2000

NP references to active participants and story development in ancient Hebrew

Stephen H. Levinsohn
SIL-UND

NP References to Active Participants and Story Development in Ancient Hebrew

Stephen H. Levinsohn

Ancient Hebrew is compared with two languages that use a conjunction or pre-verbal particle to signal new developments in a narrative. This comparison shows that Hebrew makes a significantly greater number of full NP references to active participants than the other languages. Typically, languages refer to active participants with NPs when the subject remains the same in two contexts: to mark the beginning of a narrative unit and to highlight a speech or action. Such references are found in Hebrew not only in these contexts, but also in connection with new developments.

This paper argues that the system of references to active participants in Ancient Hebrew is influenced by the presence in the story of new developments. Many languages employ inter-sentential conjunctions to indicate whether or not the material concerned represents a new development. In other languages, the choice of verb form serves a similar purpose. Neither of these options is exploited in Ancient Hebrew. Instead, full NP references to active participants help to identify those events that represent new developments in a narrative. I first outline typical systems of reference to active participants in terms of default and marked encodings and show that, at least in one specific context, Ancient Hebrew uses more encoding material to refer to active participants than the Nigerian language Tyap or Koiné Greek (§1). I then argue that marked encoding is found in Hebrew not only at the begin ning of narrative units and when an action or speech is to be highlighted, but also at places in a narrative where one might expect a developmental marker to occur (§2).[1]

1. Typical systems of reference to active participants

Each participant in a story may be in one of three activation states at any particular time, according to Chafe (1987:22ff): active, semi-active/accessible, or inactive:

- active: "currently lit up, a concept in a person's focus of consciousness at a particular moment"
- accessible/semi-active: "in a person's peripheral awareness, but one that is not being directly focused on"
- inactive: "currently in a person's long-term memory, neither focally nor peripherally active."

Thus, at the beginning of a story that begins, 'Once upon a time there were three little pigs,' the concept of pigs goes from an inactive to an active state. The listeners doubtless had some information about pigs stored in their long-term memory, but pigs are probably not in the forefront of their thoughts before they hear the first sentence of the story. If the first episode of

---

[1]Andersen 1994 claims that "a seemingly redundant unnecessarily repeated subject noun serves to highlight the distinctiveness of an event" (p. 106). One of the functions of a developmental marker is to indicate that the material concerned is distinctive (Levinsohn 2000:72), so Andersen is effectively making the same claim as the one presented here.

the story then concerns 'the first little pig,' the concepts of the second and third little pigs will lapse into an accessible, semi-active state. However, all it takes to bring them back to the active state is an utterance like 'Now the second little pig….'

This paper concerns systems of references to *active* participants, that is, to participants who are currently "in a person's focus of consciousness." In the text from Genesis that is presented in Appendix 1, Abraham is already an active participant in 22:1b, as he was the subject of the previous sentence (21:34). In contrast, 'God' is probably being reactivated in 22:1b; although reference is made to him in 21:33b, he was last presented in an active role in 21:20.

I find five ways in which Abraham is referred to as an active participant in this passage:

1) with full noun phrases (NPs), as in 22:1b ('Abraham')

2) with independent pronouns, as in 22:1c ('to him')

3) with "clitic pronouns" (Fox 1983:221), as in 22:3b ('ass-his')[2]

4) by implication with "subject agreement" (Fox 1983:220) on the verb (Ø), as in 21:33b

5) by implication as the addressee of a reported speech ('to Ø'), as in 22:1d.

I argue elsewhere (Levinsohn 2000:136) that Givón's Iconicity Principle ("The more disruptive, surprising, discontinuous or hard to process a topic is, the more coding material must be assigned to it"— Givón 1983:18) provides only a partial explanation as to why references to active participants are sometimes encoded as NPs, sometimes as pronouns, and sometimes as zero (Ø). It is more insightful to describe the selection of one of these forms of reference over against another in terms of *default* and *marked* encodings. Typically, I first identify default coding values for specific contexts. (Default values occur when, in Givón's terms, there is no great discontinuity or surprise.) Marked encodings are those that are other than the default encoding for these contexts. (See Dooley and Levinsohn 2000: §18 for a step-by-step procedure for referential analysis, together with application to a text in the Mofu-Gudur language of Cameroon.)

