Theoretical Approaches to Anaphora and Pronouns in Biblical Hebrew

Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5299-9237
University of the Free State,
South Africa
millercl@ufs.ac.za

Jacobus A. Naudé
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8680-0476
University of the Free State,
South Africa
naudej@ufs.ac.za

Abstract

Apollonius Dyscolus (second century C.E.) defined the pronoun not merely as a noun substitute but implied that a pronoun may refer to nouns anaphorically. The study of Latin scarcely improved the knowledge of anaphora and pronouns and, for centuries, thinking about anaphora and pronouns was essentially limited to the activity of compiling inventories of grammatical categories and virtually no attention was given to the role of anaphora and pronouns in syntax and discourse as such. New insights into the description and explanation of the distribution of anaphora and pronouns in human language came in the late twentieth century with the advent of Chomsky's generative linguistics. This paper presents the current state of knowledge regarding anaphora and pronouns in Biblical Hebrew as well as the unresolved issues and questions open for further research.

Keywords: anaphor; pronoun; pronominal; referential expression; binding theory; typology; pro; PRO; trace; deictic; discourse; syntax

Introduction

One of the thematic sessions of the "Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Seminar" at the Society of Biblical Literature annual meeting, which took place from 18–21 November 2017 in Boston, was entitled "Theoretical Approaches to Anaphors and Pronouns in Biblical Hebrew". The session critically examined and compared main theories that are current in linguistic study (for example, Minimalist, Cognitive, Typological, Information Structure, etc.) and the ways in which they analyse anaphora, pronouns, and, especially, anaphoric pronouns. The goal of the session was to determine the current state of our linguistic knowledge of anaphora and pronouns in Biblical Hebrew and to determine the problems still to be researched.

For the sake of clarification, the terms "anaphor" and "pronoun" are defined in what follows. Crystal (1991, 19) defines the term "anaphor" as a linguistic unit deriving its interpretation from some previously expressed unit or meaning (the antecedent or anaphoric referent). The term is thus used in grammatical descriptions for this specific process or result. In sentence (1)(b) each word has an anaphoric reference (that is, an anaphoric substitute or anaphor) that relates to a corresponding unit in the sentence in (1)(a).

(1)(a) John painted this picture in Bermuda
(1)(b) He did that there

Anaphoric reference is one way of marking the identity between what is being expressed and what has already been expressed and is often contrasted with cataphora (where the words refer forward), and sometimes with deixis or exophora (where the words refer directly to the extralinguistic situation) (Crystal 1991, 19).

Crystal (1991, 281) defines the term "pronoun" as a term used in the grammatical classification of words, referring to the closed set of items which can be used to substitute for a noun phrase (or single noun or noun equivalent). Although terminology varies somewhat between grammars, some of the types of pronouns that are identified are represented in (2).

(2)(a) Personal pronouns (I, you, etc.)
(2)(b) Possessive pronouns (my/mine)
(2)(c) Demonstrative pronouns (this/that, etc.)
(2)(d) Interrogative pronouns (who, which, what, etc.)
(2)(e) Reflexive pronouns (myself, yourself, etc.)
(2)(f) Indefinite pronouns (anyone, nobody, etc.)
(2)(g) Relative pronouns (who, whom, that, etc.)
(2)(h) Resumptive or shadow pronouns (e.g., *him* in the sentence "John, I like him")

The pronominal distribution in specific languages differ and can be quite complicated. Pinker (1994/2007, 28) refers to the Cherokee pronoun system, which has pronominal forms to distinguish among "you and I", "another person and I", "several other people and I", and "you, one or more other persons, and I", all of which English collapses into the pronoun "we".

The term "pro-form" is sometimes used to refer collectively to the items in a sentence which substitute for items like noun phrases, adjectival phrases, prepositional phrases, verb phrases, as well as clauses and sentences (Crystal 1991, 280).

The six papers listed in (3) were read during the session of 19 November 2017.

(3)(a) Vincent DeCaen, University of Toronto: "Generalising Asymmetric Coordination with Anaphoric Pronoun"
(3)(b) Matthew Anstey, Charles Sturt University: "A Construction Grammar Account of Anaphora in Biblical Hebrew"
(3)(c) Lénart de Regt, United Bible Societies: "Anaphoric Accessibility in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: Global and Local Participant Tracking across Clause Boundaries"
(3)(d) Tshokolo Johannes Makutoane, University of the Free State: "The Contribution of Linguistic Typology for the Study of Biblical Hebrew in Africa: The Case of Pronouns in Sesotho"
(3)(e) Mary L. Conway, McMaster Divinity College: "Narrative Appraisal as a Linguistic Approach to Evaluation in Text: The Case of Pronouns"
(3)(f) Elitzur Bar-Asher Siegal, Hebrew University of Jerusalem: "Interrogatives as Indefinite Pronouns in Biblical Hebrew"

After the meeting the authors reworked their papers before submitting them to be published in a separate section of *Journal for Semitics*. Matthew Anstey's paper (3)(b) was already promised as a chapter in a forthcoming book (Cook and Holmstedt forthcoming) and is only summarised below. There was also an open invitation for submitting additional papers and the paper in (4) was received.

(4) Robert D. Holmstedt, University of Toronto/University of the Free State: "Anaphora in Biblical Hebrew: A Generative Perspective"

The goal of this paper is to present the current state of knowledge regarding anaphora and pronouns in Biblical Hebrew. The following section of the paper provides a historical overview of the evolution of the knowledge about anaphora and pronouns, in general and specifically for Biblical Hebrew. After a summary of the issues discussed in the papers, the paper concludes with a section detailing issues still under debate and questions which are in need of further research.

