S1} את-יעקב^{N1 Relex}
 וילך^{S3} פדנה ארם אל-לבן בן-בתואל הארמי אחי רבקה אם יעקב ועשו:

Bibliography

- Alter, R. 1982. *The Art of Biblical Narrative*. New York: Basic Books.
- Amit, Y. 2001. *Reading Biblical Narratives: Literary Criticism and the Hebrew Bible*. Fortress Press: Minneapolis.
- Amit, Y. 1999a. *History and Ideology: An Introduction to the Historiography in the Hebrew Bible*. Sheffield Academic Press: Sheffield.
- Amit, Y. 1999b. *The Book of Judges: The Art of Editing*. Brill: Leiden, Boston, Köln.
- Amit, Y. 1992. "The Glory of Israel Does Not Deceive or Change His Mind: On the Reliability of Narrator and Speakers in Biblical Narrative." *Prooftexts* 12:201-212.
- Amit, Y. 1990. "Hidden Polemic in the Conquest of Dan: Judges 17-18." *Vetus Testamentum* 40:4-20.
- Amit, Y. 1987a. "The Dual Causality Principle and its Effects on Biblical Literature." *Vetus Testamentum* 37:385-400.
- Amit, Y. 1987b. "Judges 4: Its Content and Form." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 39:89-111.
- Andersen, A., S. C. Garrod & A. J. Sanford. 1983. "The Accessibility of Pronominal Antecedents as a Function of Episode Shifts in Narrative Text." *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 35A:427-440.
- Andersen, F. I. 1994. "Salience, Implicature, Ambiguity and Redundancy in Clause-Clause Relationships in Biblical Hebrew." In *Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, edited by R. D. Bergen. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, pp. 99-116.
- Andrews, A. D. 1985. "The Major Functions of the Noun Phrase." In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Clause Structure, Volume 1*, edited by T. Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 62-154.
- Andrews, E. 1990. *Markedness Theory: The Union of Asymmetry and Semiosis in Language*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Bailey, N. A. & S. H. Levinsohn. 1992. "The Function of Preverbal Elements in Independent Clauses in the Hebrew Narrative of Genesis." *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 5:179-207.
- Bar-Efrat, S. 1989. *Narrative Art in the Bible*. Sheffield: Almond Press.
- Barr, D. J. & B. Keysar. 2002. "Anchoring Comprehension in Linguistic Precedents." *Journal of Memory and Language* 46:391-418.
- Berlin, A. 1983. *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*. Sheffield: Almond Press.
- Bodine, W. R. 1995. "Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature: What It Is and What It Offers." In *Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature: What It Is and What It Offers*, edited by W. R. Bodine. Atlanta: Scholars Press, pp. 1-20.

- Bolinger, D. 1979. "Pronouns in Discourse." In *Syntax and Semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax*, edited by T. Givón. New York: Academic Press, pp. 289-309.
- Bolkestein, A. M. 2000. "Discourse Organization and Anaphora in Latin." In *Textual Parameters in Older Languages*, edited by S. C. Herring, P. Van Reenen & L. Schosler. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 107-137.
- Buth, R. 1999. "Word Order in the Verbless Clause: A Generative-Functional Approach." In *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Approaches*, edited by C. L. Miller. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, pp. 79-108.
- Buth, R. 1995. "Functional Grammar, Hebrew and Aramaic: An Integrated, Textlinguistic Approach to Syntax." In *Discourse Analysis of Biblical Literature: What It Is and What It Offers*, edited by W. R. Bodine. Atlanta: Scholars Press, pp. 77-102.
- Buth, R. 1994. "Methodological Collision between Source Criticism and Discourse Analysis." In *Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, edited by R. D. Bergen. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, pp. 138-154.
- Callow, K. 1974. *Discourse Considerations in Translating the Word of God*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Chafe, W. L. 1994. *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.
- Chafe, W. L. 1987. "Cognitive Constraints on Information Flow." In *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, edited by R. S. Tomlin. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 21-51.
- Chafe, W. L. 1980. "The Deployment of Consciousness in the Production of a Narrative." In *The Pear Stories*, edited by W. L. Chafe. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 9-50.
