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: October 15, 2006

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:

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. Finally, these

descriptions are applied to Gen 27 to demonstrate their explanatory value for exposition of Biblical Hebrew narrative.

Table of Contents

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

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-qtl* 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 strategies[10]). 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 pronouns[14] 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 encoding[16]
- 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	*It* (Un-stressed PRO)	*HE* (Stressed PRO), *this, that, this* N	*that* N	*the* N $N_{Anchored}$ (Most inferables)	indefinite *this* N, *a certain* N[22]	*a* N
Biblical Hebrew	*Ø,* clitic PRO	הִיא הוּא זֹאת זֶה אֵלֶּה N_{Def} הַזֶּה, etc.	N_{Def} הַהוּא N_{Def} הַהִיא	N_{Def} $N_{Anchored}$	N אֶחָד	*Ø* N
Koine Greek	*Ø,* clitic PRO	αυτος /ο /η εκεινος /ο /η N_{Def} ουτος…	N_{Def} εκεινος	N_{Def} $N_{Anchored}$, modified N	N τις	*Ø* 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>
Question: "What happened?"	"What did you do to your thumb?"
Answer: "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—Pronominals[23]—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 *un*ambiguous 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) <u>Entailment Hierarchy of Cross-Linguistic Functions of Participant Reference</u>

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 LORD$_1$ said to him$_2$ [Moses], "What is that$_3$ in your hand?"
(b) And he$_2$ said, "A staff$_3$."
(c) Then He$_1$ said, "Throw it$_3$ on the ground."
(d) So he$_2$ threw it$_3$ on the ground,
(e) and it$_3$ became a serpent$_4$;
(f) and Moses$_2$ fled from it$_4$.

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 participant$_2$, 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 *under*specification. 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.

Salience 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 overencoding[33] 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 commissioned[34] 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 particularly 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 data[35] 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 *over*emphasis 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 reader[37] 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 *over*encoding and *under*encoding).[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.

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: 'Bill$_1$ gave it to Bob$_2$ 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 אַךְ, אַף, אֲפָס, גַּם, בַּלְּתִי, and רַק. 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

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.

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 הָאִשָּׁה '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:

וַתִּקַּח שָׂרַי אֵשֶׁת־אַבְרָם אֶת־הָגָר הַמִּצְרִית שִׁפְחָתָהּ... וַתִּתֵּן אֹתָהּ לְאַבְרָם אִישָׁהּ לוֹ 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 expressions[189] 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 they 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 finding 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, on 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 improprietous (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 הָאִשָּׁה '*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 שָׂרַי אִשְׁתּוֹ 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 אִשָּׁה 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־אֲחִי '*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 כֹּהֵן לְאֵל עֶלְיוֹן 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, וְה֥וּא יֹשֵׁ֖ב בִּסְדֹֽם ‘*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 אָחִ֑יו is substituted for Lot’s proper name. This switch has two effects: thematically highlighting Lot’s relation to Abraham, and down-playing 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: וַתַּהֲרֶ֛יןָ שְׁתֵּ֥י בְנֽוֹת־ל֖וֹט מֵאֲבִיהֶֽן ‘*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 הָעִבְרִי '*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 הָעִבְרִי 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 אֵשֶׁת 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:

וַתִּקַּח שָׂרַי אֵשֶׁת־אַבְרָם אֶת־הָגָר הַמִּצְרִית שִׁפְחָתָהּ... וַתִּתֵּן אֹתָהּ לְאַבְרָם אִישָׁהּ לוֹ 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, וְעַבָדָיו '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־יָלְדָה הָגָר '*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 הַנּוֹלַד־לוֹ אֲשֶׁר־יָלְדָה־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 שִׁפְחַת שָׂרַי 'Hagar, Sarai's handmaid' and שָׂרַי גְּבִרְתִּי 'my mistress Sarai'; v. 9 גְּבִרְתֵּךְ '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 בְּנֹו '*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 22:2[207] (קַח־נָ֣א אֶת־יְחִֽידְךָ֮ אֲשֶׁר־אָהַ֣בְתָּ אֶת־יִצְחָק֒). The technique used here is similar to that pointed out in 16:15 and 21:3 above. אֶת־בִּנְךָ֔ ('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 וַתֵּ֥לֶד הָגָ֖ר לְאַבְרָ֑ם בֵּ֚ן וַיִּקְרָ֣א אַבְרָ֔ם שֵׁם־בְּנֹ֖ו אֲשֶׁר־יָלְדָ֥ה הָגָ֖ר יִשְׁמָעֵֽאל׃
21:3 וַיִּקְרָ֣א אַבְרָהָ֔ם אֶת־שֵׁם־בְּנֹ֖ו הַנּ֣וֹלַד־לֹ֑ו אֲשֶׁר־יָלְדָ֥ה־לֹּ֖ו שָׂרָ֥ה יִצְחָֽק׃