General Historical Overview

The grammatical knowledge of anaphora and pronouns in the Western world starts with the Greeks. Although Plato (428/7–348/7 B.C.E.) and Aristotle (384–322/1 B.C.E.) refer to aspects of grammar, they do not deal with grammar as a subject of inquiry. However, in his writings *Sophistes* (262 A–263 D) and *Kratylos* (*Cratylus*) (399 B, 425 A), Plato was the first to divide a sentence into a nominal (*ónoma*) [=subject] and a verbal (*rhēma*) [=predicate] part (Robins 1997, 26, 42). Aristotle added a third category, the *sýndesmoi*, which covers what were later known as conjunctions, articles and pronouns (*Rhetorica* 3.5, 3.12) (Robins 1997, 26, 42). The Stoics refined the Aristotelian system of *sýndesmoi* by separating the inflected members (the items later known as pronouns and articles) known as *árthra* from the invariant uninflected members (later known as prepositions and conjunctions) to which the term *sýndesmoi* alone is applied (Robins 1997, 28). In his *Téchné Grammatiké*, the earliest surviving

explicit description of the Greek language, comprising approximately 15 pages and 25 sections, the Alexandrian, Dionysius Thrax (second century B.C.E.), split the *árthra* into *árthron* (article, a part of speech inflected for case and preposed or postposed to nouns) and *antōnymíā* (pronoun, a part of speech substitutable for a noun and marked for a person) respectively (Robins 1997, 33, 34). Apollonius Dyscolus, writing on syntax in the second century C.E. in Alexandria, defined the pronoun in *Peri Antonymias* (*De Pronomine* or *De Pronominibus*) (33 b) not merely as a noun substitute as Dionysius Thrax had done, but also as standing for substance (*ousíā*) without qualities (Robins 1997, 37). Apollonius Dyscolus indicated this relation by a Greek adverb *ánaphorikós* in *Peri Antonymias* (*De Pronomine* or *De Pronominibus*) (5.20) (see Montanari 2015, 160). It implies that a pronoun may refer to nouns anaphorically (Robins 1997, 58, 64).

Building on the insights of the Greek and Latin grammarians, the Latin grammarian Priscian (Priscianus) (c. 500 C.E.) wrote *Institutiones Grammaticae* consisting of 18 books or nearly 1000 pages, the most complete grammar of Latin, written in Latin, and which formed the basis of mediaeval Latin grammar. Priscian translated *antōnymíā* with *prōnōmen* (the term was previously used by Marcus Terenius Varro (116–27 B.C.E.) in his *De Lingua Latina*) and stated that the property of the pronoun is its substitutability for proper nouns, as well as its specifiability to person (first, second, or third) (Robins 1997, 57, 64). He also repeated the definition of Apollonius Dyscolus that a specific property of the pronoun is to indicate substance without quality (13.6.29, 13.6.31) (Robins 1997, 58, 64).

The study of Latin continued during the Middle Ages (476–1453). As the foundation of mediaeval scholarship, the study of grammar reached a highpoint after 1100 during the time of scholastic philosophy, which was the integration of Aristotelian philosophy with Catholic theology by Thomas of Aquinas. The integration of Priscian grammar and scholastic philosophy (c. 1200–1350) produced "speculative grammars", that is, treatises on the modes of signifying by the authors known as modistae, who represent substantially the same theoretical point of view (Robins 1997, 74). The modistae preserved the grammar of Priscian as an accurate reflection of reality and the human mind (Robins 1997, 78). Every class of words is distinguished by its representing reality through a particular mode. According to Thomas of Erfurt (Duns Scotus) a *prōnōmen* is defined in his *Grammatica Speculativa* as a word class signifying through the mode of an existent without distinctive characteristics, which comes from the property of being of primal matter (Robins 1997, 79–81, 92). The study of Latin, then, scarcely improved upon the Greeks and throughout the Middle Ages grammatical study remained just as the Greeks (and Romans) had left it.

The rediscovery of learning during the Renaissance and the greatly increased travel made possible by geographical exploration extended the knowledge of languages and an interest developed in understanding their relationships. During this time the mediaeval scholastic speculative grammars were succeeded by rationalist grammars; for

example, *Grammaire Générale et Raisonnée*, published in 1660 by the French Port-Royal schools, attempted to demonstrate that various languages are only varieties of a more general and rational system (Robins 1997, 123, 132). This grammar was reprinted until 1830. In his 1767 grammar, M. Beauzée fine-tuned the Port-Royal grammar by stating that grammar has universal principles arising from the nature of human thought, and those resulting from arbitrary conventions (particular to a specific language). Consequently, word classes must be applicable to any language. A distinction is accordingly made between noun and pronoun (which express individual things, persons, and abstractions) on the one hand and verb and adjective (which express the qualities, states, and relations) on the other hand (Robins 1997, 128). In this way, for centuries, thinking about anaphora and pronouns was essentially limited to the activity of compiling inventories of grammatical categories and virtually no attention was given to the role of anaphora and pronouns in syntax and discourse as such.

Productive work which brought new insights into the description and explanation of the distribution of anaphora and pronouns in human language came in the late twentieth century with Government and Binding Theory (or the Principles and Parameters Model) as proposed by Noam Chomsky in the Pisa lectures (Chomsky 1981). This is a syntactic model of human language, which centres on universal principles argued to be common to all languages, and specific distinct sets of parameters by which the particular grammar of a specific language is derived. One implication of this model is that languages can be divided into those with optional pronominal subjects, that is, null subject or *pro*-drop languages, and languages with obligatory overt pronominal subjects, that is, non-null-subject languages or non-*pro*-drop languages (Chomsky 1981, 28, 240–48, 253–75). Chomsky (1981, 65) introduced the "Avoid Pronoun Principle", which imposes the choice of a null or empty subject over an overt pronoun where possible. In Chomsky (1981, 241, 253–75) the null element was called (big) PRO (phonologically empty subject, which was viewed as the same as the empty category of certain infinitive constructions). However, Chomsky (1982, 81, 98) stated that it was incorrect to typify the "missing subject" in *pro*-drop languages as PRO. He proposed a new element (little) pro, now understood to be a pure pronominal like its overt counterpart for this position (Chomsky 1982, 78–89).

A second implication is the distinction by Chomsky (1982, 78) among four categories of nominal expressions indicated by the features in (5).

(5)(a) [+anaphor, -pronominal]
(5)(b) [-anaphor, +pronominal]
(5)(c) [- anaphor, -pronominal]
(5)(d) [+anaphor, +pronominal]

This is a correction by Chomsky (1981, 188) which subdivided nominal expressions into three basic categories, namely anaphora, pronominals, and R-expressions. Chomsky (1981, 188; 1982, 78–79) used the term "anaphor" for the category with

features indicated in (5)(a) which refers to a type of noun phrase which has no independent reference, but refers to some other sentence constituent (its antecedent). Anaphora include reflexive pronouns (e.g., myself), reciprocal pronouns (e.g., each other), and NP-traces (which mark the place noun phrases once held before they were moved to other positions). The term "anaphor" thus has here a more restricted application than the traditional usage as defined by Crystal (1991) as indicated above. The term "pronominal" is used for the category in (5)(b) and includes the class of personal pronouns, as well as (little) *pro* (phonologically empty subject of sentences of languages which allow covert subjects) (Chomsky 1982, 78–89). The third category (5)(c) is R(eferential)-expressions which include lexical noun phrases and wh-traces (which mark inter alia the place interrogative pronouns once held before they were moved to initial positions in a sentence) (Chomsky 1981, 193–96; 1982, 78–79). Chomsky (1982, 31, 78, 85) argued that there is no overt element corresponding to the category (5)(d), but the pronominal anaphor namely (big) PRO, which is the phonologically empty subject of certain infinitive constructions, serves as covert category.

