MODALITY, REFERENCE AND SPEECH ACTS IN THE PSALMS

Andy Warren

This study takes the results of linguistic and form-critical work on the biblical Psalms, together with some of the findings of comparative linguistics in the fields of modality and speech acts, to look at forms of reference and modality in the Psalms, focussing particularly on Interrogative, Negative, and Imperative sentence-types. Amongst the most significant results are a full reanalysis of the Hebrew verbal system, primarily in terms of modality (Table 2), and a more systematic distinction between different types of cohortatives (Table 1) and jussives.

The Introduction (ch. 1) firstly surveys the work which has already been done on the distinctive lexis (Tsevat), morphology, and syntax (Sappan) of the Psalter, as well as work in sociolinguistics (Finley, Wilt), formulaic language (Culley), and form-criticism (Gunkel, Westermann, Aeigmelaeus, etc.). Then an overview is given of some of the categories and terminology standardly used in some fields of comparative linguistic semantics and pragmatics (Lyons, Levinson), including communication theory, speech-act theory (Austin, Searle) and the study of modality (Palmer). Structuralist method in the study of Biblical Hebrew (Collins, Prinsloo) is considered, as are some of the recent studies of Biblical Hebrew Narrative syntax (Richter, Talstra; Schneider, Niccacci; Andersen, Longacre), as the background to the present treatment of Discourse. The approach taken here is that

discourse functions [of individual verbal forms] are secondary, contextual applications of a more basic temporal, aspectual or modal function. Discourse functions are not inherent to the verbal form, but to the clauses within which the verbal form is incorporated.  

---


Reference (ch. 2) considers two distinct features. The first is the pragmatic function of exophoric ‘reference’ to real-world context, particularly in terms of participant reference, the use of the three grammatical persons to refer to the three rhetorical persons (or ‘actants’—the Psalmist, the enemy, and God) and the difference between reference by name, description, pronoun, and verbal morphology. The second is the syntactic function of endophoric ‘relation’ to linguistic context; this covers all kinds of deixis, nominal and adverbial, and requires a discussion of pronoun topicalisation and its most frequent function, adversativity (as in wa’ānī).

Mood (ch. 3) considers the cross-linguistic feature properly termed ‘modality’, which may be described as the grammatical reflex of assertivity or reality. Modal forms dominate the language of the Psalter. A language may give modality grammatical realisation in distinct moods, and this is shown to be the case in Biblical Hebrew, which has three moods: a Deontic (or ‘volitional’) mood [+MOD, +VOL] based on short-form yiqtōl, an Epistemic (or subjunctive) mood [+MOD, −VOL] based on long-form yiqtōl, and an Indicative mood [−MOD] based on the Anterior qātal form supplemented by the predicative participle (developing Joosten, Niccacci). The formal systems are labelled D-system, E-system, and I-system respectively, and the schema is developed into a comprehensive account of how Biblical Hebrew verbal forms and functions relate (see Table 2). Apparent exceptions are explained as either secondary, natural extensions of the primary functions as given (e.g. yiqtōl for present potentialis will [tend to], past iterative ‘would [usually]’ and past prospective ‘was about to’) or form-function ‘skewing’ (e.g. preceptive perfect ‘Oh, that you would’ and preceptive imperfect ‘You will!’). Features closely related to modality are considered, such as embedding and vocative, as well as the question of the scope of Interrogative, Negative, and Imperative force.

Interrogative (ch. 4) looks at the various basic morphemes involved in pronominal, adverbial, and clausal interrogation. Exclamatory and desiderative functions are identified, as well as relationships to subordination, Negation, and conditionality.

Negative (ch. 5) looks at the various types of Negation available in Biblical Hebrew for individual arguments, nominal clauses, infinitives, non-Deontic verbal clauses and Deontic verbal clauses. The functional distinction between lō and 'al is given particular consideration. Some of the rhetorical functions of Negation are described.
**Imperative** (ch. 6) considers not only the verbal form qʻtōl (the ‘imperative’), but the entire Deontic class, centred on short-form yiqtōl-x (‘jussive’), and also including ʼeqtʻlā (‘cohortative’). The chapter begins by considering the particle -nā and the Deontic use of modal verbs, then looks in turn at the imperative, cohortative, and jussive in terms of argument structure and illocutionary force (also Speaker and Addressee—see Table 1), and ends by looking at Deontic uses of nominal clauses.

The **Conclusion** (ch. 7) brings together the results of the preceding chapters, showing how these various features relate to each other on the grammatical level, and how they contribute to the dynamic and texture of a psalm on the rhetorical level. Some suggestions are made as to how the method and results of this work might illuminate other biblical texts.³

---

**Table 1: Functions of Main-Clause Cohortatives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>optative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A COMPETENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A PRESENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Direct / Commissive / Expressive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S COMPETENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hortative</th>
<th>precative</th>
<th>promissive</th>
<th>purposive</th>
<th>expressive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Table 2: A Reanalysis of the Hebrew Verbal System

1. Primary Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mood:</th>
<th>MOOD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[MOD]</td>
<td>[-MOD]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrealis</td>
<td>Realis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modal System:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[VOL]</td>
<td>[-VOL]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>Epistemic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Tense:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[PAST]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anterior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporaneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPECT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[PROG]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>Epistemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optative</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Eur. equiv's: perf.简单 | pres. prog.)

2. Verb Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Yiqtol-X]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(short form)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘jussive’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘cohortative’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘al-tiqtol’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Negation:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lo’ tiqtol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuation:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>w’qatal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Person-unmarked:              |       |
| qtol                         |       |
| ‘imperative’                  |       |
| qotla                        |       |
| ‘adhortative’                 |       |

3. Secondary Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pres. potentialis</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>past iterative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>past prospective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg, Int, Cond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Performativ                   |       |
| Epistolary                    |       |

4. ‘Skewing’

| ‘Predictive perf.’            |       |
| ‘Perceptive impf.’            |       |
| lo’ tiqtol                    |       |
| ‘Prohibitive’                 |       |

| Conditional:                  |       |
| ‘im qatal’                    |       |

| Sequential:                   |       |
| ‘im yiqtol’                   |       |
| ki qatal                      |       |
| w’qatal                       |       |
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MODALITY, REFERENCE AND SPEECH ACTS IN THE PSALMS

Andy Warren

This study, based on earlier work in Psalmic language and forms, comparative semantics and Biblical Hebrew syntax, examines reference and modality in the Psalms, focussing particularly on Interrogative, Negative and Imperative sentence-types.

The Introduction (ch. 1) surveys previous work on the distinctive language of the Psalter (Tsevat, Sappan, Dahood), as well as in sociolinguistics (Finley, Wilt), formulaic language (Culley) and form-criticism (Gunkel, Westermann, Aejmelaus). Studies in comparative linguistic semantics and pragmatics are presented (Lyons, Levinson), especially speech-act theory (Austin) and modality (Palmer). Structuralist method (Collins, Prinsloo) and Biblical Hebrew Narrative syntax studies (Richter, Talstra; Schneider, Niccacci; Andersen, Longacre) are also surveyed.

Reference (ch. 2) considers the pragmatic function of exophoric ‘Reference’, particularly in terms of participant reference, and the syntactic function of endophoric ‘Relation’, especially pronoun topicalisation. Metonymy and incongruence are characteristic of reference in the Psalms.

Modality (ch. 3) argues for the existence of three modally-distinct verbal systems: a Deontic system [+MOD, +VOL] based on short-form yiqtol, an Epistemic system [+MOD, -VOL] based on long-form yiqtol, and an Indicative system [-MOD] based on qatal and the predicative participle (developing Joosten, Niccacci). Vocative function is closely related to modality.

Interrogative (ch. 4) looks at the various basic morphemes involved in clausal, nominal and adverbial Interrogation. A range of modal, Negative and Exclamative functions are identified.

Negative (ch. 5) considers briefly the relationship between modally-distinct sentence types and the various forms for argumental and clausal Negation.

Imperative (ch. 6) considers the morphological ‘imperative’ as well as the D-system (‘jussive’ and ‘cohortative’); also the Affirmative Deontic particle -nâ’ and Deontic use of nominal clauses.

The Conclusion (ch. 7) surveys the most significant results and offers some suggestions for further implications of this work.
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4.3.2. Directive-precaution (request-cohortative)

4.3.3. Directive-hortative (true cohortative)

4.3.4. Commisive/Expressive (resolve-cohortative)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actant</td>
<td>participant in the speech situation: Psalmist, God, Enemy/ies; also community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdvP</td>
<td>Adverb Phrase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>opposite polarity to Negative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>thematic role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anterior</td>
<td>the function [MOD, +PAST] and the corresponding form qâṭâl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect</td>
<td>the grammatical reflex of internal temporal constituency, in particular [âPROGRESSIVE].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>type of illocutionary force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asyndetic</td>
<td>without conjunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>thematic role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissive</td>
<td>type of illocutionary force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitute</td>
<td>non-performative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporaneous Constitute</td>
<td>the function [MOD, +PAST, +PROG] and the corresponding form qâṭâl hâ’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporaneous Cursive</td>
<td>the function [MOD, +PAST, +PROG] and the corresponding form hâ’ qâṭâl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-system</td>
<td>the class of forms (analogous to English imperative) centred on short-form qâṭâl (&quot;jussive&quot;), and also including: 'âqâṭâl (&quot;cohortative&quot;), Negative 'al-qiṭâl (&quot;vetitive&quot;) and 'vocative intensifier' -mâ’; supplemented by the person-unmarked form qâṭâl (&quot;imperative&quot;) and qâṭâl (&quot;adhortative&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-system qâṭâl</td>
<td>(also 'short-form qâṭâl', 'qiṭâl-x', 'jussive') PRE2 (DeCaen), PK (KF) (Richter), Y1Q1O1-x (Niccacci).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declarative</td>
<td>sentence-type paradigmatic with Interrogative and Imperative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>declarative praise</td>
<td>type of illocutionary force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>praise of God focussing on what God has done—form-critically, the 'Song of Thanksgiving' (also 'confessional praise').</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deontic</td>
<td>the function [+MOD, +VOL] (from Greek ἑκά, 'there is need'); the modal system concerned with volition, e.g. English imperative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>praise of God focussing on who God is—form-critically, the 'Hymn'.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desiderative</td>
<td>sub-type of Deontic—Expressive modal force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>sub-type of Deontic—Directive modal force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-system</td>
<td>the class of forms (analogous to English subjunctive) centred on long-form qâṭâl (optionally with nun paragogicam), and also including: Negative lô’ qiṭâl (&quot;prohibitive&quot; when used Deontically) and continuation form waqâṭâl; supplemented by the person-unmarked form qâṭâl (&quot;infinitive absolute&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-system qâṭâl</td>
<td>(also 'long-form qâṭâl', 'x-qâṭâl') imperfect(ive), prefix conjugation (PC), PRE1 (DeCaen), PK (LF) (Richter), x-Y1Q1O1 (Niccacci).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epistemic</td>
<td>the function [+MOD, -VOL] (from Greek ἐστι ἔγνω, 'knowledge'); the modal system concerned with opinions, e.g. English subjunctive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>thematic role.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive</td>
<td>type of illocutionary force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hortative</td>
<td>sub-type of Deontic—Directive modal force.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hâ’ qâṭâl</td>
<td>(also 'Contemporaneous Cursive') identifying nominal clause.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I-system
the class of forms (analogous to English indicative) centred on qatal (‘perfective’) and also including: continuation form wayyiqtol. Supplemented by the person-unmarked form qatal (‘predicative participle’).

Illocutionary force
Constitutive, Assertive, Declarative, Directive, Commissive, Expressive.

Imperative
Deontic function, and the corresponding D-system forms; sentence-type paradigmatic with Interrogative and Declarative; treated here alongside Interrogative and Negative.

imperative
the verbal form qatal, the morphological imperative (from Latin impero, ‘to command’).

Indicative
the function [MOD].

Interrogative
sentence-type paradigmatic with Imperative and Declarative; treated here alongside Negative and Imperative.

Linguistic Attitude
Discourse vs. Narrative.

main/subordinate clause
also independent/dependent clause.

Modality
the grammatical reflex of assertivitiy or reality, in particular, [±MODAL. ±VOLITIOINAL].

Mood
the formal realisation of modality in the D- or E-systems of Biblical Hebrew.

MTA
Mood-Tense-Aspect.

Negative
opposite polarity to Affirmative; sentence-type treated here alongside Interrogative and Imperative.

NP
Nominal Phrase.

obligative
sub-type of Deontic–Directive modal force.

optative
sub-type of Deontic–Expressive modal force.

Patient
thematic role.

performative
a speech act.

permissive
sub-type of Deontic–Directive modal force.

polarity
Negative vs. Affirmative.

precative
sub-type of Deontic–Directive modal force.

prohibitive
sub-type of Deontic–Directive modal force.

Ps(s)
Psalms, Psalter.

pt(s)
other psalmic Old Testament texts.

qatal
(also ‘imperative’).

qatal
(also ‘Contemporaneous’ participle).

qatal ha’
(also ‘Contemporaneous Constatve’ classifying nominal clause.

qatal
(also ‘Anterior’) perfective, suffix conjugation (SC), SUFF (DeCaen), SK (Richter), QATAL (Nicacci).

Referential
exophoric reference to real-world context.

Relational
endophoric reference to linguistic context.

Speaker/Addresser
situationally-dependent referential terms indicating hypothetical ‘players’ in a communicative event.

S
Clause.

Tense
the grammatical reflex of time, in particular, [±PAST].

Thematic role
syntactic function, e.g. Agent, Patient, Experiencer, Beneficiary.

volitional
a less technical equivalent to Deontic (from Latin volo, ‘to want’).

VP
Verb Phrase.

wayyiqtol
imperfectum consecutive, wayyPRE2 (DeCaen), wa=PK (KF) (Richter), WAYYIQTOL (Nicacci).

wayqatal
consecutive perfect.

‘agqatal
(also ‘cohortative’).

* unattested (in examples from modern languages);

unattested (in Biblical Hebrew examples).

* ‘Is pragmatically equivalent to’.

Capitalisation is used in the text for certain technical terms including the two types of deixis (Referential, Relational), the three primary acts (Psmist, God, Enemy), the two types of Psalms discourse (Praise and Lament), the various thematic roles, the three types of modality (Indicative, Epistemic, Deontic), the three sentence types (Declarative, Interrogative, Imperative), the two types of polarity (Negative and, when marked, Affirmative) and the six types of illocutionary force (Constitutive, Assertive, Declarative, Directive, Commissive, Expressive). Common Negative, Interrogative and Imperative particles are transliterated.

All biblical references are to the Psalter unless otherwise stated, and only Psalm citations are vocalised. Translated are marked as my own (ALW) or from the NRSV.
Chapter 1
INTRODUCTION

An overview is attempted here of previous treatments of Psalmsic language. Then work from several fields in comparative linguistic semantics and pragmatics, and from Hebrew Narrative syntax research, is introduced as the basis for the ensuing treatment of Biblical Hebrew.

1. Language of the Psalter

The language of the Biblical book of Psalms has often been looked at in rhetorical terms, ranging from popular appreciation of its deep expressiveness and vitality to more technical descriptions by linguists. A characterisation of the latter type is given by Collins:

... variation of the modes of discourse is an observable feature in the language of the psalms. The most striking quality of this variation, however, is its abruptness. The readiness to permit abrupt changes in modes is a distinctive characteristic of psalm composition .... Besides being frequent and abrupt the variation is also quite arbitrary. There appears to be considerable freedom of choice in the selection of the mode of discourse from one verse to the next ... there are no rules of the grammar of psalm composition which restrict the use of the options available. ... linguistic environment does not appear to be a governing factor ....

It is this ‘variation of the modes of discourse’ which underlies the present work. Collins uses the term to refer to the rhetorical or text-type features, ‘narration, reflection, direct address, invocation, interrogation, petition etc.’, explaining that each mode of discourse is characterized by observable linguistic features: e.g. the grammatical person selected for the verbs and pronouns, the tense and mood of the verbs, the use of vocative interjections etc.

It is these linguistic features which are investigated here. The two most significant of Collins’s ‘observable linguistic features’, reference (pronominal and morphological) and mood (whether marked in the verb or the clause), are systematised, and the latter classified in terms of typological modalities. I contend that the ‘dynamic of faith and crisis in prayer’,² so integral to the rhetorical dynamic of the Psalms, lies in pronominal and modal shifts, together with the fore- and backgrounding of actants and actions which this effects. The power of these prayers lies in the very fact that

There is no fixed syntagmatic relationship between the units, no prescribed order in which they must occur³

In other words, the Psalms thrive on the rhetorical figure of oratio variata.⁴

²Collins, ‘Decoding the Psalms’, 46.
³Collins, ‘Decoding the Psalms’, 45.
The following section reviews some of the existing literature on the language of the biblical Psalms, attempting to characterise that distinct idiom used in Biblical Hebrew verse, מושף, Dialectica Poetica\textsuperscript{5} or 'die Dichtersprache'.\textsuperscript{6}

1.1. Lexis

The distinctive lexis of the Psalter was noted by Gesenius,\textsuperscript{7} who lists both poetic variants for common words used in prose:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Mench: prose סמך; verse סמך.
  \item Pfad: prose pro; verse pro.
  \item Wort: prose pro; verse pro.
  \item Schauer: verse pro; verse pro.
\end{itemize}

and words ('poet. Epitheta') which occur with a different meaning in verse:

\begin{itemize}
  \item אבק: verse pro; verse pro.
  \item בור: verse pro; verse pro.
  \item לילה: verse pro; verse pro.
\end{itemize}

Many of these and similar differences between the lexis of prose and verse can be accounted for by the later date—or later redaction—of certain Psalms, or the use of archaisms.

Tsevat's A Study of the Language of the Biblical Psalms,\textsuperscript{8} though relying on a rather simplistic methodology,\textsuperscript{9} identifies a number of lexical items which can be confidently asserted to belong to a distinct psalmic idiom. It is striking how many of these terms can be classified into groups referring to the Psalms' three primary acts:\textsuperscript{10}

\begin{itemize}
  \item Occurring solely in Psalms (occurring predominantly in Psalms\textsuperscript{11})
  \item 1. Psalmist and community
  \item 2. God Abstractions, Names, Metaphors
  \item 3. Enemies
\end{itemize}

This represents around 40% of those terms which occur solely in the Psalms and 20% of those which occur predominantly there, showing that lexical multiplication is an important feature in participant reference. Two other words identified by Tsevat as predominantly psalmic are קָדוֹם and בּּוֹל, both of a 'modal' character.\textsuperscript{12}

Further major categories are the terms for praise/prayer שָׁלוֹם, שִׁיר, פָּנָי, and for law וְהָיָה, וַיְהִי, and for law וַיֵּלֶד, לְבָרָךְ, לְבָרָךְ, מְלֻכֵו, מְלֻכֵו, מְלֻכֵו. These six lexical groupings together account for over 35% of the words occurring solely or predominantly in the Psalter and already give insight into the distinctive Psalms language. It is concerned, above all, with the relationship between three primary acts, particularly in terms of praise (Psalms to God) and conformity with the law (Psalms against Enemy).

Hebrew poetic language has been described as exhibiting 'überhaupt eine kräftige Kürze des Ausdrucks'.\textsuperscript{13} In grammatical terms this is largely true—psalmic language is highly elliptical and syntactically economical; however, extensive multiplication of lexical items and synonymous parallelism contribute to what is in fact a high level of redundancy.\textsuperscript{14} This accounts, at least in part, for the characteristic lexis of the Psalms. The term פָּרָשָׁה, 'commandments', for example, occurs only in Psalms, including twenty-one times in the Torah-Psalms 119, where other words for commandments are also used extensively; the need for variation has led to the use of a less common term from the wider lexical stock of the language. The same point could be made for the use of בְּשָׁלוֹם and בְּהָלָל in synonymous parallelism\textsuperscript{15} and for the multiplication of divine names in Psalm 57:

\begin{itemize}
  \item אתַּאֲרוֹמָהּ תַּאֲרוֹמָהּ לְאָלֹם דְּמָאָלֶיךָ.
\end{itemize}

I cry to God Most High, to God who fulfills his purpose for me. (NRSV)

We may conclude from this brief sketch that the lexis of the Psalter is highly 'marked', in the sense that, compared with standard prose, terms chosen will often carry features such as archaism or Aramaic derivation (taken, that is, from the wider chronological and geographical lexical stock of the language), or be in some other way unusual (perhaps having a usually more restricted range of meaning).

1.2. Morphology

In defence of the lexical emphasis of his study, Tsevat argues that,

One cannot expect major morphological differences between the idioms of various types of biblical literature. The speaker or writer may alter his vocabulary in a given situation, but he can hardly apply another set of verbal prefixes without the risk of speaking or writing unintelligibly. Nor does the poetical

\textsuperscript{5}Sapping, R. The Typical Features of the Syntax of Biblical Poetry in its Classical Period (Jerusalem: Kinyar Sepher, 1981) IV.