In the following sections, therefore, I approach the question of NP references to active participants in Ancient Hebrew against the background of the default way of referring to these participants in the context concerned. I first discuss typical default encodings for references to subjects in four specific contexts (§1.1). I then consider NP references in one of the contexts for which the default encoding is only subject agreement (§1.2), and provide statistical confirmation that NP references in this context occur much more frequently in Hebrew than in some other languages (§1.3). Finally, I illustrate default and marked encodings in a second context (§1.4).

1.1 Default encodings for references to subjects

When I analyze the system of reference to active participants in a language, I first identify default encodings for the following four contexts involving subjects (S) (op. cit. §18.4):

S1 the subject is the same as in the previous clause or sentence

S2 the subject was the addressee of a speech reported in the previous sentence

S3 the subject was involved in the previous sentence in a non-subject role other than addressee

S4 other changes of subject than those covered by S2 and S3.

---

[2] Both independent and clitic pronouns are glossed as pronouns in Appendix 1, since my concern in this paper is to explain the *NP* references to active participants.

The second clause in the following examples illustrates these four contexts (references are to Appendix 1—the subject reference that fits the context concerned is bolded, while the previous reference to the participant is underlined):

S1   & <u>the God</u> tested Abraham (22:1b)
         & **Ø** said to him, "Abraham." (1c)

S2   & Ø said <u>to him</u>, 'Abraham.' (1c)
         & **Ø** said [to Ø], "Here I am." (1d)

S3   & behold a ram <u>behind him</u> was entangled in a thicket by its horns (13c)
         & **Abraham** went (13d)

S4   & Abraham lived in the land of the Philistines many days (21:34)*
         & Ø happened after these things & **the God** tested Abraham (22:1a-b)
         (*<u>God</u> is not mentioned in 21:34.)[3]

A couple of provisos are needed at this point. First, "when the subject and other participants in the action of the previous clause are included in a plural subject in the next clause, this is usually treated as the same subject [S1] for the purposes of participant reference encoding" (Levinsohn 2000:138). For example:

S1   & <u>Abraham</u> said [to Ø], "God will provide the lamb for a burnt offering…" (22:8a)
         & (**3P**) went the two of them together. (8b)

Secondly, "the reverse is not true. When a member of a *group* of participants that featured in the previous clause becomes the subject of the next clause" (p. 139), this is treated as S4. For example:

S4   & (3P) went <u>the two</u> together (22:6d)
         & **Isaac** spoke to Abraham his father (7a)

Recent field research has suggested that languages in Francophone Africa fall into two groups as far as default encodings for the above contexts are concerned:

1) those languages that use minimal forms of encoding for contexts S1, S2 and S3; i.e., for all references to *active* participants, regardless of their role in the previous sentence

2) those languages that use minimal forms of encoding only for context S1, but NPs for contexts S2, S3 and S4; i.e., for all *changes of subject*.

See Appendix 2 (Tyap) for a language of the first type. See Dooley and Levinsohn (2000: §18) for a text in a language (Mofu-Gudur) that appears to be of the second type.

What is important for this paper is that, regardless of the group to which an individual language belongs, the default encoding for context S1 (the subject is the same as in the previous clause or sentence) is minimal. In Ancient Hebrew, this means that the default encoding for clauses and sentences which have the same subject as in the previous clause or sentence will be subject agreement (provided an overt reference to the subject is not obligatory).[4]

---

[3] English glosses of the Hebrew are based on Jay P. Green's *A Literal Translation of the Bible*, which appears in Green (1986).

[4] "In non-verbal clauses in E[arly] B[iblical] H[ebrew], unstressed, non-contrastive independent pronouns are almost obligatory, used much like obligatory subject agreement in verbal clauses" (Fox 1983:252, footnote 6).

1.2 Marked encoding of references to subjects in context S1

Marked encodings are those that are other than the default encoding for a specific context. In the case of context S1 in Ancient Hebrew, all occasions when a NP is used instead of subject agreement constitute marked encodings.

When *more* coding material occurs than the default rules for a language predict, this typically occurs for one of two reasons (see Levinsohn 2000:140):

1) to mark the beginning of a narrative unit (because, in Givón's terms, there is a discontinuity); or

2) to highlight the action or speech concerned (often, because it is disruptive or surprising).