A third implication is the central concern of Government and Binding Theory to characterise the positions in which nominal elements can appear in a specific language. In this regard, Chomsky (1981, 183–222) formulated his canonical binding theory. Chomsky (1981, 188) formulated the binding principles as follows:

(6)(a) An anaphor is bound in its governing category
(6)(b) A pronominal is free in its governing category
(6)(c) An R(eferential)-expression is free

The term "governing category" is the technical formalisation of the domain of a nominal expression and its antecedent, which can be a noun phrase or sentence (see Chomsky 1981, 188). To simplify, it means that an anaphor and its antecedent must be in the same domain, while a pronominal and its antecedent cannot be in the same domain. Chomsky (1982, 78) reconsidered the assumptions underlying the binding principles and suggested that (6)(a) and (6)(b) may be the only binding principles, handling only anaphora and pronominals. This formulation of the binding principles expresses the generalisation that bound pronominals and anaphora are in complementary distribution. On the ground of counterexamples, Chomsky (1986, 164–86) developed an alternative for computing the local domain.

Within the framework of the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1992; 1994; 1995; 1998; 1999) the distribution and grammatical function of anaphors and pronominals rely crucially on the operations of its structure building mechanism. Starting from a set of lexical resources, syntactic structures are built up in a stepwise bottom-up fashion by operations. Movement is always forced by the need for formal checking of features on lexical items.

Another development which has implications for the interpretation of anaphora and pronominals developed in the linguistic sub-discipline of discourse analysis. Discourse analysis has been defined in a variety of ways, but "a generally accepted linguistic definition of *discourse* itself is *language above and beyond the sentence*" (Schiffrin 2001, 263). The vast field of the study of discourse can be divided into three general areas: (1) the use of language in social interaction; (2) the distribution and function of grammatical elements over stretches of language larger than a sentence (or clause); and (3) language patterns that are characteristics of particular kinds of texts or uses of language (e.g., poetry, law, political discourse, etc.) (O'Connor 2002, 20–21).

The study of pronominal and anaphoric elements may take many different forms from the standpoint of discourse analysis. We provide only a few examples here. In the study of language as social interaction, pronouns may signal formal or informal social relationships between participants. In the study of grammatical elements above the level of the sentence, the question of variation in pronominal forms or the variation between a referring expression and a pronoun may be examined. In the study of language patterns characteristic of particular kinds of texts, one might examine the ways in which the function and distribution of pronouns differs in legal discourse as opposed to lyric poetry.

Linguistic typology, the sub-discipline of linguistics that studies the structural similarities and differences among languages (Velupillai 2012, 15), also contributes to an understanding of anaphora and pronominals. Crucially, linguistic typology examines the features of languages regardless of whether they are genetically related and regardless of whether they are in contact. On the basis of these cross-linguistic studies, it is possible to determine the range both of variation and of similarity among the world's languages. The publication of the massive on-line database, *The World Atlas of Language Structures* (Dryer and Haspelmath 2013), has made a vast amount of typological information readily available.

There are numerous ways in which pronouns are studied from the standpoint of linguistic typology. To take one example, languages differ in the extent to which gender distinctions are indicated in independent pronouns. In a study of 378 languages, 254 languages show no gender distinctions, 61 show gender distinctions only in third person singular (like English and Afrikaans), 42 show gender distinctions only in third person (both singular and non-singular), 18 show gender distinctions in third person and also first or second person (like Hebrew), two show gender distinctions in first or second person but not third person, and one shows gender distinctions only in third person non-singular (Siewierska 2013). English shows gender distinctions only in third person singular ("he" and "she" have gender, but "they" does not), whereas Hebrew shows gender distinctions in third person as well as in second person.

In the next section, we briefly describe some of the trends and developments in our knowledge of anaphora and pronouns in Biblical Hebrew syntax and discourse.

Anaphora and Pronouns in Biblical Hebrew Syntax and Discourse

Given the rich syntactic tradition of studying pronouns and anaphors, it is quite interesting that comparatively little attention has been paid to these syntactic phenomena in Biblical Hebrew (see Naudé 2013a, 72–76). There are, however, a number of important developments in our understanding of Biblical Hebrew anaphors and pronouns.

Many of the central developments in understanding the use of pronominal items relate to the pronoun as subject. Finite verbs in Hebrew differ from non-finite verbs in matrix (main) sentences in the expression of a pronominal subject. Finite verbs may have a phonologically empty subject (that is, a covert or zero subject), whereas predicative participles require an overt subject in the form of an independent subject pronoun or a noun phrase. Although these syntactic facts have long been known (expressed structurally in traditional grammars), recent developments in linguistics have broadened and deepened our understanding of them in three ways. First, generative grammar as discussed above has provided a principled explanation for the absence of an overt pronoun on finite verbs as opposed to predicative participles, as well as the distribution of subject pronouns, which impacts on the word order of sentences (see Naudé 1991; 1993). Second, cross-linguistic typological studies provided an additional perspective by revealing that the feature of *pro*-drop (the dropping of an overt pronoun; see Holmstedt 2013) is the dominant pattern among the world's languages, even though it is not a feature of English (Velupillai 2012:247). Third, discourse analysis has provided explanations of the variation in the representation of the subjects of finite verbs as zero, the independent subject pronoun, a noun phrase or a proper name (e.g., Revell 1996; de Regt 1999; Longacre 2003), with particular emphasis on the contribution of the "redundant" independent subject pronoun to the information structuring of the discourse (e.g., Joüon and Muraoka 2009, 505–08; Waltke and O'Connor 1990, 294–97). The importance of combining syntactic analysis with discourse analysis is critical to a complete explanation—one can only know which syntactic configurations are optional (and thus a matter of speaker choice) if one knows what is required; discourse-pragmatic features depend upon the choice of the speaker.

Other aspects of the syntax of the subject pronouns have also received attention. The variation in the forms of the first person singular independent subject pronoun has been examined as relating to language change, syntactic function, or meaningful stylistic variation (Waltke and O'Connor 1990, 292 and n. 12; Revell 1996, 341–49). In considering language variation, it is important to bear in mind the constellation of factors, both diachronic and synchronic, which might play a role in alternative expressions (Miller-Naudé 2012). Another subject construction that has received attention is compound subjects with an independent subject pronoun and conjoined noun phrases, as illustrated in (7) and (8):

(7)   וַתֵּ֙לֶךְ֙ הִ֣יא וְרֵעוֹתֶ֔יהָ

"She went, she and her female companions" (Judges 11:38).

