PRAGMATIC EFFECTS OF SEMANTICALLY REDUNDANT ANCHORING EXPRESSIONS IN BH NARRATIVE[1]

Steven E. Runge
University of Stellenbosch
'Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Section'
Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting
Philadelphia, PA, Nov. 19-22, 2005.

Abstract:

Referring expressions (e.g., proper names such as *Isaac* or *Eliezer*, or epithets such as *his son*, or *Abraham's servant*) are prototypically used for semantic reasons to track participants, to know 'who is doing what to whom'. Epithets can also be used to (re-)establish a thematic relation of a participant to the discourse (e.g. *Isaac, his son*), anchoring them in a specific way. However, semantically redundant anchoring expressions occur regularly in BH narrative in contexts where a participant's thematic relation is already well established. What then is the function of these redundant anchoring expressions if it is semantically redundant?[2] Scholars have noted such uses of referring expressions, as where Ruth is referred to as '*the Moabitess*' five times after being activated as such in Ruth 1.[3]

Though selected passages or terms have been studied,[4] a systematic linguistic description of the default and marked uses of referring expressions has not been completed. This paper will first outline the default function of anchoring expressions--to ground newly (re)activated participants to the discourse--following Levinsohn's *default/marked* framework (2000a, 2000b). Next, it will propose that the redundant use of anchoring expressions is *pragmatically* motivated, and represents a marked usage to accomplish various thematic effects, based on Berlin (1983), Givón (1992), and Lambrecht (1994). These effects will be illustrated through an exposition of Genesis 27. Specific functions of the marked use of anchoring expressions will be proposed (e.g., indicating center of attention, relative saliency of participants, shift in thematic role), and implications for further research will be presented.

1   The default use of anchoring expressions in BH narrative.

1.1   Activation of brand new participants

As people read a text, they form a *mental representation* of the information communicated in the discourse (Lambrecht 1994:43). When a brand new participant is introduced or *activated* into the discourse, the reader creates a new 'file' which allows storage and retrieval of discourse information about the particular participant (cf. Givón 1992:9). Two tasks must be successfully accomplished in order to facilitate activation.

One task of activation involves establishing a *primary referring expression* for the new participant. The primary referring expression becomes the *default* expression used when relexicalizing the participant. It serves as a label for the reader's cognitive file, and facilitates

---

[1] A version of this paper was published in *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 32(2):87-104, 2006.
[2] Cf. anchoring of Rebekah in Gen 25:20 in the chapter following her introduction to the discourse.
[3] Cf. Berlin (1983:87-88).
[4] Cf. especially Revell (1996:83-190) and Berlin (1983:59-61); also de Regt (1999).

subsequent reference to the participant in the discourse (Givón 1992:9). Referring expressions in BH are usually either proper names or epithets[5] (cf. Revell 1996:44-51). It should be noted that epithets are typically semantically less restrictive than proper names, having a greater likelihood of ambiguity (Ibid, 58). Consider the reference to '*Eliezer*' in Gen 15:2, compared to '*his servant, the oldest of his household…*' in 24:2. Waltke points out that it is unclear if the two expressions are coreferent due to the use of an epithet in 24:2 (2001:327).

A second task of activation involves establishing an *anchoring relation* for the newly activated participant, which guides the reader in how to ground the participant to the discourse context, which will be called the *anchoring relation*.[6] These anchoring relations are usually established either in the comment in a Topic/Comment (T/C) clause, or by use of an appositional modifier. The discourse anchor instructs the reader in how to relate the new participant to his or her own mental representation of the discourse. Cognitively, the anchoring relation tells the reader where in the mental representation to place the new file. After activation, anchoring relations appear to remain implicitly in force until another relation is specified by the writer/editor.

There are two primary methods of activating brand new participants in BH. One method of activation is to introduce the new participant's referring expression and anchoring relation in a T/C articulation. Prototypically, the participant is introduced in the comment of the sentence. Consider the activation of Abram and Lot in Gen. 11:27b.

Genesis 11:27b תֶּ֣רַח הוֹלִ֤יד אֶת־אַבְרָם֙ אֶת־נָח֣וֹר וְאֶת־הָרָ֔ן וְהָרָ֖ן הוֹלִ֥יד אֶת־לֽוֹט׃

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

The discourse anchor '*son of Terah*' is implicitly established for Abram, while several potential relations exist for Lot (e.g., '*grandson of Terah*', '*son of Haran*', or '*nephew of Abram*'). The writer will clarify the proper anchor in a subsequent reference, but establishing *some* kind of discourse anchor is required for activation. One also finds accessible minor participants or props activated as the topic of topic/comment clauses (e.g. Gen 14: 10d, 13).