\textsuperscript{7}Gesenius-Kautzsch, Grammatik, 17 §2s.


\textsuperscript{9}Tsevat, Language of the Biblical Psalms, 6-9.

\textsuperscript{10}See ch. 2, section 1 below.

\textsuperscript{11}For criteria for this, see Tsevat, Language of the Biblical Psalms, 7.

\textsuperscript{12}Though מְלֻכֵו is completely absent from the Psalter, despite 72 occurrences elsewhere in the Old Testament; Tsevat, Language of the Biblical Psalms, 31; Barr, J., 'Why? in Biblical Hebrew', JTS 36 (1985) 1-33.

\textsuperscript{13}Gesenius-Kautzsch, Grammatik, 17 §2s.

\textsuperscript{14}Prinsloo refers to 'word pairs and parallelism to retard progression', and to the ultimate intention of this as 'facilitation of the communication process'; Prinsloo, W.S., 'A Comprehensive Semiotic Exegetical Approach', OTE 7/4 (1994) 78-83 (82).

\textsuperscript{15}22:7; 80:18; 140:2 (49:2 arguably reflects a class distinction between the two).
structure of the psalms allow for the development of a syntax appreciably different from other types of biblical verse.16

The same point is expressed in a more balanced way by Waltke and O’Connor:

Poeic traditions (and to a lesser extent all literary traditions) preserve older vocabulary and grammatical forms that have been lost from ordinary speech and plain prose. The lexical and morphological resources thus tend to be larger. These linguistic facts interact in complex ways with other structural features of Hebrew verse. It is important to see the grammar in poetry in the context of Hebrew grammar. Loose notions of a special vocabulary and grammar of poetry are linguistically uninformed.17

This point is essential to the present work. I argue that but modal verb forms and clause types occur by definition only in the text-type known as Discourse (as against Narrative).18 No such grammatical distinction can then be made within Discourse verse and ‘ordinary speech’—it is only at the ‘macro-structural’, ‘stylistic’ or ‘rhetorical’ level that they may be distinguished. The following morphological distinctions of the Psalter are therefore to be explained, just as the above lexical distinctives, simply in terms of diachronic change, borrowing and variation.

Morphological distinctions include:19

1. The use of unusual pronominal suffixes:

1st-person singular in יי with prepositions (139:11 (בּוּל); בּוּל); 2nd-person feminine singular in יי with singular substantives (103:3 (לְוגֵל) and verbs (137:6 (לְוגֵל); לְוגֵל); and in יי with plural substantives (103:4 (לְגִּל) and prepositions (116:7 (לְגִּל); לְגִּל) and 3rd-person singular and plural in יי with substantives, i.e. and prepositions (12:12 (לְגִּל); לְגִּל) and verbs (5:11 (לְגִּל); לְגִּל).

2. On the verb, the long (non-apocopated) imperative of הָבָל (31:3 (לִכְּבָל); also uncontracted nun energeticum (72:15 (לְכָּבָל); לְכָּבָל) and apparently functionless -ד (adhortative and cohoritative; see ch. 6 below).

3. On the noun, the literae compaginis (114:8 (לְכָּבָל); בּוּל) and enclitic mem (59:6 (לְכָּבָל); בּוּל; אָלָל) a plural absolute in (144:2 (לְכָּבָל); בּוּל) and use of the pluralis intensivus (103:4 (לְכָּבָל); בּוּל); also prefixed nominal patterns (88:19 (לְכָּבָל); בּוּל) and reduplicating plurals (133:3 (לְכָּבָל); בּוּל).

4. Among the prepositions, long unsuffixed forms of those which normally take plural suffixes (32:5 (לְכָּבָל); בּוּל) and non-redundicating suffixed (18:23 (לְכָּבָל); בּוּל).

5. Non-elision of (36:6 (לְכָּבָל); בּוּל)

Thus the morphology of the Psalter is ‘marked’ in that otherwise unusual forms, which are often archaic, are frequently used, with the result that forms ‘draw attention to themselves’.

---

17Waltke-O’Connor, Syntax, 58-59 §3.4c.
18See below on Weisrich/Schneidereich.
19This is just a selection of some more striking forms. More extensive surveys have already been made: Daubod, M. and Penar, T., The Grammar of the Psalter, in Psalms (The Anchor Bible 17A; New York: Doubladay, 1965-70) 361-456; Tsevat, Language of the Biblical Psalms.

---

1.3. Syntax

In his Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen, Bergsträsser characterised the syntax of Biblical Hebrew in general as principally governed by three elements: the verbal system, alternation between synode and asyndesis, and the use of particular word order patterns;20 he went on to speak of the freedom with which these may be used (compare Collins above) and the resulting poetic potential:

Die beherrschenden syntaktischen Ausdrucksmodell des Hebräischen sind das reich entwickelte Verbalystem, der Wechsel zwischen grundsätzlicher Syndese und gelegentlicher besonderer Ausdrucksweisen dienender Asyndese, und die Verwendung bestimmter Stellungstypen—von den einfachen Unterschieden der Stellung Subjekt-Verb oder umgekehrt bis zu komplizierten Formen. Schon mit diesen Mitteln gelingt es, auch Unterordnung auszudrücken. Für die Verwendung dieser Mittel besteht ziemliche Bewegungsfreiheit. So ist das Hebr. eine muenchen- und farbenreiche Sprache, vorzüglich befähigt zum Ausdruck gesteigerten Erlebens wie zu lebendiger Schilderung und anschaulicher Erzählung, ohne doch einen hohen Grad gedanklicher Schürfe zu erreichen; eine Dichter- und Prophetens-, keine Denkersprache.21

Distinguishing verse, Nicacci writes that,

Poetry has its own rules concerning the use of tense and, unfortunately, they are still mysterious; they cannot be derived from prose and vice versa. In contrast with prose, poetry offers a very limited number of linguistic markers for identifying the function of individual forms and verbal constructions in a text.22

Tsevat has characterised the language of the Psalter itself:

This condensed speech frequently contains the syntactic essentials alone. Subordinate clauses are rare, and subordinating conjunctions even more so. All this restricts the possibility of syntactic varieties. On the other hand, word order is so free that there is hardly a standard from which deviations may be noted. Finally, the use of the so-called tense often escapes syntactical regulation.23

What these comments show is that the syntax (as above, the morphology) of Hebrew verse is stylistically but not systematically different from that of prose.24 If the stylistic distinctive of the Psalms’ morphology is markedness, in terms of there being so many unusual forms, that of their syntax is unmarkedness, in that distinct functions are much less consistently marked formally than in prose. Some characteristic features which have been noted include:25

---

20For the first and last of these, see ch. 3 below.
21Bergsträsser, G., Einführung in die semitischen Sprachen: Sprechproben und grammatische Skizzen (München: Max Hueber Verlag, 1928) 45-46.
25See also Daubod and Penar, ‘Grammar of the Psalter’. 
1. Omission of the relative particle ْلِّيَّةٍ، the direct-object marker، the adverbial use of nouns ْلِّيَّةٍ، omission of a preposition occurring in an a-colon from a synonymously parallel b-colon، use of ‘double-duty’ suffixes، asyndeton in general.

2. Use of prepositions to refer to a place before movement and avoidance of ْلِّيَّةٍ، status constructus before prepositions.

3. Extended role of prepositions, relative particles, question words and Negation.

4. Use of a pronominal copula (though never in early poetry).

5. Unusual uses of the verbal conjugations, such as the jussive used with personification of natural elements، qātā used statively.

6. Anarthrous use of certain nouns ْلِّيَّةٍ، and divine epithets ْلِّيَّةٍ، ْلِّيَّةٍ، ْلِّيَّةٍ، ْلِّيَّةٍ، ْلِّيَّةٍ.

7. Lack of agreement in number or between participial predicates and in number by the suffix of ْلِّيَّةٍ، referring to a plural antecedent، 3rd-person agreement in a relative clause with a vocative.

8. One-member sentences, whether in the form of exclamations (e.g. ْلِّيَّةٍ، ْلِّيَّةٍ، ْلِّيَّةٍ، ْلِّيَّةٍ، ْلِّيَّةٍ)، or one-member possessive sentences (e.g. ْلِّيَّةٍ، ْلِّيَّةٍ، ْلِّيَّةٍ، ْلِّيَّةٍ، ْلِّيَّةٍ).

9. Expression of comparison by coordination (comparant--compare).

10. Separation of a relative clause from its antecedent.

Sappan, in his Typical Features of the Syntax of the Psalms, has suggested that some syntactic phenomena occur in the Psalms for metrical and euphonic reasons: in order to give the statement a fuller sound than that of the bare verbal form.

---

Introduction

He includes in this the redundant use of the independent personal pronoun, the copula, the infinitive absolute and an internal (cognate) object. He further uses transformations to argue for parallelism between active and passive forms, or where there is ellipsis.

Syntactical studies have been made of the Psalter by Battle (generative grammar), Michel, textlinguistics, Gibson and O’Connor. Discourse analysis of Psalms is practiced in particular by Bible translators, such as Bliese, Graber, Wendland, Bratcher and Reyburn.

1.4. Sociolinguistics

Sociolinguistics considers extra-grammatical features such as power-relations between actants, the requirements of face-saving/giving and politeness. These factors are particularly important in the study of the particles in Hebrew, such as Bronger on h̄êl̄ and Wilt on -nêm, as well as studies of Deontic forms, such as Finley on ‘the proposal’. Collins has also used them in his characterisation of the Psalter. The terms Speaker and Addressee are used here to refer to the actants within the speech situation, thus interacting with the other referential categories of grammatical person (1st, 2nd, 3rd) and what I call rhetorical person (God, Psalmist, Enemy). They refer to hypothetical ‘players’ in a communicative context, not actual processors/receptors, and are hence also used where Psalms were most probably originally composed (and perhaps even intended to be received) in written form.

There is, of course, a lot of Speaker-switching in the Psalms, as well as many cases—including, most crucially, with Deontic forms—where the identity of the Addressee is unclear.

---

Sappan, Syntax of Biblical Poetry, X-XI. One might also consider in this respect Chomsky’s Negative and modal transformations (see section 3 below).


O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure.


Collins, ‘Decoding the Psalms’.
When the Addressee is God, there is usually no evidence that he has heard the Psalmist (hence my use of ‘Speaker-Addressse’ rather than ‘Speaker-Hearer’.

1.5. Formulaic Composition

In ancient times nobody sought to be original. The shelter of convention, however awkward to modern readers, was abandoned only in case of utmost need. In the oral communication with God, psalm language and form were the shelter. They covered great and small, the lonely genius and the man in charge of the regular Temple service.51

Culley’s *Oral Formulaic Language in the Biblical Psalms*52 has had a major impact on the way most modern researchers read the psalms. It has been the primary introduction to Biblica studies of the oral composition studies of the Homeric scholars Lord and Parry.53 Though this categorisation of formulas is often too strict (I see standard formulas as influencing many texts: which share no lexical items and little surface structure), his formulaic systems and formulas constitute the basis for much syntactical analysis of the Psalms. Work on these formulae leads into a better appreciation of syntactical structures throughout psalmic language.

The oral composition perspective has been considered an important factor in translation of the Psalms.54 A comparable category of ‘sememes’ has been used by Collins,55 and the word pair in Hebrew poetry has been argued to be also ‘formulaic’ in Culley’s sense.56

The rapidly-expanding field of Biblical Hebrew poetics has not been considered central to the present work, since we are concerned with Discourse as against Narrative, rather than verses as against prose. Some of the most important recent contributions have been those by Kugel,57 Watson,58 O’Connor59 and Alonso Schökel.60

---

51Culley, Language of the Biblical Psalms, 37.
53The work of these scholars has also been applied to several other fields, including e.g. the Qur’an; Neuwirth, A., *Studien zur Komposition der mekkanischen Suren* (Studien zur Sprache, Geschichte und Kultur des islamischen Orients NF 10; Berlin: Walter der Gruyter, 1981).
59O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure.
2. Theoretical Background

2.1. Comparative Semantics

The study of Biblical Hebrew has centred in recent years around tense-aspect and discourse features of the verbal system. Modal semantics has been neglected. Therefore this sector reviews some of the results of comparative linguistic research into semantics and pragmatics before they are applied in subsequent chapters to Biblical Hebrew.

2.1.1. Communication Theory

There is more to language than just its propositional content. Various terms have been used to define five primary communicative functions:76

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Grammatical Person</th>
<th>Pragmatic Role</th>
<th>Linguistic Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Referential</td>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Pragmatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SociaI</td>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>Addressee</td>
<td>Pragmatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Pragmatics/Pragmatics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Cogntext</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These distinctions are important at many points in this thesis. ‘Referential’ as a semantic/pragmatic function, connecting text ‘exophorically’ with real-world context; contrasts most distinctly with ‘Relation’, a syntactic function, connecting text ‘endophorically with linguistic context’. Hence first and second-person pronouns will tend to refer Referentially to Speaker and Addressee in Discourse, whilst third-person pronouns may refer either Referentially in Discourse (often supported by a nod or pointing towards the person concerned) or Relationally in Narrative, anaphorically picking up an earlier reference to a particular ‘actant’. ‘Interpersonal’ and ‘Vocative’ are purely pragmatic functions, governed by (and uninterpretable without) a speech situation with Speaker and Addressee. ‘Interpersonal’ has often been subdivided into that which is Speaker-oriented (‘Expressive’) and that which is Speaker/Addressee-oriented (‘Social’); this distinction is clarified by speech acts (when defined according to Speaker-Addressee relations) or modality (see below). ‘Vocative’ is usually Addressee-oriented and may involve ‘instrumental’ function (Speaker attempting to influence Addressee), hence ‘Conative’. These relationships may be depicted, reordered, as follows:

This thesis deals principally with modality in the Psalter, hence it is situated in the first three of these fields. Syntax is not treated extensively, though super-sentential syntax in the form of textlinguistics (see below) does inform the analysis. In the study of Psalms, more than perhaps in any other body of text, we may say that

the time has surely come to … replace ontological arguments with functional arguments, for what is important to readers, critics and authors alike, is what literature does, and not what it means.81

This is then the contribution of speech-act theory.

2.1.2. Speech-Act Theory

Speech-act theory, as first presented in John Austin’s 1955 Oxford lectures, posthumously published as How to do Things with Words,82 and continued particularly by Searle,83 contrasts ‘constative’ and ‘performative’ utterances (only for Austin to explode his own distinction in ch. 10, see below). Functionally, ‘performative’ are utterances such as ‘I hereby name this ship the Mr. Stalin’, which are not truth-conditional (cannot be denied) and are token-reflexive (they refer to themselves—‘I hereby …’).84 They perform ‘speech acts’ or ‘illocutionary acts’, defined most famously by Austin as the

76 Referential may also be known as: Transactional, Propositional, Cognitive, Designative, Representational Semantic, Factual-Notional, Experiential; Interpersonal may also be known as: Interactional, Atitudinal; Social may also be known as: Interaction-Management Information, Phatic Communication (Malinowski).
77 Also lists ‘metalinguistic’ and ‘poetic’: Levinson, S.C., Pragmatics (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics Cambridge: CUP, 1983) 41.
80 Referential ‘Relational’ is used by Richter, W., Grundlagen einer elliptischen Grammatik, 3 vols (ATAT 8 10, 13; St. Ottilien: EOS, 1978-80) 1, 81; and ‘Context’ ‘Context’ by Loprieno, A., Ancient Egyptian: A Linguistic Introduction (Cambridge: CUP, 1995) 80-83, both in discussions of deixis (see ch. 2 below). ‘Endophoric’ (anaphorice/aphorice) ‘Exophoric’ is coined by Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R., Cohesion in English (English Language Series No. 9; London: Longman, 1976) 33, where they note that ‘Exophora is not merely a synonym for referential meaning’, but refers to referential function.
84 Token-reflexivity is the characteristic of self-reference in sentences such as ‘This sentence contains five words’ or ‘I hereby send you’; Levinson, Pragmatics, 57; Lyons, Semantics 1, 13-15.
performance of an act in saying something as opposed to performance of an act of saying something.\textsuperscript{85} Austin demonstrates that performative function can in fact be achieved in any grammatical form (person, voice, mood, tense), that the 'explicit performative' form 'I hereby ...' can achieve many other functions (habitual, 'historic present') and that some speech acts have no corresponding explicit performatives (e.g. '*I insult you!'). Nevertheless, his basic characterisation is helpful. Austin's preliminary formal distinction reads as follows:

... any utterance which is in fact a performative should be reducible, or expandable, or analysable into form, or reproducible in a form, with a verb in the first person singular present indicative active (grammatical).\textsuperscript{86}

The mark of a performative verb is then that

there is an asymmetry of a systematic kind between [this first person singular present indicative active] an other persons and tenses of the very same verb.\textsuperscript{87}

Thus for example, 'I bet' is (usually) performative, whilst 'he bets' and 'I betted' are not, be describe what happens/happened when he says or I said, 'I bet'.

Speech acts are considered as comprising three components:\textsuperscript{88}

- **Locutionary act**
  - Meaning — the utterance of a sentence with determinate sense and reference
  - e.g. Saying, 'Shoot her!'

- **Illocutionary act**
  - Force — the making of a statement, offer, promise, etc. in uttering a sentence, by virtue of the conventional force associated with it (or with its explicit performativ paraphrase)
  - e.g. ordering, urging or advising the Addressee to shoot her.

- **Perlocutionary act**
  - Achieving of certain effects — the bringing about of effects on the audience by means of uttering the sentence, such effects being special to the circumstances of utterance
  - e.g. persuading, forcing or frightening the Addressee into shooting her.

The logical structure of the illocutionary act itself has three elements:\textsuperscript{89}

- **Phrasic**
  - propositional content, \( p \)

- **Tropic**
  - 'sign of mood' — the kind of speech act

- **Neustic**
  - 'sign of subscription' to the speech act

The illocutionary force of an utterance is thus the product of its tropic and its neustic. The tropic distinguishes between statements ('it is so'), questions ('is it so?') and mands ('so be it!'), whilst the neustic distinguishes the Speaker's commitment to what he is saying (e.g. request vs. command, possibility vs. necessity, permission vs. obligation).

There are five basic classes of illocutionary force in Searle's system:\textsuperscript{90}

1. **Declaratives** (Exegetes, Declarations, Explicit Performatives) e.g. 'I hereby excommunicate you.'
   - 'I hereby ...' — Assertion of influence or exercising of power; effect immediate changes in the institutional state of affairs and tend to rely on elaborate extra-linguistic institutions.
2. **Assertives** (Verdictives, Representatives; cf. 'Referential' above) e.g. 'I hereby assert that ...
   - 'X is true' (conviction) — Exercise of judgement; giving a finding as to something (fact, or value) which is for different reasons hard to be certain about; commit S to truth of expressed proposition.
3. **Directives** (compare 'Vocative/Conative' above) e.g. 'I hereby request that ...
   - 'H is to do something' (wish) — Attempts by S to get H to do something.
4. **Commissives**
   - 'S will do something' (intention) — Assuming of an obligation or declaring of an intention — promising or otherwise undertaking, declarations or announcements of intention; commit S to some future action.
5. **Expressives** (Behabitives; compare 'Expressive' above) e.g. 'I hereby thank you.'
   - 'S's attitude' — Adopting of an attitude; social behaviour; express a psychological state in S.

The 'Performative Hypothesis', outlined in Austin's chapter 10, argues that

... every sentence has as its highest clause in deep or underlying syntactic structure a clause of [a] form ... that corresponds to the evert prefix in the explicit performative.\textsuperscript{91}

In other words every utterance has prefixed to it a higher clause of the form

'I (hebey) \( \psi \) you (that) \( S \)'

and so even statements ('constatives') can be seen to be 'performative'. This result is intuitively correct — we know that any utterance presented as objectively true remains relative to the Speaker, and that its truth conditions lie not only with the propositional content of \( S \), but also with the higher clause of saying. The Performative Hypothesis is highly debatable as a theory of how language actually functions,\textsuperscript{92} but it has proven useful in the study of Biblical Hebrew in the analysis of vocatives and focus-markers.\textsuperscript{93}

Speech-act theory was first introduced to many Biblical scholars by Walter Houston\textsuperscript{94}, and it has been widely received, informing work by MacDonald,\textsuperscript{95} Zatelli\textsuperscript{96} and, on Psalms,

---

\textsuperscript{85}Austin, How to do Things with Words, 99-100; also cited in White, H.C. (ed.). Speech Act Theory and Biblical Criticism, 3.

\textsuperscript{86}Austin, How to do Things with Words, 61-62.

\textsuperscript{87}Austin, How to do Things with Words, 63.

\textsuperscript{88}Based on Levinson, Pragmatics, 236, and Austin, How to do Things with Words, ch. 10.

\textsuperscript{89}Hare cited in Lyons, Semantics 2:749.