- Chafe, W. L. 1976. "Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics, and Point of View." In *Subject and Topic*, edited by C. N. Li. New York: Academic Press, pp. 25-56.
- Clancy, P. 1980. "Referential Choice in English and Japanese Narrative Discourse." In *The Pear Stories*, edited by W. L. Chafe. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 127-202.
- Clark, S. A. 2000. *Participant Reference in Narrative Discourse: A Comparison of Three Methodologies*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of North Dakota-Grand Forks.
- Comrie, B. 1989. "Some General Properties of Reference-Tracking Systems." In *Essays on Grammatical Theory and Universal Grammar*, edited by D. Arnold, M. Atkinson, J. Durand, C. Grover & L. Sadler. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 37-51.
- Creason, S. 1993. "Split Subjects and Participant Reference in Biblical Hebrew". Paper read at the Seminar on Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew, Dallas, May 31-June 11, 1993.
- Culley, R. C. 1992. *Themes and Variations: A Study of Action in Biblical Narratives*. Atlanta: Scholar's Press.
- Davidson, A. B. 1902. *Introductory Hebrew Grammar: Hebrew Syntax*, (3rd ed.) Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Davidson, R. 1979. *The Cambridge Bible Commentary on the New English Bible: Genesis 12-50*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Den Exeter Blokland, A. F. 1995. *In Search of Text Syntax: Towards a Syntactic Text Segmentation Model for Biblical Hebrew*. Amsterdam: VU University Press.
- De Regt, L. J. 2001. "Person Shift in Prophetic Texts: Its Function and Its Rendering in Ancient and Modern Translations." In *The Elusive Prophet: The Prophet as a Historical Person, Literary Character and Anonymous Artist*, edited by J. C de Moor. Leiden: Brill, pp. 214-231.
- De Regt, L. J. 2000. "A Genre Feature in Biblical Prophecy and the Translator: Person Shift in Hosea." In *Past, Present, Future: The Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets*, edited by J. C. de Moor & H. F. van Rooy. Leiden: Brill, pp. 230-250.
- De Regt, L. 1999a. "Macrosyntactic Functions of Nominal Clauses Referring to Participants." In *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew*, edited by C. L. Miller. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, pp. 273-296.
- De Regt, L. 1999b. *Participants in Old Testament Texts and the Translator*. The Netherlands: Van Gorcum.
- Dooley, R. A. & S. H. Levinsohn. 2001. *Analyzing Discourse: A Manual of Basic Concepts*. Dallas: SIL International.
- Downing, P. A. 1996. "Proper Names as a Referential Option in English Conversation." In *Studies in Anaphora*, edited by B. A. Fox. Philadelphia: Benjamins, pp. 95-144.
- Downing, P. A. 1980. "Factors Influencing Lexical Choice in Narrative." In *The Pear Stories*, edited by W. L. Chafe. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 89-126.
- Eid, M. 1983. "On the Communicative Function of Subject Pronouns in Arabic." *Journal of Linguistics* 19:287-303.
- Enç, M. 1986. "Topic Switching and Pronominal Subjects in Turkish." In *Studies in Turkish Linguistics* (Typological Studies in Language 8), edited by D. I. Slobin & K. Zimmer. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 195-208.
- Erguvanli-Taylan, E. 1986. "Pronominal Versus Zero Representation of Anaphora in Turkish." In *Studies in Turkish Linguistics* (Typological Studies in Language 8), edited by D. Slobin & K. Zimmer. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 209-232.
- Fillmore, C. J. 1981. "Pragmatics and the Description of Discourse." In *Radical Pragmatics*, edited by P. Cole. New York: Academic Press, pp. 143-166.
- Fokkelman, J. P. 2004. *Narrative Art in Genesis: Specimens of Stylistic and Structural Analysis* (2nd ed). Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishing.
- Foley, W. A. & R. D. Van Valin, Jr. 1984. *Functional Syntax and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Follingstad, C. M. 1995. "Hinneh and Focus Function with Application to Tyap." *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 7:1-24.

- Follingstad, C. M. 1994. "Thematic Development and Prominence in Tyap Discourse." In *Discourse Features of Ten Languages of West-Central Africa*, edited by S. H. Levinsohn. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington, pp.151-90.