---

[5] E.g., 'the messenger' in 2 Sa 11:19, Saul's servant in 1 Sa 9:5. Berlin (1983:59-61) notes that proper names are generally associated with major participants, while epithets are generally associated with minor participants, though there are exceptions. Consider Elimelech, Chilion and Mahlon in Ruth 1:1-5. Berlin describes them as 'flat' characters, names without faces i.e., characters without depth or development.
[6] Heimerdinger (1999:134) discusses the use of anchoring as a means of making a participant identifiable, rather than as a general task of activation. The majority of his other methods cited for making a participant identifiable (e.g., anaphoric reference, generic expressions, deictic reference) involve the establishment of a anchoring relation. Therefore, we use the term 'anchor' is a different sense than Heimerdinger, as it provides a more elegant description of the activation process.

The second method of activation involves two clauses. First clause predicates the existence of the participant and establishes a relation. A following clause then assigns a referring expression. The activation of Hagar in Genesis 16:1b-1c is representative.

Genesis 16:1 וְלָהּ שִׁפְחָה מִצְרִית וּשְׁמָהּ הָגָר׃

And she [Sarai] had an Egyptian handmaid, and her name was Hagar.

Ruth 1:1 and 1 Sam. 1:1 are also examples, each using the two-step process of a presentational articulation to introduce the very first participant of the discourse.

There are three basic types of anchoring relations. First, there are generic geographical or genealogical relations (e.g. 'a young man *from Bethlehem in Judah, who was a Levite'* in Judges 17:7; 'Hirah *the Adullamite'* in Genesis 38:12). Second, there are official or titular relations (e.g. '*the priest of Midian'* in Exodus 2:16; 'Melchizedek *the king of Salem'* in Genesis 14:18). Finally, there are interpersonal relations, which relate a participant to another participant (e.g., Lot as '*Abraham's nephew'* in Genesis 12:5, 'the shepherds *of Abraham's livestock'* in Genesis 13:7). Interpersonal relations are typically used to relate non-initial participants to a specific, discourse-active participant using a possessive relationship. The participant to whom others are anchored typically plays a prominent role in the narrative, and will be referred to as the *center of attention*.[7] It will be demonstrated below that recognizing the different types of anchoring expressions is crucial to a proper understanding of their marked use.

1.2   Reactivation of an inactive participant from the discourse register:

When a participant is first introduced, it is said to be *active* in the reader's consciousness, "currently lit up" (Chafe 1987:22), and will only remain so with continued reference to it. Active participants are characteristically encoded using reduced pronominal forms (Givón 1988:249; Heimerdinger 1999:124). Chafe has also postulated two other activation states: semi-active and inactive.

A participant is considered to become *semi-active*, i.e., "in a person's peripheral consciousness" (1987:22), without implicit or explicit mention. Encoding evidence from BH leads us to conclude that this distance ranges from 1-3 clauses, depending upon the salience and

---

[7] There is a meaningful distinction to be made between *point of view* and *center of attention*. Berlin (1983, chapter 3) describes point of view as the vantage point from which the narrative is told. She notes that 'naming' or the pragmatic use of referring expressions, is often used to indicate point of view. In contrast to point of view, center of attention refers to *what* or *who* the camera is focused on. Cf. Heimerdinger's (1999:125) discussion of topic and topicality, concluding that topicality "is best described cognitively as the centring of attention of speaker and hearer on discourse entities which are the main concern of the story." Our concept of 'center of attention' is but one aspect of 'topic'.

persistence of the participant in the narrative.[8] To reactivate a semi-active participant, the reader must correctly select the speaker's intended referent from among those that are 'on stage'. Thus, reactivation requires a definite lexical NP, by default using the primary referring expression. The restatement of the participant's discourse anchor is not required since the participant remains in the reader's peripheral consciousness. For instance consider references to '*Isaac*' in Genesis 24. Isaac was last actively participating in the discourse in Gen 22, and is mentioned in the speeches of Gen 24 (vv. 4, 14, 36-40, 44, 48, 51) in the course of Abraham's servant acquiring a bride for Isaac. In v. 62, Isaac is reactivated using his default referring expression '*Isaac*' just before he and Rebekah meet. Isaac is in the reader's peripheral consciousness, but Abraham's servant is the most active third masculine singular referent prior to v. 62. Explicit reference to Isaac is semantically necessary to avoid confusion about who is out 'sitting in the field toward evening'.