\textsuperscript{90}Based on Levinson, Pragmatics, 240; Searle, Expression and Meaning; Austin, How to do Things with Words, ch. 12; Gross, H., Einführung in die germanistische Linguistik (Munich: iudicum verlag GmbH, 1990) 151-53.

\textsuperscript{91}Levinson, Pragmatics, 247, also 244.

\textsuperscript{92}See argumentation in Levinson, Pragmatics, 243-263.

\textsuperscript{93}McConnon, Hebrew Verse Structure, 79-82.


Irsigler. There has been a Semesia volume devoted entirely to the application of speech-act theory to biblical texts as well as, most recently, an impressive study by Wagner.

Speech-act theory stands conceptually between communicative function (above) and modality (below); in the words of John Lyons,

the theory of speech-acts ... gives explicit recognition to the social or interpersonal dimension of language-behaviour and provides a general framework ... for the discussion of the syntactic and semantic distinctions that linguists have traditionally described in terms of mood and modality.

It must be noted, however, that, at both the communication-theoretical and speech-act levels, no utterance has just one function. This is borne out by the difficulty of establishing a classificatory scheme for communicative functions (e.g. Social may overlap with Conative), the polyvalency of any given utterance (though a pure Expressive function is considered by Lyons and one might argue for the monovalency of explicit performatives), the lack of one-to-one correlation between communicative functions and illocutionary force, Austin's demonstration that even Conatives are in some sense 'performative', and the lack of one-to-one correlation between functional categories (communicative function, illocutionary force, utterance type) and formally distinct moods or modal markers.

2.1.3. Modality

Jeder Satz realisiert eine Satzart - [sentence type], (mindestens) eine Leistungsfunktion [utterance type] und eine Modalität [modality].

The functional analyses of communication and speech-act theory discussed above correlate with the formal study of typological grammatical modality. Modality has been variously understood as the expression of 'attitudes and opinions', different speech acts, subjectivity, non-factivity, non-assertion, non-actuality or remoteness, possibility and necessity, 'eingeschränkte Gültigkeit'; it is expressed in different languages by verbal moods, modal

verbs, particles, clitics or even simply intonation. Some of the modal systems and functions which Palmer finds grammaticalised in the languages of the world are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEMANTIC</th>
<th>FUNCTION</th>
<th>GRAMMATICAL FORM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utterance Type</td>
<td>Utterance Type</td>
<td>Modality Systems and Functions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEMENT</td>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>EPISTEMIC (possibility/necessity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEMENT</td>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>JUDGEMENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATEMENT</td>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td>IMPERATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>DEONIC (permission/obligation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>VOLITIVES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>EXCLAMATIONS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


99Lyons, Semantics 2, 725.

100Lyons, Semantics 1, 1-5.

101Lyons, Semantics 1, 79-80.

102Lyons, Semantics 1, 3, 48.

103Lyons, Semantics 2, 796 n. 4.


106Examples are given in French and German where modal forms are not available in English. They may be translated as follows: Conditional: If he is rich; Hypothetical: If he were rich; Concessive: Though he is rich; Speculative: He is probably rich, He is perhaps rich; Quotative: He is said to be rich. Prescriptive: He is to go. Palmer also refers to the 'Discourse' and 'Speaker/Hearer knowledge' systems of some languages.

2.1.3.1. Utterance Type

The above presentation begins on the left with the three basic utterance types, statement, question and mandate, extended to four if exclamatory is included. The answer to a question may in some systems be distinguished from a statement. 'Mand' is used by Lyons to refer to that subclass of directives where the speaker wants the action carried out; it is classified above sociolinguistically according to the relationship between speaker and addressee.

2.1.3.2. Illocutionary Force

The five types of performative utterance and the supposedly non-performative constatives can be considered in relation to the four primary utterance types and their grammatical realizations.

Constatives are truth-conditional, 'non-modal' utterances, in which 'we abstract from the illocutionary ... aspects of the speech-act, and we concentrate on the locutionary'. They are characterized by the indicative in declarative sentences making a statement:

e.g. 'It is raining.'  

Explicit perf.: '(It is true that ... it is raining)'

Because constatives are theoretically opposed to performatives (though Austin himself finally shows them to be in fact equally 'performative') and 'non-modal', they are excluded from the present work.

Assertives involve an element of objective doubt. They are therefore characterized by expressing modal verbs or the subjunctive in declarative sentences making a statement:

e.g. 'It will be raining in London by now.' Explicit perf.: 'I hereby assert that ... it is raining there.'

Declaratives have extralinguistic function and must be non-modal, since they are token-reflexive. They are characterized by expressing the first-person simple present indicative in declarative sentences making a statement:

e.g. 'I hereby name this ship X.' Explicit perf.: 'I hereby declare that ... this ship is called X.'

Directives involve volition. They are characterized by expressing the imperative, jussive, cohortative, optative etc. in imperative sentences issuing a mand:

e.g. 'Come here!' Explicit perf.: 'I hereby command you to come here'

Commissives involve indirect volition (purpose); they are characterized by expressing the future in declarative sentences making a statement:

e.g. 'I will come tomorrow.' Explicit perf.: 'I hereby promise to come'

Expressives usually 'cannot be performed except by saying something', so that when expressed as an explicit performative, the same word is used. They are characterized by expressing interjections (of various origins) in exclamative sentences making an exclamation.

e.g. 'Thank you!'  

Explicit perf.: 'I hereby thank you'

Questions are problematic here. It is unclear from comparative study whether questions are properly classified as a kind of directive (getting the addressee to give information), or a kind of assertive (expressing doubt, with the indirect force of expecting information to be supplied). On the one hand, the common practice of analyzing questions as sub-types of mandates ... enable[s] us to handle the illocutionary force of the three main classes of utterances in terms of the two primitive notions of asserting and issuing mandates.

On the other hand, the verbal form of questions usually corresponds to that of statements. Lyons distinguishes between asking of an addressee a factual question (e.g. 'Is the door open?') and posing (with no addressee) a deliberative question (with the sense of 'I wonder whether the door is open'). He concludes that:

Corresponding statements and factual questions, on the one hand, and corresponding mandates and deliberative questions, on the other, can be said to have the same phrasic and tropic, but to differ in their neustic.

In other words, the binary opposition statement/mand [± Volition] is retained in the tropic ('sign of mood'), with assertion/doubt [± Doubt] superimposed upon it in the neustic ('sign of subscription') thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tropic</th>
<th>± Volition</th>
<th>± Doubt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neustic</td>
<td>'it is so'</td>
<td>'I say so'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'so be it'</td>
<td>'I don’t know'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Factual</td>
<td>Deliberative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

110 Lyons, Semantics 2, 745.
111 Lyons, Semantics 2, 746; coined by the behaviourist, B F. Skinner.
112>signifies 'greatest than' in terms of social hierarchy.
113Austin, How to Do Things with Words, 145-46.
114Austin, How to Do Things with Words, 120.
115Compare the discussion of deictic verbs in ch. 3, section 2.4.5. below.
117Lyons, Semantics 2, 753.
118So also Richter, Grundlagen 3, 185: 'Der Aussage kann die Frage zugeordnet werden.'
119Lyons, Semantics 2, 755.
120This presentation still seems problematic to me, since mandates and factual questions both require an addressee, whereas statements and deliberative questions do not.
2.1.3.3. Sentence Type

Declarative, Interrogative and Imperative are traditionally regarded as the three main classes of sentences and correspond characteristically to the three main utterance types, statement, question and mand. This is to say, undeniable, though only imperfect correspondences hold between formal and semantic features of language. However, it is well known that language involves form-to-function ‘skewing’ and that it is possible, for example, to issue a mand (e.g. ‘Tell me the time’) using a statement (e.g. wonder if you could tell me the time’) or a question (e.g. ‘Have you got the time?’). Levinson provides some amusing, yet quite idiomatic, examples:

Statement
I’d be much obliged if you’d close the door.
You ought to close the door.
It might help to close the door.
I am sorry to have to tell you to please close the door.

Question
Can you close the door?
Would you mind closing the door?
May I ask you to close the door?
Did you forget the door?
Now Johnny, what do big people do when they come in?
Okay, Johnny, what am I going to say next?

This skewing may be expressed in terms of sentences with literal force as against indirect speech acts (Austin, Searle), or natural meaning as against non-natural meaning (Grice). One might alternatively say that an utterance is ‘the pairing of a sentence and a context’ (Ba Hillel)—the meaning of a sentence is the domain of semantics; that of an utterance, the domain of pragmatics.

2.1.3.4. Modal Systems

It may be said that in the Epistemic modal system, the Speaker tries to get the words to match the world, whilst in the Deontic system (or strictly only in its Directive ‘core’), he tries to get the world to match the words. The modal forms of a given language may distinguish between these two systems (as in English subjunctive vs. imperative) or between strength of modality within the systems (as in English must vs. may).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tropic</th>
<th>EPISTEMIC (subjunctive)</th>
<th>DEONTIC (imperative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neutic</td>
<td>‘it is so’</td>
<td>‘so be it!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRONG</td>
<td>Necessity</td>
<td>Obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(must)</td>
<td>It must be raining</td>
<td>You must come in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I say so’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAK</td>
<td>Possibility</td>
<td>Permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(may)</td>
<td>It may be raining</td>
<td>You may come in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I don’t know’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future is usually classified as belonging to Epistemic modality. This is reflected in the use in English of a ‘modal verb’, will, and the formal analysis of the Arabic auxiliary sawfa as not a tense marker, but a ‘modal anchor’. As noted above, future represents Proximate illocutionary force, though related to the Deontic ‘promissives’.

This two-way distinction is expanded to four by von Wright:

| Aesthetic | modes of truth |
| Epistemic | modes of knowing |
| Deontic   | modes of obligation |
| Existential | modes of existence |

The distinction between Aesthetic and Epistemic is analogous to Austin’s distinction between Constatives and Assertives (which, as we have seen, he finally resolves). Palmer concludes:

... there is no formal grammatical distinction in English, and, perhaps, in no other language either, between alethic and epistemic modality. ... There is no distinction between the uses of to state what is logically true and what the speaker believes, as a matter of fact, to be true.

Existential sentences are considered in chapter 3 below.

A further ‘Dynamic’ modality is suggested by von Wright to describe utterances such as ‘Marcus can speak Welsh’ or simply, ‘Marcus speaks Welsh’. This corresponds strikingly to Joosten’s standard example of modal (potentialis) yiqtol for the general or habitual present.

121Lyons, Semantics 2, 745; ‘exclamatives’, ‘imprecatives’ and ‘optatives’ are also suggested by Levinson, Pragmatics, 42.
123Selected from Levinson, Pragmatics, 264-65.
124Levinson, Pragmatics, 263-76.
125Levinson, Pragmatics, 16-18.
126Levinson, Pragmatics, 18-19.
127For a further refinement of the distinction, see Levinson, S.C., ‘Three levels of meaning’, in Palmer, F.R. (ed Grammar and Meaning (FS Lyons; Cambridge: CUP, 1995) 90-115; see also comments above on how ti grammar of verse relates to that of prose.

128Palmer, Mood and Modality, 57-58, 98, though note his reservations, pp. 20-21; see also his discussion of have to and can, pp. 11, 103-4. See the application of this schema in Warren, A.L., ‘Did Moses permit Divorce? Modal weqyal as Key to NT Readings of Deuteronomy 24:1-4’, Tybphil 49.1 (1998) 39-56.
129Palmer, Mood and Modality, 216-18, also referring to the morphological futures of French and Russian.
130Shlonsky, Clause Structure and Word Order in Hebrew and Arabic, 96.
131Palmer, Mood and Modality, 11.
132Palmer, Mood and Modality, 12.
The door turns / will turn / can turn on its hinges.

This is discussed at length below.134

2.1.3.5. Mood

From comparative study, Palmer identifies, amongst others, the modalities in the table above. This list is, of course, neither systematic nor comprehensive, though it does cover the vast majority of the modal functions known to be grammaticalised in the languages of the world.

Judgements and Evidentials are commonly considered the two main types of Epistemic modality;135 the latter is not relevant to English or Biblical Hebrew. In Indo-European languages, Epistemic modality is characteristically expressed with the subjunctive, optative (Greek) or modal verbs (English).

The questionable status of Interrogative as Assertive (Epistemic) or Directive (Deontic) has been discussed above. Palmer accepts the possibility of understanding Interrogative modality as an independent category, which sometimes functions dubitatively (rather than necessarily vice versa).136 I tentatively follow Lyons's distinction between factual questions (Assertive-dubitativo) and deliberative questions (Directive-deliberativo).

The imperative can, depending on context, fulfill all of the functions listed in the left-hand column under mood and so is clearly unmarked for intensity (neutic). It may therefore be described as the unmarked member of the Directives just as the indicative is the unmarked member of the Assertives.137 In fact, it can be shown in Biblical Hebrew that the imperative may also fulfill non-Directive Deontic functions such as optative (e.g. 128:6, "כבר לא תיימן ילידך; ‘May you see your children’s children!’").

Formally, too, the imperative is unmarked, being most often the shortest verbal form in a language (e.g. Latin, English, French, German, Hebrew). Deontic function can be expressed in European languages, however, with imperative, subjunctive or optative moods. Similarly in Hebrew, we find Deontic function expressed with imperative qaṭṭal, long-form yiḥṭal (‘preceptive imperfect’) or even qaṭṭal (‘preceptive perfect’); meanwhile, the otherwise Deontic short-form yiḥṭal (‘jussive’) can be used in the dependent way yiḥṭal form.138

The attempt to get the world to match the words involves Directives when the Addressee has the power to act (hence, e.g. ‘request-cohortatives’) and Commissives when the Speaker has the power to act (hence ‘resolve-cohortatives’).

Expressives may be considered in two classes. Volitivis have Directive force without being addressed to the one with the power to act (i.e. Addressee ≠ agent) and are often used in indirect speech acts (e.g. Expressive ‘May I not be put to shame!’ in place of Directive ‘Don’t let me be put to shame!’). Optatives are realisables; desideratives are unrealisable. Intentional fits here as the opposite of fear, though it has also been included under Epistemic–purposive. Evaluatives include the Expressive side of warnings (Vocative), though this of course merges into Directive force (Conative).

At many points, as we have seen, clear distinctions cannot be made in the study of verbal mood, since no principled basis has yet been developed for modal distinctions. The above range of modal functions does provide a basis, however, for our consideration of Hebrew forms.

2.1.3.6. Hebrew Moods

The marked main-clause modal functions in Biblical Hebrew are listed by Richter as:

- Emphase, Wunsch, Eventualis, Frage, Verneumung, Beteuerung.139

These are expressed by both a range of modal particles and by verbal mood. Mood has been traditionally understood as only embracing the morphological imperative qaṭṭal, short-form yiḥṭal (‘jussive’) and ‘eqṭṭal (‘cohortative’). However, Joosten in particular has argued for a modal understanding of long-form yiḥṭal too, and this is key to the present work.140

2.1.4. Thematic Roles

Finally, we should mention an area of linguistic theory which has provided a framework for our study of reference. The argument structure (‘valency’) of lexical verbs and adjectives can be described by identifying the various ‘thematic roles’ which they assign. A fairly standard inventory of thematic roles might read as follows (where E [entity] is a person or thing, and P = ‘expressed by the predicate’):141

| Agent/Actor | E who intentionally initiates action P. |
| Patient/Goal | E undergoing action P. |
| Theme | E moved by action P. |
| Experiencer | E experiencing (psychological) state P. |
| Beneficiary/Benefactive | E benefiting from action P. |

---

134 See ch. 3, section 2.4.3.2.1. below.
135 Palmer, Mood and Modality, 57.
136 See Lyons, Semantics 2, 748.
137 Straightforward statements of fact (i.e. categorical assertions) may be described as epistemically non-modal (Lyons, Semantics 2, 797); ‘the imperative is “deontically non-modal”’ (Palmer, Mood and Modality, 29); ‘… the Impressive is best seen as the unmarked member of the deontic system, or rather of the directive sub-system, just as the Declarative is the unmarked member of the epistemic system’ (Palmer, Mood and Modality, 108). Similarly Richter, Grundzüge 3, 185: ‘Als neutrale Glieder werden Aussage und Aufforderung gesetzt’.
139 Richter, Grundzüge 3, 167.
140 See ch. 3 below.
Collins describes sentences as ‘conjugable’, he is referring to variation both in utterance type or mood, and in grammatical person.

Secondly, Collins looks at ‘patterns of relationships in force between the semantic constants’ (a more grammatically-informed equivalent of form criticism) and binary oppositions such as people (the just / the wicked), ways (right way / wrong way) and results (happiness / ruin). 150

Thirdly, Collins refers to ‘narrative analysis’, introducing Greimas’s ‘actantial model’ with intersecting axes of ‘communication’ (Sender gives Object to Recipient), ‘volition’ (Subject conveys Object to Recipient) and ‘power’ (Opponent impedes Subject; Sender sends Helper to Subject). 151 Such an analysis properly belongs to the field of ‘semiotics’. 152

Several of Collins’s points have been taken up in the present work, particularly the emphasis on utterance types, reference and mood, the identification of binary oppositions and the use of a sociolinguistic distinction between actants.

‘A Comprehensive Semiotic Exegetical Approach’ is described in a paper of the same title by Prinsloo. 153 ‘Semiotic’ means that ‘meaning is determined via the structure of the text’. 154 He emphasises the use of poetic conventions:

Poetic conventions are defined ... as the conscious ordering of language so that linguistic phenomena occur in a concentrated form at different language levels, with the result that the text concerned is classified as poetry. The language levels concerned are those of phonology, morphology and syntax. Linguistic phenomena include pattern formation on these three language levels, as well as conscious deviation from established patterns in order to achieve a particular effect. 155

Within the text, these poetic conventions have ‘segmenting, cohesive and communicative functions’ 156; in the terms of communication theory introduced above, one might then say that poetic conventions function Relationally and Interpersonally.

2.2. Biblical Hebrew Narrative Syntax

2.2.1. Traditional Syntax

In recent years, the classic traditional studies of Hebrew syntax 157 have been challenged by works with a much more sophisticated theoretical basis. Three full syntaxes, in particular, by

146Collins, ‘Decoding the Psalms’.
147Collins, ‘Decoding the Psalms’, 42.
148See section 2.2.3.2. below.
149Collins, ‘Decoding the Psalms’; 43.
150Collins, ‘Decoding the Psalms’, 48-52.
151Collins, ‘Decoding the Psalms’, 52-55.
157For example, König, E., Historisch-Comparative Syntax der hebräischen Sprache (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1897); Gesenius-Kautzsch, Grammatik; Bergsträsser, G., Hebräische Grammatik, II. Teil
2.2.2. Richter, Talstra and Automatic Text Processing

The Munich 'school' of Wolfgang Richter,161 Harald Schweizer,162 Walter Groß,163 Hubert Insinger164 and Theodor Seidel, all of whom publish in the ATAT series founded by Richter, has produced top quality linguistic work, which has suffered from over-fragmentation, making it inaccessable (or, probably more to the point, unattractive) to most traditional linguists. Their strictly distributionalist165 form-to-function methodology has (like that of Chomsky) been motivated by an interest in the computerised analysis of texts. Transliteration forms a part of this task, serving morphemic analysis,166 though there have also been a number of structural analyses of extended texts, including Psalms and other poetic texts.

Eep Talstra and the Werkgroep Informatica at the Free University of Amsterdam naturally (since they are also concerned with computers) share the Munich form-to-function method. They concentrate more on the textual level, however, and so overlap more with the equally form-based textlinguistics of the Weinrich-Niccacci tradition (as against the functional descriptions of Andersen-Longacre). Ironically in the light of his high-tech applications, Talstra continues to maintain, against Weinrich-Niccacci, that traditional grammar has much to contribute.

161Richter, Grundlagen; Untersuchungen zur Valenz, altsprachlicher Verben (ATAT 23/25; St. Ottilien: EOS, 1985/86).
166Richter, W., Biblia Hebraica transcripta (BHT) (ATAT 33; St. Ottilien: EOS, 1991/93), prepared in: Richter, W., Transliteration and Transcription—Objects and metasprachliche Metaziehensysteme zur Wiedergabe hebräischer Texte (ATAT 19; St. Ottilien: EOS, 1983).

2.2.3. Textlinguistics

Several surveys are available of the wide range of work produced in the 'textlinguistics',167 or super-sentential syntax, of Biblical Hebrew in the last thirty years;168 the present survey is therefore very cursory, concerned to fulfill only the requirements of the present study.

Most modern textlinguistic work on Biblical Hebrew deals with the interpretation of the Hebrew verbal conjugations (qāṭal—wayyiqtol vs. yiqtol—waqātāl) and word order (SVO/VSO) rather than with other discourse-level features such as the use of personal and demonstrative pronouns and particles. Such study is almost always based on some form of text-type identification.