(8)   וַיַּעַל֩ אַבְרָ֨ם מִמִּצְרַ֜יִם ה֠וּא וְאִשְׁתּ֧וֹ וְכָל־אֲשֶׁר־ל֛וֹ וְל֥וֹט עִמּ֖וֹ הַנֶּֽגְבָּה׃

"Abram went up from Egypt, he and his wife and all that was his, and Lot with him, to the Negev" (Genesis 13:1).

In (7), the pronominal subject affix on the verb expresses the subject; the conjoined subject pronoun and noun phrase are an adjunct providing additional information (Naudé 1999; 2013b; see also Holmstedt 2009 who considers more broadly the question of subject-verb agreement). In (8), the personal name Abram is the subject, the conjoined subject with the independent subject pronoun is an adjunct that has been right dislocated to the end of the sentence. Although the use of the construction may function for discourse-pragmatic reasons within the broader text (Revell 1993), the syntactic features of the construction relate to the structure of the sentence.

Aspects of non-subject pronouns that have received attention involve in particular the expression of notions of reflexivity and reciprocity. Hebrew does not have lexically differentiated reflexive or reciprocal pronouns. Reflexivity can be expressed through the so-called "ethical dative", the preposition *lamed* with a pronominal clitic that is co-referential with the covert subject of a finite verb (Naudé 1997; 2013c):

(9)   עַתָּ֗ה קֻ֚מוּ וְעִבְר֣וּ לָכֶ֔ם אֶת־נַ֖חַל זָֽרֶד

"Now, get up and move yourselves (lit. cross over to you) through the Wadi Zered!" (Deuteronomy 2:13).

Pronominal (and nominal) expressions of reciprocity, and their historical development, are explored by Bar-Asher Siegal (2012).

We have seen in this section that some issues relating to pronouns are worked out for Biblical Hebrew, especially regarding the independent subject pronoun. However, many other important issues remain, including the following: anaphora, the status of resumption, the relationship between deictics and pronouns, the status of interrogatives used as indefinite pronouns, the interaction between sentence syntax and participant reference in discourse, and language typology. In the following section, we describe how the papers in this volume contribute to the development of a linguistic understanding of these remaining issues.

Contribution of the Papers

Features of Anaphora in Biblical Hebrew

Holmstedt (2019, this issue) provides an overview of the generative approach to anaphora and an overview of the uncontroversial features of anaphora in Biblical Hebrew. Most instances of anaphora in Biblical Hebrew are long-distance (or discourse) anaphora, that is, anaphora across immediate clause boundaries. Overt subject pronouns may be necessary in order to produce well-formed sentences, for example, with participial predicates or copular clauses. Overt subject pronouns with finite verbs, however, are used for the discourse pragmatic purpose of indicating topic or contrastive focus; Hebrew finite verbs allow *pro*-drop (the subject pronoun may be covert rather than overt). Three problematic areas of Biblical Hebrew anaphora are reflexive and reciprocal anaphora, backwards anaphora (cataphora), and null complement anaphora.

Biblical Hebrew does not have reflexive or reciprocal pronominal forms but rather uses either specific reflexive verbal forms or lexical strategies ("his neighbour" and "his brother") to express notions of reflexivity and reciprocity. However, the lexical strategies may also be used with non-reflexive or non-reciprocal meanings. Reciprocal or reflexive interpretations require the antecedent to be local (in the same clause), but non-reciprocal or non-reflexive interpretations are also possible. There do not seem to be simple syntactic conditions for distinguishing the reciprocal-reflexive and non-reciprocal-reflexive meanings.

According to Holmstedt, backwards anaphora (in which the anaphor precedes its antecedent) seems not to occur in Biblical Hebrew. Proposed examples of backwards anaphora should rather be understood as clitic doubling (a feature of very late Biblical Hebrew) or apposition.

Null object anaphora are a particularly thorny problem. Holmstedt suggests two different possibilities. One analysis interprets null object anaphora as topic-drop pronouns, that is, covert pronouns used in cases where the object has low animacy and low specificity. Another analysis is that the null object pronouns are the result of object ellipsis.

Features of the Resumptive Pronominals

DeCaen (2019, this issue) contrasts topicalisation (in which a constituent is moved to the beginning of a sentence) from hanging topic (in which a constituent is base-generated in a position before the sentence and has resumption within the sentence). In topicalisation there is a gap indicating the original position of the moved constituent. In the construction which DeCaen refers to as extraposition (otherwise known as left dislocation), there is no gap but rather a resumptive pronoun. However, according to DeCaen, the resumptive pronoun of extraposition may be either overt or covert. This means that if a subject constituent is extraposed, resumption may be expressed overtly by an independent subject pronoun or overtly by a finite verb form since Hebrew is a

pro-drop language. For this reason, DeCaen sees topicalisation and extraposition as potentially having the same surface structure shape and thus being easily confused.

Functioning of Interrogative Pronouns as Indefinite Pronouns

In a taxonomic investigation, Bar-Asher Siegal (2019, this issue) examines the problem of interrogative pronouns *mâ* and *mî* functioning as indefinite pronouns. He notes that the indefinite use is found only in negative statements, conditional statements, imperatives, and in statements of possible events in the future; there are no examples of the indefinite use in assertions in the present with a specific semantic interpretation of the indefinite.

On the basis of cross-linguistic typological data, Bar-Asher Siegal determines that the range of semantic meanings in Biblical Hebrew is similar to the use of interrogative-indefinites in other languages. He therefore does not see a diachronic explanation as appropriate but rather sees both uses as synchronic functions.

Intra-discursive Functions of Anaphora versus Extra-discursive Functions of Deictics

Anstey's paper (see (3)(b)), which was presented at the SBL session, is briefly summarised here. He uses the theoretical approach of Construction Grammar, a metatheoretical term used to refer to linguistic theories which are grounded in human cognition and social interaction and which posit form-meaning pairs (constructions) that are larger than morphemes and words. One of the important aspects of a Construction Grammar approach to anaphora is that anaphora and deixis are considered to be aspects of the same phenomenon in that both are grounded in the mental representation—anaphora point to something intra-discursive whereas deictics point to something extra-discursive.