With reference to the instances of a NP in context S1 in Appendix 1, it is generally agreed that 22:1 ('& Ø happened (*wayhî*) after these things & the God tested Abraham') begins a new narrative unit. For example, Longacre (1989:26) mentions this example before obser   ving, "In general, *wayhî* + a temporal phrase marks an episode break in Hebrew narrative prose." Consequently, one would expect a NP to be used in 22:1 to refer to the subject, even though it is the same as in the previous sentence. See also 22:4a ('On third day & Abraham lifted up his eyes'), where the forefronted adverbial phrase again marks a discontinuity of time. There is probably a discontinuity also at 22:14 ('& Abraham called the name of that place "YHWH will see"'), which concerns "The Naming of the Place" (Heimerdinger 1999: 114) and may well not be the next event in sequence after Abraham offered the ram (22:13f).

In contrast, the other instances of a NP in context S1 (22:5a, 6a, 10a) do not appear to occur at points of discontinuity. Rather, there appears to be   *continuity* of time, place, action, and participants (Givón 1984:245, Dooley and Levinsohn 2000: §7.3). Neither are the events concerned "disruptive, surprising" (Givón 1983:18). See, for example, the events of 22:9b-10b:

9b	& Abraham built there the altar
9c	& Ø arranged the wood
9d	& Ø bound Isaac his son
9e	& Ø laid him on the altar on wood.
10a	& Abraham stretched out his hand
10b	& Ø took the knife to slay his son.

These events appear to follow a *script*: "a predetermined, stereotyped sequence of actions, with a specific goal" (Heimerdinger 1999:229). Furthermore, the goal is already known ('"Take your son … & go … & offer him for a burnt offering…"'—2a). Consequently, the information of 22:10a is not, in Givón's words (ibid.), "disruptive, surpri sing, discontinuous or hard to process." Some other explanation for the presence of a NP in these clauses is therefore needed. I present a plausible explanation in §2.

1.3 Statistical confirmation

First, however, I offer some confirmation that instances of NPs in context S1 are more frequent in Ancient Hebrew stories than in comparable stories in certain other languages. I do so by comparing passages in three languages in which one participant performs most of the actions. The passages appear in Appendices 1 (Hebrew), 2 (Tyap), and 3 (Koiné Greek).[5]

---

[5] A much more extensive corpus would need to be examined to demonstrate that the differences in frequency between Hebrew and the other languages were statistically significant. However, I am satisfied that these passages are typical, as far as the points being made in this paper are concerned.

Table 1 indicates the number of clauses in each passage, the number of clauses that fit context S1, and the number of these in which a NP is used to refer to the subject. As the figures indicate, the percentage of NPs in context S1 is far higher in Ancient Hebrew than in the other two languages.

Language	Total Clauses	in Context S1	NPs in S1	% NPs in S1
Hebrew	45	26	6	23%
Tyap	42	34	2	6%
Greek	17/26*	15/24*	0	0%

*The first figure for Greek indicates the number of independent clauses in the passage. The second figure includes participial clauses.

Table 1: NPs in context S1 in Hebrew, Tyap, and Greek

1.4 Default and marked encoding of references in context S2

Before considering why the percentage of NPs in context S1 is so high in Ancient Hebrew, I look at the encoding of references to the subject in context S2; i.e., when the subject was the addressee of a speech reported in the previous sentence. Three groups of three examples occur in the passage presented in Appendix 1: 22:1d-3a, 7c-8a, and 11c-13a. In each group, the encoding for the first two S2 references happens to be subject agreement alone, whereas the encoding for the final S2 reference is a NP.[6] See, for example, 22:7-8a.

7a	& Isaac spoke to Abraham his father
7b	& Ø said, "My father."
7c	& Ø said, "Here I am, my son."
7d	& Ø said, "See, the fire and the wood! & where [is] the lamb for a burnt offering?"
8a	& Abraham said, "God will provide the lamb for a burnt offering, my son."

If we take the default encoding for context S2 to be subject agreement alone, the instances of marked encoding (NP references) can be easily explained.