Two of the most influential books in Hebrew textlinguistics have been Alviore Niccacci’s (formal) Syntax and Robert Longacre’s (functional) Joseph.169 Both authors refer to having become acquainted, via review articles by Eep Talstra,170 with Wolfgang Schneider’s Grammatik,171 which, in turn, bases its ‘Funktionsbestimmung der Tempora’ on Harald Weinrich’s Tempus: Besprochene und erzählte Welt. The influences can thus be traced as follows:


We will first consider the work of Weinrich and Niccacci, then turning separately (for reasons which will become obvious) to Longacre.

2.2.3.1. Weinrich to Niccacci—Form-to-Function

Niccacci was the first to take up the full implications of Weinrich’s textlinguistic interpretation of the linguistic category of ‘tense’. Weinrich had demonstrated that, in Indo-European languages (French, German, English), tense is not so much a temporal category, with Referential value, as a textual category, with Relational value. In other words, what has always

167In America, referred to as ‘Discourse Analysis’; more recently, also ‘Narrative Syntax’, in the sense of ‘the syntax of narratives’ (e.g. van Wolde (ed.), Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible).
172Weinrich, Tempus, 71, warns against English, however: ‘In Englishen hat die Kombination von Erzähltempora und genauen Zeitangaben stärker gefestigt als in anderen Sprachen’.
been known as the ‘sequence of tenses’ is a more significant factor, between one sentence and
the next, than actual time reference.

Verbal forms should be described not on the basis of their time reference outside the world of text [tenze]
not on the basis of reference to their mode of action (either completed or continuous) [aspect] but rather as
linguistic signs that guide and determine the mode of communication.173

Weinrich begins by showing how the category of grammatical person, ‘im ... informations-
theoretischen Sinne’, effects not only a semantic (Referential), but also a syntactic (Relational)
function—a ‘große Vorsortierung der Welt’.

Unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Kommunikation wird die Welt grob eingeteilt in die Positionen Sprecher
(Sender), Hörer (Empfänger) und ‘alles übrige’ (Restkategorie).174

In a linguistic tradition that can be traced back to the Greek grammarian, Apollonius Dyscolus,
other categories are, by extension from the primacy of the 1st person in communication, also
interpreted in terms of deixis,

Versteht als die Zeigefunktion derjenigen Sprachelemente, die sich auf den Ich-hier-jetzt-Punkt als die
origo der personalen, lokalen und temporalen Deixis beziehen.175

Thus, after discussing the syntactic functions of person and determination (the definite article),
Weinrich establishes the hypothesis:

Was nun die beiden skizzierten Beispiele der Person- und Artikel-Morpheme betrifft, die hier kurz
besprochen worden sind, so gewinne ich aus ihnen durch Extrapolation die Erwartung, daß es sich auch mit
den Tempora, die im Textgebrauch die gleiche Obstination [defined as ‘highly regularized referentiality’ 176]
die syntaktischen Klassen Person und Artikel erkennen lassen, ähnlich verhalten dürfte und daß man
folglich auch die Signalwerte des Besprechens und Erzählens so verstehen muß, daß durch diese Signale
die Kommunikationsstimmung in einer Weise verändert wird, die für den Hö rer höchst relevant ist.177

So Talstra summarises Weinrich’s theory in terms of participant reference:

Some verbal forms refer to the actual situation of communication; others refer to acts or facts outside the
domain shared by speaker and listener.178

This communication-theoretical background is essential to our understanding of the Referential and
Relational values of personal reference (ch. 2 below) and verbal modality (ch. 3 below).

Conflicting the opening paragraph of George Orwell’s 1984 (‘Winston Smith ... slipped
quickly through ...’) and the summary of its contents by the literary critic Abraham Lass
(‘Winston Smith takes time off ... ’), Weinrich comments:

Was ist hier geschehen? Die wiedergegebenen Ereignisse sind offenbar die gleichen. Was läßt es in dem
einen Buch im Preritum, im anderen Buch aber im Present erscheinen? Hat die Zeit solche Wirkung? Eine
solche Annahme hätte keinen Sinn. Denn die Zeit dieses Romans ist, das wird deutlich genug gesagt, das
Jahr 1984, also weder Vergangenheit noch Gegenwart. Wir interpretieren daher den Befund ohne

174Weinrich, Tempus, 29.
175Weinrich, Tempus, 32.
176Weinrich, Tempus, 14.
177Weinrich, Tempus, 33.
179Weinrich, Tempus, 46.
180Weinrich, Tempus, 20. Schneider, Grammatik, 189 §8.3.3 n. 9, goes so far as to say: ‘Das Perfekt ist also
einheitlich gar kein Tempus, weil es gegenüber der grundlegenden Opposition: Erzählen/Besprechen indifferent ist.’
It is just this excessive insistence on syntactic over semantic function which Talstra criticises in his review
articles.
181So Watson: ‘Linguistic attitude: Discourse/Narrative’ (Niccacci, Syntax, 19-20) from Niccacci’s
‘atteggiamento linguistico commento/narrazione’ (Niccacci, A., Sintassi del verbo ebraico nella prosa biblica
began with ‘Orientation: Narrative/Discursive’ (‘Text Grammar and Biblical Hebrew’, 272), but now prefers
‘Domain: Narrative/Comment’ (van der Merwe, ‘An Overview of Hebrew Narrative Syntax Research’, 15; and the
title of Talstra’s recent book, Talstra, E. (ed.), Narrative and Comment (FS Schneider; Amsterdam: Societas
Hebraica Amstelodamensis, 1999)); de Regt has modified the concept slightly and termed it a ‘domain’ (Talstra,
182Weinrich, Tempus, 33. Talstra, ‘Text Grammar and Biblical Hebrew’, 283. is highly critical of this
‘psychologising’ explanation as used by Niccacci and others: ‘narrative and discursive are not psychological
concepts about the state of mind of a writer or speaker but, rather, labels that define a set of linguistic markers’.
183Schneider, Grammatik, 183 §48.1.3.1.
184‘Future II’ refers to what is termed in English the ‘Future Perfect’.
185Weinrich, Tempus, 18 (German), 39 (French); Niccacci, Sintassi, 14 §3 (Italian); Syntax, 19 §3 (English); 20
§3 (Hebrew).
As Talstra says, 'most psalms ... are completely discursive', the present study is therefore concerned primarily with long-form x-yiqtol, weqatal, and the Deontic forms.

Within these categories, a text is given 'Relief' (Watson: 'Emphasis (or highlighting)'; 'Prominence'; here, 'Salience') through a distinction of background and foreground tenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SALIENCE</th>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreground</td>
<td>[Volitive, Present]</td>
<td>[Simple past]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x-yiqtol (indic.), (x-)qatal, NC</td>
<td>weqatal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>[Circumstantial / gerund / past pt.]</td>
<td>[Imperfect / past perfect]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>we-x-qatal, we-x-yiqtol, weNC</td>
<td>weqatal, we-(x-)qatal, we-(x-)yiqtol, NC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Discourse foreground is by definition non-past, and that of Narrative, past. The verb forms have absolute temporal reference in the foreground and 'relative tense' in the background ('Sprechperspektive', Watson: 'Linguistic perspective'): 'Rückschau' (Watson: 'Recovered information (r)'; e.g. the Perfect), 'Null-Stufe' ('Degree zero (Ø)') and 'Voraussicht' ('Anticipated information (j)').

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSPECTIVE</th>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>[present perfect]</td>
<td>[past perfect]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x-yiqtol</td>
<td>we-x-qatal (CNC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>[present / volitive]</td>
<td>[simple past / imperfect]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volitive, (x-)qatal, x-yiqtol (indic.), NC</td>
<td>weqatal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>[future]</td>
<td>[conditional]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yiqtol, final clauses</td>
<td>yiqtol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combining all three categories and applying them to Biblical Hebrew, Nicacci gives a linguistic equivalent to Collins' 'rhetorical' characterisation of Hebrew verse cited at the head of this chapter:

in Discourse all three axes of time (present, past and future, or in text-linguistic terms: degree zero Ø, recovered information ↑, anticipated information ↓ of Linguistic Perspective ...) can be in the foreground of the Prominence ... In other words, all three axes of time (or the three levels of Linguistic Perspective) can comprise a main line of communication ... This provides Discourse with a very much greater variety of possibilities than is true of Narrative where the fundamental axis (the past) is unavoidably fixed.

In terms of particular forms, then:

The foreground can be denoted by the jussive YIQTOL and the other volitional forms (imperative, cohortative) and by the indicative x-YIQTOL, (x-Q)ATAL, ... and simple noun clauses; the background can be indicated by simple noun clauses, usually preceded by WAW (contemporaneity), WAW-x-QATAL (anteriority); recovered information is indicated by QATAL (preceded by *יַאֲשׁ, יָשִּׂרֵא etc.); anticipated information by indicative YIQTOL, various kinds of final clauses etc.

---

2.2.3.2. Andersen to Longacre—Function-to-Form

The 'functionalist' model of Kenneth and Evelyn Pike192 and Francis Andersen, and of Longacre's own earlier work,194 forms the background to Longacre's Joseph. For this reason, it seems, Longacre has much to add to the text-linguistic model of Weinrich and Nicacci, and in fact it is this Tagmemics model which has informed Khan's study of extrapolation195 and Eskhult's of we-subj(q)atal clauses,196 and has been popularised by David Allan Dawson.197

One of the distinctive of Andersen's work is his insistence on 'a grammatically-organized hierarchical structure'.198 This is reflected in Longacre's extensive 'verb-rank schemes', that is, verbal spectrums ... from clauses that are relatively dynamic to clauses that are relatively static.199

I prefer to term these salience-graded 'predication hierarchies',200 and Longacre has developed them for the text-types or 'genres',201 'Narrative',202 'Predictive',203 'Hortatory'204 and, implicitly (since it is the inverse of the others) 'Expository'.205 Thus the category of Salience is further differentiated from foreground/background (Weinrich/Nicacci) to a full spectrum of predication-types, and the category of Linguistic attitude from Discourse/Narrative to a range of text-types.206 Longacre himself comments:

---

190Talstra, 'Text Grammar and Biblical Hebrew', 283.
192For example, Pike, K. L. and E. G., Grammatical Analysis (Dallas: SIL, 1977).
195Khan, Studies in Semitic Syntax, xxxiv, acknowledges a debt to Joseph Grimes, Robert Longacre and Teun van Dijk.
197Dawson, Text-Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew. The Pikes, Andersen, Longacre and Dawson are all Bible translators—field linguists working with the Summer Institute of Linguistics, the academic branch of Wycliffe Bible Translators.
198Talstra, 'Text Grammar and Biblical Hebrew', 283, who comments that 'Schneider, as well as the European 'distributionalists' in general, could benefit greatly from the introduction of this concept into their theories if they were able to develop a model integrating the search for formal text markers with the notion of textual hierarchy.'
199Longacre, Joseph, 81.
200Since not all predication involve verbs!
201For an early distinction of deep-structure and surface-structure genres according to the two parameters, 'succession' and 'projection', see Longacre, Anatomy of Speech Notions, 199-206.
202Longacre, Joseph, 81.
204Longacre, Joseph, 121.
205Longacre, Joseph, 111.
206So also Winther-Nielsen, cited in Eskhult, 'The Old Testament and Text Linguistics', 95.
My work differs from [Schneider's and Niccacci's] mainly in regard to my sharper insistence on the relevance of discourse types to the analysis.\textsuperscript{207}

I acknowledge with Longacre a more complex hierarchy of predications, but like Weinrich-Niccacci do not differentiate text-types beyond Narrative vs. Discourse. Instead of focussing on supposedly different meanings of the same verb form in different text-types (so Weinrich-Niccacci), I consider the extent to which particular meanings (and hence the corresponding forms) are restricted to particular linguistic situations, for example:

The actual present is naturally limited to direct speech.\textsuperscript{208}

Thus tense is interpreted according to speech context (Narrative defaulting for past and Discourse for non-past)—it is a deictic category.

2.2.3.3. Conclusion

The scholars reviewed above are still interacting vigorously. Two major conferences should be mentioned. The Seminar on Discourse Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew (Summer Institute of Linguistics, Dallas 1993) produced the volume Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics,\textsuperscript{209} and the Tilburg Conference on Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible (Nederlandse Onderzoekschool voor Theologie en Religiewetenschap, Tilburg 1996) produced Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible.\textsuperscript{210} These conferences highlighted the particularly controversial emphases of the various scholars, such as Niccacci's nominal clause vs. verbal clause distinction and Joosten's modal yiqtōl, as well as the methodological oppositions, such as Niccacci's textlinguistics vs. Joosten's traditional morpho-syntaxis. An ongoing debate between Andersen/Longacre-style textlinguistics (represented by Bryan Rocine) and generative syntax (represented by Vincent DeCaen) has been conducted for several years on the email discussion group ('electronic conference') b-brew.

Most important for the present work is the identification of Psalnic language as having the Speaker Orientation / Linguistic Attitude (Weinrich, Niccacci) or text-type (Longacre) 'Discourse'—a mode of communication with distinctive prominence features (Longacre, Niccacci) and tense-aspect system (Niccacci). This has important implications for both reference and mood. The Mood features of Discourse have been characterised by Niccacci (cited above), and particularly involve a distinctive range of (primarily modal) verb forms, such as long-form yiqtōl, short-form yiqtōl ('jussive') and the cohortative. The Reference features of Discourse have not received much attention in the literature; three distinctions should be mentioned.

Firstly, in Discourse, the referential lexicon will be restricted to a number of primary acts, unlike in narrative, where any number of characters can appear. The primary acts will be those identified as the grammatical 1st and 2nd persons (functionally, Speaker and Addressee), the 1st person being obligatory, of course:

The dialectic character of the prayers is also portrayed through a high incidence of first- and second-person verbal forms.\textsuperscript{211}

The 3rd person slot will be free.

Secondly, Discourse exhibits a greater tendency towards subject topicalisation:

not only the non-narrative character, but also the very spatial relation of a dialogue puts the participants in focus, and thus would account for the prior position of the subject.\textsuperscript{212}

In other words, Discourse is a highly deictic and pragmatically-fixed 'speaker orientation'.

Whilst in Narrative, the narrative sequence may be considered topicalised (hence, in the foreground, uninterrupted wayyiqtōl forms), in Discourse, the participants are topicalised, as is in fact required by the focus on the primary acts. The subject is most often topicalised to indicate a subject shift.\textsuperscript{213}

Thirdly, there is the influence of pragmatics/sociolinguistics. The referential value of deictic terms such as personal pronouns is pragmatically assigned; indeed, there are some pragmatically-assigned thematic roles which have no grammatical realisation.\textsuperscript{214} On the other hand, sociolinguistic factors influence the Speaker's choice of certain expletives for redressive action to 'give face' to the Addressee (e.g. -nā'),\textsuperscript{215} and may extend the scope of Negative, Interrogative and Imperative to the speech turn.\textsuperscript{216} Many of these pragmatic/sociolinguistic features of Discourse correspond to textlinguistic features in Narrative, where personal pronouns are assigned according to principles of clausal and argument relations, there is greater use of logical expletives, the scope of MTA values is limited to the clause,\textsuperscript{217} and thus episode-boundaries are marked by TA.

2.3. Conclusions for the Language of the Psalms

The above discussions of the language of the Psalter and of some new theoretical approaches yields the following linguistic characterisation of the Psalter:

\textsuperscript{211}Primlos, 'A Comprehensive Semiotrastrucrual Exegetical Approach', 82.

\textsuperscript{212}Eskhult, Studies in Verbal Aspect and Narrative Technique, 39, though see also Weinrich, Tenqups on the 'Obstinat'ion of the categories Person, Article and Tense.

\textsuperscript{213}See on topicalisation and adverbarity in ch. 2 below.

\textsuperscript{214}See ch. 6 on Directive-precative coheratives and 3rd-person passives.

\textsuperscript{215}Wilt, 'A Sociolinguistic Analysis of אֵל', 241-42.

\textsuperscript{216}"...it is assumed that the (non-use of -nā'\ functions at the turn level, rather than the clause level.‘ Wilt, 'A Sociolinguistic Analysis of אֵל', 243.

\textsuperscript{217}Disregarding for the moment the possibility of MTA-neutral 'continuation-forms'.
A particular emphasis in the nominal lexis of the Psalter is on the three primary actants, referred to in marked forms such as psychophyelical substitutes, descriptive terms and unusual names instead of personal pronouns or deisis; emphases of verbal lexis are the psalm-act itself (praise and prayer) and the acts of deliverance which are subject-matter of the thanksgiving or prayer. Throughout, there is a high level of lexical multiplication and redundancy.

Morphological variation can also been seen, for example in the frequent use of the adhortative and long forms of prepositions and pronouns, though it is the frequency of modally marked terms that is most striking.

It is at the syntactical level that the language of the Psalter may be described as unmarked, especially in its many different uses of asyndetic relations between clauses.

Finally, the discourse speaker orientation of the Psalter is marked by the characteristic personal reference and modal verb forms. The Prominence feature may also be described as marked in the sense that there is frequent interchange between fore- and backgrounding.

3. Interrogative—Negative—Imperative

After foundational studies on reference (with a view to argument hierarchy) and modality (with consideration of predication hierarchies), I have chosen to treat the three grammatical features of Interrogativity, Negativity and Imperativity. This juxtaposition can be justified from a range of viewpoints, as there is considerable overlap between these three features at several levels.

3.1. Modality

Interrogative and Imperative clauses, together with Declarative clauses, represent the grammatical reflexes of the three basic and universal utterance types—statement, question and command, corresponding to the typological modes Indicative, Dubitative and Volitional. The term ‘modal’ is used here to distinguish Interrogative, Imperative etc. (‘modal’—irrealis) from Indicative (‘non-modal’—realis).

But what does Negativity have to do with these two ‘modal’ clause types? It is clearly not paradigmatic with them, since all three principal clause types can be Negated. Moreover, in most languages, Negation is lexically rather than morphosyntactically realised, whilst Interrogative can often be realised in word-order and Imperative is most often morphologically.

The subjunctive mood has already been mentioned. If realis modality is expressed grammatically primarily with the indicative, irrealis modality is expressed in classical languages with the imperative, optative and subjunctive. Some types of Negativity exhibit irrealis (perhaps better, ‘non-assertive’) features, particularly in some subordinate clause types, such as causal (Latin ‘non quod’ + subjunctive; similarly Spanish (‘ninguén que’ + subjunctive), purpose, fear and conditional clauses, and reported speech. Where there is ‘Negative raising’ (i.e. where the negative belongs syntactically … or semantically to the subordinate clause) Negation further distinguishes between Epistemic and Deontic modality in the English modal verbs may and must; it has been shown to be related by ‘dubativity’ to Interrogative and is in fact included in some definitions of the concept ‘modality’ in terms of all the ‘non-propositional’ elements of a sentence. Finally, it has been said that:

A proposition … is a unit of communication, that is, it affirms, denies, questions or commands something.

This work deals with the latter three of these.

3.2. Deep-Structure Syntax

The relationships between Interrogative, Negative, mood, tense and aspect are considered in chapter 3 below with reference to generative grammar. Chomsky’s earliest presentation of his ‘transformations’ of a ‘kernel’ clause refers to compound sentences, Negative, passive and Interrogative/Imperative.

219 Though some languages have Negative verbs etc.; see e.g. Egyptian and Japanese.
220 Or, indeed, indicated by the absence of morphological marking on the bare stem.
221 Subjunctive forms are used volitionally in many European languages, and the non-assertive nature of questions and subordinate clauses has been argued cross-linguistically to indicate that the later develop out of the former; Harris, A. C., and Campbell, L., Historical Syntax in Cross-Linguistic Perspective (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 74; Cambridge: CUP, 1995) 293-308.
222 Palmer, Mood and Modality, 184.
223 Palmer, Mood and Modality, 219.
224 Palmer, Mood and Modality, 145.
225 Palmer, Mood and Modality, 219.
227 E.g. Lewis lists tense, aspect, Interrogative and Negative; Palmer, Mood and Modality, 14-15.
228 Beckman, J. and Callow, J., Translating the Word of God (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1974) 272.
229 Chomsky, Syntactic Structures, 63-84; Lyons, J., Chomsky, Rev. edn. (Fontana Modern Masters; Glasgow: Fontana/Colliins, 1977) 118-9.
The second and fourth of these transformations are considered in this study. The first, subordination, has had to be omitted for reasons of space, since it involves discourse-level considerations (between clauses). The third transformation is realised in Hebrew within the verbal stem morphology (*niph'āl, pa'āl, hoph'āl*). Generative grammar considers some or all of these categories under a node termed INFLECTION.230

The modal verbs of English itself have a set of properties which bring together the features considered here; Huddleston has coined the acronyms NICE:231

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>I can't go.</td>
<td>Deny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inversion</td>
<td>Must I come?</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Yes, you must.</td>
<td>Repeat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphatic Affirmation</td>
<td>He will be there.</td>
<td>Confirm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inversion and Code are characteristic respectively of questions and answers, pragmatically-determined discourse functions. Emphatic affirmation, like answer, is grammaticalised as a distinct verbal mood in some languages (so Palmer above) and also represents a discourse function in the pragmatic or Referential (as opposed to Relational) sphere. Thus these properties bring together Negation, Interrogation and the English modal verbs.

