Cleft Sentences with Pleonastic Pronoun: A Syntactic Construction of Biblical Hebrew and Some of its Literary Uses

STEPHEN A. GELLER

Jewish Theological Seminary

I

The aim of this study is to examine the uses of a construction of Biblical Hebrew syntax,[1] the so-called "nominal sentence" with "copula," or "verbless clause" with "pleonastic pronoun."[2] The construction in question occurs in a number of patterns with different kinds of constituents. These patterns may be reduced to two basic abstract formulae: x PR y and x y PR, in which PR stands for the pleonastic pronoun, and x and y stand for other syntactic elements. The major possibilities may be represented by model sentences which will be used throughout this study as convenient mnemonic examples to refer to all statements of the same type.[3] In most examples of x PR y, both x and y are definite nouns (*dāwīd hûʾ*[4] *hammelek*).[5] Less often, x is a personal pronoun (*ʾattâ hûʾ hammelek*), an interrogative pronoun or adverb (*mî hûʾ hammelek*, *ʾayyēh hûʾ hammelek*), or a demonstrative pronoun (*zeh hûʾ hammelek*).[6] In most examples of x y PR, x is a definite

---

1. I wish to thank Professors Stephen J. Lieberman, Edward L. Greenstein, and Menahem Kaddari for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper.

2. In this study the pronoun in question will be referred to as "pleonastic." "Copula" reflects an analogy with the copula of other languages. In English it is the verb "to be" which "connects" a subject with its "complement": "George is good." Since even those who use the term "copula" for Hebrew do not claim that the pronoun is truly, or only, a "copula" in this sense, that term will be avoided here.

3. These examples are not intended to represent a full inventory of variations but only the major types. Note especially that this study will not treat *hāyâ*, often viewed as a verbal "copula," but whose primary function is to indicate tense; nor will supposedly pleonastic pronouns in relative clauses be treated, as in *ûmin habbĕhēmâ ʾăšer lōʾ ṭĕhōrâ hîʾ*, "from the animals which are not pure" (Gen. 7:2). The latter type should be studied in the context of relative clauses.

4. The pleonastic pronoun appears to be first person in Gen. 42:11 and second in Ps. 76:8. Lack of agreement in number or gender between pronoun and subject(s) is uncommon; cf. Isa. 47:10; Job 3:19; Jer. 10:3. See S. R. Driver, *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew* (Oxford, 1892), 268, obs. 2.

5. The Y term is only rarely indefinite, and then seems to be mainly participles; cf. Deut. 31:3; Ps. 68:36; Isa. 43:25. Other examples seem to be in effect definite; cf. Job 28:28 *ḥokmâ* (note *haḥokmâ* in vv. 12 and 20); 2 Chr. 20:6 *ʾĕlōhîm*. The X term is indefinite in a few cases: Lev. 13:4; Job 32:8; Song 6:8–9 (numbers); Jer. 50:25 (if the text is sound). Both X and Y terms may be indefinite in Prov. 28:26. In Gen. 27:38 the X term seems to be indefinite and the Y term a prepositional phrase.

6. *GKC* treats the pleonastic pronoun with demonstratives and interrogatives "almost as enclitics" (§§136c–d) and separately from the "copula" (§141h); so also F. I. Andersen, *The Hebrew Verbless*

noun, Y an indefinite one[7] (dāwīd melek hû').[8]

This study is limited in scope and reflects certain methodological constraints. Since only basic contours of meaning are of concern here, no diachronic distinctions will be made in the corpus of biblical evidence. Moreover, no attempt will be made, beyond a few peripheral observations, to penetrate into comparative or historical dimensions. Indeed, such penetration has often served to obscure the meaning of the biblical construction in its own context.[9] However, it is also an illusion to suppose that study of an ancient language can proceed in a purely descriptive manner. Rather, I shall present several working hypotheses which, like all hypotheses, must be tested against further evidence. No claim is made that the meaning of a single biblical verse will be radically changed; but it is hoped that the light shed on the possible nature of the construction may result in a sharpened understanding of some passages and, in general, of the play of rhetorical stress and counter-stress so essential to literary meaning. If this discussion deals primarily with syntax its final focus is on literature.

Historically, there have been two basic approaches to the pleonastic construction. One approach views the clauses as essentially simple, and the pronoun as at least the beginnings of a true "copula." This view denies the pronoun any emphatic nuance. The other approach regards the clauses as compound and finds emphasis in at least some examples. A classical representative of the former view is A. Albrecht, of the latter view, S. R. Driver.

Albrecht, whose study of word order in the nominal sentence remained influential for a century, regarded the pleonastic clauses as mere extensions of the

---

Clause in the Pentateuch (Nashville, 1970), 36. To be sure, the former are commonly joined by a *maqqēp* to the preceding term and are enclitic in later Hebrew; but this says nothing about the nature of the biblical construction.

7. The Y term is rarely an adverb, e.g., Job 3:19. It is more often an interrogative: Isa. 41:22; 49:21; Zech. 1:15; Ps. 39:5. The Y term in this construction is almost always indefinite, or at least less defined (i.e., a construct or suffixed noun) than the X term. Exceptions seem to be only apparently so; for example, Exod. 3:5; 16:36; 32:16 really contain generic terms in construct. Gen. 40:18 is a numeral in construct.

8. These formats are often presented syntactically in terms of "subject" and "predicate" of the nominal sentence:

dāwīd hû' hammelek, 'attâ hû' hammelek: subject-pronoun-predicate

zeh hû' hammelek, mî hū' hammelek: predicate (so, for demonstratives, Joüon, *Grammaire*, §154i; T. Muraoka, *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew* (Jerusalem, 1985), 77)-pronoun-subject

dawid melek hu': subject-predicate-pronoun (Isa. 41:4 and 46:4 are rare examples of predicate-subject-pronoun)

This kind of presentation is avoided in this study, for the most part, because the establishment of "subject" and "predicate" in nominal clauses, especially when both are definite, is notoriously difficult and often arbitrary. Moreover, discussion is bedeviled by the distinction between "grammatical" and "logical," or "natural," subject and predicate, the latter often associated with "emphasis" in some degree. For example, the frequent (but not universal) identification of demonstratives and interrogatives as "predicate" refers to their "logical" rather than their "grammatical" status, as can easily be seen by reference to corresponding verbal clauses: *zeh qāṭal, mî qāṭal*, etc., in which both are certainly grammatical subjects. In this essay "subject" and "predicate" will be used only as necessary to a certain point.

9. Needless to say, reference to Modern Hebrew—not, alas, unattested in the literature—is particularly meaningless.

corresponding simple clauses, and the pronoun as virtually meaningless. He took pains to deny it any emphatic nuance. The only type he attempted to explain was that represented by *dāwīd hû² hammelek*. In such cases he maintained that the function of the pronoun was to separate the defined nouns, to prevent the second of them, the predicate, from being construed as in apposition to the first noun.[10] His model was the "pronoun of separation" (*ḍamīru lfaṣli*) of Classical Arabic, which has that function.[11] Albrecht explicitly denied any link between the Hebrew pronoun and the emphasizing pronoun of Arabic (*ḍamīru tta²kīdi*).

Albrecht's adherence to an Arabic model to explain Hebrew was typical of nineteenth century scholarship. His hidden agenda was to establish two word orders for the nominal clause: "normal" subject-predicate, and "inverted," "emphatic" predicate-subject. The use of the pleonastic pronoun, if emphatic in any way, would disturb this pristine polarity.[12] His concept of "emphasis," normally quite elastic, suddenly became rigid in considering possible emphasis in examples with the pleonastic construction.

S. R. Driver, whose discussion of the topic was brief but amazingly comprehensive, viewed all the constructions in question as compound clauses, some with, others without, or with less, emphatic nuance. He distinguished two basic types. The first involved extraposition of the subject of the simple sentence and resumption of the subject by the pleonastic pronoun which, as subject of the new main clause, is really no longer "pleonastic." Thus, simple *dāwīd hammelek*, in which the predicate is a definite noun, is replaced by compound *dāwīd hû² hammelek*, literally, "David, he is the king." Similarly, simple *dāwīd melek*, in which the predicate is an indefinite noun, is replaced by compound *dāwīd melek hû²*, literally, "David, a king is he."