First of all, it is common cross-linguistically for the final speech of a reported conversation to be highlighted when its content is important. As indicated in §1.2, one way of high   lighting a reported speech is by increased encoding of reference to the speaker. Heimerdinger (1999:224) describes this mechanism for "foregrounding" as a violation of Grice's (1975:45-46) Maxim of Quantity, "Do not make your contribution more informative than is required." The effect of violating this maxim by making a 'redundant' reference to the speaker is to throw the element (sentence) concerned into relief. In the case of 22:8a above, it is appro priate for the speech to be highlighted because its assertion 'God will provide' is "the turning point of the story," explaining the name of the place 'YHWH will see' (Wenham 1994:109, 100—see v. 14; the Hebrew verb *ra'ah* means 'see, provide').

Secondly, "one common change of ACTION that is marked cross-linguistically is when a story moves from reported conversation to non-speech events" (Dooley and Levinsohn 2000: §7.4). In other words, the move from a reported conversation to the non-speech events that follow

---

[6] See Genesis 3:1-6 for a reported conversation in which all three of the S2 references are NPs. In 4:9-16, three of the five S2 references are NPs. In 37:13-14, neither of the two S2 references is a NP.

is treated as an "action discontinuity" (Levinsohn 2000:4). Both of the remaining instances of NPs in context S2 occur at such points of action discontinuity. See, for example, 22:3a.

1b   & the God tested Abraham

1c   & Ø said to him, "Abraham."

1d   & Ø said, "Here I am."

2a   & Ø said, "Take now your son, your only one whom you love, Isaac, & go into the land of Moriah & offer him there for a burnt offering on one of the mountains which I will say to you."

3a   & Abraham rose early in the morning

     If these three examples of increased encoding in context S2 are typical of Ancient Hebrew, then the presence of a NP in such a context signals either the highlighting of the speech concerned (a common cross-linguistic device in such circumstances) or an action discontinuity.

2. NPs as markers of development in Ancient Hebrew

This section argues that the increased frequency of NP references to active participants in Ancient Hebrew compensates for the absence of a developmental marker in the language. I begin by discussing NP references in contexts S1 and S2 (§2.1). I then consider some examples of NP references to active participants in other contexts (§2.2).

2.1 NP references in contexts S1 and S2

I noted in §1.4 that "one common change of ACTION that is marked cross-linguistically is when a story moves from reported conversation to non-speech events" (Dooley and Levinsohn, loc. cit). The quotation continues as follows (the italics are mine), "Changes in action are often marked *by the use of a sentence-initial conjunction such as 'so' or 'then'*." See, for example, the following passage in Koiné Greek (John 9:7):

7a   and [Greek *kai*] he [Jesus] said to him, "Go, wash in the pool of Siloam" (which means Sent).

7b   So [Greek *oun*] he went, and washed, and came back able to see.

See also the New English Bible translation of Genesis 22:3, "So Abraham rose early in the morning…" and the New Living Translation of 22:13, "Then Abraham looked up…."[7]

     In many languages, conjunctions such as 'so' and 'then' are mutually exclusive with the default way of conjoining clauses or sentences (whether a conjunction such as 'and' or the absence of any conjunction). In Ancient Hebrew narratives, however, the norm is for every clause or sentence to begin with the same conjunction (*waw*). This means that the option of signaling an action discontinuity by selecting a particular con junction is not available i n Ancient Hebrew. I suggest that the use of NPs to refer to active participants compensates for this.

     I call conjunctions like 'so' and 'then'   *developmental markers*. A developmental marker "constrains the material with which it is associated to be interpreted as a new step or development in the author's story or argument" (Levinsohn 2000:293). In Tyap (Appendix 2), the preverbal particle *kàn* "indicates that the proposition is viewed by the author as representing a new development in the storyline" (Follingstad 1994:153; see also the discussion of this text in Dooley and Levinsohn 2000: Appendix C). In Koiné Greek (Appendix 3), although the default

---

[7] An interesting question arises: should these translations have used a NP reference to Abraham as well as the conjunction 'so' or 'then'?

developmental marker is *de* (Levinsohn 2000:70), *oun* and *tote* also indicate that the material which they introduce represents a new development (op. cit. 85; Levinsohn 1987:150).

Heimerdinger makes the following observation about the clauses of Genesis 22 in which Abraham is referred to by name (the italics are mine): "they start a new scene or *open a new burst of closely related actions*" (1999:124). In other words, they are viewed by the author as representing a new development in the storyline. This is not indicated in Hebrew by a developmental conjunction or preverbal particle, however. Rather, it is implied by the 'redundant' use of a NP in context S1.