- Fox, A. 1983. "Topic Continuity in Biblical Hebrew." In *Topic Continuity in Discourse: Quantified Cross-Linguistic Studies*, edited by T. Givón. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 215-254.
- Fox, B. A. 1987a. "Anaphora in Popular Written English Narratives." In *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, edited by R. S. Tomlin. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp.157-174.
- Fox, B. A. 1987b. *Discourse Structure and Anaphora: Written and Conversational English* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 48). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Garrod, S. & A. Sanford. 1988. "Thematic Subjecthood and Cognitive Constraints on Discourse Structure." *Journal of Pragmatics* 12:519-534.
- Givón, T. 2001. *Syntax: An Introduction, Volume II*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. 1992. "The Grammar of Referential Coherence as Mental Processing Instructions." *Linguistics* 30:5-55.
- Givón, T. 1987. "Beyond Foreground and Background." In *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, edited by R. S. Tomlin. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 175-188.
- Givón, T. 1984. *Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction, Vol. 1*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. 1983a. "Topic Continuity in Discourse: An Introduction." In *Topic Continuity in Discourse: Quantified Cross-Linguistic Studies*, edited by T. Givón. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 3-41.
- Givón, T. 1983b. "Topic Continuity in Spoken English." In *Topic Continuity in Discourse: Quantified Cross-Linguistic Studies*, edited by T. Givón. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 347-363.
- Gordon, P. C., B. J. Grosz & L. A. Gilliom. 1993. "Pronouns, Names, and the Centering of Attention in Discourse." *Cognitive Science* 17: 311-348.
- Grice, P. 1981. "Presupposition and Conversational Implicature." In *Radical Pragmatics*, edited by P. Cole. New York: Academic Press, pp.183-198.
- Grice, P. 1975. "Logic and Conversation." In *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, edited by P. Cole & J. Morgan, pp. 41-58.
- Grimes, J. E. 1982. "Topics Within Topics." In *Analyzing Discourse: Text and Talk*, edited by D. Tannen. Washington D.C.: Georgetown, pp.164-176.
- Grimes, J. E. 1978. *The Thread of Discourse* (2nd ed.). The Hague: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Gundel, J. K. 1980. "Zero Noun Phrase Anaphora in Russian: A Case of Topic-Prominence." In *Papers from the Parasession on Pronouns and Anaphora*, edited by J. Kreiman & E. Ojeda. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 139-146.

- Gundel, J. K., N. Hedberg & R. Zacharski. 2004. "Demonstrative Pronouns in Natural Discourse." Paper presented at DAARC-2004 (The Fifth Discourse Anaphora and Anaphora Resolution Colloquium), São Miguel, Portugal, Sept. 23-24, 2004.
- Gundel, J. K., N. Hedberg & R. Zacharski. 1993. "Cognitive Status and the Form of Referring Expressions in Discourse." *Language* 69 (2):274-307.
- Hauser, A. J. 2000. "Participants in Old Testament Texts and the Translator (Book Review)". *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62: 319-322.
- Hawk, L. D. 1991. *Every Promise Fulfilled: Contesting Plots in Joshua*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox.
- Hedberg, N. 2002. "The Prosody of Contrastive Topic and Focus in Spoken English." Paper presented at the Workshop on Information Structure in Context, University of Stuttgart, Germany, November 15-16, 2002.
- Heimerdinger, J-M. 1999. *Topic, Focus and Foreground in Ancient Hebrew Narratives*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Hopper, P. J. 1979. "Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse." In *Syntax and Semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax*, edited by T. Givón. New York: Academic Press, pp. 213-241.
- Hopper, P. J. & S. A. Thompson. 1984. "The Discourse Basis for Lexical Categories in Universal Grammar." *Language* 60:703-52.
- Huang, Y. 2000. *Anaphora: A Cross-linguistic Study* (Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hudson-D'Zmura, S. B. 1988. *The Structure of Discourse and Anaphoric Resolution: The Discourse Center and the Role of Nouns and Pronouns*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Rochester, Rochester, NY.
- Joüon, P. & T. Muraoka. 1996. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (2nd ed., 2 volumes). Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.