Finally, Richter selects the three features considered here as paradigmatic transformations:


3.3. Points of Contact

These theoretical principles of language can be seen to be at work in a wide range of points of contact between Interrogative, Negative and Imperative in Semitic languages. To take some assorted points of contact from the grammar of Arabic:

1. Negative, Interrogative and Affirmative (la, ‘truly’) free a clausal subject from ‘grammatical influence’ (accusative marking) by a governing ‘verb of the heart’, e.g. ‘I think Zeid [Nom] is not truthful’.232

2. Negative, Interrogative and Affirmative nominal clauses can have an indefinite subject.233

---

230 See for example Shlonsky, *Clause Structure and Word Order in Hebrew and Arabic, 3. referring to IP (the ‘functional layer’) as comprising Asp(ect), TenseIP and NegIP.


233 Wright, *Grammar, 261.

3. Negative and Interrogative nominal clauses have predicate-subject word order.234

4. mi has both Interrogative (‘what?’) and Negative (‘not’) senses.235

5. Interrogative and Negative can be combined in the particle *‘āla (Hebrew ‘hālā’; Latin *nonne*) ‘to draw close attention to the certainty of the following assertion’, i.e. Negative Interrogative = emphatic Affirmative, Declarative. The particle frequently occurs together with Imperative (optative perfect, imperative, passive, energetic).

Diachronic study shows many relationships between markers of Negative and Interrogative in Semitic languages.236

4. Corpus and Approach

Text criticism tends to purge the more glaring cases of abruptness by viewing some psalms as compilations of originally separate psalms or by designating particular verses as secondary additions. This procedure simply produces an alternative text. In this study we are taking the text of Psalms as it is.237

The choice of the canonical book of Psalms as a corpus for syntactic description should not need defending.238 Canonical books have often been considered in isolation, whether in terms of theology (Deuteronomy, Psalms), language in general (Deuteronomy, Ezra-Nehemiah) or syntax in particular (the Joseph narrative and Jonah [Blau], the Joseph narrative [Longacre], the succession narrative [Richter, Samuel-Kings [DeCaen]). Neither the thought nor the language of any Old Testament book can be isolated from its historical or canonical context, but both can be extracted for particular study, and this is the purpose of the present work. It should be noted that what is universally recognised as the most thorough of modern studies of psalms syntax uses just fourteen assorted texts (O’Connor).239 The present work is concerned, then, with a closed corpus and a particular range of linguistic phenomena, not with a historical literary type.240 It considers the relationship of grammatical form to a distinct type of language.

---

234 Wright, *Grammar, 296.

235 Compare Greek *μη* used as an interrogative particle when a negative answer is expected to the question. οὐχ can also have this function, and both *μη* and *οὐχ* are more often used in rhetorical questions than in real ones (Beekmann and Callow, *Translating the Word of God*, 236-37).


237 Collins, ‘Decoding the Psalms’, 58 n. 3. For a structuralist rationale, see Collins, ‘Decoding the Psalms’, 41; Talstra, *Text Grammar and Hebrew Bible, 1*, 169; Saussure, F. de, *Cours de linguistique générale* (Paris: Payot, 1916) 30. Compare also Tsevat, *Language of the Biblical Psalms, 12*; ‘With such a large amount of material as the basis of the inquiry, characteristic phraseology is as likely to be omitted as added in the process of textual corruption.’


240 Compare the corpus of Tsevat, *Language of the Biblical Psalms, 4-5*. My linguistic analysis could be skewed by many factors, not only 45 and the narrative 78 and 103, but also the excessively-formalic acrostics (9-10; 25: 14: 111: 112: 119: 145); the refrains and doublets (14 = 53; 40:14 = 18 = 70; 75:7-12 = 108:2-6; 60:7-14 = 108:7-10).
The method of the present work is strongly influenced by structuralist grammatical study, that is, that which works from form to function:

The real question that should be asked is: "How are the syntactic devices available in a given language put to work in the actual use of this language?" (Chomsky)\textsuperscript{241}

O'Conner expresses the rationale for this approach with reference to rhetorical questions:

Rhetorical questions are questions in form and assertions (or the like) by conversational implication. Both facts must be treated. The theory of grammar (as of any scientific inquiry) requires that complex facts be treated in terms of simpler ones. Thus, the interrogative shape of rhetorical questions must be accounted for before their assertive function is described.\textsuperscript{243}

More recent Hebrew grammars follow this trend (e.g. Gibson, Waltke-O’Connor).\textsuperscript{244}

Reference is considered first, and in terms specific to the sociolinguistic context of the Psalter, with its three primary actants. Much of this discussion, and the whole of the subsequent chapter on modality is, however, not specific to the Psalter, but to the Linguistic Attitude of Discourse (as distinct from Narrative). The latter chapter therefore makes extensive use of stretches of Discourse from other parts of the Old Testament in order to establish a clear view of the verbal system. The results of these two chapters are then used in the analysis of Interrogative, Negative and Imperative sentences in chapters 4-6. After consideration of the basic morphemes and structures concerned with that sentence type, we look at the range of rhetorical functions which can be achieved pragmatically. Frequently, we see how one grammatical form may be interchangeable with another; this is the rhetorical figure of \textit{heterosis}\textsuperscript{245} or \textit{enallage}\textsuperscript{246} (e.g. Interrogative יִדְרֵי בָּרוּךְ (lit. miracle of Barukh). We thus attempt to bridge the gap driven by Western Latin-based models of grammar between the—in Arabic models, integrated—fields of grammar, rhetoric and poetics,\textsuperscript{247} as well as accounting in part for a much wider tendency towards form—function ‘skewing’ as attested to by the titles of some recent form-critical works on the Psalms, such as Frost’s ‘Asseveration by Thanksgiving’ and Fuchs’s \textit{Die Klage als Gebet}.\textsuperscript{248}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{14} The many imperatives addressed to God in 119, the singular imperatives addressed to the community in the \textit{wisdom Psalms} and \textit{Songs of Ascent} and the plural imperative calls to praise in the \textit{Hallelujah} Psalms.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{241} Chomsky, \textit{Syntactic Structures}, 93.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{242} Saussure, \textit{Cours}, 105.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{243} O'Conner, \textit{Hebrew Verse Structure}, 12.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{244} Though compare Andersen, \textit{Sentence}, 35.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{245} Waltke-O’Connor, \textit{Syntax}, 572 §34.4c.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{246} \textit{die Ersetzung} einer Wortart, einer Konjunktionsform oder eines Kasus durch eine andere Wortart, Konjunktionsform oder Kasus"; Bühmann, W. and Scherer, K., \textit{Stiftergesetze der Bibel: ein kleines Nachschlagewerk} (Biblische Beiträge 10; Fribourg: Schweizerisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1973) 74.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{247} van der Merwe, ‘Overview’, 1.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{248} Frost, S., ‘Asseveration by Thanksgiving’; VT 8 (1958) 380-90; Fuchs, O., \textit{Die Klage als Gebet: eine theologische Besinnung am Beispiel des Psalms} 22 (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1982).}

---

Chapter 2

REFERENCE

The term ‘Reference’ in this chapter refers primarily to two distinct features. The first is the pragmatic function of exophoric ‘Reference’ to real-world context; we are concerned particularly with participant reference, the use of the three grammatical persons to refer to the three rhetorical persons (or ‘actants’) and the difference between reference by name, description, pronoun or verbal morphology. The second is the syntactic function of endophoric ‘Reference’ to linguistic context; this covers all kinds of deixis, nominal and adverbal, and requires a discussion of pronoun topicalisation and its most frequent function, adversativity. Metonymy and incongruence are two features of participant reference in the Psalms which affect the referential value and agreement features of referential terms.

1. The Referential Lexicon—Primary Referents

1.1. The Implications of Text-Type Identification

The text-type Discourse was shown above to involve a restricted referential lexicon, subject topicalisation and the influence of pragmatics/sociolinguistics.\textsuperscript{1} For the Psalter, in particular, the grammatical 1st person is by definition always the Psalmist except in reported direct speech, especially what are usually termed priestly ‘oracles’ (i.e. the voice of God, e.g. 50). The 2nd person is usually God, but not always:

\textit{Direct address}. This is obviously the most frequent mode of discourse and the address is made chiefly to God, but it may be to others such as the king (Ps. 20, 25) or the wicked (Ps. 52).\textsuperscript{2}

The 3rd person in the Psalter is usually the Enemy/ies. This is the natural result of a strong moral dualism (good/evil) intersecting with a certain social dualism (master/servant), rendering:

\begin{align*}
\text{Master} & \quad \text{Good} \\
\text{Servant} & \quad \text{Evil}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{GO} & \quad \updownarrow \quad \text{PSALMIST} \\
\text{Idols} & \quad \updownarrow \\
\text{ENEMY} & \quad \leftrightarrow \quad \text{community} \\
\text{Enemies} & \quad \leftrightarrow \quad \text{Enemies}
\end{align*}

Since the Psalmist’s world thus consists primarily of a horizontal plane in which he interacts with the Enemy, and a vertical plane in which he interacts with God, the language of Psalms (and of prayer in general) is concerned with these two relationships and actants.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{1} Ch. 1, section 2.2.3.3.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{2} Collins, ‘Decoding the Psalms’, 43. It is because of these ‘others’ that I reject Tsedat’s definition of a Psalm as ‘man’s address to God in metrical form’; Tsedat, \textit{Language of the Biblical Psalms}, 4).}
1.2. The Referential Triangle and its Place in Rhetorical Analysis


There are three elements which occur with such regularity that they can be taken as cardinal points around which all the statements hinge. They are: the protagonist, the opposition and God.

It has been recorded as a convention of the first group of psalms that there are three main actants or groups of actants, to wit the suppliant, Yhwh and the wicked, who are represented as enemies of the suppliant.

The three primary actants in the language of the Psalms are represented here by the points of a triangle within a category of ‘rhetorical person’. Of course, not all psalms have a 1st person, some being purely liturgical (15; 24; 134), hymnic (113), sapiential (1, 112) or narrative (the body of 78; 105); other characters also appear—the community of Israel, idols etc. However, the relational triangle will prove to be a useful heuristic tool.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{GOD} \\
(2\text{nd person})
\end{array}
\hspace{1cm}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PSALMIST} \\
(1\text{st person})
\end{array}
\hspace{1cm}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ENEMY} \\
(3\text{rd person})
\end{array}
\]

The God-Enemy axis of this triangle has been added here—it was not present in the above moral and social dualism matrix. It therefore has three distinctive properties:

Firstly, God and the Enemy do not share any one feature (either good/evil or master/servant). The contrast is highlighted by the distinctive pronunciation tradition of the poetic books, as reflected in the Massoretic Text’s placing of paseq euphemisticum before or after the Divine Name or other terms for God—אֱלֹהִים, אָלָל, אָלָלִים, even the pronoun אלל, to prevent its being joined, in the reading, to a word, which—in the opinion of the accentuatrors—it was not seemly,مشא,כִּבְּשָׁהֹם, to bring into contact with it.

3Westermann, Lob und Klage, 128.
4Collins, 'Decoding the Psalms', 45.
5Prinzlo, 'A Comprehensive Semostructural Exegetical Approach', 82.
6The placement of the community with the Psalmist is not ideal, since it results in equating self-exhortations with exhortations addressed to the community, which sometimes appear very similar to those addressed to the Enemies. On the other hand, it is valuable in removing the distinction between, for example, individual and communal laments.

The largest set of such words is terms for the Enemy (אֱלֹהִים, רֵעַ, אֱלֹהִים, נְאָעָר, נְאָעָר), though it also occurs with אלֹהִים referring to ‘other gods’. It is important that אלֹהִים and אֱלֹהִים are treated identically here—in our study, too, they will both fill the rhetorical 3rd-person slot, since they have the same referent and are only specified with respect to plane of relation (represented by the sides of the rhetorical triangle).

Secondly, relationship between God and the Enemy is essentially one-way—the Enemy himself ‘prompts God’ (9:17; 141/53; 50:22; 119:139), whilst God punishes the Enemy, avenging his servants.

Thirdly, whilst the Enemy is impacted by the linguistic force of speech acts such as curses on the horizontal level, he also receives the literal force of God’s intervention on the vertical level. This dual origin of the effective force of a curse—from the Speaker and then the source. God—is analogous to the linguistic fact that the subject of a (1st-person) request constitutive (e.g. אלֹהִים, ‘may I not be put to shame’ 31:2) or a 3rd-person jussive (e.g. פֶּרֶךְ, ‘may they fall’ 5:11) is not the source of the action. The thematic role of the source is here termed ‘Causative’, to indicate its relation to causative valency relations. The rhetorical function of such forms may be termed ‘causativum dividum’—deliberate avoidance of reference to God.

1.3. Reference to Rhetorical Person

The three unireferential semantic sets referred to here as ‘rhetorical person’ can be referred to in:

1. any of the three grammatical persons,
2. singular or plural number,
3. subject, object, prepositionally-governed or construct position, and
4. nominal or pronominal form.

However, as we have seen, their prototypical or ‘iconic’ values correspond to those of 1st, 2nd and 3rd grammatical person. They govern other syntagms at the formal level (e.g. plural imperatives are not addressed to God) and at the functional level (e.g. calls of praise are not addressed to the Enemy).

‘Rhetorical Person’ is, then, the place of the referent in the moral/political/social world of the Psalms. God stands appropriately at the head since he is the Judge whom the Psalms call to ‘end the violence of the wicked (בְּמֶשֶׁךָ) and establish the righteous (יִשְׁתַּמְשֵׁהוּ) 7:9. His just judgement and siding with the righteous are the prerequisites for prayers of lament and petition.

8Also with (usually following) certain verbs of condemning (מָרַה, צָרְבָּה, צָרָה, צָרָה, צָרָה, צָרָה) even when God is grammatical subject,םִינֶפֶר indicating ‘a plurality’ and even ספר ‘as conveying a strongly anthropomorphic idea’; Wickes, Treatise, 97.
10See ch. 6, section 1.2 below.
Considering the Temple-based cultic 'Sitz im Leben' of at least most of the Psalms, one might compare these three poles with three stages in a Priestly 'graded holiness':\(^{11}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Holiness/Unholiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holy of holies</td>
<td>profane/clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctuary</td>
<td>Temple courts outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>Israel nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1st person (clean) is the Psalmist. The 2nd person (holy) is God alone. The Divine Name יְהֹוָ֣אֹל predominates in books I and IIIB-V (Psalter Y), with אֱלֹהִים in book II and IIIA (Psalter E); the 'seam' in book III is the evenly balanced Psalm 84 (seven occurrences of both Y and E). Hence the differences between them is that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIIA</td>
<td>47-48</td>
<td>108-2-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 3rd person (unclean) is the Enemy, the פַּלְפָּלָן, the מַטְנַיִם, the מַלְאַכֵּי עֵצָה, etc., who practice סַעֲדֹת; also the בַּתֹּלָם, the בַּתֹּלָם מַטְנַיִם, the בַּתֹּלָם מַלְאַכֵּי עֵצָה, etc., etc. \(^{12}\)

Participants can be referred to by a name, description, pronoun or verbal morphology: \(^{13}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Verbal Morphology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Proper Noun)</td>
<td>(Common Noun)</td>
<td>(Free Pronoun)</td>
<td>(Bound Pronoun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qəḏəl</td>
<td>qīyāl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. אֱלֹהִים (יִהְוָֽה) | אֱלֹהִים | qəḏəl | qīyāl |
2. אֱלֹהִים | לֶאֱלֹהִים | qəḏəl | qīyāl |
3. לָאָרָץ | לָאָרָץ | qəḏəl | qīyāl |

These various forms of participant reference lie on a continuum of referentiality:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Verbal Morphology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td>Verbal Morphology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\(^{12}\) Other parallel passages which show no particular tendencies are: 14 [Y]: // 2 Sam 22 [Y]; 2:1-7 [E]: // 1 Sam 10:7-14 [E]; 105:1-15 [Y]: // 1 Chr 16:8-22 [Y]; 96 [Y]: // 1 Chr 16:23-33.

\(^{13}\) But compare 40:18b אֱלֹהִים with 70:6 אֱלֹהִים.

\(^{14}\) Together with 90, these are the two exceptions to the distribution presented here.

\(^{16}\) Or even zero anaphora. Not all of these options occur in the Psalter. See 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.’ Summer Institute of Linguistics (ed.), Field Linguistics 1998 Grammar (SIL: 1998) 131.

Thus *names* have the highest referential value, in that their referents are absolute, being lexically determined. It is for this reason that the *name* of God is most often used (especially in the lament Psalms), reflecting the psalmist’s concern, in a polytheistic world, to ensure correct addressing of the message to the Addressee, lest it be lost in transmission and received by some other deity.\(^{17}\) This is one aspect of what might be considered overspecification, as against the frequent apparent underspecification in other parts of Psalms.\(^{18}\) Descriptions, and then pronouns, are less referential, their referents being determined by context or context. Verbal morphology has the lowest referential value, being specified purely pragmatically by reference to real-world context or textually by relation to Psalm context. It has the advantage of lending more "cohesion"\(^{19}\) to a text and not interrupting its flow.

Rhetorical force is the inverse of referentiality. That is, a name, for example, is more referential but less rhetorically forceful than a pronoun.

In pragmatic terms, a name or description in fact has no rhetorical force, since, though identifying the referent, it does not identify the Addressee within the clause. For example, with a 3rd-person verb, a name may function as subject or vocative: \(^{20}\)

1. The LORD will protect you! 121:7
2. LORD, may they be put to shame!

This shows that it has no value in specifying the Addressee. Rhetorical force in participant reference is achieved by specifying the participants in relation to the Speaker; for this purpose, verbal morphology is very powerful.

There are thus two types of prominence against which the features of grammatical and rhetorical person are set:

1. Argument hierarchy (function): Subject—Direct Object—Indirect Object—Prepositional Object etc.
2. Rhetorical force (lexical form): Verbal Morphology—Pronoun—Description—Name

I.4. Form-critical focus

Westernmann has taught us to see psalms language as riding on a sliding scale between praise and lament, referring to

\(^{17}\) Aemmelius, The Traditional Prover, 56.

\(^{18}\) See van der Merwe’s comments on the importance of this for narrative syntax; van der Merwe, ‘Overview’, 6.

\(^{19}\) Halliday and Hasan, Cohesion.

\(^{20}\) Interestingly, there are no examples in the Psalter of a vocative immediately preceding a 3rd-person jussive, perhaps because of the ambiguity. See ch. 3 below on word order and the interpretation of qīyāl-a vs. x-qīyāl, and ch. 6, section 5.1. on the passive.
I would like to characterise the entire dynamic of the psalms as riding on two interacting planes/dimensions—Westermann’s bipolar attitudinal plane of praise and lament and22 the tripolar referential plane of God, Psalmist and Enemy.

These two planes intersect completely to present a response-referent matrix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psalm</th>
<th>Lament</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Psalm</td>
<td>אֲנִי הַרְשָׁפָה לְאָדָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will rejoice! I will be happy!</td>
<td>אני אמוות, ולא מנקום</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. God</td>
<td>יִדְרֹכַת מְלֹא שָנָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I will acknowledge you!</td>
<td>מדוע נמחקתי?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enemy</td>
<td>מַמְיָה שְׁלֹא מַה שְּלֹא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May you strike all my enemies on the cheek!</td>
<td>איך עליון עליון</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This matrix is useful in tracing the shift of rhetorical person within the Psalms; we are particularly interested in lines such as:

| בֵּיתָנִי, בְּצֵאתְיוּךְ נִמְצָא | 109:28 |
| I have been like a potent to many, but you are my strong refuge. (NRSV) |
| בֵּיתָנִי, בְּצֵאתְיוּךְ נִמְצָא | 19:87 |
| Let them curse, but you will bless. Let my assailants be put to shame; may your servant be glad. (NRSV) |
| בֵּיתָנִי, בְּצֵאתְיוּךְ נִמְצָא | בֵּיתָנִי, בְּצֵאתְיוּךְ נִמְצָא |
| They have almost made an end of me on earth; but I have not forsaken your precepts. (NRSV) |

The first of these switches from Lament focussing on the rhetorical 1st person to Praise focussing on the 2nd person. Similarly, each of the parallel cola of 109:28 shifts from Lament (3rd person) to Praise (2nd person); and 19:87 shifts from Lament (1st person) to Praise (1st person). The assignment of cola to particular rhetorical persons is debatable of course (e.g. 119:87 as 1st person), though this kind of analysis may prove useful in showing up recurrent patterns of shift in personal referent, which go together with patterns of shifting Praise and Lament on the grammatical base of clause-types (Declarative, Interrogative, Imperative), to make up the rhetorical artistry of the psalms.