The following chart shows how the presence of NP references to active participants might lead us to divide 22:1-6 into five 'development units' (represented by boxes). (On the basis of discontinuities of time and of action, in contrast, the passage would divide into only three or four episodes—see §§1.2 and 1.4.)[8]

1	& Ø happened after these things & the God tested Abraham, & Ø said to him, "Abraham."
	& Ø said, "Here I am."
2	& Ø said, "Take now your son, your only one whom you love, Isaac, & go into the land of Moriah & offer him there for a burnt offering on one of the mountains which I will say to you."

3	& Abraham rose early in the morning, & Ø saddled his ass, & Ø took two of his youths with him & Isaac his son, & split wood for a burnt offering, & Ø rose up, & Ø went to the place which God had said to him.

4	Ø On third day & Abraham lifted up his eyes, & Ø saw the place from a distance.

5	& Abraham said to his young men, "You stay here with the ass, & I & the boy will go on to that place, & we will worship & return to you."

6	& Abraham took the wood of the burnt offering, & Ø laid [it] on Isaac his son, & Ø took in his hand the fire & the knife, & Ø went the two together.

Notice, in the above diagram, that the reported conversation of 22:1-2 is grouped as a single development unit. The conversation only represents a development in the story as it moves beyond the opening speeches to the instruction of 2.

In contrast, the reported conversation of 22:7-8 (discussed in §1.4) extends over two development units, as represented in the following diagram.

7	& Isaac spoke to Abraham his father, & Ø said, "My father."
	& Ø said, "Here I am, my son."
	& Ø said, "See, the fire and the wood! & where [is] the lamb for a burnt offering?"

8-9a	& Abraham said, "God will provide the lamb for a burnt offering, my son."
	& (3P) went on the two of them together, & (3P) came to the place which God had said to him.

---

[8] Heimerdinger divides 22:1-6 into four episodes (1999:264-65): 1-2, 3, 4-5, and 6. However, since 5 contains a single reported speech rather than a conversation of two or more speeches, I would not perceive a discontinuity of action between 5 and 6.

The above discussion might give the impression that every time a NP reference occurs in context S1 or S2, a new development unit will begin, even though a NP reference might have been expected anyhow, because of the presence of a discontinuity. [9] However, in languages that have developmental conjunctions or pre-verbal particles, the developmental marker does not have to be used when there is a discontinuity. For example, in the Tyap text (Appendix 2), there is a discontinuity of time between 10 and 11, but the developmental marker *kàn* is not used following the discontinuity until 15.[10]

I am not sure how one might distinguish in Ancient Hebrew between a NP reference to an active participant that is motivated by a preceding discontinuity and one that is motivated by the beginning of a new development unit. The language employs several means for signaling a discontinuity of time. For example, the sentence may begin with an adverbial phrase of time that may or may not be separated from the main clause by the conjunction *waw* (&). In 22:4a, for instance, *waw* is not used until after the adverbial phrase (Ø On third day &…). In 14:4, in contrast, *waw* precedes the adverbial phrase (& in thirteenth year they rebelled). Similarly, when *wayhî* (it happened) precedes the adverbial phrase of time, *waw* may or may not follow the adverbial phrase. Compare 22:1a (& Ø happened after these things &…) with Exodus 16:27 (& Ø happened on the seventh day some of the people went out). It may be that certain of these means imply that the line of development continues across the discontinuity, while others bring the previous line of development to an end. Research is needed in this area.[11]

2.2 NP references to active participants in other contexts

NP references to active participants may be motivated by the presence of a new development not only in contexts S1 and S2, but also in other contexts. This section considers examples of NP references in non-subject contexts N1 and N2, where N1 to N4 are defined as follows (see Dooley and Levinsohn 2000: §18.4):

> N1   the referent occupies a non-subject argument role in the current clause and in the previous clause or sentence
>
> N2   the addressee of a reported speech was the subject (speaker) of a speech reported in the previous sentence
>
> N3   the referent was involved in the previous sentence in a role other than those covered by N1 and N2
>
> N4   other non-subject references than those covered by N2 and N3.

This section also considers the implications of referring in the same clause to *two* active participants with NPs (e.g. in contexts S1 and N1).