Driver's position in regard to emphasis was curiously unclear. He stated that resumption is *with* emphasis on the subject in the case of *dāwīd hû² hammelek*: "David, *he* is the king;" but *without* such emphasis in the case of *dāwīd melek hû²*, "David, a king is he." Yet he also stated that in the latter type "the subject . . . has greater prominence, and at the same time the pred[icate] . . . is not entirely deprived of emphasis."[13]

Driver's discussion of the second type, represented by examples with pronominal or interrogative elements in the initial position (*²attâ/zeh/mî hû² hammelek*, etc.) was radically different. These examples he analyzed also as compound, but with "anticipation" of the following noun: "you are he: the king," "this is he: the king," "who is he: the king?" He did not seem to regard such examples as emphatic.[14]

---

10. C. Albrecht, "Die Wortstellung im hebräischen Nominalsatz," *ZAW* 7 (1888), 249–63, at 252. On the *ḍamīru tta ²kīdi*, see W. Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language* (Cambridge, 1967), 2:§130. Note Reckendorf's observation, *pace* Albrecht and Wright, that "es ist jedoch nicht immer mit Sicherheit zu sagen, ob Verstärkerungspron. oder bloss Kopula vorliegt . . . "; H. Reckendorf, *Die syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen* (Leiden, 1895), 384.

11. Wright, *Grammar*, 2: §124.

12. Andersen, *Hebrew Verbless Clause*, allows no emphasis, which is extraneous to his approach, other than as a surreptitious "contrastive focus" (p. 41); see on this J. Hoftijzer, "The Nominal Clause Reconsidered," *VT* 23 (1973), 446–510, at 475.

13. Driver, *Treatise*, 268.

14. Driver also includes types with numerals in initial position, and supposedly "predicates," as examples of "imperfect anticipation;" cf. Isa 51:19; ibid., 272.

Two basic issues emerge from this sketch of previous study of the pleonastic construction: the problem of its syntactic nature, simple or compound; and of its function, syntactic ("separation") or rhetorical ("emphasis"). In discussing a dead language such problems can never be "solved" definitively. Nevertheless, there are indirect arguments which seem to support Driver's view of the compound nature of at least some types. As he pointed out, the (admittedly rare) insertion of a particle in the x y pr pattern before the y term (*dāwīd hălō² melek hû²*) suggests that the Hebrews themselves regarded the initial term as extraposed in *casus pendens*, a common form of compound clause. In this regard, it is perhaps significant that the statistically dominant *melek dāwīd* type (indefinite noun-definite noun)[15] is made pleonastic not by simple insertion of the pronoun (*melek hû² dāwīd*) but by inversion of terms as well (*dāwīd melek hû²*), so that the resulting statement falls within the pattern of extraposition-resumption so common in the language.[16] This inversion also suggests that the clause in question was felt to be compound. On the whole, therefore, Driver's analysis of the compound nature of the types involving resumption seems attractive. More problematic is his recourse to "anticipation" to explain types like *²attâ/zeh/mî hû² hammelek*. Other scholars prefer to seek some other, possibly historical explanation for such examples.[17] Anticipatory structures are rare in vso languages like Hebrew, although they are attested.[18] Since the anticipatory types are limited in number and distribution and will not disturb the major points to be made in this study, they, too, will be viewed as compound.

These compound patterns may be taken as Hebrew equivalents, in a general way, of "cleft sentences."[19] In English clefting involves the replacement of a simple clause like "George came" by a compound "it is George who came." The subject and predicate of the simple clause have been "clefted" and placed in different clauses; the subject as the "complement" of the copula "is" and its "dummy subject" "it"; and the predicate as the predicate of a relative clause. Despite obvious

---

15. This seems to be an assured result of Andersen's important study, *Hebrew Verbless Clause*.

16. Andersen does not seem to mention this inversion in his "rule 4"; ibid., 45. The only certain examples I find of the supposed sequence predicate-pronoun-subject (excluding "logical" predicates like demonstratives and interrogatives) are the following: Lam. 1:18 *ṣaddîq hû² YHWH*, an acrostic; 1 Chr. 9:26 *kî be²ĕmûnâ hēmmâ ²arba²at gibbôrê haššō²ărîm*; and, possibly, the examples with a numeral in initial position, like Prov. 30:29. It seems reasonable at least to suggest that the dominant inversion is motivated by a desire to avoid anticipation of the subject in a construction like **melek hû² dāwīd*.

17. Cf. Muraoka, *Emphatic Words*, 67, 69–70.

18. On anticipation, see *GKC* §§131m, n (given as examples of "apposition with suffixes"). It is important to note that anticipation seems to occur especially with demonstratives, above all with *zeh*, which, like (originally anaphoric) *hû²*, can also be used in pleonastic constructions. *Zeh* is especially common in constructions parallel to the troublesome anticipatory pattern; i.e., after pronouns (*²attâ zeh*), interrogatives (*mî zeh*), etc. *Zeh* does seem to occur independently in anticipatory structures; so, with dates: *zeh šĕnātayim* and, rarely, *zeh hayyôm* (Ps. 104:25—but see *GKC* §136, n. 1). Compare Ezek. 3:18 *hû² rāšā²*; note also the anticipation in 3:21 *hizhartô ṣaddîq*). There seems to be little reason why, if *mî zeh hā²îš* can be construed as *mî zeh: hā²îš*, "who is this: the man?" that *mî hû² hā²îš* cannot be construed as *mî hû²: hā²îš*, "who is he: the man?"

19. For an analysis of clefting in many types of languages, see H. Harries-Delisle, "Contrastive Emphasis and Cleft Sentences," in J. H. Greenberg, *Universals of Human Language* 4 (Stanford, 1978), 515–86.

differences, the compound Hebrew constructions seem so similar that it is reasonable to regard them also as clefted from simple clauses like *dāwīd hammelek* and *dāwīd melek* (or *melek dāwīd*). In English cleft sentences serve to mark emphasis syntactically. Is this also the function of the Hebrew analogues?

The second issue, that of function, is the major theme of this study. It cannot be denied that Albrecht is correct in maintaining that the insertion of a pronoun in the *dāwīd hû² hammelek* type to separate subject and predicate clarifies the syntactic structure. But is this clarification the main function, or merely an additional result, of the presence of the pronoun? In any case, what is its role in all the other types of statements in which it occurs? Is Driver perhaps right in viewing its function as indicating "emphasis?" If so, to what degree?

I propose to approach the problem of function by dealing first with the role of "emphasis," a problem which in my opinion admits of a definitive solution, at least in terms of the criteria to be established. I shall then turn to other aspects of function, to present an over-all hypothesis in regard to the meaning of the pleonastic constructions.

So long as "emphasis" is defined in an idiosyncratic manner, i.e., as what *I* consider to be "important" in a given speech context, analysis is bound to be arbitrary and speculative. Here "emphasis" will be defined in semantic terms in such a way as to limit arbitrariness. Emphasis is stress arising from contrast between two terms or topics in context. Examples in which the contrast is explicitly stated in the text may be taken as incontrovertibly "emphatic." This definition may be applied to the evidence.

Analysis is based on examination of a corpus of about 130 examples of the pleonastic constructions in question, a comprehensive inventory of the biblical evidence.[20] Because focus is on the role of contrastive emphasis, no distinction will be made between the several pleonastic patterns. The results are the following: after eliminating examples with doubtful text, and a few problematic examples to be considered in an appendix, examination of the corpus reveals about 30 examples of explicit contrastive emphasis. In all cases contrast arises immediately

---

20. Omitted for textual reasons are the following: Gen. 15:2, a famous crux; Exod. 19:13: unobjectionable linguistically but of uncertain reference in context—*hēmmâ* perhaps refers to the mountain-climbing party of Exodus 24; Isa. 33:6, probably a gloss; Isa. 34:16, in which *pî hû²* is probably to be read as *pî YHWH* or *pîhû*; Isa. 44:9, in which *hēmmâ* is dotted and perhaps dittography; Isa. 57:6, almost certainly corrupt; Jer 6:28—I suspect that *kullām mašḥîtîm hēmmâ* belongs with vv. 22–23; Jer. 10:8, which looks like a garbled repetition of vv. 3–4; Jer. 45:4, in which initial *wĕ²et* is suspicious; Hos. 11:5, in an obscure context; Mic. 7:3, whose context looks corrupt or at least obscure; Zeph. 2:12, in which the change of person looks suspicious. Qoh. 5:8 is a difficult and probably corrupt verse.