Anstey illustrated how Construction Grammar would look at Biblical Hebrew pronouns by providing examples of zero anaphora (e.g., zero subject of verbless clause, zero object), unstressed/bound pronouns or agreement (e.g., finite verbs with *pro*-drop, bound object pronouns, pronominal suffixes on prepositions), stressed/independent pronouns (e.g., independent subject pronouns, the definite object marker with suffixed pronoun), and noun phrases (NPs). The last category demonstrates an important theoretical difference of Construction Grammar—noun phrases with the definite article that refer back to a previous referent in the discourse are considered a kind of anaphor.

Cross-clausal Tracking of Participants by Pronominal Reference

Lénart de Regt (2019, this issue) examines the question of cross-clausal tracking of participants using pronominal reference. He identifies a number of regularities concerning the identification of participants: (1) a pronominal subject will be coreferential with a preceding object (direct or indirect) or object complement, provided that it is of the same number and gender; (2) the subject and object remain the same in

cases where two or more verbs refer to the same movement, action, utterance, cognition/perception, or decision; (3) an anaphoric subject may be coreferential with a discourse-active subject in cases where there is no animate direct or indirect object or object complement in the preceding clause; and (4) when instructions are carried out, the subject is coreferential with the object who was commanded in the preceding sentence.

On the basis of these generalisations, de Regt argues that purported instances of ambiguity of the subject in Biblical Hebrew reflect the sensibilities of the interpreter's grammar shining through and not the Hebrew. Two important observations by de Regt involve the fact that objects and subjects do not behave symmetrically with respect to coreference (this may have a bearing on Holmstedt's question of null objects) and the fact that instructions take precedence over the coreferentiality (also relating to Holmstedt's question concerning command and response sequence).

Roles of Pronouns in the Narrative Appraisal of Biblical Characters

Conway (2019, this issue) has developed a model for evaluating characters in biblical narrative and their actions as well as the ideology of the biblical text. Her "narrative appraisal analysis" takes into account the implied author and the implied narrative of the biblical text. It is based upon the Appraisal Theory of Martin and White (2005) and Martin and Rose (2007) within the broader framework of Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday and Hasan 1985).

As examples of how pronouns can play a role in providing a narrative appraisal of biblical characters, she examines three passages. In the first passage, Judges 3:19 and 26, the independent personal pronouns contribute to the narrative appraisal of Ehud. In verse 19, Ehud himself turned back from the idols (וְהוּא שָׁב מִן־הַפְּסִילִים). In verse 26, Ehud passed by the idols (וְהוּא עָבַר אֶת־הַפְּסִילִים). In both verses, the actions of Ehud are described using a pleonastic independent personal pronoun with a perfect verb. The independent subject pronoun has an "emphatic" function and serves to provide a [+propriety] appraisal of Ehud with respect to the idols.

The second passage that Conway examines is Judges 8:4–5. In verse 4, Gideon and his 300 men are mentioned together as pursuing the enemy even though faint with hunger. In verse 5, the independent subject pronoun וְאָנֹכִי differentiates Gideon from his men— "they are weak with hunger but I am pursuing." The appraisal is [+security: confidence] showing Gideon's arrogance. In the following verses of the narrative, his men are not mentioned, and it appears as if he attacks and is victorious on his own. Although it should be noted that the independent personal pronouns in verse 5 are grammatically required (since neither participles nor predicate adjectives can index the subject), the fact remains that Gideon differentiates himself as the warrior from his men who are hungry and need food. The appraisal of Gideon as arrogant seems justified.

In the third passage, Judges 13:28, the prayer of Samson has five instances of first person pronouns in his request for personal revenge for the harm done to him by the Philistines in putting out his eyes: "O Lord God, please remember *me*, and give *me* strength just this once, O God, and may *I* take revenge on account of one of *my* two eyes from the Philistines." He ignores the national crisis of the Philistines as well as his own divinely appointed role. He is self-centred and arrogant. The pronouns assist in evaluating his character. The appraisal is [+happiness: antipathy].

Typological Features of Biblical Hebrew Pronominal Systems in Translation

Drawing upon the theoretical and methodological insights of linguistic typology, Makutoane (2019, this issue) compares the typological features of the pronominal systems of Biblical Hebrew and Sesotho, a Bantu language and one of the eleven official languages of South Africa. Sesotho has an intricate pronominal system with "absolute" (independent) pronouns and pronominal concords (agreement morphemes), possessive pronouns with pronominal concords, demonstrative pronouns, relative pronoun concords, and quantitative pronouns. The concords (agreement features) relate not just to the person of the antecedent but also to its noun class (in the case of third person antecedents)—every noun has agreement features based upon its membership in one of the seven Sesotho noun classes. Makutoane demonstrates how the Biblical Hebrew pronominal system may be represented in translation into Sesotho in a variety of ways, depending upon the translator's interpretation of the Hebrew source text.

To summarise, these papers advance our knowledge of anaphora and pronouns of Biblical Hebrew. However, various aspects of the syntax and discourse-pragmatics of pronouns in Biblical Hebrew are disputed and other aspects of pronouns and anaphora remain to be investigated. In the next section some of these issues are listed.

Disputed Issues and Open Questions

Distinction of Anaphora and Pronominals

Holmstedt (2019, this issue) demonstrates that Biblical Hebrew employs the same pronominal form as an anaphor (indicated by example 15 in his paper, repeated here as 10) and as a pronominal (indicated by example 16 in his paper, repeated here as 11) and that this overlap needs some sort of formal constraint distinguishing the two.

(10) וַיַּעַשׂ־לוֹ בָתִּים בְּעִיר דָּוֵיד
"he [David] made for *himself* houses in the city of David" (1 Chr 15:1)

(11) וַיַּעַשׂ לוֹ לִשְׁכָּה גְדוֹלָה
"he [Eliashib] made for *him* [Tobiah] a large room" (Neh 13:5)

A similar problem is handled by Chomsky (1986, 170), where both the anaphor (*each other*) in (12)(a) and the pronoun (*their*) in (12)(b) are in the possessor position and can

be bound by the antecedent (*the children*), which is a violation of the binding theory. In (12)(b) the pronominal [*their*] must be free.

(12)(a) the children like each other's friends
(12)(b) the children like their friends

Chomsky (1986, 171–72) reformulated binding theory to allow an alternative for determining the domain, called the Complete Functional Complex, a domain in which all grammatical functions of a given predicate are realised. For (12)(a) the domain [each other's friends] cannot be the Complete Functional Complex to realise all grammatical functions of the anaphor [each other], because it needs an antecedent. For [each other] it is sufficient if it is bound in the next higher binding domain [the children like each other's friends], which it is too. For this reason, the Complete Functional Complex can only be [the children like each other's friends]. For (12)(b), the domain [their friends] fulfil all grammatical functions—it is sufficient if the pronominal [their] is free in the domain [their friends], which it is.