In the diagram below of Genesis 4:3-6, (N1) and (N3) indicate where NPs are used to refer to active participants in these non-subject contexts. In 4b, there is a NP reference to Abel, who was the subject of the previous clause (4a). 5b and 6 contain NP references to Cain, who was also involved in a non-subject role in 5a. This suggests a division of the passage into four development units as follows:

> 3   & Ø happened in the end of days & Cain brought an offering from the fruit of the ground to YHWH

---

[9] NP references to active participants for highlighting do not present a problem, because the highlighted action or speech is usually a new development anyhow.

[10] Elsewhere I argue that continuity and development "are *different* parameters" (Levinsohn 2000:77).

[11] For possible explanations of the functional differences between using vayyiqtol versus qatal forms following an adverbial phrase of time, see Heimerdinger 1999:204-06 and Levinsohn forthcoming.

| 4a | & Abel, he also brought (an offering) from the firstborn of his flocks & their fat. |

| 4b | & YHWH had favor on Abel (N3) & on his offering |
| 5a | & on Cain & on his offering Ø did not have favor. |

| 5b | & it upset Cain (N1) very much, & his looks were downcast. |

| 6-7 | & YHWH said to Cain (N1), "Why does it upset you, & why are your looks downcast? ..." |

Sometimes, a single clause contains *two* NP references to active participants. Such is the case in 4:8b, in the contexts S1 (Cain) and N1 (Abel). The probable effect is to increase the highlighting of this unexpected climactic development.

| 8a | & Cain said to Abel his brother, "Let us go into the field." |

| 8b | & Ø happened when they were in the field & Cain attacked Abel his brother, & Ø killed him. |

Two NP references to active participants are also found in 4:13: in the contexts S2 (Cain) and N2 (YHWH). The speech which is introduced in this way is a "countering move" (Dooley and Levinsohn 2000: §1.3; see Longacre 1996:131) in which Cain objects to YHWH's pronouncement of 10-12. The use of the two NP references to active participants probably increases the highlighting of this unexpected development.

9a	& YHWH said to Cain (N3), "Where is Abel your brother?"
9b	& Ø said, "I don't know. Am I my brother's keeper?"
10	& Ø said, "What have you done? The voice of the blood of your brother cries to me from the ground. (11) And now you are cursed more than the ground which opened its mouth to receive your brother's blood from your hand. (12) When you till the ground, it will not again give its strength to you. You shall be a vagabond and a fugitive on the earth."

| 13 | & Cain (S2) said to YHWH (N2), "My punishment is greater than I can bear. (14) Lo, you have driven me out from the face of the earth today, & I shall be hidden from your face, & I shall be a vagabond & a fugitive on the earth, & it will be that anyone who finds me shall kill me." |

3. Conclusion

Statistics suggest that Ancient Hebrew uses a significantly greater number of NP references to active participants than Tyap and Koiné Greek do. I have argued in this paper that this increase compensates for the absence of a developmental conjunction or pre-verbal particle in Hebrew. Languages typically refer to active participants with NPs when the subject remains the same either to mark the beginning of a narrative unit or to highlight the speech or action concerned. Hebrew uses NP references to active participants not only in these contexts, but also in connection with new developments.

Appendix 1   Ancient Hebrew (VSO): Genesis 21:33b-22:14[12]