The final activation state is *inactive*, wherein the participant has moved from the semi-active peripheral consciousness to the *long-term memory* of the reader (Chafe 1987:22). Reactivation from the inactive state requires both a definite NP and reestablishment of the anchoring relation. The writer is no longer simply disambiguating from among a few 'on-stage' participants, but is asking the reader to correctly select the participant from members of the larger discourse register.

Lambrecht advocates viewing activation states as "potential for activation" rather than as discrete states (1994:104). A participant's thematic saliency (i.e. the significance of its role in the narrative) and persistence in the discourse can influence its accessibility in the reader's consciousness.[9] Compare the reactivations of *Lot* and *Mephibosheth* after approximately the same amount of inactivity. *Lot* figures fairly prominently in the narratives of Gen. 12-14, and is last mentioned in 14:16. When he is reactivated 106 verses later in 19:1, only his primary referring expression is utilized, indicating that the writer judges the referent to still be semi-active and accessible to the reader.

---

[8] Pu, Prideaux, and Stanford (1992) found that protagonists "stay in focus longer" than less salient participants, and thus are more likely to be pronominalized (cited in Pu 1995). Cf. Perrin's (1978:110f.) corollary finding in Mambila that minor participants are always nominalized; also Pu's (1995:295) finding that "noncentral characters are frequently nominalized [within the episode], even when pronoun gender could distinguish between central and non-central referents.

[9] These comments only apply to referents which are textually accessible (cf. Lambrecht 1994:100). Some participants are unaffected by such issues since they are inferentially accessible via cognitive schemata, or situationally accessible from the text-external world (e.g., deities and government officials, cf. Levinsohn 2000a; Lambrecht 1994:100; Heimerdinger 1999:133-4). Thus, discretion must be exercised in making judgments about activation states. Nonetheless, attested patterns of referential encoding provide a heuristic guide in making such decisions. For an exceptional example of a situationally accessible referent, cf. Exo 17:9 and the activation of Joshua, who appears in a comment without anchor or introduction.

Mephibosheth is first introduced using a two-step process of predication and identification in 2 Sam 4:4, and then is not mentioned again for 108 verses. However, *Mephibosheth's* reactivation in 9:6 includes '*the son of Jonathan the son of Saul*', ostensibly to reestablish his discourse relation. Admittedly one cannot quantify activation status based on verse counts, but the contrast is illustrative of the correlation which I believe exists between the participants' past salience and persistence and the apparent differences in activation states as reflected in the differences in referential encoding.

To summarize, anchoring relations are semantically required to connect non-accessible participants to the discourse at their initial activation, and at reactivation from an inactive state. Once the relation has been (re)established, it remains accessible as long as the participant does.

1.3   Markedness and the processing of redundant anchoring expressions

Anchoring expressions serve two semantically-required, default functions in discourse: to anchor newly-activated participants to the discourse context, and to reestablish anchoring relations of inactive participants that are reactivated from long-term memory. The description of these functions will provide a baseline against which marked uses will be identified and described (cf. Levinsohn 2000a, 2000b). This pragmatic approach is based upon the application of Levinson's (1987) revision of Grice's conversational implicatures: the Q-, the I-, and the M-principles.

The Q-principle states that speakers should be as informative in their utterances as their knowledge of the situation allows. This principle leads us to expect that by default, a speaker will use the most specific referring expression available to him or her in order to avoid ambiguity. The I-principle states that speakers should be as brief as possible in their utterance, not including unnecessary or redundant information. This leads us to expect the speaker, by default, to use the most morphologically and semantically basic referring expression available.

The M-principle accounts for deviations from the first two principles, essentially stating that if a speaker uses a non-default form in a context, then some meaning *other than that communicated by the default* is intended. The expectation is that the breaking of either the Q- or the I-principle in an utterance is intentionally and pragmatically motivated in order to accomplish some purpose other than that obtained from a default expression.

Yan Huang (2000) further revises Levinson's (1987) pragmatic explanation into what he calls a "neo-Gricean pragmatic theory" in order to develop a cross-linguistic account of anaphora resolution. Of particular interest to Huang are so-called "pragmatic languages" which rely more upon language usage than upon grammar for anaphora resolution. "In these 'pragmatic' languages, many of the constraints on the alleged grammatical processes are in fact primarily due

to principles of language use rather than rules of grammatical structure" (2000:213). In other words, Huang understands anaphora resolution in these languages to be governed more by usage than grammar-proper.