The following verses are probably not examples of the pleonastic construction in question: Num. 13:3: I suspect two clauses, *kullām ²ănāšîm / rā²šê bĕnê yiśrā²ēl hēmmâ*, "all of them (important) men; they were leaders of Israel." On *²îš* as "great, brave, important man," cf. 1 Sam. 26:15. Note also 1 Sam. 4:9; 1 Kgs. 2:2; see also the comments of Rashi and Ibn Ezra. 2 Sam. 23:18, 20 (1 Chr. 11:20, 22) are probably not clefted but represent part of a list in which the function is anaphoric: "he is the one who . . . "; Isa. 1:13: parallelism suggests that *qĕtōret*, which is parallel to *minḥat šāw²*, may also be the object of the verb: "(Do not continue to bring) incense—it is an abomination to me!" This reading was suggested to me by Dr. Baruch Levine: Job 3:19: the sense of *hû²* is uncertain, as is the syntax; cf. M. Pope, *Job*, AB (Garden City, NY, 1965), 32.

from the context; for example: Deut. 1:17 *lōʾ tāgûrû mippěnê ʾîš kî hammišpāṭ lēʾlōhîm hûʾ*, "Do not be afraid of man, for it is God to whom judgment belongs"; Job 28:28 *hēn yirʾat ʾădōnāy hîʾ ḥokmâ wěsûr mērāʿ bînâ*, "It is fear of the Lord that is wisdom and avoiding evil that is understanding." Contrast here is between hidden, cosmic wisdom, inaccessible to man, and the topic of the preceding poem, and piety, man's "true" wisdom.[21]

It seems possible to apply the strict definition of contrastive focus to certain examples of implicit emphasis, all of which in some way involve divinity. Some of the explicitly contrastive examples refer to God; for example, Deut. 4:35 *kî YHWH hûʾ hāʾělōhîm ʾên ʿôd millěbaddô*, "for it is YHWH who is God, none but He alone"; cf. also 4:39; Josh. 24:27; 1 Kgs. 8:60; 18:39; Jer. 14:22; Neh. 9:6, 7. It seems likely that, especially in the context of hymns and prayers, such references to divinity may always be understood to imply contrast with other gods or divine beings, even if unstated. The nuance may be expressed as "God alone," "He alone," "I alone," etc.; or, as required by context, "God Himself," "You Yourself," etc.; for example: Josh. 23:3 "You have seen everything YHWH your God has done to these nations for your sake"—*kî YHWH ʾělōhêkem hûʾ hannilḥām lākem*— "for it was YHWH your God Himself who fought for you." Such implicit emphasis may even involve a pronominal suffix: Ps. 39:8 "And now, how else can I look for help, O YHWH"—*tôḥaltî lěkā hîʾ*—"my hope is in You alone!"[22]

Such strongly implicitly contrastive statements brings the total of emphatic examples to about 55, or nearly half of the corpus. One question may therefore be answered definitively: no more than half the number of pleonastic examples display documentable emphasis. Even in these cases, it is circular to state that clefting "marks" contrast, since the latter was determined by context alone. It is only certain that in half of the examples clefting accompanies emphasis.

This does not mean that emphasis is absent in the other half of the corpus, any more than it is in the hundreds of biblical clauses which are clearly contrastive in context but which contain no pleonastic pronoun; to cite a famous example:

---

21. Other examples are (contrast in parentheses): Gen. 30:33 ("my wages"); Gen. 31:16 (Rachel's and Leah's, not Laban's); Gen. 31:43 (Laban's, not Jacob's); Gen. 34:23 (Shechem's, not Simeon's and Levi's); Gen. 41:25 (one dream, not two); Gen. 48:5 (Jacob's, not Joseph's); Lev. 13:4 (not previous symptoms); Lev. 13:15 (not the white flesh); Lev. 25:33 (not other property); Deut. 4:35, 39 (God, none other; cf. also 1 Kgs. 8:60; Neh. 9:6–7); Deut. 10:9 (not another inheritance; cf. also 18:2; Josh. 13:14, 33; Lev. 25:33); Deut. 14:19 (vs. clean fowl); Deut. 31:3 (not Moses; cf. also v. 6); Josh. 22:22 (God vs. Israel); Josh. 24:17 (other gods); 1 Kgs. 18:39 (not Baal; cf. also Jer. 14:22); Prov. 28:26 (he who trusts in his own intellect vs. he who walks in true wisdom); Job 32:8 (spirit vs. longevity); Song 6:8, 9 (sixty vs. one); Qoh. 1:9 (contrast with "nothing new"); Neh. 8:10 (contrast with "don't grieve"); 1 Chr. 21:17 ("these sheep").

22. Other examples: Deut. 3:22; 7:9; 9:3 (cf. also 31:6, 9); 10:17; Josh. 23:3, 10; Ps. 24:10; 68 :36; 100:3; 2 Chr. 33:13. Pronominal examples: *ʾatta*: 2 Sam. 7:28 = 1 Chr. 17:26; 2 Kgs. 19:15; Isa. 51:9; Jer. 14:22; Ps. 44:5; *ʾani/ʾanoki*: Isa. 41:4; 43:25; 51:12; 52:6. Isa. 43:10; 13; 46:4; 48:12 probably belong in this category. Isa. 43:10 seems to contain a relative clause as predicate: "I am the one before whom no other god was created" (note the similarity to Ps. 102:28, in which the relative clause is perhaps preceded by *waw*: "you are He whose years have no end"). Isa. 48:12 displays repetition of the subject. In 46:4 the pronoun may anticipate the verb in the following clause and so be an example of the verbal construction to be discussed below: "To old age it is I, to hoary age it is I who bears. . . ." These suspended, repetitive structures are beloved by Second Isaiah and need further study; see the Appendix.

Exod. 9:27 *YHWH haṣṣaddîq waʾănî wĕᶜammî hārĕšāᶜîm*, "it is YHWH who is the blameless one, I and my people the guilty ones." In such cases emphasis was presumably marked phonetically by intonation and pitch—as, indeed, it may have been also with the contrastive clefted examples. Pleonastic, but non-contrastive, examples may also have been so marked phonologically.

One may "feel" that a pleonastic question like *mî hûʾ hammelek* is somehow "stronger" than simple *mî hammelek*, and perhaps that *mî hûʾ zeh hammelek* is "stronger" than either.[23] But there are not sufficient examples in complementary distribution to establish such a point conclusively. It therefore seems inaccurate to view the construction with pleonastic pronoun as "emphatic" in any but the limited sense presented here: in about half the cases it occurs in explicitly or implicitly contrastive contexts. In terms of what is provable, instead of merely "felt," no broader conclusion seems justified.

II

Despite this essentially negative result in regard to emphasis, it is still possible to posit a single function for virtually all examples of the pleonastic construction. It is necessary first to inventory the types of contexts in which they appear in terms of their role in the flow of discourse. There are seven such contextual functions:

1. *Syntactic resumption*: in both x PR y and x y PR formats examples occur in which the pronoun resumes a long initial extraposed phrase. The latter may consist of a relative or participial phrase or, less commonly, a compound coordinated phrase; for example, Gen. 2:19 *wĕkol ʾăšer yiqrāʾ lô hāʾādām . . . hûʾ šĕmô*, "whatever Man called it . . . that was its name." It is reasonable to suggest with Driver and others that in such cases the aim is syntactic clarity, a matter of linguistic perception. The resumption of the long extraposed phrase helps the listener grasp its function in the larger sentence.[24]

2. *Topical reference*: in some examples the initial term refers to a topic mentioned in the immediately preceding context, so that a translation "the aforementioned" is appropriate; for example, Gen. 9:18 *wĕḥām hûʾ ʾăbî kĕnāᶜan*, "it was (the aforementioned) Ham who was the father of Canaan."[25] Some examples are definitions; for

---

23. For example, it seems likely that in Ps. 24:10 *mî hûʾ zeh melek hakkābôd / YHWH ṣĕbāʾôt hûʾ melek hakkābôd*, as the culmination of the hymn, is more "emphatic" than v. 8, which lacks the pleonastic pronoun. But what is the nuance of meaning in the presence of the pleonastic pronoun in the repetition of *māh (hēmmâ) ʾēlleh* in Zech. 1:9?

24. Other examples: Gen. 24:44; 30:33 (contrastive); 31:16 (contrastive); 31:43 (contrastive); 34:23 (contrastive); 48:5 (contrastive); Exod. 3:5 (cf. Josh. 5:15); Lev. 11:10, 12, 23, 26, 27 (cf. Deut. 14:10; 27:30); Num. 16:7; 18:9; 19:15; 32:4; Josh. 6:19; 1 Kgs. 18:24; Jer. 41:9; Ezek. 42:13; Qoh. 1:9; 5:8; Dan. 8:21. Ezek. 27:13, 17, 21, 22, may offer rare examples of contrastive environments. The cited verses occur in an inventory of the great symbolic ship of Tyre, a listing all the nationalities that manned it and were the merchants in it. In the long list the cited verses display the pleonastic construction, the others do not. It is a fact that the clefted examples have a subject composed of two or more coordinated terms; the non-clefted are formed with only one subject. Contrast, for example, 27:13: *yāwān tûbal wāmešek hēmmâ rōkĕlāyik* with 27:15: *bĕnê dĕdān rōkĕlayik*.