Ref	Conjn	Pre-verbals	Subject	Context	Predicate
33b	&		Ø	S1	called there on name of YHWH God everlasting.
34	&		Abraham	S1	lived in the land of the Philistines many days.
1a	&		Ø	-	happened after these things
1b	&	the God	[PRE]	S4	tested Abraham
1c	&		Ø	S1	said to him, "Abraham."
1d	&		Ø	S2	said [to Ø], "Here I am."
2a	&		Ø	S2	said [to Ø], "Take your son, your only one whom you love, Isaac, & go into land of Moriah & offer him there for a burnt offering on one of the mountains which I will say to you."
3a	&		Abraham	S2	rose early in the morning
3b	&		Ø	S1	saddled his ass
3c	&		Ø	S1	took two of his youths with him & Isaac his son
3d	&		Ø	S1	split wood for a burnt offering
3e	&		Ø	S1	rose up
3f	&		Ø	S1	went to the place which the God had said to him.
4a	Ø	on 3rd day &	Abraham	S1	lifted up his eyes
4b	&		Ø	S1	saw the place from a distance
5a	&		Abraham	S1	said to his young men, "You stay here with the ass…"
6a	&		Abraham	S1	took the wood of the burnt offering
6b	&		Ø	S1	laid [it] on Isaac his son
6c	&		Ø	S1	took in his hand the fire & the knife
6d	&		(3P)	(S1)	went the two together
7a	&		Isaac	(S4)	spoke to Abraham his father
7b	&		Ø	S1	said [to Ø], "My father."
7c	&		Ø	S2	said [to Ø], "Here I am, my son."
7d	&		Ø	S2	said [to Ø], "See, the fire & wood! & where [is] the lamb for a burnt offering?"
8a	&		Abraham	S2	said [to Ø],"God will provide the lamb for a burnt offering..."
8b	&		(3P)	(S1)	went the two of them together
9a	&		(3P)	S1	came to the place which the God had said to him.
9b	&		Abraham	(S4)	built there the altar
9c	&		Ø	S1	arranged the wood
9d	&		Ø	S1	bound Isaac his son
9e	&		Ø	S1	laid him on the altar on wood
10a	&		Abraham	S1	stretched out his hand
10b	&		Ø	S1	took the knife to slay his son
11a	&		angel of YHWH	INTRO	called to him from the heavens
11b	&		Ø	S1	said [to Ø], "Abraham, Abraham."
11c	&		Ø	S2	said [to Ø], "Here I am."

[12] The following abbreviations are used in the Appendices: INTRO: introduction of participant; [PRE]: subject prior to verb; [ ]: implicit; &: Hebrew conjunction   *waw*; Ø: 3rd. person singular subject agreement only; (3P): 3rd. person plural subject agreement; 3S: 3rd. person singular pronoun.

12 &		Ø	S2		said [to Ø], "Do not lay your hand on the boy…"
13a &		Abraham	S2		lifted up his eyes
13b &		Ø	S1		looked
13c &	behold a ram behind him [PRE]		INTRO		was entangled in a thicket by its horns.
13d &		Abraham	S3		went
13e &		Ø	S1		took the ram
13f &		Ø	S1		offered it for a burnt offering instead of his son
14 &		Abraham	S1		called the name of that place 'YHWH will see'…

Appendix 2   Tyap (Nigeria) (SVO)

Extract from "The Healer and His Wife" (Follingstad 1994)

Pre-verbal particles: *si* 'thematic prominence';   *kàn* 'developmental';   *kìn* 'additive, non-developmental'

Ref	Pre-nuclear constituents	Subject	Context	Particles		Predicate
1		Bashila	?			was coming from grinding,
2		3S	S1	*si*	*kàn*	heard the healer singing to their child [that he used to go and eat people]
3		3S	S1	*si*		stood behind the room
4		3S	S1	*si*		heard the song that 3S was singing.
5		Bashila	S1	*si*	*kìn*	passed
6		3S	S1	*si*		entered,
7		3S	S1	*si*		returned
8		3S	S1	*si*		kept quiet.
9		3S	S4	*si*		took the child
10		3S	S1	*si*		gave it to Bashila.
11	It became morning,	3S	S1	*si*		got up,
12		3S	S1	*si*		got up.
13	When 3S (S1) got up,	3S	S1	*si*		left,
14		3S	S1	*si*		again went to eat people.
15	When 3S (S1) went to eat people,	Bashila also	S4	*si*	*kàn*	got up
16		3S	S1	*si*	*kìn*	gathered her things
17		3S	S1	*si*		fetched ashes
18		3S	S1	*si*		added an egg
19		3S	S1	*si*		put the things on her head
20		3S	S1	*si*		caught the road.
21		3S	S1			caught the road,
22		3S	S1			went,
23		3S	S1			went,
24		3S	S1			went,
25		3S	S1	*si*	*kàn*	looked
26		3S	S1	*si*		saw the healer.
27		Healer also	S3	*si*	*kàn*	saw her.

Ref		Subject	Context			Predicate
28		Healer	S1			said, 'What kind of woman looks like this?'
29		3S	S1			walked,
30		3S	S1			walked,
31		3S	S1			walked,
32		the woman	S4			was nearing him,
33		3S	S1	*si*	*kàn*	rubbed the ashes on her face
34		3S	S1	*si*	*kàn*	put the egg in her mouth.
35		3S	S1	*si*		reached him,
36		3S	S1	*si*	*kàn*	bit down on the egg
37		3S	S1	*si*		bit down on it in her mouth
38		the egg	S1	*si*	*kàn*	burst [all over her face].
39	There	3S	S1			said that the woman was not his wife, that 3S could pass.
40		The woman	S2	*si*	*kìn*	passed.