The balance between pragmatic languages and syntactically-governed languages varies based on the typology of the language. Therefore, study of actual usage in various discourse contexts is thus required. This is in opposition to the traditional grammatical practice of removing the token under consideration from its discourse context and studying the sentence in isolation. Huang states, "the interpretation of certain patterns of anaphora can be made using pragmatic inference, depending on the language user's knowledge of the range of options available in the grammar, and of the systematic use or avoidance of particular linguistic expressions or structures on particular occasions" (2000:214).

In light of Huang's findings, we have taken a test corpus of BH narrative (viz. Gen 12-25, and Exo 1-12) and established default encoding rules for participants in narrative proper based on the methodology of Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:112ff.), which has successfully been applied to a number of typologically-diverse languages. As a result of their study, they posit three basic functions of participant reference: semantic, processing, and discourse-pragmatic. The semantic function enables readers/hearers to track participants, to know who is doing what to whom. The processing function enables readers both to track participants in contexts that are disruptive or discontinuous. Finally, the discourse-pragmatic function is prototypically used as a cataphoric highlighting device, giving prominence to a following speech or event that is surprising or particularly salient.

Huang's study does not give consideration to encoding levels more complex than the lexical NP. Thus, the function of redundant anchoring expressions is not considered. Thus, we must develop a suitable framework to describe the overencoding of participants, one which is consistent with and informed by cross-linguistic principles of participant reference.

In applying these revised Gricean implicatures to the resolution of participant encoding, we propose that readers interpret semantically redundant forms as intended to accomplish some marked function *other than* semantic disambiguation. Therefore, we postulate an entailment hierarchy to describe how readers process the encoding of participants.

1) *Entailment hierarchy of anaphoric resolution in narrative*

Semantic→Processing→Pragmatic[10]

---

[10] Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:112) postulate that there are three functions of participant reference: semantic, discourse processing, and pragmatic. Discourse processing concerns the use of redundant NPs to segment the discourse into development units for easier processing. The use of redundant NPs in BH

The reader first expects that encoding is semantically motivated, intended to disambiguate participants. Semantic redundancy of an expression, based on either the expectations expressed in the Q- or I-principle, leads the reader to analyze the form as intending some marked, non-default purpose.[11] It is important to outline the default use of discourse anchors as the basis for the discussion of their marked uses. We will begin by describing how readers/hearers process a discourse.

2   Marked use of anchoring expressions in BH narrative.

As stated in the introduction, anchoring expressions are frequently added to proper names of active and semi-active participants. The objective of this study is to discretely isolate and describe pragmatic uses of non-default anchoring expressions by the writer/editor. In order to accomplish this, the following criteria will be utilized.

Marked anchoring expressions considered here must:
- occur within narrative proper, *not* reported speech, based upon the differences in reference, i.e., the use of 1st and 2nd person inflection, vocatives expressions, etc.;
- *not* be the primary lexical referring expression, i.e. the default expression for the participant;
- either temporarily *replace* the primary referring expression, **or**
- directly *modify* the primary referring expression of a participant that is (most probably) active or semi-active.

It is important to narrow the scope of data considered here in order to develop a preliminary description of redundant anchors.

2.1   Marked use of anchors for thematic highlighting

To illustrate the marked use of anchoring expressions for pragmatic purposes, consider the referring expressions used to refer to *Saul* in 1 Samuel, and the thematic effects of selectively including the titular anchor '*king*' at various points. Saul's proper name is used 258x, only once with '*son of Kish*' as a redundant anchor.[12] Interestingly, the titular expression '*king*' is only

---

narrative for processing purposes is well documented (cf. Andersen 1994:106-107; Levinsohn 2000a; Heimerdinger 1999:124, 154), but is beyond the scope of this paper. For a full treatment of the processing function of participant reference in BH narrative, see chapter 4 of Runge (forthcoming).

[11] Based on Huang (2000), a reader's expectation is that the referring expression used to encode a participant will follow the 'Be brief' and 'Be informative' guidelines of the Q- and I-principles. When these principles are 'flaunted', the reader moves beyond the semantic resolution of the expression to a pragmatic one. The referring expression still carries semantic information, but by virtue of its redundancy, i.e., breaking the I-principle—the reader moves up the resolution hierarchy based on the M-principle. In the case of the redundant discourse anchors, several pragmatic effects can be obtained by virtue of the reader analyzing the expression as semantically unnecessary. The semantic role of the marked expression then is not to disambiguate, but to signal redundancy in order to accomplish certain pragmatic effects.

[12] Cf. 1 Samuel 10:21.

substituted for '*Saul*' fourteen times, and 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 prompted Saul's paranoia of David: 'Saul has slain his thousands, and David his ten-thousands'.