25. Other examples (many of which will be discussed in detail below): Gen. 2:14; 36:8; 42:6; Exod. 32:16; 39:5, 14; Num. 1:4 (cf. Josh. 22:14); 21:26; 1 Sam. 1:13; 17:14; 2 Sam. 21:2; Dan. 8:26.

example, Exod. 16:36 *wĕhā^cōmer ^căśîrît hā^ɔêpâ hû^ɔ*, "the (aforementioned) *omer* is one tenth on an *ephah*."[26] Others involve interpretations of dreams or visions; for example, Gen. 40:12 *šĕlōšet haśśārîgîm šĕlōšet yāmîm hēm*, "the (aforementioned) three branches are three days."[27]

3. *Questions*: the pleonastic construction occurs in some interrogative clauses (mainly the *mî hû^ɔ hammelek* or *hammelek ^ɔayyēh hû^ɔ* patterns); for example, Gen. 21:29 *māh hēnnâ šeba^c kĕbāśōt hā^ɔēlleh*, "what, then, are these seven sheep?"; Isa. 49:21: *^ɔēlleh ^ɔêpōh hēm*, "where, then, are these?"[28]

4. *Demonstratives*: some examples involve demonstratives (the *zeh hû^ɔ hammelek* types); for example, Gen. 25:16 *^ɔēlleh hēm bĕnê yišmā^cēl*, "the aforementioned are the sons of Ishmael." Like the cited case, the examples with *^ɔēlleh* are resumptive, and some are after lists, like the following category.[29]

5. *Lists*: a few examples contain no demonstrative pronoun and introduce rather than follow a list; for example, Prov. 30:24 *^ɔarbā^câ hēm qĕṭannê ^ɔāreṣ*, "four things are the tiniest on earth."[30]

6. *Causal clauses*: a large category (about 30 examples) is composed of causal subordinate clauses. The majority are headed by *kî*; for example, Gen. 45:20 "Don't worry about your moveables"—*kî ṭûb kol ^ɔereṣ miṣrayim lākem hû^ɔ*—"for yours is the best of the whole land of Egypt." A smaller number of cases lack introductory *kî* but are definitely logically causal in context in that they express a motive for the action in another clause; for example, Ezek. 18:4 *hēn kol hannĕpāšôt lî hēnnâ kĕnepeš hā^ɔāb ûknepeš habbēn lî hēnnâ hannepeš hahōṭē^ɔt hî^ɔ tāmût*, "(because) all lives are mine, both the life of the father and the life of the son, it is the individual ('life') that sins that will die."[31]

7. *Contrastive*: some examples fall into none of the cited categories but are indeed like many of the above, clearly contrastive in nuance; for example, 1 Kgs. 18:39 *YHWH hû^ɔ hā^ɔĕlōhîm*, "it is YHWH alone who is God!"[32]

On the one hand, these categories are certainly heterogeneous. Three distinct foci are represented. Some categories represent a primarily syntactic function (1, 3, 4 and 6). Others (2 and 5) have a predominantly thematic connection to their context and may be said to represent a semantic focus. One category (7) is rhetorical in nature.

---

26. Also Num. 11:7.

27. Also Gen. 40:18; 41:26; Isa. 9:14 (note: indefinite . . . definite!)

28. Additional examples: (X PR Y): Gen. 27:33; Ezek. 38:17; Zech. 1:9; 4:5; Ps. 24:10; Job 4:7; Est. 7:5; (X Y PR): Isa. 41:22; Zech. 1:15; Ps. 39:5. Gen. 27:38 probably belongs in this category.

29. Also (with *zeh*): Qoh. 1:17; 1 Chr. 22:1; with *^ɔēlleh*: Num. 3:20, 21, 27, 33; 1 Sam. 4:8; 1 Chr. 1:31; 8:6; 12:16.

30. Also Prov. 30:29; Isa. 51:9.

31. Examples with *kî*: Gen. 45:20; Lev. 17:11, 14; 25:33; Deut. 1:17; 3:22; 4:24; 10:17; 11:10; 30:11; Josh. 23:3, 10; 24:17; Jer. 10:3; 31:8; 50:25; Ezek. 3:7; Qoh. 9:4; Neh. 8:10; 1 Chr. 9:25; 2 Chr. 28:23. The following examples seem to be logically causal in context, although they lack a conjunction: Gen. 34:21; 47:6; Lev. 13:15; 27:28; Jer. 45:4; Mal. 1:7, 12; Neh. 8:9. Admittedly, other subordinate nuances are possible in some of these examples.

32. Among other examples: Deut. 4:35, 39; 10:9; 18:2; Josh. 13:14, 33; etc. It seems that many purely contrastive examples involve divinity, like the one cited.

On the other hand, the separate foci frequently overlap, most notably in the case of rhetorical contrast which, as stated above, involves about half of the corpus. Moreover, there are distinct similarities between some categories. Specifically, categories 3 and 5 are anticipatory in nature and 1, 2 and 4 resumptive. In fact, I believe this blending and overlapping is the result of a common denominator that underlies all seven categories. It is scarcely coincidental that all involve segments of speech in which relationship plays a primary role. This relational aspect applies not only to examples displaying anticipation or resumption,[33] but also by its very nature to the contrastive category (7) and to causal clauses (6), which serve as the motive for another statement.[34] The divergence of focus through which this relational function finds expression obscures but does not negate its central role.

This central relational aspect may also be termed "deictic" or, to avoid the narrower connotations of that term, "indicatory." All the clauses in which the pleonastic construction occurs "point to" another aspect of the speech context, another clause or, in the case of syntactic resumption (1), part of a clause, in regard to some aspect of syntactic, topical or rhetorical function.

Here again, it cannot be proven that the pleonastic construction is the marker of this relational, indicatory function; merely that it accompanies it. Yet as a bystander at many crimes is likely to bring suspicion upon himself as a possible perpetrator, it is difficult to believe that the presence of the pleonastic construction in so many diverse statements of essentially similar import is only incidental. It may therefore be posited as a working hypothesis that the function of that construction is to highlight, or foreground, the relational aspect inherent in all statements in connected speech in such a way as to indicate its special relevance to the given context. In other words, if the utterance is a question, that fact is underscored; if the introduction to a list, that fact is stressed. If the contrast is present in context, that fact is brought to the fore; and so on. It is in this sense that the

---

33. J. Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* (Cambridge, 1968), 308, notes the role of "expectation" in some kinds of interrogative utterances; i.e., in questions which expect a "yes" or "no" answer, etc., and views the distinctions as modal in nature.

34. In many languages causal clauses, at least of some types, are formed in ways that reveal their anticipatory-resumptive nature. It is a striking fact that in many languages some ways, often the oldest, of forming causal clauses, as well as some other types of subordinate clauses, are by openly anticipatory-resumptive structures, often with deictic elements. For example, Old English often employed a "double determinative" construction with the instrumental case of "that"; literally, "on that account, that. . . ." Thus, "I went to bed on that account, that: I was tired." Alternatively use was made of deictic "so" "which . . . pointed as with an index finger to the following explanatory remark: 'I am going to bed, *so* (= *it is thus*) *I am very tired*"; G. Curme, *Syntax* (Boston, 1931), 313. Strengthened by "all" (like Modern German *also*) this deictic compound eventually became modern causal "as." Similar constructions might be paralleled in many European languages. A few random examples: Russian *potomy čto*, "because" (literally: "for that, that") seems close to the Old English construction mentioned above. Old High German was even more direct in its use of anticipatory-resumptive patterns. It often employed interrogative *wan*, "why," in causal clauses. Literally, one said, "I went to bed early, why? I was tired"; cf. W. Lockwood, *Historical German Syntax* (Oxford, 1968), 230. Note also French *car*, "because," from Latin *quare*, "why": and Italian *perchè*, used both for "why" and "because." Greek *hoti* seems to reflect the deictic construction. Closer to Hebrew, Arabic *li³an(na)* may be formed with deictic elements.

construction's function might be called "emphatic," if by that term one means the foregrounding of the fact of relationship.[35]

III

Up to this point our discussion of the clefted construction may fairly be termed descriptive. It may be possible to view the suggested relational, foregrounding function as secondary, the by-product, as it were, of some hypothetical primary function other than the one presented here; but that other function must, of course, be demonstrated.