- Kidner, D. 1967. *Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries: Genesis*. Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Knauf, E. A. 1990. "War 'Biblich-Hebräisch' eine Sprache? - Empirische Gesichtspunkte zur linguistischen Annäherung an die Sprache der althebräischen Literatur." *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 3:11-23.
- Korpel, M. C. A. 2000. "Introduction to the Series Pericope." In *Delimitation Criticism: A New Tool in Biblical Scholarship*, edited by M. C. A. Korpel and J. Oesch. Assen: Van Gorcum, pp. 1-50.
- Kuno, S. 1987. *Functional Syntax: Anaphora, Discourse and Empathy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lambrecht, K. 1996. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinsohn, S. H. 2006. *Self-Instruction Materials on Narrative Discourse Analysis*. Online at <http://mail.jaars.org/~bt/narr.zip>.

- Levinsohn, S. H. 2003. "Towards a Unified Linguistic Description of *Houtos* and *Ekeinos*." Paper read in the Biblical Greek and Linguistics Section of the SBL Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA.
- Levinsohn, S. H. 2002. "Book Review of Heimerdinger, Jean-Marc, 1999. *Topic, Focus and Foreground in Ancient Hebrew Narratives*." *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 14:126-147.
- Levinsohn, S. H. 2001. "*Erchomai* and *Poreuomai* in Luke-Acts: Two Orientation Strategies." *Notes on Translation* 15.3:13-30.
- Levinsohn, S. H. 2000a. *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek (2nd ed.)* Dallas: SIL International.
- Levinsohn, S. H. 2000b. "NP References to Active Participants and Story Development in Ancient Hebrew." *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session*, Volume 44:1-13. Available online URL <http://www.und.edu/dept/linguistics/wp/2000Levinsohn.PDF>.
- Levinsohn, S. H. 1994. "Field Procedures for the Analysis of Participant Reference in Monologue Discourse." In *Discourse Features of Ten Languages of West-Central Africa*, edited by S. H. Levinsohn. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington, pp. 109-121.
- Levinsohn, S. H. 1978. "Participant Reference in Inga Narrative Discourse." In *Anaphora in Discourse*, edited by J. Hinds. Edmonton, Alberta: Linguistic Research, Inc., pp. 69-135.
- Levinson, S. C. 1987. "Pragmatics and the Grammar of Anaphora: A Partial Pragmatic Reduction of Binding and Control Phenomena." *Journal of Linguistics* 23:379-434.
- Li, C. N. 1997. "On Zero Anaphora." In *Essays on Language Function and Language Type: Dedicated to T. Givón*, edited by J. Bybee, J. Haiman, & S. A. Thompson. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 275-300.
- Li, C. N. and S. A. Thompson. 1979. "Third-Person Pronouns and Zero-Anaphora in Chinese Discourse." In *Syntax and Semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax*, edited by T. Givón. New York: Academic Press, pp. 311-335.
- Li, C. N. and S. A. Thompson. 1976. "Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Language." In *Subject and Topic*, edited by C. N. Li. New York: Academic Press, pp. 459-489.
- Linde, C. 1979. "Focus of Attention and the Choice of Pronouns in Discourse." In *Syntax and Semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax*, edited by T. Givón. New York: Academic Press, pp. 337-354.
- Lode, L. 1984. "Postverbal Word Order in Biblical Hebrew: Structure and Function (Part one: Genesis)." *Semitics* 9:113-164.
- Longacre, R. E. 2003. *Joseph: A Story of Divine Providence: A Text Theoretical and Textlinguistic Analysis of Genesis 37 and 39-48*(2nd ed). Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Longacre, R. E. 1996. *The Grammar of Discourse* (2nd ed). New York: Plenum.
- Longacre, R. E. 1994. "*Weqatal* Forms in Biblical Hebrew Prose." In *Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, edited by R. D. Bergen. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, pp. 50-98.

- Longacre, R. E. 1992. "The Analysis of Preverbal Nouns in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: Some Overriding Concerns." *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 5:208-251.
- Longacre, R. E. 1985. "Discourse Peak as Zone of Turbulence." In *Beyond the Sentence: Discourse and Sentential Form*, edited by J. R. Wirth. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers, pp. 81-105.