2. Deixis

2.1. Definition

‘Deixis’ is a functional term for a group of words which have little or no inherent semantic content, but function beyond the limits of the sentence. Richter gives a useful definition of pronominal deixis:

Die Deixis dient dazu, das im Nomen Ausgedrückte in einem Satz hervorzuheben und mit dem Bezeichneten außerhalb des Satzes zu verbinden, sei es in weiteren Satz[en (Relation) oder außerhalb von Sätzen (Referenz); hier verweist sie auf Sachverhalte.23

It has already been noted in chapter 1 above how referential (pragmatically-defined) deixis is restricted to Discourse, whilst relational (textlinguistically-defined) deixis is most characteristic of Narrative.

Many kinds of clausal constituents have deictic terms in Hebrew:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Personal pronoun (distal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative pronoun (proximal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative pronoun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjectival</td>
<td>Demonstrative adjective (distal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative adjective (proximal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clausal</td>
<td>Interrogative particle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A range of other terms, known as ‘Discourse Deixis’ (e.g. many conjunctions and adverbs) and ‘Social Deixis’ (e.g. honorifics) could be added to this list,24 but the above are those most important for the present discussion. The ‘distal/proximal’ distinction (Richter’s ‘Nah-’ and ‘Fern-Deixis’) is also important, since it contributes to the rhetorical texture of a Psalm. Indicative pronouns are considered here, and Interrogative pronouns in chapter 4 below.

Personal pronouns are distinguished by person, number and gender. Their Referential values can be defined in pragmatic terms as follows:25

---

21Westermann, Loh und Klage, 6. One might argue for the addition of poles of ‘prayer’ and/or ‘wisdom’ (rhetorically neutral—a genre in which righteous and evil action is spoken of often with only minor reference to the self or God’s personal interests).
22Verb-Phrase, propositional categories, unrelated to the Inflectional Phrase, clausal category of mood.
23Richter, Grundlagen 1, 81. See also Loprieno, Ancient Egyptian, 80-83 on context and context.
24Levinson, Pragmatics, 54-96.
25The term ‘representative’ is coined here in the absence of a conventionally-accepted term.
In the Semitic, and even in many non-Semitic languages such as in Greek and Latin, for example, the third persons of the personal pronoun are not taken from the same paradigm as that of the first and second persons.30

Generalisations have also been made cross-linguistically:

First and second person pronouns cannot be impersonal, they are intrinsically fully referential. There are no first or second person expletives, only "third" person expletives. Benveniste makes the typological claim that in many languages the 'third person' is not a 'person'; it is really the verbal form whose function is to express the non-person'.31

A further distinction exists between Speaker and Addressee themselves. This distinction is initially evident in morphology in the lack of gender-marking in the 1st-person—this grammatical person is bound to the (self-defining) function 'Speaker'. The distinction is expressed formally in the Hebrew pronouns in the 2nd-person morpheme -7-, which is also present in yiqtîl (lit. '7') and qitâl morphologies.

Demonstrative pronouns are formed from the two 'Groundmorpheme'-7- (distal) and -1/1 (proximal).32 The 37, 32 (<7>) system suggests case-marking within the proximal system,33 33 being originally a relative pronoun.34

Finally, in addition to the use of the -7- morpheme in 2nd-person enclitic personal pronouns, it occurs in Interrogative 3-7-, in the adverbial י on and י, emphatic and restrictive י and emphatic and conjunctive י. -7- also occurs as the article and Interrogative particle, as well as in י, י, and י. Other deictic terms in Hebrew include the complementary adverbs of place, י, 'where?', and י, 'there'.

2.2. Pronominal Deixis and Adversativity

2.2.1. Topicalisation

Here, the function of topicalisation is dealt with; the formal question of what is the unmarked word order for verbal clauses is treated in chapter 3 below.

In Hebrew, if a VSO paradigm for clause constituents is held to, SVO word order must be accounted for in terms of either stylistics (e.g. constituent weight), syntax above the clause (textlinguistics) or pragmatics (topicalisation).

30Müller, 'Ergative Constructions', 270.
31Shlonsky, Clause Structure and Word Order in Hebrew and Arabic, 123. Demonstrated also with י (pp. 140-41) and independent pronouns versus qitâl-form suffixes (pp. 215).
32See also the combined forms י, י, י, י, and י, Richter, Grundlagen 1, 87.
33Richter, Grundlagen 1, 87.
34the true relative pronoun' (Williams, Syntax, 27 §129); 'das älteste RPrell' (Richter, Grundlagen 1, 88 n. 247); י is 'probably a vernacular element' (Seewo, C.L., 'Linguistic Evidence and the Dating of Qohelet', JBL 115 (1996) 643-66 (662)); Compare Shlonsky, Clause Structure and Word Order in Hebrew and Arabic, 132-33.
Clause constituents in Hebrew tend to be ‘light’, three-term construct phrases being quite rare and relative clauses being easily reduced. Nevertheless, this factor has not received sufficient consideration amongst scholars.

Syntax above the clause has become strongly argued as the principal reason for certain kinds of subject topicalisation.35 Schneider and Niccauci have seen discourse function in (we)-subject-qiṭal clauses within a chain of narrative wayyiqṭol forms, and Eshkult has linked this with an aspectual study. On the other hand, the distinctions between x-qiṭol and yiqṭol-x, and between ha' qitl and qitl ha' have been shown by Niccauci and Joosten respectively to be not contextualistic due to semantic (modality and aspect respectively).36

Topicalisation is used here to refer to the pragmatically-significant fronting of any element of a clause. Its most frequent function in the Psalms is for contrast, or ‘adversativity’.

2.2.2. Adversativity

Adversativity37 is marked or unmarked shift in referent, particularly between verbal arguments of the same type (e.g. subject-subject or locative-locative). Usually there will be some inherent opposition already present in the contrasted elements, such as rhetorical person or grammatical person, or there will be a common element in the two contrasted predications. This functions at a number of levels, from a higher textual level, down to the relation of arguments within a clause. Shifts in subject-topic between clauses are an important feature of the Psalter.

Psalms 1 hinges on the axis ... אֱלֹהֵינוֹ יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל (v. 4), the change of rhetorical person אֱלֹהֵינוֹ יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל [דִּבְרֵי יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל, v. 6] / דִּבְרֵי אֱלֹהִים יִשְׂרָאֵל distinguishing two distinct parts of a psalm in a Deuteronomy-style contrast of blessing and curse.38 Though similar contrasts are made of comment in vv. 1-2 (… גַּם כֹּל הַשָּׁמָיִם וְהָאֵרֶץ, we are concerned here only with shift in topic.39

Adversativity can be marked in a variety of ways including verbal forms (such as wayyiqṭol marking ‘actions, events, or states, which are to be regarded as the temporal or logical sequel of actions, events, or states mentioned immediately before40) and particles (‘ap,41 kl42 and, after a Negative clause, typically ki ‘im). Here, however, we are primarily concerned with purely syntactical markers of adversativity—fronting of a constituent such as a pronoun (waʾnni,
This presentation shows that adversative wa'yāni, wa'attā and wawēhmda functions throughout the rhetorical world of the Psalms to establish contrasts between the three primary acts. In fact, both wa'yāni and wa'attā occur in Psalm 59 as macrostructural devices, establishing contrasts between the Enemies and God (wa'attā, vv. 6, 9) and the Enemies and the Psalmist (wa'yāni, v. 17). Westermann has shown how these terms occur at key points in the individual lament—they may mark the transition from the lament to the confession of trust or from the petition to the assurance of being heard. Thus they are key markers, not only of shift in grammatical and rhetorical person, but also of the shift from Lament to Praise.

As Westermann has further noted,

The contrast is actually made, not by the waw, but by the structure of the sentence. This is supported by the homonymy of adversative ('but') and copulative ('and') waw and the absence of waw in some adversative contexts:

May their bellies be filled ... As for me, I shall behold your face in righteousness (NRSV)

Some of the functions of adversative waw with a personal pronoun may be exemplified from the occurrences of wa'yāni. Often occurring as the last line of a Psalm, these references to the self often involve what Gunkel called 'Beweggründe des göttlichen Einschreitens'—appeals to the Psalmist's need or righteousness. Compare, for example:

But I call upon God, and the LORD will save me. (NRSV)

with the 'traditional prayers':

But as for me, I walk in my integrity; redeem me, and be gracious to me. (NRSV)

Vindicate me, O LORD, for I have walked in my integrity. ... (NRSV)

wa'yāni tends to introduce stative clause types (e.g., nominal clauses) in contrast with the modal verbal character of preceding imprecations against the Enemy.

The most frequent function of the term wa'yāni itself is contrast in both topic and comment across two lines. However, it should be noted that there are some differences between the use of wa'yāni in Hebrew and the use of 'But as for me' in English.

The English expression tends to signal a contrast of topic and comment, and the topic is usually new—English favours verses such as:

They will be destroyed, but as for me, I will be saved.

or

They roam about for food, and growl if they do not get their fill.

But I will sing of you mighty; I will sing aloud of your steadfast love in the morning. (NRSV)

In these examples, there is a contrast between topics ('they ... I') as well as between comments ('be destroyed ... be saved' and 'growl ... sing').

In Hebrew, by contrast, it is possible to have no contrast between topics—wa'yāni may open direct speech:

I have set my king on Zion, my holy hill. (NRSV)

or be repeated:

I was stupid and ignorant; I was like a brute beast toward you.

Nevertheless I am continually with you; you hold my right hand. (NRSV)

or there may simply be no contrast conceivable between the cola:

Are your wonders known in the darkness, or your saving help in the land of forgetfulness?

But I, O LORD, cry out to you ... (NRSV)

In the latter two examples, though a translation with 'But as for me ...' would not be possible, 'But I ...' is acceptable. Prominence is given not only to the subject, but to the entire clause.

Hebrew also allows less sharp contrasts between comments:

(They) meditate treachery all day long. But I am like the deaf, I do not hear ... (NRSV)

and the topic is not necessarily new (it may have already occurred as an object, for example):

... they scheme together against me, as they plot to take my life. But I trust in you, O LORD ... (NRSV)

One would require 'But as for me myself ...' in English here.
Where there is no contrast between comments, the הָוַדָּה is, of course, conjunctive.54

2.2.3.1. וַאֲמַלָּה in Subject Position
The subject position is the most frequent for וַאֲמַלָּה, mostly contrasting the Psalmist with the Enemy:56

... my foes will rejoice ... But I have trusted in your covenant love. May my heart rejoice in your salvation!
(ALW)

... statues of the Psalmist by the Lord of salvation. ... (NRSV)

But I am like a green olive tree in the house of God. ... (NRSV)

The preceding reference to the Enemy may be as a subject,56 subject of a jussive,57 object,58 prepositional object59 or even Addressee.60 It is thus not really true, as Waltke–O’Connor claim, that,

When two clauses in contrast are joined by a וַאֲמַלָּה adversative, a species of וַאֲמַלָּה disjunctive, the subject often comes first in both.__

There may alternatively be contrast with the community:52

... may all who seek you rejoice and be glad in you ... As for me, I am poor and needy, but the Lord takes thought for me. (NRSV)

Truly God is good to the upright, to those who are pure in heart. But as for me, my feet had almost stumbled. (NRSV)

2.2.3.2. וַאֲמַלָּה in Extraposition
The English syntactic structure used to express the adversative nature of וַאֲמַלָּה, ‘But as for me’ is itself extrapositional, requiring repeated reference to the same clausal constituent in the main clause (‘As for me, I ... ’). In Hebrew, the extraposed 1st person may be recovered in the object position:

By this I know that you are pleased with me; because my enemy has not triumphed over me. But you have upheld me because of my integrity ... (NRSV)

or under a preposition:

55Similarly 38:14.
571:13.
585:7 (with object topicalisation and similar reference to the Enemy as 55:24); 31:7.
5926:9.
61Waltke–O’Connor, Syntax, 129 88.3b.
6217:15.

2.3.3. Anticipatory Contrast
The contrast is not always with what precedes; occasionally, it is with what follows. A particularly important example of this in the Psalter is בּוְאַסְרֵי,64 followed by the report of an experience which did not accord with expectations.

2.3. Adverbial Deisis
It has been seen above how adversativity may be expressed by free-standing pronouns, often with ‘adversative הָוַדָּה’. There are a range of other deictic terms, too, however, which may function in the same way. In particular, there are those of manner (kên), cause (לָכֵן, ‘al-קֶנָּה), time (‘אָטָד) and logical deixis (‘דָּא).

2.3.1. Manner: kên
Adverbial deisis of manner is usually achieved by means of the particle כְּ, ‘thus’.

ken may be used together with כְּ, functioning at the clausal level just as it does at the argumental level. The clausal function is normally achieved in prose with ... כְּ ... בָּאָסְרֵי,65 but in verse כְּ ... אֱלֹהֵי is often omitted,66 so that the clausal form כְּ ... אֱלֹהֵי, ‘As my father did, so will I do’, corresponds exactly to the argumental form כְּאֶלֹהֵי, ‘As was my father, so am I’.67 This is clearly analogous to the colloquial English ‘He did it like an expert’ meaning both ‘He did it as an expert does’ (clausal) and ‘He did it as if he were an expert’ (argumental).

Both functions of כְּ ... בָּאָסְרֵי are attested in the Psalter. Argumental:68

Like arrows in the hand of a warrior are the sons of one’s youth. (NRSV)

and clausal:69

64Tsevat, Language of the Biblical Psalms, 26 no. 164. See also ch. 3 on direct discourse. 30:7; 31:23; 41:5; 82:6; 116:10-11.
65So 48:9.
66As also in many other contexts; see ch. 1 above.
67So 1 Sam 25:25; 2 Sam 11:21; 2 Sam 23:25; 10:11.
68Similarly 48:11; 103:15.
69Similarly 83:15-16; 123:2.
This is the case in the Psalmist’s warning to the kings of the earth in the light of the LORD’s
domination:

Then he will speak to them in his wrath, and terrify them in his fury ...

Now therefore, O kings, be wise; be warned, O rulers of the earth. (NRSV)

Something of this consequential meaning is evident in the assertion of present confidence in
the light of future security:

For he will hide me in his shelter in the day of trouble … Now my head is lifted up above my enemies all
around me. (NRSV)

Secondly, wa‘atât may be used, like hinnâ (the standard performative marker), lelô’
(Interrogative/Negative) and wa’ânil (pronominal deixis) to signal a performative utterance. This
may be the best interpretation of

Before I was humbled I was going astray, but now I pledge myself to your word. (ALW)

Similarly, wa‘atât may be used to signal a question:

And now, O Lord, what do I wait for? My hope is in you. (ALW)

The response to a blessing may also be introduced by ‘atât:

Now I know that the Lord has ordained salvation for his anointed (ALW)

This is a common juxtaposition of elements, and it appears that ‘atât functions—as elsewhere
also 30ânil (135:5 … 135:6) and demonstratives (41:12 … 41:13) to signal a formal expression of faith. This formula shows well the common
general of ‘atât, pronominal (ânil) and demonstrative (zîl, zît) deictic elements.

Finally, ‘atât occurs frequently in the Psalter in the formulaic expression
in blessings of God (113:2; 115:18) or of Israel (121:8; 125:2; 131:3).

2.3.3. Time: ‘atât

Proximal temporal deixis is the basic meaning of ‘atât, which frequently occurs with
adversative wâv. Two main functions are essential to the present work.

Firstly, wa‘atât may frequently be used to express logical consequence:

… used like the English “so” or “therefore” … to relate a preceding circumstantial clause to a following
volitional clause …

744:6 is too debatable to form part of this argument. ‘atât alone marks a commissive in 12.6 81:4, 19:75, 140:13.

73In contrast, a relative clause with the qîqûl form and functions temporally, referring to the general past.

77See ch. 3 on qîqûl for general past.
The wicked are not so, but are like chaff that the wind drives away. (RSV)

Occasionally שָׁם alone can have this sense:

Not to us, O LORD, not to us, but to your name give glory (RSV)

It may follow an Interrogative sentence, whether nominal Interrogative:

If you, O LORD, should mark iniquities, Lord, who could stand?

But there is forgiveness with you ... (RSV)

or clausal Interrogative:

Cannot God perceive this?

Yet for your sake we are being killed all day long. ... (ALW)

Thus we see a further relationship between Negative and Interrogative highlighted by an adversative particle.

4. Metonymy

In the discussion of Psalm 145 which began this chapter, it was noted that terms such as ‘your name’ and ‘their eyes’ are used to refer to ‘you’ and ‘they’ respectively. This is the rhetorical feature of metonymy, and the terms used ‘pars pro toto’ in place of participant reference (which itself is lowered to the adnominal or ‘genitive’ level) are described as ‘psychophysical substitutes’.

Therefore my heart is glad, and my soul rejoices; my body also rests secure. (RSV)

O God, you are my God; I seek you, my soul thirsts for you; my flesh faints for you, as in a dry and weary land where there is no water. (RSV)

My flesh and my heart may fail, but God is the strength of my heart and my portion forever. (RSV)

---

78 Similarly 51:21; 56:10; 96:12.

79 See ch. 3 below.

80 See ch. 3, section 2.4.5, on performative function.

81 Section 2.1.

82 Strictly, synecdoche.

My soul longs, indeed it faints for the courts of the LORD: my heart and my flesh sing for joy to the living God. (NRSV)

In these examples, the terms יָדוֹ, רַגּוֹ, שָׁאוֹר, עָשָׂר, and מָפָשַׁת are all used in metonymical reference to the self, enabling the Psalmist to speak of his own well-being in terms of the well-being of his ‘flesh’, ‘heart’ etc. This function is analogous to three other forms of reference-skewing.

The first is the use of Names and Descriptions, as discussed above in section 2.3. If the Psalmist or God refers to himself using a name, such as יָדוֹ or רַגּוֹ, or a description, such as עָשָׂר, the corresponding agreement throughout will be in the 3rd person, creating an asymmetry between grammatical and rhetorical person. This may have an important rhetorical function, in accentuating the sociolinguistic aspect—emphasising Speaker-Addressee status relations. Thus the Psalmist’s reference to himself as יָדוֹ will emphasise his inferiority (it will ‘give face’ to the Addresser), whilst God’s reference to himself as עָשָׂר will emphasise his superiority. A particularly striking example of this is Hannah’s triple use of מָפָשַׁת to refer to herself and use of יָדוֹ to refer to God in her prayer in 1 Samuel 1:11. A collective singular use may be seen in:

O that the deliverance of Israel would come from Zion! When the LORD restores the fortunes of his people, let Jacob rejoice; let Israel be glad! (ALW)

In this example, the desiderative mode of יָדוֹ shows the Psalmist’s personal involvement in his prayer. He is part of Israel himself, and is in fact praying the equivalent of מָפָשַׁת—praying for himself, just as much as Hannah. Analogous to this question of Speaker-reference is the interpretation of the strength-neutral Deontic particle -נָדַד and of Deontic verbal forms as imperative (requests) or directive (commands).85

Secondly, the Psalms exhibit reference to nature praising God.

Let the heavens be glad, and let the earth rejoice; let the sea roar, and all that fills it; let the field exult, and everything in it. Then shall all the trees of the forest sing for joy. (NRSV)

Just as the use of the divine name enables the Psalmist to cry more Expressively (and less Directly), יָדוֹ, רַגּוֹ, שָׁאוֹר, עָשָׂר, מָפָשַׁת —‘Let God arise, let his enemies be scattered’ (68:2) instead of ‘יהוה רָגֹז וּפִיטָר עָשָׂר’ and ‘Arise, Lord, save me, my God!’ (3:8), so the use of jussives enables him to cry out to the creation to praise God without directly addressing it. This has an extremely important theological aspect, of course, in that it avoids the risk of charges of animism or polytheism.

Thirdly, and related to the above questions, is the increased use within the Psalter, in place of the imperative, of cohortatives and jussives (person-marked Directives) with their more complex argument structure.86 This is analogous to the use of the passivum divinum (e.g. יָדוֹ, רַגּוֹ, ‘the arms of the wicked shall be broken’, avoiding reference to God) or the derived feature of causativum divinum as, for example, in

May my heart rejoice in your salvation, may I sing to the LORD because of what he has done for me. (ALW)

or

and the waters that are the water of the earth, you sent to rescue me from sinking in the mire; let me be delivered from my enemies and from the deep waters. (NRSV)

The causativum divinum exists for cohortatives and 3rd-person jussives, and implies three actants—the subject, the Agent and the Addressee (the latter two both being God). This is the most oblique and indirect form of request available in Biblical Hebrew.

The feature of metonymy is also related to other concerns of the present work, such as to what extent the אֲדֹנִי אֱלֹהָי can really be considered as equivalent rhetorically to אָדָם אֶלֹהִים in contexts such as:

With a freewill offering I will sacrifice to you; I will give thanks to your name, O LORD, for it is good. (NRSV)

One final particularly striking use of metonymy in the Psalter is the use of abstract nominal complements in nominal clauses, such as: 120:7 אֲנִי שַלֹּחַ; 'I am all peace'; 109:4 אֲנִי פָּלָח; 'I am all prayer.'87

5. Discrepancy

Various irregularities may be noted in the referential structures of the Psalms.