What is the logic of the link between clefting and the indicatory function? Syntactic discussion of Hebrew has not progressed to the point where such a question can be answered with confidence. However, it may be suggested here that the link may be asseveration. It is interesting to note that the only type of subordinate clause commonly found with the pleonastic construction is the causal clause headed by *kî*. In such clauses it is reasonable to view the function of that particle

---

Biblical Hebrew itself possesses ways of forming causal clauses that clearly involve anticipation-resumption, especially the use of *kî* followed or preceded by *ʿal kēn* or *lākēn* in the main clause; e.g., Gen. 11:9 *ʿal kēn qārāʾ šěmāh bābel kî šām bālal YHWH śěpat kol hāʾāreṣ*, literally "therefore was its name called Babel: because there YHWH mixed up the language of all the earth." Especially interesting is the use, admittedly infrequent, of *kî ʿal kēn* in the causal clause itself; for example, 2 Sam. 18:20 (*Qere*) *wěhayyôm hazzeh lōʾ těbaśśēr kî ʿal kēn ben hammelek mēt*, "but today you shall not bring news because (lit.: for this:) a king's son has died." One may also note the use of *bězōʾt* in the sense of "on account of this," quite like the use of the demonstrative in the instrumental case of the Old English construction cited above; for example: Ps. 41:12 *bězōʾt yādaʿtî kî ḥāpaṣtā bî kî lōʾ yārîaʿ ʾōyěbî ʿālay*, "because of this (lit.: by means of this) I know that you favor me: that my enemy will never shout in triumph over me." (*Bězōʾt* is commonly used with impf. to indicate purpose, result, also an anticipatory-resumptive function; e.g., Gen. 34:22 (cf. 15) *ʾak bězōʾt yēʾōtû lānû hāʾănāšîm lāšebet ʾittānû . . . běhimmôl lānû kol zākār*, "but it is only through this that these men would be willing to live with us . . . : that all our males be circumcised (lit. through the circumcising. . .)."

Most significant of all, of course, is the probably deictic origin of *kî* itself, related to *kēn* and *kōh*, as well as the preposition *kě(mô)*, quite on the pattern of English "as" from deictic "(all) so" mentioned above; cf. Akkadian *kî* and *kīʾam*, as well as *kima*.

35. Several points must be noted: (1) The basic meaning of the sequence of terms, as (perhaps) determined by word order, is unaffected by clefting with the pleonastic pronoun. Examples may belong to X PR Y or X Y PR patterns, although certain categories seem to display a preference for one or the other. For example, causal clauses seem to show an affinity for the sequence X Y PR, Andersen's "clauses of classification." However, I can find no conclusive patterns. That the pleonastic pattern reproduces the word order for the "core sequence," subject-predicate for "clauses of identification" and predicate-subject for "clauses of classification" (Andersen, *Hebrew Verbless Clause*), seems also to have been noticed by Driver, *Treatise* 268. The hypothetical distinction between the two types is not affected by the topic of this study. (2) There is a frequent interpenetration of categories; i.e., many examples belong to more than one, so that the assignment of a given example to one or another category reflects my impression of which nuance seems to be dominant. So, to give just two examples, Exod. 3:5 and Josh. 5:15, assigned above to the category of syntactic resumption, are both also causal clauses. There seems to be little point in listing here all the possible intersections. Reassignment of individual examples to other categories would not affect the hypotheses presented in this study, so long as the over-all repertoire remains the same. Of course, the largest single feature of interpenetration is contrastive emphasis, which extends to about half the corpus.

as primarily asseverative. Indeed, it is often difficult to determine whether the sense of *kî* in such cases is "truly" or "because," or both. It is therefore possible that the primary function of clefting is to foreground the fact of predication itself, as in "David is indeed the king," or the like. This foregrounding of predication then easily passes over to the relational aspect, even to subordination in some cases. The logical connection is that which can also be observed in many clauses headed by *hinnēh*, also probably a clefted type of construction, which must often be viewed, or at least translated, as logically subordinate in a variety of nuances— "because," "although," etc.—as required by context. This pattern of logic may be discerned by comparing two sets of English sentences: (1) "I'm tired. I'm going to bed." (2) "Look here, I'm tired. I'm going to bed." In both sets the first sentence is logically causative (or the second logically resultative); but in the second set the relational, even subordinate nature of their juxtaposition is made more pronounced by the fact that the circumstance of fatigue is foregrounded.

In the case of the Hebrew constructions, the foregrounding of the fact of predication is put to use as an (optional) syntactic marker of the fact that a whole statement, or part of a statement, has some heightened relevance to another aspect of the immediate speech situation. The exact nuance, or nuances, are determined by context, according to the range of meanings allowed by the categories listed above, the largest single nuance being contrastive emphasis. In later Hebrew this original function became weakened and the pronoun could be viewed as a "pronoun of separation" or a "copula," etc. Its use in the Bible, however, is much more subtle and context conditioned, as I have tried to show.

IV

The foregrounding function of the clefting construction can be put to sophisticated literary use by biblical authors. Especially interesting is the way that legitimate ambiguity in regard to anticipatory and resumptive functions of the construction can be made to serve as a kind of "hinge" in a narrative. The following examples will illustrate this device:

> Gen. 9:18: The sons of Noah who emerged from the ark were Shem, Ham and Japheth— *wĕhām hûʾ ʾăbî kĕnāʿan*—and the (aforementioned) Ham was the father of Canaan.

> Exod. 32:16: Moses came back down the mountain with the two covenant tablets in his hand, tablets written on both sides, front and back—*wĕhallūḥōt maʿăśēh ʾĕlōhîm hēmmâ wĕhammiktāb miktab ʾĕlōhîm hûʾ*—and the (aforementioned) tablets were divine workmanship, and the (aforementioned) writing was divine script.

> 1 Sam. 17:12–14: Now David was the son of an Ephrathite . . . named Jesse who had eight sons . . . the name of the three who had gone to war were: Eliab, the eldest . . . — *wĕdāwid hûʾ haqqāṭān*—the (aforementioned) David was the youngest.

All three examples clearly resume topics mentioned previously in their context. Yet just as clearly they point forward to a following narrative, as many commentators have noted: Gen. 9:18 to the curse of Canaan; Exod. 32:16 to the breaking

of those divine tablets;[36] and 1 Sam. 17:14 to the killing of the giant Goliath by
this youngest son of Jesse.[37]

Num. 21:26 is similar: "so Israel settled in all the Amorite cities, including
Heshbon and its dependent towns—kî ḥešbôn ʿîr sîḥōn melek hāʾĕmōrî hîʾ "for
the (aforementioned) Heshbon was the city of Sihon, king of the Amorites. . . . "
The clause is not only resumptive but also causal and as such introduces the fol-
lowing passage, which deals with Sihon's capture of Heshbon. The aim is to
explain how Heshbon, a Moabite town, came to be Israelite—a touchy subject, as
Judges 11 shows.

Gen. 36:8 is another literary hinge: ʿēśāw hûʾ ʾĕdōm, "(the aforementioned)
Esau is Edom." This clause resumes the previous narrative and also serves as an
introduction to the following genealogy: wĕʾēlleh tōlĕdôt ʿēśāw ʾăbî ʾĕdōm.[38]
Num. 13:32 is a syntactically resumptive example of the clefting construction:
hāʾāreṣ ʾăšer ʿābarnû bāh lātûr ʾōtāh ʾereṣ ʾōkelet yôšĕbehā hîʾ, "the land we
passed through to spy out is a man-devouring land." At the same time it is surely
intended to contrast with the parallel statement in 14:7: hāʾāreṣ ʾăšer ʿābarnû bāh
lātûr ʾōtāh ṭôbā hāʾāreṣ mĕʾōd mĕʾōd. This sentence is marked as emphatic not
only by contrast but also by the double adverb and the resumption of the extrap-
osed subject by the noun itself rather than by a pronoun: "the land we passed
through to spy out, that land is very, very good."

A most clever use of the hinge device is Gen. 42:6 wĕyôsēp hûʾ haššallîṭ ʿal
hāʾāreṣ hûʾ hammašbîr lĕkol ʿam hāʾāreṣ, "as for (the aforementioned) Joseph, it
was he who was the administrator over the land, who was supplying food to all the
people of the earth." This translation tries to capture some of the nuances of the
sentence in context. On the one hand wĕyôsēp hûʾ haššallîṭ is resumptive topically.
It is important to note that 42:7–45:16 forms the core of the Joseph story, encap-
sulated, as it were, by the descent of the brothers to Egypt in 42:1–5 and the Phar-
aonic invitation to re-descend in 45:17ff. The key phrase ʾaḥê yōsēp, "Joseph's
brothers," occurs only in this opening and closing framework (42:3, 6; 45:16). In
42:3–6 Joseph is intentionally highlighted by the author in a manner that seems to
be an attempt to account for all the brothers: "so Joseph's ten brothers went
down . . . but Benjamin, Joseph's brother, Jacob would not send . . . as for (the
aforementioned) Joseph. . . . The structure is reminiscent of the opening of the
book of Exodus (wĕyôsēp hāyâ bĕmiṣrāyim) where there is a similar accounting of
the brothers. The striking use of bĕnê yiśrāʾēl in Gen. 42:5, as in Exod. 1:1, per-
haps strengthens the associative link between the narratives. The literary force of
the resumption in Genesis 42 is effective. The story is gathering its strength, so to
speak, by accounting for all the protagonists before the central episodes. On the

---

36. The later tablets were apparently not as divine as the first. Despite wĕkātabtî of Exod. 34:1, they
were Moses's work (34:27); all the more reason to highlight the divinity of those that were broken
through Israel's rebellion.