[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 אִישׁ 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 כִּי־זֶה׀ מֹשֶׁה הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱלָנוּ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם לֹא יָדַעְנוּ מֶה־הָיָה לוֹ '*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 זֹאת מִיֵּדְכֶם '*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 come 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־בֶּן־הָגָר הַמִּצְרִית 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 הַנַּעַר '*the lad*' in vv. 12, 17 (2x), 18, 19, and 20, with the exception of בֶּן־הָאָמָה '*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 הַיֶּלֶד '*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 attention[214] 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 PoV[215] 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 תֶּרַח אֶת־אַבְרָם... וַיֵּצְאוּ אִתָּם מֵאוּר כַּשְׂדִּים לָלֶכֶת אַרְצָה כְּנַעַן 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 בוא 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 <u>when she saw that she had conceived</u>[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 YWHW 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 narrator[223] and participants[224] 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:

[23] וַיֵּאָנְחוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִן־הָעֲבֹדָה וַיִּזְעָקוּ וַתַּעַל שַׁוְעָתָם אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים מִן־הָעֲבֹדָה׃
[24] וַיִּשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים אֶת־נַאֲקָתָם וַיִּזְכֹּר אֱלֹהִים אֶת־בְּרִיתוֹ אֶת־אַבְרָהָם...
[25] וַיַּרְא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֵּדַע אֱלֹהִים׃

[23]And the sons of Israel (S4) groaned from the labor and cried out and their cry (S3) went up to God (N4) from the labor.
[24]And God (S3) heard their cry (N3), and God (S1) remembered his covenant (N4) with Abraham…
[25]And 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.

[10]וַיִּשָּׂא־לוֹט אֶת־עֵינָיו וַיַּרְא אֶת־כָּל־כִּכַּר הַיַּרְדֵּן כִּי כֻלָּהּ מַשְׁקֶה לִפְנֵי׀ שַׁחֵת יְהוָה אֶת־סְדֹם וְאֶת־עֲמֹרָה
כְּגַן־יְהוָה כְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם בֹּאֲכָה צֹעַר׃
[11]וַיִּבְחַר־לוֹ לוֹט אֵת כָּל־כִּכַּר הַיַּרְדֵּן וַיִּסַּע לוֹט מִקֶּדֶם...

[10]And 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.
[11]And 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] וְאַחַר בָּאוּ מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֶל־פַּרְעֹה כֹּה־אָמַר יְהוָה...שַׁלַּח אֶת־עַמִּי...
[2] וַיֹּאמֶר פַּרְעֹה מִי יְהוָה אֲשֶׁר אֶשְׁמַע בְּקֹלוֹ לְשַׁלַּח אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל...
[3] וַיֹּאמְרוּ אֱלֹהֵי הָעִבְרִים נִקְרָא עָלֵינוּ נֵלְכָה נָּא דֶּרֶךְ שְׁלֹשֶׁת יָמִים...
[4] וַיֹּאמֶר אֲלֵהֶם מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם לָמָּה מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן תַּפְרִיעוּ אֶת־הָעָם מִמַּעֲשָׂיו...
[5] וַיֹּאמֶר פַּרְעֹה הֵן־רַבִּים עַתָּה עַם הָאָרֶץ וְהִשְׁבַּתֶּם אֹתָם מִסִּבְלֹתָם:

[1]And afterward Moses and Aaron (S3) came and said to Pharaoh (N4), "Thus says YHWH, 'Let my people go…'"
[2]And Pharaoh (S2) said (to Ø), "Who is YHWH that I should obey his voice to let Israel go…"
[3]And Ø (S2) said (to Ø), "The God of the Hebrews met with us. Let us go three days journey…
[4]And the King of Egypt (S2) said to them (N2), "Why, Moses and Aaron, do you cause to refrain…
[5]And 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 סְדֹם הֲרִימֹתִי 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:

[5] וַתֹּ֣אמֶר שָׂרַ֗י אֶל־אַבְרָם֙ חֲמָסִ֣י עָלֶ֔יךָ... [6] וַיֹּ֤אמֶר אַבְרָם֙ אֶל־שָׂרַ֔י...

[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.

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, pp.151-90. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.

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 Istitutu Bibilico.

Kidner, D. 1967. *Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries: Genesis.* Chicago: Inter-Varsity Press.

Knauf, E. A. 1990. "War 'Biblisch-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. Gaebelein. 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.