- Longacre, R. E. 1979. "The Paragraph as a Grammatical Unit." In *Syntax and Semantics 12: Discourse and Syntax*, edited by T. Givón. New York: Academic Press, pp. 115-134.
- Longacre, R. E. & S. H. Levinsohn. 1978. "Field Analysis of Discourse." In *Current Trends in Textlinguistics*, edited by W. U. Dressler. Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 103-22.
- Maibaum, A. 1978. "Participants in Jirel Narrative." In *Papers on Discourse*, edited by J. E. Grimes. Dallas: SIL, pp. 203-207.
- Manabe, T. 1984. "Authorial Intent and Intents of Participants in a Narrative Text." *Selected Technical Articles Related to Translation* 11:3-35.
- McDonald, J. L. & D. M. Shaibe. 2002. "The Accessibility of Characters in Single Sentences: Proper Names, Common Nouns, and First Mention." *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 9:356-361.
- Michel, A. 1997a. "Gespaltene Koordination in biblisch-hebräischen Verbalsätzen." In *Studien zur hebräischen Grammatik*, edited by A. Wagner. Göttingen/ Freiburg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht/ Universitätsverlag, pp. 45-71.
- Michel, A. 1997b. *Theologie aus der Peripherie*. Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Miller, C. L. 2003. *The Representation of Speech in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: A Linguistic Analysis*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Miller, C. L. 1994. "Introducing Direct Discourse in Biblical Hebrew Narrative." In *Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, edited by R. D. Bergen. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, pp. 199-241.
- Muraoka, T. 1985. *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem/Leiden: Magnes/Brill.
- Nariyama S. 2001. "Argument Structure as Another Reference-Tracking System with Reference to Ellipsis." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 21:99-129.
- Nariyama S. 2000. "Ellipsis and Markedness Theory: Ellipsis as Unmarked Representation of 'Sameness'." *Melbourne Papers in Linguistics and Applied Linguistics* 1:55-68.
- Paivio, A. & I. Begg. 1981. *Psychology of Language*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Perrin, M. 1978. "Who's Who in Mambila Folk Stories." In *Papers on Discourse*, edited by J. E. Grimes. Dallas: SIL, pp. 105-118.
- Porter, S. E. 1992. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Prince, E. F. 1981. "Toward a Taxonomy of Given-New Information." In *Radical Pragmatics*, edited by P. Cole. New York: Academic Press, pp. 223-255.

- Pu, M-M. 1995. "Anaphoric Patterning in English and Mandarin Narrative Production." *Discourse Processes* 19:279-300.
- Revell, E. J. 1996. *The Designation of the Individual: Expressive Usage in Biblical Narrative*. Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok Pharos.
- Ross, A. P. 1987. *Creation and Blessing: A Guide to the Study and Exposition of Genesis*. Grand Rapids: Baker.
- Runge, S. E. 2006. "'Where Three or More are Gathered, There is Discontinuity': the Correlation between Formal Linguistic Markers of Discontinuity and the Masoretic Paragraph Markers in Genesis 12-25. Paper presented in the 'Pericope: Scripture as Written and Read in Antiquity' Section of the Society of Biblical Literature International Meeting, Edinburgh, Scotland, July 2-6, 2006.
- Runge, S. E. 2005. "Pragmatic Effects of Semantically Redundant Anchoring Expressions in Biblical Hebrew Narrative." Paper presented in the 'Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew' Section of the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, PA November 19-22, 2005.
- Sailhamer, J. H. 1990. "Genesis." In *The Expositor's Bible Commentary, Vol. 2*, edited by F. E. Gaebelin. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, pp. 1-284.
- Sailhamer, J. H. 1992. *The Pentateuch as Narrative*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Sanford, A. & S. C. Garrod. 1981. *Understanding Written Language*. New York: Wiley.
- Sanford, A., J. K. Moar, & S. C. Garrod. 1988. "Proper Names as Controllers of Discourse Focus." *Language and Speech* 31:43-56.
- Speiser, E. A. 1964. *Anchor Bible Commentary: Genesis, Introduction, Translation and Notes*. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Sperber, D & D. Wilson. 2002. "Relevance Theory." In *Handbook of Pragmatics*, edited by G. Ward & L. Horn. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 607-632.