37. Perhaps significant in this regard is the foregrounding of ʾaḥîw haggādôl in 17:28.

38. Note the echo of the opening phrase of the passage: wĕʾēlleh tōlĕdôt ʿēśāw hûʾ ʾĕdôm, "the fol-
lowing are the generations of Esau, that is, Edom." Here hûʾ has its (perhaps original) anaphoric func-
tion as in hûʾ ʾahărôn ûmōšeh . . . hûʾ mōšeh wĕʾahărôn (Exod. 6:26–27), etc.

other hand *wĕyôsēp hû³ haššallîṭ*, etc., obviously anticipates the following narrative as a kind of introductory circumstantial clause, setting the specific scene of 42:7ff. The phrase is one of the most artful hinges in the Hebrew Bible.

V

Driver and others have noted, very briefly and sometimes offhandedly,[39] the similarity between the nominal construction represented by *dāwīd hû³ hammelek* and certain verbal constructions, which may be represented by *dāwīd hû³ qāṭal* (*yiqṭōl*). Here, too, the subject of the simple clause *dāwīd qāṭal* (or *qāṭal dāwīd*) is extraposed in *casus pendens* and resumed by a pleonastic pronoun. However, the position of the second noun is taken by a finite verb, of which the pronoun is also the subject: "David, he killed."

There are strong reasons for associating the nominal and verbal constructions (an intermediate stage perhaps being sentences with participles like *dāwīd hû³* (*haq*)*qōṭēl*). Some examples occur in the same passages; for example, Josh. 22:22 *³ēl ³ĕlōhîm YHWH hû³ yōdēa° wĕyiśrā³ēl hû³ yēda°*, "God, very God, YHWH knows and Israel must know. . . . " Some statements are so alike that it is difficult not to view them as essentially parallel; for example, as Driver noted, Prov. 30:24 *³arba°â hēm qĕṭannê ³āreṣ*, "four things are among the tiniest on the earth," or 30:29 *šĕlōšâ hēmmâ mêṭîbê ṣā°ad*, "three things have graceful gaits"—both nominal clauses—and a verbal clause like Prov. 30:18 *šĕlōšâ hēmmâ niplĕ³û mim-mennî*, "three things are too difficult for me to comprehend"; cf. Prov. 6:16.

Driver viewed the verb in such cases as nominalized, i.e., as a relative clause: *dāwīd hû³ qāṭal = dāwīd hû³ ³ăšer qāṭal*,[40] so that the verbal pattern is in fact nominal, in every way equivalent to *dāwīd hû³ hammelek*. Like the latter, the verbal construction may be viewed as clefted, a compound sentence.

Of the approximately 65 examples of this construction I have located in the Hebrew Bible,[41] the only large category representing the syntactic focus is syntactic resumption (about 20 examples): Gen. 3:12 *hā³iššâ ³ăšer nātattâ °immādî hî³ nātĕnâ lî . . .* , "it was the woman you put with me who gave me. . . ."[42] A few examples are questions, mainly of the *mî hû³ qāṭal* type: Job 13:19 *mî hû³ yārîb °immādî*, "who is it that would bring a suit against me?"[43] The causal category is represented only by a couple of examples: Lev. 17:11 *kî haddām hû³ bannepeš yĕkappēr*, "for it is the

---

39. Driver, *Treatise*, 272; Muraoka, *Emphatic Words*, 82; note also König, cited by Muraoka in note 2; A. Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew* (Tel Aviv, 1971), 2:740 [in Hebrew].

40. Driver, *Treatise*, 272. Supporting this interpretation are passages like 1 Chr. 21:7 *wa³ănî hû³ ³ăšer ḥātā³tî* and Ezek. 38:17 *ha³attâ hû³ ³ăšer dibbartî*. Possible support is also from constructions with *waw* between constituents; cf. Ps. 102:28: *wĕ³attâ hû³ ûšnôtekā lō³ yittāmmû*; see *GKC* §143d. Note also Mic. 7:12.

41. Omitted are: 1 Sam 3:18, which probably consists of two clauses: "it is YHWH. He will do as He pleases"; note the disjunctive accent; Job 31:12: if the text is sound, the pronoun probably continues those of v. 11: "it is a fire (that burns to Abaddon . . .)"; Hos. 7:8, whose context is obscure.

42. Other examples: Gen. 14:24; 15:4; 24:7; 44:17; Exod. 12:16; Deut. 1:30, 38, 39 (cf. 1:36); Josh. 22:22; Jud. 7:4; 1 Sam. 17:37; Isa. 33:22; Ezek. 36:7; 44:15; Qoh. 3:14 (cf. also 3:13); 5:18.

43. Other examples: Isa. 50:9; Jer. 30:21; 49:12; Ezek. 38:17; Job 9:24; 17:3; 41:2.

blood which substitutes for life."[44] The semantic focus is represented hardly at all in terms of separate categories. Although some examples assigned primarily to other foci may also be topically resumptive, the latter category is present independently perhaps only in Num. 35:19 *gō'ēl haddām hû' yāmît 'et hārōṣēaḥ,* "it is the (afore-mentioned) blood avenger who shall kill the murderer." Otherwise, semantic focus is found only in Prov. 30:18, an introduction to a list.[45]

The dominant focus is rhetorical. Contrastive emphasis accounts for about 30 units; for example, Isa. 38:19 *ḥay ḥay hû' yôdekā,* "(not the dead) it is the living man, the living man who can praise you!"[46] Most examples are explicitly contrastive; a few represent the type of implicit emphasis, centering on divinity, mentioned above.[47] Since most examples of the large category of syntactic resumption are also explicitly contrastive,[48] about two-thirds of the corpus of verbal pleonastic examples may be said to express emphasis. This high proportion is to be expected. In verbal examples the pleonastic pronoun not only resumes the extraposed subject but also anticipates the following finite verb. it is doubly redundant and, according to the usual understanding of expressed pronominal subjects with finite verbs, doubly "emphatic."

Like the nominal, the verbal clefted construction can put its foregrounding function to literary use. In Ps. 23:4 one can see that clefting is employed not only to highlight a phrase or a statement, but specifically to bring focus on a pronominal suffix: *šibṭekā ûmiš'antekā hēmmâ yĕnaḥămûnî.* No statement could be more definitely clefted right down the middle; hence the common translation, "your rod and your staff, they comfort me."[49] However, examination of the preceding context makes it clear that the nuance must be captured by an English cleft sentence: "it is *your* rod and *your* staff which comfort me."

Analysis of the first part of v. 4 establishes this point conclusively. It is the very core of the psalm, as can be demonstrated even diagrammatically: clauses

---

44. With inversion of verb and prepositional phrases; cf. vv. 11, 14 (nominal). 2 Sam. 14:19 is the only other example I find with *kî.* A possible causal clause without conjunction is Prov. 6:32, since the logical relationship of the clauses is most pointed if causal: "he who commits adultery with a woman is lacking in intelligence, for it is only someone who would destroy himself who would do that."

45. But many examples assigned primarily to other categories may also be viewed as examples of topical resumption; so, e.g., Josh. 22:23 (implicit contrast); 2 Sam. 14:19 (causal), etc. Note that in Num. 35:19 resumed is not only *gō'ēl haddām* (v. 12) but also the repeated death sentences of the preceding verses. Note the use of the pleonastic pronoun also in the next phrase: "it is when he meets him that he may kill him." Both clauses seem not only to resume but also to contrast with v. 12: "until he stands before the congregation." Note that these clauses are repeated without the pleonastic pronoun in v. 21, where they seem to be mere repetition and the relational aspect is perhaps not foregrounded.

46. Other examples: Lev. 22:11 (cf. also 12); Deut. 1:36 (cf. 38, 39); 1 Sam. 6:9; Isa. 38:19; 59:15; 63:5; Ezek 18:4, 20; 23:45; 44:3; Ps. 27:2 (ignoring the disjunctive accent after *ṣāray wĕ'ōyĕbay lî*); 37:9; 101:6; Prov. 11:28; 13:13; 19:21; 21:29; 24:12; 28:26; 31:30 (cf. 10:22). Note the concentration in Proverbs, where the contrast activates the antithesis essential to the force of the proverb.

47. Other examples: Josh. 22:23 (cf. 22:22); 23:5; Isa. 34:16; 35:4; Prov. 10:22; Neh. 2:20.

48. I find the following examples: Gen. 14:24; 15:4; 44:17; Exod. 12:16; Deut. 1:30, 38, 39; Josh. 22:22; Judg. 7:4; Isa. 33:22; Ezek. 36:7; 44:15; 44:29. Two questions also seem to be contrastive: Isa. 50:9; Jer. 49:12.