Returning to the Biblical Hebrew examples in (10) and (11). For (10) the domain [for himself houses in the city of David] cannot be the Complete Functional Complex to realise all grammatical functions of the anaphor [himself], because it needs an antecedent. For [himself] it is sufficient if it is bound in the next higher binding domain [he [David] made for *himself* houses in the city of David], which it is. For this reason, the Complete Functional Complex can only be [he [David] made for *himself* houses in the city of David], which is in line with statement (1) of Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (2017, 299). For (11), the domain [for *him* [Tobiah] a large room] fulfils all grammatical functions—it is sufficient if the pronominal [him] is free in the domain [for *him* [Tobiah] a large room], which it is. This interpretation is in line with statement (2) of Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (2017, 299).

Note that the binding principles are not heuristic (for the discovering of anaphora and pronominals) but rather descriptive and explanatory of how they function and are distributed in the grammar of a language. There could be cases where the binding principles will not help to resolve ambiguity. But in the Biblical Hebrew examples presented in this section, the context is very clear in indicating the antecedents of the anaphora and pronominals. However, much study is still needed to differentiate anaphora and pronominals and their distribution in Biblical Hebrew.

Categorial Status of Resumptive Pronouns

The debatable question in this section is: does a finite verb count as a zero resumptive? The paper of DeCaen (2019, this issue), in which he concluded that there is possible ambiguity between a fronted constituent and its gap versus the hanging topic and a resumptive null subject pronoun, puts the categorial status of resumptive pronouns on the table. DeCaen (2019, this issue) also asks an important question concerning its distribution: "And again, if a resumptive null pronoun is present, where is it, in

[spec,TP] or in [spec,TopP]? Presumably the null pronoun's position would have a direct bearing on discourse analysis." This relates also to the syntax of disputed cases in verbal clauses where a constituent is separated from the matrix clause by a *wāw* and not resumed within it by an overt resumption as in (13) (Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze 2017, 512).

(13)   הַנְּבִיאִים אֲשֶׁר הָיוּ לְפָנַי וּלְפָנֶיךָ מִן־הָעוֹלָם וַיִּנָּבְאוּ אֶל־אֲרָצוֹת רַבּוֹת
"The prophets who were before me and you from ancient times, they prophesied against many countries" (Jeremiah 28:8).

As indicated in Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (2017, 512), there are two analyses of this construction. The first analysis sees this construction as an instance of extreme topic fronting/heavy topicalisation, which presupposes an *NP-trace* [+anaphor, -pronominal] (which marks the place that the noun phrase once held before it was moved to another position) in the subject position of the matrix clause. The second analysis sees this construction as left dislocation, which presupposes *pro* [-anaphor, +pronominal] (phonologically empty subject of sentences of languages which allow covert subjects) in the subject position of the matrix clause. DeCaen (2019, this issue) proposed *pro* [-anaphor, +pronominal] (the phonologically empty subject of sentences of languages which allow covert subjects) as a candidate.

Other possibilities for the categorical status of the resumptive element are *wh*-trace [-anaphor, -pronominal] (which marks inter alia the place interrogative pronouns once held before they were moved to initial positions in a sentence), and PRO [+anaphor, +pronominal] (the phonologically empty subject of certain infinitive constructions).

This discussion also puts the status of overt resumptive pronouns on the table, which occur in left dislocation constructions (Miller-Naudé 2019; Miller-Naudé and Naudé 2019a; 2019b) and relative clauses in Biblical Hebrew and which are not thoroughly investigated. The possibilities are anaphor [+anaphor, -pronominal], pronominal [-anaphor, +pronominal], referential expression [-anaphor, -pronominal] or pronominal anaphor or anaphoric pronoun [+anaphor, +pronominal]. The last-mentioned possibility is a very attractive candidate (see, for example, Holmstedt 2016, 135–40 and the linguistics literature cited there). However, recall that Chomsky (1982, 31, 78, 85) argued that there is no overt element with the features [+anaphor, +pronominal]; see also the paradigm marked as (5) in Holmstedt's paper (2019, this issue). A hypothesis to be investigated is that the categorical status of resumptive pronouns are anaphoric pronouns within the proposal of the Complete Functional Complex (Chomsky 1986). As [+pronominal] the Complete Functional Complex is the matrix sentence/relative and as [+anaphor] the Complete Functional Complex includes the complete left dislocation construction/relative clause with its relative head.

Zero Objects

As described above, the issue of subject *pro*-drop (covert or zero subjects) has been extensively studied in Biblical Hebrew and many of the syntactic issues are resolved. The question of whether object pronouns are also subject to *pro*-drop is still not resolved, as Holmstedt (2019, this issue) has described. Arguments for recognising zero objects in Biblical Hebrew have been set forth by inter alia Andersen and Forbes (2012, 92–93), Holmstedt (2013), Naudé (2013), and DeCaen (2019, this issue).

The question of object *pro*-drop is more difficult for at least two reasons: (1) the object is not obligatorily indexed on the finite verb as is the subject; and (2) in order to know whether the object is obligatory with a particular lexical verb, one must solve the thorny problem of valency and transitivity in Biblical Hebrew (see Cook 2016). In addition, a complete analysis of the phenomenon of zero objects also requires consideration of the full range of variation exhibited in the representation of the object, including the alternation between bound object pronoun on the verb and object pronoun cliticised to the definite object marker (see Garr 2015). Such an analysis requires both a description of the syntactic features and distribution as well as a discourse-pragmatic analysis of its function in larger structures of language.

Tripartite Nominal Clauses

Tripartite nominal clauses have long been debated among Hebraists with respect to (1) the status of the third-person singular pronominal element as a copula (Kummerow 2013), resumptive pronoun (Zewi 2000), a copula or resumptive (Holmstedt and Jones 2014), or a pronoun of "last resort" (Naudé 1990; 1994; 1999; 2002); and (2) the internal syntactic analysis of the tripartite nominal clause and its relationship to left dislocation. A recent approach has examined the construction from the standpoint of the interface of syntax and prosody (Naudé and Miller-Naudé 2018). When the pronominal element is prosodically connected to the initial noun phrase in the construction, it is a pronominal clitic to resolve ambiguity concerning the subject of the verbless predication. When the pronominal element is not prosodically connected to the initial noun phrase, it is a resumptive pronoun and the initial noun phrase is left dislocated.

This construction raises two important issues. First, the syntax and functions of pronominal clitics in other constructions need to be investigated. Second, the interface of pronouns and anaphora with prosody (as it is represented in the Masoretic accents) also needs to be investigated (see preliminarily Pitcher 2018).