Firstly, arguments may be expressed with forms from higher up the argument hierarchy,88 such as when a direct object is expressed with a bare subject pronoun (e.g. יָדוֹ, רַגּוֹ, ‘Remember me!’); or they may be expressed with forms from lower down the argument hierarchy, such as when direct objects are marked with י (e.g. the ‘accusative of theme’ in

86See below ch. 6.
87Compare also 119:94 אָנִי, אָנִי שַלֹּחַ, 'I am yours'.
88Sophisticated argument hierarchies are given by Richter, Grundlagen 3, 41, 93.
Chapter 3

MODALITY

The term 'modality' refers to the cross-linguistic feature which may be described as the grammatical reflex of assertivity or reality. A language may give it grammatical realisation in distinct verbal moods, and I argue that this is in fact the case in Biblical Hebrew, which has three moods: a Deontic mood [+MOD, +VOL] based on short-form qal, an Epistemic mood [+MOD, -VOL] based on long-form qatal, and an Indicative mood [-MOD] based on the Anterior qatal form supplemented by the predicative participle. Features closely related to modality are considered, such as subordination and vocative, as well as the question of the scope of Interrogative, Negative and Imperative force. Other forms of clause modification such as passivity and tense-aspect are considered throughout because they share certain formal characteristics with modal markers.

1. Introduction

The style of the first psalms is generally that of prayers, and a high incidence of imperatives, emphatic forms, jussives, hortatory sentences, exclamations and asseverative particles are found. This characterisation of the Psalms in terms of Deontic modality ('imperatives', 'jussives', 'hortatory sentences'), expletives ('exclamations') and other forms marked for emphasis corresponds to the wide functional range of the Linguistic Attitude of Discourse (as opposed to Narrative).

That these various functions are, like reference-shift, all clause-level functions is shown clearly in their common textlinguistic function: One of the functions of rhetorical questions is to introduce a new theme or topic. … Another evidence of change of theme is the use of the vocative form of address. … Other details of the discourses, such as change of participant, or a change in the tense, mood, or aspect of a verb, may indicate that a new unit is starting. Every occurrence of such forms will certainly not indicate a new unit, since, in Weinrich’s terminology, these features are characteristically 'obstinate' (highly recurrent). For this very reason, however, a change in clause type or MTA marking will exhibit a high degree of salience.

---

8Prinsloo, 'A Comprehensive Semistructural Exegetical Approach', 82.
9Beveniste shows that 'There can be no relation between discontinuous elements … The distinction between foreground and background functions is made on the textual level, and so is not affected by verb forms, but by the sentence i.e. word order'; Looten, Tilburg handout; similarly, 'The Indicative System'. 56.
10Beezerman and Callow, Translating the Word of God, 279-80.
2. Main-Clause Modification

There are many ways in which a simple unmarked clause can be modified—for restriction, intensification, mood, polarity etc. Here we are concerned with the modification of main clauses by means of internal grammatical, external grammatical and lexical morphemes.

2.1. Introduction

2.1.1. An Illustration: Existential Clauses

The three functions considered in this thesis—Negative, Interrogative and Imperative—can be well illustrated for existential clauses, since their non-verbal character excludes MTA features in the unmarked clause. The forms we are concerned with are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MTA-unmarked:</th>
<th>Affirmative (Int)</th>
<th>Negative (Int)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MTA-marked:</td>
<td>qātal</td>
<td>אֶזֶזִּי (lit. 'he is')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>long-form yiqtol</td>
<td>אֵלֵי (lit. 'he is')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>short-form yiqtol</td>
<td>אֵל (lit. 'he is')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationships between these various forms can tell us something about the relationships which exist between their corresponding functions. The form הַדְיָן אֱלוֹלָה shows that the order of constituents is Int—Neg—M.

Interrogativity has one distinct formal marker used throughout the system (hayēṣ/hōʿēn), though it may be left unmarked. Since it is the highest-level feature, it is compatible with all other forms, with the exception of Deontic modality.

Within the predicate, the primary distinction (before MTA values) is that of polarity. It has three distinct forms: 'ēn for nominal and participial clauses, lōʿ for Indicative and Epistemic clauses, and 'al for Deontic clauses. The distinct lexeme, 'ēn, for nominal and participial Negation is probably derived diachronically from an Interrogative morpheme, but synchronically, it may be interpreted as lōʿ yeṣ in the light of the analogy between Negative, conditional and Interrogative patterns in the Indicative Cursive:

| Neg:         | 'ēn-Su-Pep | לֶאָנַּה לָאֵלָה |
| Cond:        | 'im-yeṣ-Su-Pep | לֹא יָאָנַּה לָאֵלָה |
| Int:         | hōʿ-yeṣ-Su-Pep | לֹא יָאָנַּה לָאֵלָה |

This is clearly true diachronically too for the equivalents of הָיִו in other Semitic languages, such as Aramaic הָיִו and Arabic lāysa.8 It should be noted, however, that the two terms yeṣ and ēn do not occur in fully complementary distribution, since yeṣ is usually restricted to existential (e.g. יָאָנַּה לָאֵלָה 58:11), possessive (e.g. יהָאָנַּה לָאֵלָה 1 Sam 17:46) and locative clauses, whilst ēn can also Negate nominal clauses which have a nominal subject, such as those with adjectival or prepositional complements, and also (if the subject is a cliticised pronoun) those with a nominal or participial complement. Negation is compatible with all MTA values except the mood-neutralised consecutive forms, waqātal and wayyiqtol.

Certain relationships can be shown to hold between Interrogative, Negative and Imperative.

Firstly, Negative and Interrogative have the same effect on the choice of verb form. We see complementary distribution of Affirmative plus wayyiqtol (which is consecutive and so MTA-neutral10) and Negative plus qātal (the Indicative Anterior form):

Neg: הַדְיָן אֱלוֹלָה

Judg 3:10

The spirit of the LORD came upon him.

Int: נַעֲשֶׂה בַּעֲשָׂר הָרָע.

Jos 5:1

there was no longer any spirit in them

This can be explained as due to the compulsory initial position of wayyiqtol (a syntactic criterion) and the discontinuative function of Negation (a semantic criterion). Under Interrogative, we see the same complementary distribution; here it is attributable to the same factors and the distinction in Linguistic Attitude between Narrative and Discourse, since Interrogative implies a Speaker–Addressee relationship, and so is limited by definition to Discourse.

Secondly, the clitics corresponding to these three functions relate in similar ways to the verb. Deontic Negative 'al-, Deontic Affirmative -nā2 and Consecutive wa= are the only particles in Hebrew exclusively associated with the verb, and whereas these three select short-form yiqtol-x, so lōʿ selects long-form x-yiqtol.11 Even when the Consecutive wa= stands with qātal, it selects a distinct form with a similar fraction of the stress to that seen in short-form yiqtol-x.

Thirdly, the relationship between Negative and Interrogative can be seen in that hōʿēn is normally used where an Affirmative answer is expected.

 Isn't there a woman among the daughters of your relatives and among all my people, that ...

8Joosten, 'The PREDICATIVE PARTICIPLE', 137.
9Here termed the Indicative Cursive.
10See below, section 2.4.7.
11Richter, Grundlagen 2, 75: 'Nun die Konj wa=, die Neg 'al, die Wunsch-Psk nā2' und der Inf abs sind ausschließlich mit dem Verb verbunden. Dabei setzen nā2 'al, wa= (PK KF) und lōʿ (bei PK/FL) die Wahl bestimmter Konjunktionsformen voraus. ... Diese eingeschränkten Fugungswerte deuten auf Realisierung bestimmter Funktionen hin.'
Effectively, then, we may say that Interrogative x Negative = Affirmative.12

These links, illustrated here with respect to existent clauses, show up a complex interrelationship of parts of language which are often considered as functioning independently. We will see in the following how several linguistic functions, especially Negative, Interrogative and Imperative, but also conditional, consecutive and various types of emphasis, all interact around the central parameter of modality, which is also fundamental to the Hebrew verbal system.13

2.1.2. Morpheme Types

The following discussion of main-clause morphemes will be structured around a distinction made by Moscati,14 and followed by Richter,15 between lexical,16 internal grammatical, external grammatical17 and syntactical morphemes. Lexical morphemes correspond to the (mostly tri-) consonantal roots of Hebrew. Internal grammatical morphemes are inflectional types (vocalisation, consonant doubling, stress) such as for broken plurals and passive conjugation. External grammatical morphemes are verbal, nominal and adverbal18 pre-, in- and suffixes. Syntactical morphemes are constituted by word order or independent elements such as auxiliary verbs.

Each of these kinds of morphemes may modify the entire clause:

Semantische Funktionsklassen, die den Satz betreffen, drückt ... das Verb mit den grammatischen Morphem für Imp, Koh, Juss, Energies, mit den grammatischen oder lexikalischen Morphem für Akkonsnt, Aspekt, Tempus, usw. aus. Ebenfalls auf der Satzebene wirken, durch eine Wortart (Mod) bezeichnet oder nicht, die Modalitäten, durch grammatische Morpheme am Verb, durch Wortart (Int) bezeichnet oder nicht, die Leistungsfunktionen der Sprache, vor allem Darstellung, Appell, Kündgabe.19

Thus the modal ‘layer’ with which we are concerned here may involve modal clitics such as -nā or -al (lexical), inflections such as the increase of arguments under causative (internal grammatical), modal reductions as the short-form yiqtol and the tone-fronting in wayyiqtol and waqū'al and modal suffixes such as the cohortative and adverbative -ā ending (external grammatical), and modal verbs such as הָיְתָה, יָרָא and יָדַע (syntactical). Throughout, we will have to consider at what grammatical level a morpheme is functioning:

12 See ch. 4, section 2.4 below.

13 For an example of how modal categories can be used to characterise ‘main-clause verbs, verbs of reporting, verbs of divorcing and conditional clauses’, see Warren, ‘Did Moses permit Divorce?’


15 Richter, Grundlagten 1, 91.

16 Conventionally termed ‘free morphemes’, but also ‘root morphemes’ (Moscati); ‘Grundmorphe’, ‘Lexeme’ (Richter).

17 Conventionally termed ‘bound’ morphemes.

18 E.g. -im contra Richter, Grundlagten 1, 91: ‘Grammatische Morpheme sind beschränkt auf Nomen und Verb.’

19 Richter, Grundlagten 1, 35.

20 See particularly Andersen, Sentence.

There exist ... a gradation from the lexical-semantic properties of verbs, to their propositional-semantic properties in coding states/events/actions, and onward to their contextualized properties in connected discourse. The TAM system in grammars thus reflects this gradation, whereby some features may be viewed as having a narrower, lexical-semantic scope, others as having a wider propositional scope, and others yet as having the widest, discourse-pragmatic scope. It is also common for the same coding unit, say a morpheme, to code a cluster of lexical, propositional and discourse functions.20

2.2. Lexical Morphemes

Particular lexical morphemes are characteristic of particular clause types. Those corresponding to Negative, Interrogative and Imperative are therefore considered in more detail in the respective chapters.

Lexical words21 are conventionally distinguished from grammatical words. The latter (in his terminology, ‘Funktionswörter’), are distinguished by Richter22 as deictic pronouns, deictic adverbs, prepositions, and a fourth, eclectic class of non-deictic words which do not combine with an enclitic personal pronoun. This class includes: Modalwörter, ‘das in Verbindung mit einem Hauptwort oder Satz steht’ (hē, lō, là, ē, ē, al),23 Konjunktion ‘die einen Satz einleitet’ (wa, kl, ã, gam, ‘ap), and Interjektion, ‘die einen Satz ersetzt’. In the terms of Communication Theory introduced in chapter 1 above, modal words belong primarily to the Interpersonal (Social/Expressive) function of language, conjunctions to the Relation and interjections to the Vocative.

Modal words form the basis for the forms for Negation and Interrogation. There is much overlapping of morphemes (e.g. Negative ʻēn / Interrogative ʻēk),24 corresponding to a broader functional overlap (e.g. Negative ፥ን / Interrogative ፥ን). Related functional categories are conditional (e.g. conditional / Introgative / precative ʻim cf. disjunctive question hē ... ‘im), relative, exclamatory and indefinite (e.g. Interrogative / relative / exclamatory / indefinite mā25).

Conjunctions may mark inter-clausal relations such as coordination/apposition (wā),26 alternativity (ʼō) and cause (kl). However, they also express restriction (raq, ʼak), and
intensification (ki, 'ap, hên). Some of these functions overlap with those of, for example, topicalisation and casus pendens, and the figura etymologica, or use of a cognate infinitive.

2.3. Internal Grammatical Morphemes—Voice/ Stem

The various options for clausal voice are not essential to the present work, though transitivity is a category closely related to emphasis, vocative and modality. The functions of passivity have been considered as: divineum, agent unknown, agent mentioned, focus, and each of these has some importance for the sociolinguistic context of the Psalter. True passive imperatives seem logically impossible; Hebrew therefore has no imperative pu'tal or hop'hal forms, but imperative niphtal forms are attested (e.g. 24:7 הָצֵּר הנִּשְׁתַּתְוַה, 'be lifted up, ancient doors!). Imperativity thus resists passivity just as it also resists Negation.

2.4. External Grammatical Morphemes—Verbal Mood/Tense/Aspect

Some recent text linguistic treatments of the Hebrew verbal system were reviewed in chapter 1. There are four principal parameters within which the system has been treated. These are: mood (2MODAL), tense (2PAST), aspect (2PERFECTIVE) and discourse function (2CONTINUATION). Historically, the prevailing view has shifted from tense to aspect to discourse.

Tense theories were held by all Hebrew grammarians, such as Gesenius (1813), until the middle of the nineteenth century; they have remained popular with such as Joshua Blau (1976), Joüon (1923), Rainey (1990), Gropp (1991) and, most recently, DeCaen (1995). Aspectual theories, introduced via Ewald’s relative tense theory (i.e. ‘Perfect’ tense) and then Driver, have been pursued also by Turner (1876), Eskhult (1990), Gibson (1994) and, in conjunction with absolute tense, by Huennergard (1988) and Bath (1992), and in conjunction with relative tense, by Hendel (1996). Discourse theories are held by Michel (1960) and Niccacci (1990), and, in conjunction with aspect, by Waltke-O’Connor (1990). Finally, a modal view of the system is held by Turner (1876) as interpreted by Ljungberg, 36 Zuber (1986) and Joosten (1996).

In the following, we will be concerned with the interaction of these four verbal parameters, and, in particular, with the category mood. Against the background of the text linguistic (‘Discourse’-based) study reviewed in chapter 1, I understand the Hebrew verbal system primarily in terms of relative tense (Kurylowicz, DeCaen) and mood (Joosten).

2.4.1. Interrelationship of Constituents

In the discussion of the Hebrew Verbal System, it has generally been insufficiently recognised to what extent the categories of mood, tense and aspect “merge” into one another. Loprieno expresses well the nature of the interaction:

Since these verbal categories [TAM] overlap in actual strings of discourse, where they are combined with semantic references provided by the context and by the lexical choices of the speaker, it is more predictable—obviously not on the theoretical level, but rather in terms of the likelihood for a form to actually occur in spoken or written discourse—for a preterite predicate to be non-finite, i.e. as presented as completed, for a temporally unmarked form to be imperfective, i.e. not (yet) completed, and for an action expected to take place in the future to convey the attitude of the speaker to this expected predication, i.e. to exhibit modal features.

In cross-linguistic perspective, it has been noted that,

The aspectual type [of language] is defined by a marked term that combines in varying degrees past tense, perfective aspect and realis mood. It may well be that every language expresses in some way objective/external temporal relations (tense), subjective/internal temporal relations (aspect) and subjective truth
conditionality (mood). It has often been argued, however, that Hebrew has no tense element, but solely aspect; this has been shown to be impossible by Kuryłówicz, who shows clearly that aspectual distinctions can only be made within an identifiable tense, and thus further that

In binary verbal systems aspect can be only a context-conditioned tertiary function of the verb.

Some further interdependencies of these parameters can be shown in the following.

Firstly, tense marking will often imply aspectual and modal functions, so that, for example, [+PAST] will tend to imply [+PERF] and [-PAST] will tend to imply [+MOD] (so Loprieno above). It will be shown below that not only future, but also many types of present tense are strictly modal. In most European languages, it is also true that [-PAST] implies [-PERF], that is, a present tense will tend to have imperfective aspect, as in the French ‘j’écoute’, interpreted by default as ‘I am singing’. Biblical Hebrew and modern English, by contrast, have a ‘perfective default’.

From the perspective of aspect, we can say the converse, that [+PERF] will tend to imply [+PAST]. A completed action will tend to be referred to in the past. However, it should be noted that both pastness and perfectivity are distinct from the ‘perfect’, which is an aspectually imperfective ‘relative-absolute tense’, which may exist in any time frame.

Finally, modal forms [+MOD] will tend to be [-PERF] in that they will often refer to incomplete situations, and [-PAST] in that they will tend to be in the uncertainty (Epistemic) or volition (Deontic) of the future or present. Hence, as DeCae says,

No language save the artificial Esperanto has a future tense that is not subject to decomposition into irrealis and/or nonpast and/or perfective aspect.

A fourth category which has been shown to interact with these three is the stativity or ‘situation’ of the lexical verb.

2.4.2. Order of Constituents: MTAV

Considering the form of natural languages, generative syntax considers the three categories of tense, mood and aspect as together heading the clause in deep structure (pre-transformation.

syntax, congruent with ‘meaning’), under a node INFL. It has been shown that contrary to many common assumptions, they in fact occur in the order MTA. Mood, though most often marked in verbal morphology, is strictly a feature not of the verb, but of the clause. Thus Palmer writes:

The modal system of most familiar languages, whether it is mood in Latin and Greek or modal verbs in English, is formally associated, along with tense, aspect and voice, with the verbal system of the language (and even gender, number and person are marked on the verb). But modality … does not relate semantically to the verb alone or primarily, but to the whole sentence. Not surprisingly, therefore, there are languages in which modality is marked elsewhere than on the verb or within a verbal complex. It should be noted that most world languages front Imperative (Deontic) forms, thus indicating the primacy of mood within their word order.

Above mood, there stand the other higher level features of Interrogative and Negative, so that we have the following order of constituents at deep structure:

Int > Neg > Mood > Tense > Aspect > Verb

This ordering reflects the fact that Negative usually applies to the entire predication (i.e. stands outside the verb phrase at the head of the predicate phrase); and Interrogative functions within Referential language similarly to conjunctions in Relational language (i.e. stands outside the predicate phrase). This result from the study of morphology and syntax can be verified in semantic terms, too:

... I whole-heartedly agree with you that the order should be MTA. In my thinking, modality is very obviously outside the core, and more in the realm of the pragmatic/sociolinguistic dimension of language, whereas aspect is the innermost, drawing both from morphology and lexicon for its meaning, (and highly influenced by syntax), and tense navigating in the deictic dimensions, and perhaps mostly influenced by semantics.

We see the ordering of constituents which we have established here reflected in Biblical Hebrew, as already seen in the form הָלָּךְ הַרְגוּשָׁה (Int-Neg-Mood) in the discussion of existentials above. Some examples from the Psalter are:

have they no knowledge, all the evildoers … ? (NRSV)

Do not hide your face from me … (NRSV)

14:4

102:3

49 ‘According to the generative-semantic hypothesis the deep structure of a sentence is its semantic representation.’ Lyons, Chomsky, 94. A logician might be more likely to think of it in terms of illocutionary (or perhaps even perlocutionary) force.


51Palmer, Mood and Modality, 2.

52Ljungberg, pers. comm. Compare Comrie, Aspect, 5, who contrasts situation-internal time (aspect) and situation-external time (tense).
The kind of ordering of constituents performed by Generative Grammar as discussed above has been illustrated for Biblical Hebrew by Battle. He posits the sample sentence:

The morphology of Biblical Hebrew supports the position of mood between TA and Int/Neg in that TA is marked morphologically (grammatical morphemes) and Int/Neg with particles (lexical morphemes), whilst mood uses both morphology (e.g. cohortative -d) and particles (e.g. -nd).

This discussion has argued for a constituent order in deep structure: Interrogative–Negative–Mood–Tense–Aspect. This has two major implications for the present work. Firstly, Interrogative, Negative and Imperative are the clause types considered in the following chapters; it is argued that they are all related to the concept of modality, and it is shown how they function within the rhetoric of the Psalter. Secondly, a constituent order of MTA is integral to the view of the Hebrew verbal system presented here, which iconically (i.e. with surface structure reflecting deep structure) distinguishes verbal forms first by mood, then by tense, then by aspect as follows:54

That this is the correct way of understanding the basic distinctions in the Hebrew verbal system will be argued in the following. First, however, we must consider the key to the system—the yiqtol form.