49. Or "rescue me" or "guide me" (*yanḥûnî*); the sense of *yĕnaḥămûnî,* though disputed, is immaterial to the point being made here.

generally build up in length before v. 4 and decreases in length after it. Verse 4a consists of a central clause, the very heart of the poem, *lôʾ ʾîrāʾ rāᶜ*, "I shall fear no harm," evoking the initial statement *YHWH rōʾî*, "it is YHWH who is my shepherd";[50] and two dependent clauses enveloping it, *gam kî ʾēlēk bĕgêʾ ṣalmāwet . . . kî ʾattā ᶜimmādî*, "though I walk through death's dark valley . . . for You (Yourself) are with me." The latter phrase itself, so similar to the explanation of the Tetragammaton in Exodus 3, *ʾehyeh ᶜimmāk*, "I shall be with you,"[51] evokes initial YHWH of v. 1. It is precisely at this point, the evocation of the divine name, that the poet turns the psalm from third to second person, from statement to direct address, "You Yourself." The pronoun *ʾattā* is implicitly contrastive in the manner described above. The following clause, *šibṭĕkā ûmišᶜanteka hēmmâ yĕnaḥămûnî*, is in apposition to *kî ʾattā ᶜimmādî* and continues both the causal nuance and the emphasis on the pronoun, which here appears as the pronominal suffixes of the head terms. This example is instructive because it sheds light on the function of the clefting construction. Both causal nuance and implied emphasis would be present from the context even if the clause were unclefted: *šibṭekā ûmišᶜanteka yĕnaḥămûnî*. The role of clefting is to foreground them, to make sure we do not overlook them: "(for) it is *Your* rod and *Your* staff that comfort me" The valley is no ordinary valley, but then the shepherd is no common shepherd, His rod and staff no standard implements!

Awareness of the subtle role of the clefting pleonastic construction can also help to sharpen meaning in sentences without extended context. For example, Prov. 22:9 *ṭôb ᶜayin hûʾ yĕbōrak / kî nātan millaḥmô laddāl*, "it is the generous man who is blessed, for he gave some of his bread to the poor." Like many proverbs, this statement probably contains a contrast, here implied. To the ancients divine blessing revealed itself, at least partially, in wealth; cf. Prov. 10:22 *birkat YHWH hîʾ taᶜăšîr*, "it is YHWH's blessing that makes one rich." The contrast implied in Prov. 22:9 involves the paradox that the generous man's liberality, far from diminishing his wealth, only makes him richer.[52] It is perhaps not too bold to suggest a further contrastive nuance. Since "bless" also means "thank," the proverb may be intimating that the generous man stands in the place of God, as it were, as the recipient of the poor man's blessing.[53]

---

50. Note the similarity to the related Ps. 27:1: *ʾôri^ . . . ʾîrāʾ*.

51. Cf. Deut. 31:23; Josh. 1:5; 3:7; Jud. 6:16, etc.

52. This is also the traditional interpretation of Qoh. 11:1.

53. Three biblical sentences may represent an inversion of the verbal clefted construction:

Num. 18:23 *wĕᶜābad hallēwî hûʾ ʾet ʾăbōdat ʾōhel môᶜēd*, "it is only the Levites who shall perform cultic service in the tent of assembly."

Isa. 7:14 *lākēn yittēn ʾădōnāy hûʾ lākem ʾôt*, "therefore it is my Lord who will give you a sign."

Est. 9:1 *(ʾăšer) yišlĕṭû hayyĕhûdîm hēmmâ bĕśōnĕʾêhem*, "it was the Jews who dominated their enemies."

These three statements, apparently the only such in the Hebrew Bible, may simply represent an emphatic use of the personal pronoun (cf. also Driver, *Treatise*, 271). However, it may also be possible to view them as inversions of the verbal clefted structure; i.e., as rearrangements of **hallēwî hûʾ yaᶜăbōd*, **ʾădōnāy hûʾ yittēn* and **hayyĕhûdîm hēmmâ yišlĕṭû*, respectively. Inversion in the first example may have been to assimilate the clause to the normal sequence of tenses by placing the verb first; the initial position of *yittēn* in Isa. 7:14 is surely to mark emphasis, because the context is highly contrastive.

VI

Speculative, but suggestive, is the possibility that some unclefted verbal clauses with pleonastic pronouns may be influenced by the clefted construction to the point of sharing its nuances. Reference is to clauses in the x PR y pattern in which the initial x term is not an extraposed subject of the verb but its object, direct or prepositional. In principle there seems to be little difference in meaning between a statement like Prov. 30:18 *šĕlōšâ hēmmâ niplĕʾû mimmennî*, "Three things there are that are too difficult for me to understand," in which the initial term is subject, and Prov. 6:16 *šēš hēnnâ śānēʾ YHWH*, "six things YHWH hates," or "six things there are that YHWH hates," in which the initial term is direct object.[54] This echoing of clefting may be termed "quasi-clefting."

In some examples one can easily see that a nuance associated with the pleonastic clefted construction is indeed required by the context, so that it is reasonable to suppose that the use of the pleonastic pronoun in "quasi-clefting" is explicable. A good example is Isa. 53:4 *ʾākēn ḥŏlāyēnû hûʾ nāśāʾ*. The contrast is between the former opinion of the speakers that the Suffering Servant's maladies were his own burden, just cause for shunning him, and their current recognition that his sufferings were vicarious atonement for *their* sins. The New JPS translation captures the nuances through a cleft sentence: "Yet it was our sickness that he was bearing." The initial placement of the object confirms its emphatic status. The function of "quasi-clefting," marked by the pleonastic pronoun, may be to foreground the fact that specific emphasis is to be placed on the pronominal suffix, as

---

Ahaz has refused a divine sign; nevertheless, the prophet says, God *will* give it!

It is also possible that the pleonastic pronoun in Isa. 7:14 highlights the pronominal suffix in the manner to be suggested below: "it is *my* Lord. . . . " Such emphasis seems required by context, for the suffix of *ʾădōnāy* is not merely part of the divine name, as normally, but resumes the suffix of *ʾĕlōhāy* in v. 13; and, as many have noted, the latter contrasts strongly with *ʾĕlōhekā* of v. 10: "your God . . . *my* God." Like emphatic *ʾĕlōhāy*, *ʾădōnāy* expresses the prophet's disgust with the king.

Yet the possibilities of meaning in this famous verse are not yet exhausted; for the common translation "the Lord Himself" makes good sense, either as explicit or implicit contrast involving divinity, of the type described above. The possibility of explicit contrast is raised by parallelism to the context of Isaiah 38, in which Isaiah offers a sign to Hezekiah. It is explicitly termed a "sign from YHWH" but is delivered by the prophet in the first person, ambiguously referring either to God or to himself: *hinĕnî mēšîb* . . . (v. 7). (Num. 20:10ff. shows how touchy the matter of the use of the first person in such contexts should be!) In Isaiah 7, too, there may be an implied contrast between a sign delivered through the prophet, which Ahaz has refused, and a sign directly from YHWH. What the effective difference between the two might be is a matter for exegesis in this notoriously difficult passage. However, it is important to recognize that in such cases of multiple meaning, all justifiable linguistically, it is wrong to "choose" between competing interpretations. The literary meaning lies precisely in the interplay among them.

Another example of the clefted verbal construction is Lev. 25:11 *yôbēl hîʾ šĕnat haḥamiššîm šānâ tihyeh lākem* (inverted from **yôbēl hîʾ tihyeh šĕnat haḥamiššîm*), "it is a jubilee that the fiftieth year shall be to you." I am inclined to view this as a causal clause without conjunction, logically subordinated to what follows: "because the fiftieth year is a jubilee to you, you may not sow or reap. . . . " Support for this interpretation comes from *kî yôbēl hîʾ* of v. 12. Note that 25:10 *yôbēl hîʾ tihyeh lākem* is not a cleft construction because *hîʾ* refers to *šĕnat haḥamiššîm* of 10a.

54. Note also Ezek. 44:29, in which the initial term is *casus pendens*.

in Ps. 23:4, discussed above: "it was *our* sickness that he bore."[55] Similar is Isa. 53:11 *wĕ ʿawōnōtām hûʾ yisbōl*, "and it is their punishment that he suffered." This interpretation is altogether more pointed and powerful than one that places stress on the pleonastic pronoun itself, like that of NEB—"Yet on himself he bore our sufferings"—in which the sense of contrast, required by initial *ʾākēn*, "but," is imperceptible.