Complexity Thinking

A final issue involves viewing the interrelated systems of anaphora and pronouns in Biblical Hebrew from the standpoint of complexity thinking (see Marais 2014; 2019; Naudé and Miller-Naudé 2019). The main tenet of complexity thinking is that reality is complex and emergent; it cannot be reduced to one dimension or explanation, but rather

there must be interlocking and interacting series of explanations in order to analyse and describe all the phenomena involved.

Pronouns and anaphora are perfect examples of complex phenomena in that they cannot be viewed reductionistically from a single viewpoint. Instead, they must be analysed from a variety of interlocking and interrelated perspectives, both on the microlevel of their morphology and syntax and on the macrolevel of their discourse-pragmatic functions. On the microlevel, pronouns and anaphora must be analysed from the standpoint of inter alia their syntactic distributions and functions, their boundedness relations, their relationships to antecedents, and their interactions with other linguistic processes of movement, dislocation, and ellipsis. On the macrolevel, they must be analysed for their contribution to inter alia the tracking of participants, information structure (including topic, focus and information status), cognitive processing, and narrative appraisal (the implied author and implied narrator). Furthermore, the microlevel and the macrolevel phenomena must be considered together. On the one hand, a feature that is obligatory on the microlevel (e.g., the requirement for an overt pronoun for predicative participles) means that such a feature cannot contribute meaning at the macrolevel (e.g., to highlight a character as focused or prominent). On the other hand, some kinds of variation at the microlevel may be largely inexplicable without recourse to macrolevel considerations. A robust description of pronominals and anaphora in Biblical Hebrew cannot be reduced to a description of phenomena on either level but must incorporate both levels in a complex way. A third dimension must also be considered, namely, the diachronic development and change of both microlevel and macrolevel features. Diachrony by its very nature is both the result of language variation and the cause of language variation (Naudé 2012). It therefore must be integrated into all levels of analysis.

Conclusions

In this article, we have provided a brief overview of the general history of the study of anaphora and pronouns in the West from the earliest times to the present. Particular emphasis was placed on Chomsky's generative linguistics, which raised important questions concerning the categorical status, features, and syntactic roles of anaphora and pronouns. We then provided a brief overview of the major developments in the linguistic study of Biblical Hebrew anaphora and pronouns as preparation for an exposition of the main contributions of the papers presented in this volume on the topic. Finally, we outlined a number of fruitful avenues of future research in the application of linguistics to Biblical Hebrew anaphora and pronominals. Given the rich morpho-syntactic features of pronominals in the Hebrew Bible as well as the prosody of the Tiberian tradition of oral reading of the text, there are many fascinating features of these complex systems to be discovered in an integrative way.

References

Andersen, F.I. and Forbes, A.D. 2012. *Biblical Hebrew Grammar Visualized*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Bar-Asher Siegal, E. 2012. "Diachronic Syntactic Studies in Hebrew Pronominal Reciprocal Constructions," in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*, edited by C.L. Miller-Naudé and Z. Zevit, 209–44. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Bar-Asher Siegal, E. 2019. "Interrogatives as Indefinite Pronouns in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal for Semitics* 28 (2): #6828. https://doi.org/10.25159/2663-6573/6828

Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Chomsky, N. 1982. *Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. 1986. *Knowledge of Language. Its Nature, Origin and Use*. New York: Praeger.

Chomsky, N. 1992. "A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory." MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 1. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Chomsky, N. 1994. "Bare Phrase Structure." MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 5. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Chomsky, N. 1995 *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Chomsky, N. 1998 "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework." MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 17. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Chomsky, N. 1999 "Derivation by Phase." MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Conway, Mary L. 2019. "Narrative Appraisal as a Linguistic Approach to Evaluation in Text: The Case of Pronouns." *Journal for Semitics* 28 (2): #6406. https://doi.org/10.25159/2663-6573/6406

Cook, J.A. 2016. "Verbal Valency: The Intersection of Syntax and Semantics," in *Contemporary Examinations of Classical Languages (Hebrew, Aramaic, Syriac, and Greek): Valency, Lexicography, Grammar, and Manuscripts*, edited by T.M. Lewis, A.G. Salvesen and B. Turner, 58–86. Perspectives in Linguistics and Ancient Languages 8. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias. https://doi.org/10.31826/9781463237332-010

Cook, J.A. and Holmstedt, R.D. Forthcoming. *Linguistics for Hebraists and Biblical Scholars*. University Park: Penn State University Press.

Crystal, D. 1991. *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics.* 3rd edition Oxford: Blackwell.

DeCaen, Vincent. 2019. "Generalizing Asymmetric Coordination with Resumptive Pronoun: A Syntactic Analysis of Certain Dislocations in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal for Semitics* 28 (2): #6734. https://doi.org/10.25159/2663-6573/6734

de Regt, Lénart J. 1999. *Participants in Old Testament Texts and the Translator: Reference Devices and their Rhetorical Impact*. SSN 39. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum.

de Regt, Lénart J. 2019. "Participant Tracking in Biblical Hebrew and Obligatory Explicitation of Anaphors in Translation." *Journal for Semitics* 28 (2): #6746. https://doi.org/10.25159/2663-6573/6746

Dryer, M.S. and Haspelmath, M. Eds. 2013. *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Accessed 20 December 2019. http://wals.info.

Garr W.R. 2015. "On the Alternation Between Bound and Free Pronominal Objects in Biblical Hebrew." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 127 (2): 262–80. https://doi.org/10.1515/zaw-2015-0015

Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. 1985 *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Deakin, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Holmstedt, R.D. 2009 "So-called 'First-Conjunct Agreement' in Biblical Hebrew," in *Afroasiatic Studies in Memory of Robert Hetzron: Proceedings of the 35th Annual Meeting of the North American Conference on Afroasiatic Linguistics (NACAL 35)*, edited by C. Häberl 105–29. Newcastle on Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars.

Holmstedt, R.D. 2013. "Pro-drop," in *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, edited by G. Khan, volume 3, pp. 265–67. Leiden: Brill.

Holmstedt, R.D. 2016. *The Relative Clause in Biblical Hebrew*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Holmstedt, R.D. 2019. "Anaphora in Biblical Hebrew: A Generative Perspective." *Journal for Semitics* 28 (2): #6677. https://doi.org/10.25159/2663-6573/6677

Holmstedt, R.D. and Jones, A.R. 2014. "The Pronoun in Tripartite Verbless Clauses in Biblical Hebrew: Resumption for Left-dislocation or Pronominal Copula?" *Journal of Semitic Studies*, 59 (1): 53–89. https://doi.org/10.1093/jss/fgt035

Joüon, P. and Muraoka, T. 2009. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2nd reprint of 2nd edition, with corrections. Rome: Gregorian Biblical Press.