Even more interesting are the places where the writer/editor has chosen to substitute the expression '*king*' for '*Saul*' in narrative proper: four times in the aftermath of David's victory over Goliath, where Saul's paranoia of David first begins[13], twice in 1 Sam 20:24, 25, where David avoids a feast after Saul has twice tried to pin him to the wall with his spear, seven times surrounding Doeg the Edomite's agreement to slay the priest of Nob[14], and once in 1 Sam 28:13 when the medium with whom Saul consults realizes for whom she has been conjuring.

Thus, it is noteworthy that the writer/editor has chosen to refer to Saul as '*king/King Saul*' **only** in instances where his actions appear **less** than kingly. Such selective usage gives us reason to argue that inclusion and exclusion of redundant anchors is indeed pragmatically motivated. In the case of selectively calling Saul '*king*', the writer/editor is able to highlight higher-level discourse themes, viz., Saul's worthiness to be king compared to David. The explicit mention of a non-relational anchoring expression (i.e., a generic or titular relation), which is implicitly available in the reader's mental representation, has the pragmatic effect of adding thematic prominence to that relation in the particular context, cognitively reorienting the reader to the participant based upon a specific anchoring relation.

2.2   Anchoring relations and 'center of attention'

In §1.1, we described the discourse-active participant to whom others are anchored as the 'center of attention'. This description is based on the apparent correlation between the anchoring participant and the relative salience of this participant to the larger discourse. Characteristically, the anchoring participant is either the *primary initiator* of action, or who the narrative is primarily 'about'. Consider the following patterns.

Abram is the anchoring participant in the narratives beginning in Gen 12:1 and 12:10, with both Sarai and Lot being anchored to him. In the narrative of Gen 13—the narrative where Abram and Lot separate—Lot is not anchored to Abram, but ostensibly stands alone as a main participant. He is first mentioned rather conspicuously in a right-dislocated construction in 13:1, "And Abram went up from Egypt, he and his wife and all of his belongings, and Lot with him, to

---

[13] Cf. 1 Samuel 17:56; 18:26, 27(2x).
[14] Cf. 1 Samuel 22:11(2x), 14, 16, 17(2x), 18.

the Negev". [15] He is next mentioned in v. 5 following *gam*, and modified by the appositive '*the one going with Abram*'. Such descriptions affirm Lot's presence with Abram, but avoid establishing an anchoring relation to him.

Lot's encoding contrasts sharply with that of Sarai in the same context. She is encoded using the expression '*his wife*' in 12:20 and 13:1, anchoring her to Abram without using a proper name. Lot is explicitly referred to seven more times in Gen 13, each time with an unanchored proper name. While each participant is mentioned frequently in the respective chapters, we believe that the contrast in encoding between Sarai and Lot corresponds to the contrast in their roles. Sarai is largely a prop in Gen 12, while Lot functions as a major participant in Gen 13. The contrast in encoding at the transition between the narratives reflects the differences in their roles.

On the other hand in Gen 14, where Lot is carried away by four kings and rescued by Abram, Lot's first mention in v. 12 encodes him as '*Lot, Abram's nephew*'. Based on Lot's significant role in the previous chapter *and* the clarification in v. 12c that "*he was living in Sodom*", there is no semantic need to clarify *who* Lot is. The redundancy of the encoding information calls the M-principle into play. Such variation in anchors is consistent with the proposal being put forward here: there is an apparent pattern to the anchoring of participants to a thematically central participant. This 'center of attention' tends to be the initiator of action, or the thematic focal point at that stage in the narrative. As we shall see in the application of these proposals to Gen 27, centers of attention can shift within a pericope by changing the participant to whom others are anchored. Let us now consider the referential encoding of Gen 27 to more fully demonstrate the pragmatic effects of redundant anchoring expressions in BH narrative.

3   Redundant use of anchoring expressions in Gen 27

3.1   Marked use of anchors for thematic highlighting

One significant theme which is developed in the text prior to Gen 27 is 'the younger supplanting the older' (23:23, 29-34). The use of the modifiers '*great/older*' and '*small/younger*' here in vv. 1c, 15a, 15b, 42a and 42c appears to be pragmatically motivated. Compare the usage here with other pericopes where an '*older/younger*' distinction exists and seems salient, but is *not* pragmatically highlighted by the writer: Leah and Rachel in Gen 29:16ff,[16] and the blessing of

---

[15] It is interesting to note that there are no major disjunctive accents (e.g. *Atnach* or *little Zaqeph*) used to divide this verse; thus, the verse was apparently viewed as a single, complex clause rather than two smaller ones.