Appendix 3   Koiné Greek (VSO): Matthew 26:36-47

Conjunctions: *gar* 'for'; *kai* 'and (default non-developmental)'; *tote* 'then (developmental)'

Ref	Conjn	Pre-verbals	Subject	Context	Predicate
36a	*tote*		Jesus	S2	comes with them to a place called Gethsemane
36b	*kai*		Ø	S1	says to the disciples, "Sit here while I go over there and pray."
37	*kai*		Ø	S1	having taken Peter and the two sons of Zebedee began to be grieved and agitated.
38	*tote*		Ø	S1	says to them, "I am deeply grieved… remain here & stay awake with me."
39	*kai*		Ø	S1	having gone forward a little fell upon his face praying and saying, "Father, if it is possible, let this cup pass"
40a	*kai*		Ø	S1	comes to the disciples
40b	*kai*		Ø	S1	finds them sleeping
40c	*kai*		Ø	S1	says to Peter, "So, could you not stay awake with me one hour?"
42	Ø	again for 2nd time	Ø	S1	having left prayed saying, "Father… your will be done."
43a	*kai*		Ø	S1	having come again found them sleeping
43b	*gar*		their eyes	S3	were heavy.
44	*kai*		Ø	S1[13]	having left them again having gone away was praying for the third time having said again.
		the same thing			
45a	*tote*		Ø	S1	comes to the disciples
45b	*kai*		Ø	S1	says to them, "Are you still sleeping and taking your rest? … See, my betrayer is at hand."
47	*kai*	yet he	[PRE]	S1	speaking…

[13] "[I]f the subject is the same as in the last independent clause that describes a storyline event, no overt reference is made to it, even if intervening background material has a different subject" (Levinsohn 2000:138).

References

Andersen, Francis I. 1994. Salience, implicature, ambiguity, and redundancy in clause-clause relationships in Biblical Hebrew. In *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*, edited by Robert D. Bergen, 99-116. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Chafe, Wallace. 1987. Cognitive constraints on information flow. In *Coherence and grounding in discourse*, ed. by Russell Tomlin, 21-52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dooley, Robert A., and Stephen H. Levinsohn. 2000. *Analyzing discourse: a manual of basic concepts*. URL: http://www.und.nodak.edu/dept/linguistics/textbooks/DooleyLevinsohn.pdf.

Follingstad, Carl M. 1994. Thematic development and prominence in Tyap discourse. In *Discourse features of ten languages of West-Central Africa*, ed. by Stephen H. Levinsohn, 151-90. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and the University of Texas at Arlington.

Fox, Andrew. 1983. Topic continuity in Biblical Hebrew narrative. In *Topic continuity in discourse: a quantitative cross-language study*, ed. by T. Givón, 215-54. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Givón, Talmy. 1983. *Topic continuity in discourse*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

——— 1984. *Syntax: a functional-typological introduction.* Part I. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Green, Sr., Jay P. 1986. *The interlinear Bible: Hebrew-Greek-English*. Second edition. Lafayette, IN: Sovereign Grace Publishers.

Heimerdinger, Jean-Marc, 1999. *Topic, focus and foreground in Ancient Hebrew narratives. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*: Supplement Series 295. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. 1987. *Textual connections in Acts*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

———. 2000. *Discourse features of New Testament Greek: a coursebook on the information structure of New Testament Greek.* Second. edition. Dallas: SIL International.

———. forthcoming. Review of Heimerdinger 1999. *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics*.

Longacre, Robert E. 1989. *Joseph: a story of divine providence: a text theoretical and text-linguistic analysis of Genesis 37 and 39-48*. Winona Lake, IL: Eisenbrauns.

———. 1996. *The grammar of discourse*. Second. edition. New York: Plenum.

Wenham, Gordon J. 1994. *Genesis 16-50. Word Biblical Commentary*, vol. 2. Dallas, TX: Word Books.

58 Hithercroft Road
High Wycombe, Bucks.
HP13 5RH
England

stephen_levinsohn@sil.org