Other examples may not be so clear, but careful attention to context may indicate that there, too, stress placed on the pleonastic pronoun rather than on the initial term misrepresents the intended nuance. For example, in Ezek. 33:19, *ʿălêhem hûʾ yiḥyeh*, is emphasis to be placed primarily on the initial term, "it is by them that he shall live," or on the pleonastic pronoun, "it is he who shall live by virtue of these things" (NJPS)? The context in fact contains three explicit contrasts: the righteous and wicked man (*ṣaddîq, rāšāʿ*), their respective conduct: justice and righteousness vs. iniquity (*mišpāṭ wĕṣedeq, ʿāwel*), and their respective punishments for reversing that conduct: death and life. However, examination of the immediately preceding context, 33:17–18, reveals that the prophet's specific aim is to refute the people's false notion that God's ways are unfair. On the contrary, he says, their ways may be unfair but God's conduct is perfectly intelligible and consistent. Every man gets what his conduct deserves (v. 20). If a formerly good man performs evil deeds, he dies because of them (v. 18). But if a wicked man repents and now commits just and right acts, it is *by them* that he will now be allowed to live. Conduct is the main point; hence the initial placement of prepositional *ʿălêhem*. It seems reasonable to see in the use of pleonastic *hûʾ* not stress on that pronoun, but quasi-clefting to foreground initial *ʿălêhem*, "it is by *them* that he shall live." Man's fate is determined solely by his conduct, a refutation of the people's accusation of unfairness and arbitrariness. The nuance is a fine one, but literary understanding is molded by attention to such nice distinctions of language.[56]

---

55. In the case of 53:4 context makes the stress clear. In 53:11 stress on the suffix surely sharpens the meaning of the verse: "it was *their* punishment he bore." This stress highlights *rabbîm* which precedes, setting up a contrast with *rabbîm* in v. 12 (note the concomitant pun: *rabbîm*, "many, multitude," and *rabbîm*, "mighty, great," parallel to *ʿăṣûmîm*, "powerful."

56. Other possible examples of "quasi-clefting" are: Num. 35:19 (*bĕpigʿô*); Isa. 63:9 (note the similarity to Isa. 59:16, a clefted example); Ezek. 12:27; Prov. 3:34; 28:10. It may be noted that in some examples, both clefted and "quasi-clefted," stress seems to be specifically on the pronominal suffix of the initial term. This is probably always the case when the pleonastic pronoun is cognate with the suffix; i.e., the same person, number and gender. For example, Isa. 63:9 ("quasi-clefted") *bĕʾahăbātô ûbḥemlātô hûʾ gĕʾālām*, "it was with His own love and mercy that he redeemed them." Similar examples are Prov. 6:32; 28:10. Such examples may represent a coalescence of clefting, or "quasi-clefting," and that "emphatic" use of the independent personal pronoun after a cognate suffix that is well attested in Hebrew (*malkî ʾănî, malkô hûʾ*, etc.; GKC §§135d–h). But, as stated above, this may also be the case even when the pronoun is not cognate with the suffix; e.g., Isa. 59:16, so similar to 63:9 in context and nuance: *weṣidqātô hîʾ sĕmākāthû*, "it was His own triumphant (arm) that supported Him" (following JPS translation). This seems to be similar to Isa. 53:4, 11, cited above.

In such examples the pleonastic pronoun seems to be freeing itself, so to speak, from clefting. The ultimate result of this process may be observed in the use of enclitic, indeclinable *hûʾ* in Syriac (T. Nöldeke, *Syriac Grammar* [London, 1904], 175). An extreme example in Hebrew is Ezek. 11:15 *lānû hîʾ nittĕnâ hāʾāreṣ*, "it is to us that the land is given" (note the anticipation of the subject; cf. Lev.

Appendix

Included in this brief appendix are a few examples of the clefted construction whose significance is uncertain, or simply of special literary interest.

1. Gen. 2:14 wĕhannāhār hārĕbîᶜî hû² pĕrāt, "the (aforementioned) fourth river is the Euphrates." As the translation indicates, this example may be topical resumption. Verse 10 states that the great river of paradise breaks into four branches: "the name of the first is Pishon . . . the name of the second river is Gihon . . . the name of the third river is Tigris . . . as for the (aforementioned) fourth river, it's the Euphrates." It was the latter river that was known to Israel as the Great River, the farthest boundary of the Davidic realm.[57] The rather off-hand manner of its listing here must reflect the fact that an Israelite would naturally assume that this famous stream was one of the world rivers. It is so well-known that, unlike the other rivers it needs no further description.[58]

2. Isa. 45:18 seems to be a long, complex sentence composed of several clauses. The first contains two pleonastic pronouns: kî kōh ²āmar YHWH / bôrē² haššāmayim hû² hā²ĕlōhîm / yōṣēr hā²āreṣ wĕ²ōśāh hû² kônĕnāh. The structure seems to be similar to Ps. 100:3 dĕᶜû kî YHWH hû² hā²ĕlōhîm hû² ᶜāśānû wĕlō² ²ănaḥnû and Deut. 31:8 YHWH hû² hahōlēk lĕpānekā hû² yihyeh ᶜimmāk (cf. also Gen. 42:6, discussed above). In these examples it seems possible to view the first pleonastic pronoun as anticipatory of the second. Translation with the English relative pronoun seems appropriate: Ps. 100:3: "know that it is YHWH (who is) God who made us, not we ourselves"; Deut. 31:8: "it is YHWH (who is) the one who is going before you who will Himself be with you. . . . " Isa. 45:18 is more complex. The following rendering attempts to reflect something of the complex structure of the passage: "Thus says YHWH, creator of the skies who alone is God, the former and maker of the earth, who is the one who established it—not creating it a waste, but to be inhabited—I, YHWH, none other: 'Not in secret did I speak. . . . '" (This translation is close to that of NJPS and NEB).

3. Isa. 47:10 wattibṭĕhî bĕdaᶜtēk / ²āmart ²ên rō²ānî ḥokmātēk wĕdaᶜtēk hî² šôbĕbātek/ wattō²mĕrî ²ănî wĕ²apsî ᶜôd (reading bedaᶜtek with IQIsᵃ for MT's bĕrā²ātēk). The pleonastic construction here seems to be topically resumptive: "You trusted in your knowledge; you said, 'there is None to see me.' It is that very

---

25:11, cited above). The context is definitely contrastive, but a clefted or even quasi-clefted interpretation as lānû hî² (²ăšer) nittĕnâ hā²āreṣ sounds most peculiar. One gets the impression that the force of the pronoun here is approaching that of Syriac indeclinable hū: it simply foregrounds the term that precedes it; cf. Muraoka, *Emphatic Words*, 82. This may also be the case in Ezek. 12:12 yaᶜan ²ăšer lō² yir²eh lāᶜayin hû² ²et hā²āreṣ, "because it is with his eye that he must not see the earth." The clause is causal, but admittedly difficult. Still, the foregrounding of ᶜayin is certainly appropriate to the context of the symbolic action being performed by Ezekiel; cf. lĕᶜênêhem (vv. 3, 5, 6, 7—in vv. 5 and 6 in initial position). The deed is to be done in Israel's *sight*, and Ezekiel is contrasting Zedekiah, who will be blinded by the Babylonians. The clause may be inverted, for *lāᶜayin hû² lō² yir²eh. The irony is that Zedekiah's servants wrap up his face to hide him, so that he cannot even see the ground, falls into the trap and, after being actually blinded, goes off into exile in a land he literally "cannot see" (v. 13). The foregrounding of lāᶜayin in 12:12 is therefore meaningful in context, if not completely explicable.

57. Cf. Muraoka, *Emphatic Words*, 72; and Rashi ad loc.

58. Cf. Bendavid, *Biblical Hebrew*, 730.

(aforementioned) 'wisdom' and 'knowledge' that have led you astray, so that you said, 'I alone am supreme'!" However, the force of the passage lies in the implied contrast between the pride and confidence falsely engendered by Chaldean "wisdom" and the doom of which it is to be the primary cause. The "wisdom" and "knowledge" in question are magic (v. 9), in which the Chaldeans placed their confidence, expecting it to avert disaster. Their "wisdom," they thought, approached divinity. It made them impregnable to divine punishment. But far from being a justified source of confidence, it is that very "wisdom" that will do them in in the form of calamities that cannot be charmed away.

4. Ezek. 44:24 *wĕᶜal rîb hēmmâ yaᶜămĕdû lĕmišpāṭ* should mean "it is in lawsuits that they shall stand up for judgment." However, I can find no reason for a foregrounding of the initial phrase in this quasi-clefted example—a foregrounding indicated by word order as well as the use of the pronoun. Note that the LXX apparently read *rîb dāmîm* or the like (*haimatos*), i.e., capital cases. Perhaps there is here an implicit contrast with the previous verse, which states that priests shall give "instruction" in regard to cultic matters. Verse 24 might then refer specifically to the only type of civil case priests had jurisdiction over; but the legal role of the priesthood is unclear.[59]

---

59. See R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel* (New York, 1961), 155.