[16] The '*older/younger*' modifier does not occur in this pericope's narrative proper after initial activation of the participants.

Manasseh and Ephraim in Gen. 48:1ff.[17] In neither case are the terms used more than once each. On the other hand in Gen 19:30ff., the terms '*older*' and '*younger*' are heavily used for Lot's daughters, but as *primary referring expressions* and NOT as *pragmatic modifiers*. Thus, Gen 27 appears to be one of the few texts in Genesis that *pragmatically highlights* the *older/younger* opposition by the addition of these appositives to the participants' primary referring expressions.

Furthermore, the pragmatic insertion of these modified anchors comes at significant points in the narrative. In v. 1c, Isaac is commissioning '*Esau, his older son*' to go out and hunt game for him in anticipation of receiving Isaac's blessing. The significance of this speech to the theme of the narrative is further reinforced by the use of a complex quotative frame to introduce the following dialogue in vv. 1c-1d (cf. Miller 1994:216). The insertion of the modified anchors in vv. 15a and 15b comes at the point that Rebekah is dressing Jacob in Esau's clothes, a crucial detail of the ruse to steal the blessing. Finally in vv. 42a and 42c, Rebekah hears the plans of '*her older son Esau*' to kill '*her younger son Jacob*', and a complex quotative frame is again used to introduce her plan to send Jacob into exile and thus protect his life.

As mentioned above, there is a meaningful distinction to be made between interpersonal anchoring relations and non-interpersonal anchoring relations. Only interpersonal relations have the semantic capacity to indicate centers of attention. This is due to the fact that only interpersonal relations can relate a participant to another that is discourse-active, non-interpersonal anchoring relations cannot. On the other hand, non-interpersonal relations (i.e., generic geographical or genealogical relations and titular anchoring relations) serve to thematically highlight the anchoring relation, as exemplified in the selective references to *Saul* as *king*, whether through use of the relation as an appositive, or as a substitute referring expression.

Interpersonal relations can also pragmatically highlight thematic relations, as was seen in the use of 'older' and 'younger' in Gen 27:1c, 15a, 15b, 42a, 42c, but this effect is apparently secondary to identifying the center of attention. We noted above the use of the modifiers *'older'* and '*younger*' with interpersonal anchoring relations, which made the thematic highlighting explicit. Thematic highlighting can also be implicit, simply by virtue of including a redundant appositive (e.g. '*Rebekah, his mother*' versus '*Rebekah*'). There are several examples in Gen 27 where unmodified interpersonal anchors are used for such purposes.

In v. 11a, Jacob protests the plan of '*Rebekah, his mother*' by countering that her plan may result in a curse instead of a blessing. This speech introduces a significant aspect of the

---

[17] Joseph's son's are reactivated from Gen 41:51 ff., but are not assigned '*older/younger*' modifiers until this relation becomes thematically salient when Jacob crosses his hands during his blessing in Gen 48:14.

deception recounted in this chapter, the need to make Jacob feel like Esau. Another example is the use of the expression '*Isaac, his father*' at each dramatic point of Jacob's deception:

- when Isaac first questions Jacob's identity in v. 19a;
- each time Isaac asks Jacob to draw near (vv. 22a, 26a);
- as Jacob leaves '*Isaac his father*', and '*Esau his brother*' returns from hunting (v. 30, this encoding coincides with a very unusual temporal frame to describe how close the brothers came to meeting each other);
- in v. 32a at the point that Isaac begins to realize that he has been deceived; and
- in the complex quotative frame of v. 39 which introduces Isaac's pronouncement over Esau.

I propose that such blatant overencoding of participants has the pragmatic effect of cataphorically drawing the reader's attention to a significant speech or action.[18] The fact that some of these speeches are also introduced with complex quotative frames further corroborates my proposal that the encoding is intended to cataphorically draw attention to thematically important portions of the narrative. These conclusions are preliminary however, and will need to be applied to more data to verify them. While certain uses of anchoring relations as appositives can be thematically motivated, their primary pragmatic function appears to be identifying the 'center of attention', to which we shall now turn.

3.2   Discourse anchors and 'center of attention'

The redundant interpersonal anchors of Gen 27 primarily serve to identify centers of attention. This chapter contains seven discrete shifts in referential center, each explicitly indicated by the pragmatic inclusion of redundant interpersonal anchors.