- Stamatatos, E., N. Fakotakis & G. Kokkinakis. 2001. "Computer-Based Authorship Attribution without Lexical Measures." *Computers and the Humanities* 35:193-214.
- Sternberg, M. 1985. *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Stirling, L. 2001. "The Multifunctionality of Anaphoric Expressions: a Typological Perspective." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 21:7-23.
- Talstra, E. 1997. "A Hierarchy of Clauses in Biblical Hebrew Narrative." In *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible: Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996*, edited by E. J. van Wolde. Leiden: Brill, pp. 85-118.
- Tao, L. 1996. "Topic Continuity and Zero Anaphora in Chinese Discourse: Cognitive Strategies in Discourse Processing." In *Studies in Anaphora* (Typological Studies in Language 33), edited by B. A. Fox. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 487-514.

- Thompson, S. A. and R. E. Longacre. 1985. "Adverbial Clauses." In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description Vol. 1*, edited by T. Shopen. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, pp.171–234.
- Toba, S. 1978. "Participant Focus in Khaling Narratives." In *Papers on Discourse*, edited by J. E. Grimes. Dallas: SIL, pp. 157-162.
- Tomlin, R. S. 1987. "Linguistic Reflections of Cognitive Events." In *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*, edited by R. S. Tomlin. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 455-479.
- Ullendorff, E. 1977. *Is Biblical Hebrew a Language? Studies in Semitic Languages*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Van der Merwe, C. H. J. 1999. "A Major Step towards a Better Understanding of Biblical Hebrew Word Order." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 25:277-300.
- Van der Merwe, C. H. J. 1997a. "A Critical Analysis of Narrative Syntactic Approaches, with Special Attention to their Relationship to Discourse Analysis." In *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible: Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996*, edited by E. J. van Wolde. Leiden: Brill, pp. 133-156.
- Van der Merwe, C. H. J. 1997b. "An Overview of Hebrew Narrative Syntax." In *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible: Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996*, edited by E. J. van Wolde. Leiden: Brill, pp. 21-50.
- Van der Merwe, C. H. J. 1997c. "'Reference Time' in Some Biblical Temporal Constructions." *Biblica* 78:503-524.
- Van der Merwe, C. H. J. 1997d. "Workshop: Text Linguistics and the Structure of 1 Samuel 1." In *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible: Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996*, edited by E. J. van Wolde. Leiden: Brill, pp. 157-166.
- Van der Merwe, C. H. J. 1994. "Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Grammar." In *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, edited by R. D. Bergen. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, pp.13-49.
- Van der Merwe, C. H. J., J. A. Naudé, & J. H. Kroeze. 2000. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press.
- Van Hoek, K. 1997. *Anaphora and Conceptual Structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Setters, J. 2006. *The Edited Bible: The Curious History of the 'Editor' in Biblical Criticism*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Van Vliet, S. 2002. "Overspecified NPs Marking Conceptual Shifts in Narrative Discourse." *Linguistics in the Netherlands 2002*, pp. 187-198.
- Van Wolde, E. J. 1997. "Linguistic Motivation and Biblical Exegesis." In *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible: Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996*, edited by E. J. van Wolde. Leiden: Brill, pp. 21-50.
- Vonk, W., L. G. M. M. Hustinx and W. H. G. Simons. 1992. "The Use of Referential Expressions in Structuring Discourse." *Language and Cognitive Processes* 7:301-333.

- Von Rad, G. 1972. *Genesis: A Commentary* (rev. ed), translated by J. Marks. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Waltke, B. K. 2001. *Genesis: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Walton, J. H. 2001. *The NIV Application Commentary: Genesis*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Watkins, L. J. 1990. "Noun Phrase Versus Zero in Kiowa." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 56:410-426.
- Watson, W. G. E. 2003. "Review of *Focus Structure in Biblical Hebrew: A Study of Word Order and Information Structure*, by Katsuomi Shimasaki." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 25:196.
- Wenham, G. J. 1994. *Word Biblical Commentary, Volume 2: Genesis 16-50*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.
- Whaley, L. J. 1997. *Introduction to Typology: The Unity and Diversity of Language*. Thousand Oaks/London: Sage Publications.