Kummerow, D. 2013. "Object Predication in Tiberian Hebrew: A Typological Approach to the Nonverbal Copula." *Kleine Untersuchungen zur Sprache des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt*, 19: 1–135.

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: Eisenbrauns.

Makutoane, Tshokolo J. 2019. "The Contribution of Linguistic Typology for the Study of Biblical Hebrew in Africa: The Case of Pronouns in Sesotho." *Journal for Semitics* 28 (2): #6483. https://doi.org/10.25159/2663-6573/6483

Marais, K. 2014. *Translation Theory and Development Studies: A Complexity Theory Approach*. New York and London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203768280

Marais, K. 2019. *A (Bio)Semiotic Theory of Translation: The Emergence of Social-Cultural Reality.* London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315142319

Martin, J.R. and Rose, D. 2007 *Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause.* 2nd ed. New York, NY: Continuum.

Martin, J.R. and White, P.R.R. 2005. *The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Miller-Naudé, C.L. 2012. "Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew: Linguistic Perspectives on Change and Variation," in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*, edited by C.L. Miller-Naudé and Z. Zevit, 3–15. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns. https://doi.org/10.18218/jmas.2013.15.1.89

Miller-Naudé, C.L. 2019. "Sentential Edges and their Structures in Biblical Hebrew." Unpublished presentation for the 8th Hyvernat Memorial Lecture, Catholic University of America, Washington DC, 28 March 2019.

Miller-Naudé, C.L. and Naudé, J.A. 2019a. "Differentiating Left Dislocations in Biblical Hebrew." Unpublished conference presentation at Biblical Hebrew and Rabbinic Hebrew: New Perspectives in Philology and Linguistics, University of Cambridge, 10 July 2019.

Miller-Naudé, C.L. and Naudé, J.A. 2019b "Differentiating Dislocations, Topicalisation and Extraposition in Biblical Hebrew: Evidence from Negation." *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus* 56: 179–99.

Montanari, F. 2015. *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Leiden: Brill.

Naudé, J.A. 1990. "A Syntactic Analysis of Dislocation in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 16: 115–30.

Naudé, J.A. 1991a. "On the Syntax of *dy*-Phrases in the Aramaic of 1QtgJob." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 16: 45–67.

Naudé, J.A.1991b. "Qumran Hebrew as a Null Subject Language." *South African Journal of Linguistics* 9 (4): 119–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/10118063.1991.9724303

Naudé, J.A. 1993. "On Subject Pronoun and Subject Noun Asymmetry: A Preliminary Survey of Northwest Semitic." *South African Journal of Linguistics* 11 (1): 119–25. https://doi.org/10.1080/10118063.1993.9724323

Naudé, J.A. 1994. "The Verbless Clause with Pleonastic Pronoun in Biblical Aramaic." *Journal for Semitics* 6: 74–93.

Naudé, J.A. 1997. "The Syntactic Status of the Ethical Dative in Biblical Hebrew." *Journal for Semitics* 9: 129–65.

Naudé, J.A. 1999. "Syntactic Aspects of Co-ordinate Subjects with Independent Personal Pronouns." *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 2: 75–99.

Naudé, J.A. 2002. "The Third Person Pronoun in Tripartite Verbless Clauses of Qumran Hebrew," in *Pronouns: Representation and Grammar*, edited by H.J. Simon and H.H. Wiese, 161–82. Amsterdam: Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/la.52.11nau

Naudé, J.A. 2012. "Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew and a Theory of Language Change and Diffusion," in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*, edited by C.L. Miller-Naudé and Z. Zevit, 61–81. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Naudé, J.A. 2013a. "Government and Binding," in *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, edited by G. Khan, volume 2, 72–76. Leiden: Brill.

Naudé, J.A. 2013b. "Pronominalization," in in *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, edited by G. Khan, volume 3, 272–77. Leiden: Brill.

Naudé, J.A. 2013c. "Dative: Biblical Hebrew," in *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, edited by G. Khan, volume 2, 655–58. Leiden: Brill.

Naudé, J.A and Miller-Naudé C.L. 2018. "At the Interface of Syntax and Prosody: Differentiating Left Dislocated and Tripartite Verbless Clauses in Biblical Hebrew." *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus* 48: 223–38. https://doi.org/10.5774/48-0-293

Naudé, J.A and Miller-Naudé C.L. 2019. "Sacred Writings and Their Translations as Complex Phenomena: The Book of Ben Sira in the Septuagint as a Case in Point, in *Complexsity Thinking in Translation Studies: Methodological Studies*, edited by K. Marais and R. Meylaerts, 180–215. Routledge Advances in Translation and Interpreting Studies. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203702017-9

O'Connor, M. 2002. "Discourse Linguistics and the Study of Biblical Hebrew," in *Congress Volume Basel 2001*, edited by A. Lemaire, 17–42. Leiden: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004276185_003

Pinker, S. 1994/2007. *The Language Instinct*. New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics. https://doi.org/10.1037/e412952005-009

Pitcher, S.L. 2018. "Towards the Development of an Intonation-based Prosodic Model for the Masoretic Cantillation Accents of Tiberian Hebrew." MA dissertation, University of the Free State.

Revell, E.J. 1993. "Concord with Compound Subjects and Related Issues." *Vetus Testamentum* 43: 68–87. https://doi.org/10.1163/156853393X00304

Revell, E.J. 1996. *The Designation of the Individual: Expressive Usage in Biblical Narrative*. Kampen: Kok Pharos.

Robins, Robert H. 1997. *A Short History of Linguistics*. 4th ed. London: Longmans.

Schiffrin, D. 2011. "Discourse Analysis (Linguistic)," in *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Language Sciences*, edited by P.C. Hogan, 262–66.. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Siewierska. A. 2013. "Gender Distinctions in Independent Personal Pronouns," in *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*, edited by M.S. Dryer and M. Haspelmath. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. Accessed 20 December 2019. http://wals.info/chapter/44.

Van der Merwe, C.H.J., Naude, J.A. and Kroeze, J.H. 2017. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. 2nd edition. London: Bloomsbury.

Velupillai, V. 2012. *An Introduction to Linguistic Typology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Waltke, B.K. and O'Connor, M. 1990. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

Zewi, T. 2000. "Is There a Tripartite Nominal Sentence in Biblical Hebrew?" *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 26 (2): 51–63.