The narrative opens with Isaac as the center of reference, with Esau anchored to him in vv. 1 and 5, where he sends Esau out to hunt. After Rebekah has heard about the plan, she becomes the center of reference as the narrative's attention shifts to her as she begins to give '*Jacob, her son*' instructions in v. 6. As Jacob counters Rebekah's proposal in v. 11, a shift to a new center is indicated through the phrase "And Jacob said to *Rebekah his mother*". Rebekah continues to be anchored to Jacob by substitution of the epithet אִמּוֹ for her proper name in vv. 13a, 14c, and 14d. Isaac is anchored to Jacob as well in v. 14d.

The use of older/younger in v. 15 has already been mentioned, but the corresponding shifts of attention have not. At the point that Rebekah resumes the initiating role by dressing Jacob in Esau's clothes, the participants are again anchored to her (cf. v. 15a עֵשָׂו בְּנָהּ הַגָּדֹל,

---

[18] Cf. Dooley and Levinsohn (2001:134) and Levinsohn (2000:140), who note many languages use increased encoding of participants to cataphorically *highlight information*.

'*Esau, her older son*', v. 15b יַעֲקֹב בְּנָהּ הַקָּטָן, 'Jacob, her younger son' and v. 17, יַעֲקֹב בְּנָהּ,
'*Jacob, her son*').

In vv. 18-30, where Jacob executes the ruse to steal the first-born's blessing, shifts in
center of attention correspond to the initiator and countering roles played by Jacob and Isaac,
respectively. As Jacob and Isaac first begin to interact, Isaac remains anchored to Jacob (cf. vv.
18a, 19a, אָבִיו, 'his father'). But when Isaac counters Jacob's intentions by asking how it is
possible that he has returned from the hunt so quickly in v. 20a, the anchoring shifts from Jacob
to Isaac as center. Verse 21 does not specify any relation as Isaac asks Jacob to draw near. At
the point that Jacob completes the deception in v. 22, anchoring once again shifts back to Jacob as
center (cf. vv. 22a, 26a, 30b, 30c, יִצְחָק אָבִיו, '*Isaac, his father*').

Esau becomes the next center of attention as he brings the savory dish to אָבִיו, '*his
father*'. This epithet is used as a substitute to refer Isaac *six times* in Esau's pursuit of a
blessing.[19] At the crescendo of Esau's interview with Isaac in v. 39, Isaac continues to be
anchored to Esau, but this time using his proper name + appositive in a complex quotative frame
introducing Isaac's pronouncement over Esau's future (וַיַּעַן יִצְחָק אָבִיו וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו). Both the
complex referring expression and the complex quotative frame we construe as intended to
cataphorically highlight the speech that follows.

Finally, in v. 42, attention shifts back to Rebekah as she becomes the initiator of the final
actions of the pericope. When she hears the plans of עֵשָׂו בְּנָהּ הַגָּדֹל, '*Esau, her older son*',
Rebekah orchestrates the departure of יַעֲקֹב בְּנָהּ הַקָּטָן, '*Jacob, her younger son*', also introduced
with a complex quotative frame.

4   Conclusions

This paper has shown that while anchoring relations play a semantic role to thematically
link a participant to the discourse at (re)activation, they can also play pragmatic roles. Based on
Levinson's (1987) principles of conversational implicature, the choice to substitute anchoring
relations for proper names is best construed as pragmatically motivated to accomplish some effect
that the default expression would *not* have achieved. The same analysis obtains for the use of
anchoring relations modifying proper names of active or semi-active participants.

We have argued that the marked use of non-interpersonal anchoring relations has the
pragmatic effect of highlighting thematically salient relations which are already familiar to the
reader. Interpersonal anchoring relations can also explicitly accomplish thematic highlighting
when they are added to referring expressions as appositives (e.g., יַעֲקֹב בְּנָהּ '*Jacob, her son*'), or

---

[19] Cf. vv. 31b, 31c, 34b, 34c, 38a, and 41a.

they are modified by a thematically salient term (e.g., בְּנָהּ הַקָּטָן 'her younger son'). The use thematic referring expressions was shown to coincide with particularly crucial points of the story, and to coincide with use of other highlighting devices.[20]

It has also been shown that the redundant use of interpersonal anchoring relations has the pragmatic effect of indicating the narrative's current 'center of attention'. Both the use of interpersonal anchors as substitute referring expressions, and their use as redundant modifiers, have this pragmatic effect. 'Centers of attention' need not remain fixed, as the exposition of Gen 27 has demonstrated. Switches in the anchoring expressions are the primary means of explicitly specifying such shifts. The patterns described in Gen 27 betray an intentional shaping of the story to better accomplish the writer/editor's communicative purposes, explicitly highlighting countering moves where one participant blocks the goals or objectives of another by shifting the center to the countering participant (cf. vv. 11, 20, 22).

Anchoring relations are only one means of pragmatically highlighting salient portions of the narrative. Marked use of these anchors was demonstrated to coincide with the use of other devices, such as the unusual temporal frames in v. 30, and complex quotative frames (cf. vv. 1, 6, 27, 34, 37, 39, 42). The seven complex quotative frames appear to cataphorically highlight the speeches they introduce,[21] and occur at thematically salient points in the pericope. Of the seven, five use marked expressions to encode an interlocutor. Three of these frames encode an interlocutor using a proper name + anchoring relation, which coincides with establishing a new center of attention (vv. 1, 6, 42). Two of them reaffirm Esau as center of attention when he endeavors to obtain a blessing from Isaac (vv. 34, 39).

A number of issues regarding the pragmatic use of referring expressions remain to be studied. First, the use of discourse anchors as appositives or substitute referring expressions presupposes the use of a lexical NP. However, many of the marked referring expressions occurred in contexts where use of a full NP is semantically unnecessary. An empirically based study is needed to determine what constitutes default morphological encoding in different discourse contexts. Conclusions from such a study would provide the needed framework both to identify marked referential encoding, and to determine its pragmatic effect in particular discourse

---

[20] One finds similar thematic use of interpersonal relations as elsewhere in Genesis. Cf. Gen 22 and the use of 'Abraham, his father'(22:7a) and 'Isaac, his son' (22:3c, 6b, 9d, 13f); also Gen 16:3:

Genesis 16:3 (NRSV) So, after Abram had lived ten years in the land of Canaan, Sarai, Abram's wife, took Hagar the Egyptian, her slave-girl, and gave her to her husband Abram as a wife.

[21] Cf. Levinsohn (2000a:231 ff.) on the similar function of complex quotative frames in NT Greek.

contexts. Second, further study is needed to determine whether the distinction between interpersonal non-interpersonal anchoring relations is indeed significant. A broader study of their distribution and discourse function would serve to clarify the preliminary conclusion drawn here.

Works cited

Anderson, Frances I.
  1994 "Salience, Implicature, Ambiguity and Redundancy in Clause-Clause Relationships in Biblical Hebrew." In *Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, edited by Robert Bergen. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, pp. 99-116.

Berlin, Adele
  1983 *Poetics and Interpretation of Biblical Narrative*. Sheffield: Almond Press.

Dooley, Robert A. and Stephen H. Levinsohn
  2001 *Analyzing discourse: A manual of basic concepts*. Dallas: SIL International.

Givón, Talmy.
  2001 *Syntax: An Introduction, Volume II*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, revised edition.

  1992 "The Grammar of Referential Coherence as Mental Processing Instructions." *Linguistics* 30:5-55.

Heimerdinger, Jean-Marc
  1999 *Topic, Focus and Foreground in Ancient Hebrew Narratives*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Huang, Yan
  2000 *Anaphora: A Cross-linguistic Study (Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Miller, Cynthia L.
  1994 "Introducing Direct Discourse in Biblical Hebrew Narrative." In *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, edited by Robert D. Bergen, pp. 199-241.

Lambrecht, Knud
  1996 *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levinsohn, Stephen H.
  2000a *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek: A Coursebook on the Information Structure of New Testament Greek.* 2nd edition. Dallas: SIL International.

  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.

Levinson, Stephen C.
  1987 "Pragmatics and the grammar of anaphora: a partial pragmatic reduction of Binding and Control phenomena." *Journal of Linguistics* 23:379-434.

Perrin, Mona
  1978 "Who's Who in Mambila Folk Stories." In *Papers on Discourse*, edited by Joseph E. Grimes. Dallas: SIL, pp. 105-118.

Pu, Ming-Ming
1995 "Anaphoric Patterning in English and Mandarin Narrative Production." *Discourse Processes* 19:279-300.

Pu, Ming-Ming, G. D. Prideuax, and L.M. Stanford
1992 "Episodes as memory units in discourse production." *Linguistica Atlantica* 14:89-102.

de Regt, Lenart J.
1999 *Participants in Old Testament Texts and the Translator*. The Netherlands: Van Gorcum.

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

Runge, Steven E.
(Forthcoming) *A Discourse-Functional Description of Participant Reference in Biblical Hebrew Narrative*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Stellenbosch, South Africa.

Sternberg, Meir
1985 *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative*: *Ideological literature and the drama of reading*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Waltke, Bruce K.
2001 *Genesis: A Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.