2.4.3. Long-Form yiqtol as Modal

Long-form yiqtol is usually understood in tense theories as [-PAST] and in aspectual theories as [-PERF]; these categories have been shown above to be often associated with modal forms.

[MOD]. Throughout the literature on the Hebrew verbal system, comments can be found suggesting a relationship between long-form yiqtol (and its continuation form waqatal) and modality. So, for example S.R. Driver:

or Gesenius–Kautzsch:

It is perhaps Lambdin who comes closest among the standard textbooks to a modal description of yiqtol:

With the exception of the future usage, where the action described may be quite specific, the imperfect is otherwise used to describe action conceived by the speaker as general, non-specific, habitual, potential, or to some degree probable. It is not entirely accurate, however, to describe such an action as incomplete or unfinished, as is often done.55

Long-form yiqtol is morphologically distinct in some forms and stems from a short-form yiqtol.58 In an important paper on ‘A Neglected Point of Hebrew Syntax’,59 Niccacci has demonstrated that this morphological distinction corresponds to a syntactical distinction between x-yiqtol and yiqtol-x; he calls the latter ‘passive’, and characterises the former as ‘simply future, not volitive … indicative’.60 The description of any verbal form as ‘simply future … indicative’ seems problematic from the outset, since as we have already seen, future is properly a form of Epistemic modality. In the following, I therefore accept Niccacci’s distinction between the two forms, as well as his (conventional) interpretation of yiqtol-x as Deontic [+MOD, +VOL], but analyse x-yiqtol with Joosten as Epistemic [+MOD, -VOL].61

---

54Gesenius–Kautzsch, Grammatik, 324 §107a. See also, in particular, Gesenius–Kautzsch’s review in the same paragraph of Knudtzon’s view: [Imperf. setze] die Handlung usw. zu dem Bewußtsein, Urteil oder Gefühl des Redenden in direktere Beziehung.
55Lambdin, T.O., Introduction to Biblical Hebrew (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1971) 100 §91. The proper counterpart to such a characterization must be realis modality, not (contra DeCaen, Placement and Interpretation, 184) progressive aspect.
56The distinction is usually considered as reflecting dual origins, in Proto-Semitic yiqatla for relative future, weak volition and, most strikingly, [-progressive] (DeCaen, Placement and Interpretation, 184), and yiqatla for preterite and the volitional paradigm. That is, yiqatla is not ‘univocal’; Eskhult, Studies in Verbal Aspects, 19.
50Compare the nesting preliminarily offered by DeCaen, Placement and Interpretation, 54; his assumption of TMA encourages him towards an essentially tense-based theory.
Joosten considers the Hebrew verbal system in terms of three `subsystems': The Deontic modal subsystem (here, `D-system') is characterised throughout by verb topicalisation (as also Niccacci’s argument for yiqtól-x as jussive):

Deontic system: 

The Epistemic modal subsystem (here, `E-system') centres around long-form yiqtól:

Epistemic system: 

The Indicative non-modal subsystem (here, `I-system') stands in opposition to both of these:

Indicative system: 

Essential to the development of this view has been a relocation of the predicative participle into the Hebrew verbal system, where it functions as Indicative Contemporaneous (cursive [+PROG] hā’ qōṭēl v.s. constative [+PROG] qōṭēl hā’), and a demonstration that several purportedly Indicative uses of yiqtól are in fact extensions of its modal nature. This quite radical reanalysis, which goes so far as to say that

From the point of view of the system, the indicative functions of yiqtól are negligible, is developed below in a fuller way than has been done by Joosten himself. Firstly, I consider more conventionally `modal' uses of yiqtól, then turning to its broader functional range, as conditioned both by extension of its own inherent modal properties and by forms of clausal modality. The waqāṭal `continuation form' is considered later.

2.4.3.2. Extended Functions

There are some functions of yiqtól for the past and present which, it might be argued, must be Indicative, and disprove the present contention that yiqtól is fundamentally modal. Three key examples are the general present (which is here reanalysed as present potentialis), the past iterative and what I here term the past prospective.

2.4.3.2.1. General Present as Present Potentialis

Waltke-O’Connor describe the `general present' uses of yiqtól as (non-modal) `progressive', `incipient' and `habitual'. Joosten instead shows that the participle provides the Hebrew progressive form, whilst these uses of yiqtól refer to an event’s `liability to happen', i.e. `potentialis'.

In the discussion of modal systems in chapter 1 above, it was suggested that a sentence of the type `Marcus can speak Welsh' might be best described as `Dynamic' modality, since it involves no volition (so is not Deontic) or contingency (hence not Epistemic). It was in fact classified as Epistemic, however, on the understanding that there is in fact a condition present: `...if he wants to'. The same implicit condition is present in many English sentences with `will'; for example, the sentence, `An unused book will gather dust' really means, `If a book is not used, it will gather dust'. Thus this potentialis function covers not only ability (`can speak'), but also liability (`will [tend to] gather'), and both of these functions can be expressed with an apparently non-modal form: `Marcus speaks Welsh' or `An unused book gathers dust'.

63Joosten, ‘Biblical Hebrew w′qāṭal’.
64Joosten, ‘Biblical Hebrew w′qāṭal’.
65He has not yet convinced the consensus how Niccacci’s and Revell’s descriptions of his Epistemic system as `indicative' can be `mostly a matter of terminology’ (Joosten, ‘Biblical Hebrew w′qāṭal’, 13 n. 78; van der Merwe, ‘Overview’, 16 n. 29) and has qualified his own presentation as `only a rapid schema, not a serious attempt to describe the BH verbal system’ (Joosten, ‘Biblical Hebrew w′qāṭal’, 14).
66Waltke-O’Connor, Syntax, 506-9 §31.4.
67The modal range Permissive to Obligative is discussed with relation to waqāṭal in Warren, ‘Did Moses permit Divorce’.
68Waltke-O’Connor, Syntax, 504-6 §31.3.
69Joosten also comments elsewhere on the relationship between factual present and potentialis: ‘This is clearly an application of the factual-present function: the action is envisaged as a potentiality, not as actually going on.’ (Joosten, ‘The Predicative Participle’, 148). It will be shown below that the range of E-system yiqtól in fact covers the full range presented in ch. 1, section 2.1.3.2 above, that is, necessary (related to Joosten’s `liable') to possible (related to Joosten’s `able'). The corresponding Epistemic functions, obligative and permissive, are attested for short-form yiqtól and for Deontic use of the E-system.
70Ch. 1, section 2.1.3.4.
That *potentialis* covers both ability and liability is important for the interpretation of Joosten’s main example in Hebrew:71

The door turns on its hinge and a slaggard on his bed. (ALW)

Though the first clause of this proverb refers to the inherent ability of the door, the second clause, *םַעֲלָה יִבְשָׂר* (after resolution of verb-gapping), is clearly not concerned with ability (*A slaggard can turn*), but with liability (*A slaggard will tend to turn*). Further, the underlying condition is clearly not *A slaggard will turn, if …* but can only be discovered by decomposing *םַעֲלָה יִבְשָׂר* into the semantic constituents [+ANIMATE, +LAZY]: ‘A person will turn, if he is lazy’. Thus conditionality, and hence Epistemic modality, is implied by both *ability* (*can*), and *liability* (*will tend to*), and the content of the condition may be expressed in either an adjective (*unused*) or a nominal subject (*ישע*).

**Potentialis of ability** may be seen in many examples of *yiqtol* in the Psalter:

.chapter 138, line 14

But I am like a deaf man— I can’t hear; and like a mute, who can’t open his mouth. (ALW)72

It frequently occurs with both content and polar questions:

.chapter 130, line 3

If you, O LORD, should mark iniquities, Lord, who could stand? (NRSV)

...לָא אֵלֹהִים וּתְקַּחְנָה 44, 22

CANNOT God perceive this? … (ALW)

The relationship of *yiqtol* to what we know as modal verbs has been demonstrated quite apart from extended grammatical discussions. In an old work on formulaic expressions in Biblical Hebrew idiom, Lande writes:

Da die Hilfsverben im Hebräischen im grossen Ganzen fehlen, übernimmt das blasse Imperfekt des Hauptverbes, das wir im Deutschen mit dem Hilfszweck verbunden, ihre Stelle.73

She cites as examples 2 Sam 2:22 אֲרָךְ אֵצוֹם אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר אֶלְּא stmt and 1 Sam 26:9 (corr.) אֲרָךְ אֵצוֹם אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר אֶלְּא stmt, ‘Wer dürfte seine Hand und den Gesalben … legen?’, then going on to discuss the Desiderative idiom כוֹלֶל.74 Two of Waltke-O’Connor’s examples can be clearly shown to have potentialis meaning by the use of one of very few modal verbs in Biblical Hebrew, כוֹלֶל, in parallel texts. Deuteronomy 1:12 אֲרָךְ אֵצוֹם אֱלֹהִים אֶלְּא stmt, ‘How can I carry’, is paralleled by Deuteronomy 1:9 כוֹלֶל, אֲרָךְ אֵצוֹם אֱלֹהִים אֶלְּא stmt, ‘I cannot carry’, and 2 Samuel 22:39 כוֹלֶל, אֲרָךְ אֵ zoek, אֲרָךְ אֵ zoek.

They couldn’t get up’, by Psalm 18:39 כוֹלֶל אֱלֹהִים אֲשֶׁר אֱלֹהִים אֶלְּא stmt, ‘They couldn’t get up’.75 A further example can be seen within the parallelism of:

can he give even bread, or provide meat to his people? (ALW)

To take one other recent grammar, many of Gibson’s general present *yiqtol* can be interpreted as potentialis of liability. He cites firstly comparisons:76

alted יִלְגָּלָל 7,5

as a dog will lap (ALW)

Exod 33:11-17

...as a man will speak to his friend (ALW)

As a deer will long for streams of water, so my soul will long for you, God. (ALW)

Eccl 3:15

As fire will burn a forest, and as a flame will set fire to mountains. (ALW)

The first four of these refer to general characteristics of dogs, friends, deer and fires under certain conditions. Dogs do not spend all their time lapping, nor do fires always burn forests.77 Though 42:2b might seem more problematic, it should be noticed that longing implies the condition of dissatisfaction.

Secondly, Gibson cites ‘proverbial sayings and general truths’:

As for man, his days are like grass; he will flourish like a flower of the field.

For when the wind has passed over it, it is no more; and its place will not recognise it any more. (ALW)

The nature of the condition implied by potentialis *yiqtol* of liability here is made clear by the ensuing verses, which speak of the contrasting benefits for those who fear God.

Finally, Gibson lists uses ‘of a characteristic or a habit’:

The mouth of a righteous man will utter wisdom and his tongue will speak justice. (ALW)

In conditional terms, ‘If a man is righteous, he will …’. But here, as in all the above examples, one element in the modal nature of the clause is the indefinite nature of the subject. One might compare the use of the French subjunctive after an indefinite subject.

---

71Offered at Tilburg; also in Joosten, ‘The Indicative System’, 58. This example seems further problematic, however, since Joosten himself had earlier cited it as an example of the archaic ‘general present’ (‘The Predicative Participle’, 156-7)! 72The 3rd-person reference in בִּפְרָשָׂה makes this a tautological non-restrictive relative clause.


74See ch. 4, section 3.2.4. below.

75Waltke–O’Connor, Syntax, 507 §31.4c and n. 28. See also Blau, 86 §62. on יִלְגָּלָל and Gen 43:7 ‘perhaps because of the modal colour of the interrogation: "could we know"; in fact, the modal potentialis lies already in the yiqtol form.

76Gibson, Davidson’s Syntax, 74-75 §63b. Gibson’s own examples are reinterpreted here, with further examples added from the Psalter as necessary.

77The habitual wafterl in the first clause corresponds to *yiqtol* in the parallel Num 12:8.

78See also 2 Sam 17:12 יִלְגָּלָל אֱלֹהִים אֱלֹהִים אֶלְּא stmt, ‘as the dew falls’. 
In conclusion, we might consider a cross-linguistic treatment of 'gnomic' utterances. Lyons\textsuperscript{79} shows that these may be timeless, omnitemporal or non-deictically time-bound. They may be present tense in languages where this is the semantically unmarked tense, past tense when basing a general truth on past experience, iterative aspect when basing it on what is usually the case, and Epistemic modality when subjective. The potentialist/conditionality argument put forward above is therefore only one aspect of these utterances, and, as we shall see below, some occurrences of q{	extipa{t}}at\textsuperscript{i} may also be analysed as gnomic.

2.4.3.2.2. Past Iterative

'Iterative', 'habitual' or 'frequentative' past represents a (non-modal) tense-aspect description of yi\textipa{q}t\textipa{ol}-waq\textipa{t}\textipa{t}.

Joose\textsuperscript{80} has argued, however, that this is 'a regular extension'\textsuperscript{81} of the main, modal function, comparable to the use of 'would' for iterative past in English\textsuperscript{82} and the iterative use of the Greek optative and Latin subjunctive\textsuperscript{83}.

Often the context demands an iterative reading, whether it be in the exposition to a Narrative (which is presented in the Linguistic Attitude Discourse):

\begin{verbatim}
1 Sam 3:1-5
And he would go up ... year by year ... and he would give ... he would give ... and she would provoke her ... he would do ... she would provoke her. (ALW)
\end{verbatim}
or in an iterative interpolation:\textsuperscript{85}

\begin{verbatim}
Exod 33:7-11
... and would pitch ... and would call ... and it would happen that ... would go out ... and it would happen that ... would rise ... and would stand ... and would look ... and it would happen that ... would descend ... and would stand ... and would speak ... (ALW)
\end{verbatim}

General historical background may also be presented in this way:

\begin{verbatim}
Gen 50:3
And they fulfilled forty days for him, for thus they would fulfill the days of embalming. (ALW)
\end{verbatim}

The subordinate clause here must exist in the past, not the present,\textsuperscript{86} since, however early one dates this text, there is clearly a historical displacement from the writer and a parallel with יְכִּי אֵלָה.

One rather idiosyncratic aspectual treatment of the Hebrew verbal system lends surprising support to this 'past iterative' interpretation of yi\textipa{q}t\textipa{ol}. In his excursus on the 'precative perfect', Moses Buttenwieser\textsuperscript{87} discusses an 'imperfect of progressive duration', reading for example יָכִּי אֵלָה 'became more and more filled with smoke' (Isa 6:4), יָכִּי אֵלָה 'speaks ever more clearly' (Isa 40:1), יָכִּי אֵלָה 'The mist lifted in layers' (Gen 2:6) and even a sequence of verbs of striking with disease (Job 16:13-14), as descriptive of the nature of the disease from which Job was suffering. A person stricken with elephantiasis actually dies by inches: the members of the body rot away and drop off one by one.\textsuperscript{88}

Though these examples might not be best translated with English 'would', they are clearly iterative. They cannot be truly progressive, due to their punctual Aktionsart.

Finally, Nicacci\textsuperscript{89} has shown that following יָכִּי אֵלָה (a position which he interprets as an apodosis), yi\textipa{q}t\textipa{ol}-x (usually Deontic) can perform this same function.\textsuperscript{90} So, for example:

\begin{verbatim}
2 Kgs 4:8b
And so, every time (Elisha) passed by, he used to turn there to eat bread. (Nicacci)
\end{verbatim}

Since it is located in the past, this function of yi\textipa{q}t\textipa{ol} is not frequent in the Psalter. We find some examples in the historical Psalms:

\begin{verbatim}
1 Sam 1:10
And she prayed to the Lord and was on the point of crying. (ALW)
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
2 Sam 15:37
And David’s friend Hushai entered the city just as Absalom was about to enter Jerusalem. (ALW)
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
Exod 15:5
The deep waters were about to cover them. (ALW)
\end{verbatim}

2 Kgs 13:14
And Elisha became ill with the illness of which he was going to die. (ALW)

\begin{verbatim}
78:34
When he had killed them, then they would seek him and would return and would pursue God. (ALW)
\end{verbatim}

2.4.3.2.3. Past Progressive

Joose\textsuperscript{80}’s examples of the past prospective yi\textipa{q}t\textipa{ol} include:

\begin{verbatim}
1 Sam 1:10
And she prayed to the Lord and was on the point of crying. (ALW)
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
2 Sam 15:37
And David’s friend Hushai entered the city just as Absalom was about to enter Jerusalem. (ALW)
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
Exod 15:5
The deep waters were about to cover them. (ALW)
\end{verbatim}

2 Kgs 13:14
And Elisha became ill with the illness of which he was going to die. (ALW)

\begin{verbatim}
89Contra Gibson, Davidson’s Syntax, 74 §63b.
91Buttenwieser, Psalms, 20.
92Nicacci, ‘A Neglected Point’, 13 §2.3.
93Similarly throughout this Psalm, though there are also several ways yi\textipa{q}t\textipa{ol} seems possible, though way yi\textipa{q}t\textipa{ol} itself can be iterative.

\textsuperscript{79}Lyons, Semantics 2, 681.
\textsuperscript{80}Walke-O’Connor, Syntax, 502-3 §31.2b; Gibson, Davidson’s Syntax, 73-74 §63a.
\textsuperscript{81}Joose, ‘Biblical Hebrew w\textipa{q}t\textipa{ol}’, 12.
\textsuperscript{82}Joose, ‘Biblical Hebrew w\textipa{q}t\textipa{ol}’, 8.
\textsuperscript{83}See also Eskhult, Studies in Verbal Aspect, 43: ‘wa\textipa{q}t\textipa{ol} indicates the future or (str ingently enough) habituality in the past’.
\textsuperscript{84}Problems here are what Joosten calls a ‘false start’ in v. 4a (taken up at the end of v. 7); Joosten, J., ‘Workshop: Meaning and Use of the Tenses in 1 Samuel 1’, in van Wolde, E. (ed.), Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible: Papers of the Tilburg Conference 1996 (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997) 72-83. Strikingly, it is just this passage that is promoted by DeCue, Placement and Interpretation, 261-62, in evidence of its tenses theory; he unconsciously reads yi\textipa{q}t\textipa{ol} here as ‘Narrative Present’.
\textsuperscript{85}Note the way yi\textipa{q}t\textipa{ol} narrative sequences which precede and follow this passage. See similarly 2 Sam 15:1-6.
Walkie-O’Connor describe this function of qiytôl as non-modal ‘incipient’ or ‘ingressive’ and so translate ‘began weeping’, ‘while Absalom began entering’, ‘began to cover them’.91 The key to a defence of Joosten’s reading lies in the punctual Aktionsart of the verbs used here. ‘Entering’, ‘covering’ and ‘dying’ clearly do not happen over a period of time, so we must translate ‘to be about to’ (prospective mood with punctual Aktionsart) rather than ‘to begin to’ (incipient aspect with durative Aktionsart).

2.4.3.2. Conclusion

These three extended functions of qiytôl are essential to an understanding of the basic meaning of the qiytôl conjugation as modal. If it is accepted that present and past uses of qiytôl are potentials (ability: ‘can speak’ or liability: ‘will turn’), iterative (‘would go up’) or prospective (‘was about to’), it will no longer be possible with Niccacci to describe qiytôl-x as ‘indicative’.

2.4.3.3. Modally Marked

The above extensions of the modal capacity of qiytôl have had to be carefully argued, relying as they do on complex matters of contingency and Aktionsart. This next category, however, looks at three characteristic modal clause-types (Negative, Interrogative and conditional), marked for modality by lexical morphemes. Even Eskhult, with his strong aspect theory, acknowledges that these are special cases:

... there are particles that deny, dispute or question the full and real activity of a verbal form, such as negations, interrogatives, conditional particles etc. It goes without saying that such particles deprive qiytôl (*<qiytôla>) from executing its curing value.

Modal qiytôl can be shown to stand in these contexts in complementary distribution to the (Indicative Contemporaneous) predicative participle in unmarked contexts. 92

2.4.3.3.1. Negative Present

The participle may be Negated with qiytôl.94

1 Sam 1:13

And Hannah was speaking in her heart; only her lips were moving and her voice could not be heard. (ALW)

The participles here may be considered as ‘historic present’ according to a theory of absolute tense, or, better, ‘progressive/Contemporaneous’ in a relative tense theory. The function of Negated qiytôl is clearly related to Dynamic potentials of ability as discussed above.

1 Kgs 1:1

And they covered him with clothes, but he could not get warm. (ALW)

(It should be noted how many of the above examples of past potentialis qiytôl are Negative or Interrogative.) These examples confirm the relationship discussed in chapter 1 between Negative and mood. The same point can be made for Arabic lân yaqûl, description of which as an allomorph of qatala is clearly wrong, since they are distinguished by the feature [tMOD].

2.4.3.3.2. Interrogative Present

Joosten has tentatively suggested that

... the use of qiytôl to refer to the real present in questions etc. is modal: in a question the action is not entirely ‘real’, it is questioned.95

This can be shown most clearly in conversational exchanges:

Gen 16:8

Where have you come from and where are you going? ... I’m fleeing from Sarai my mistress. (ALW)

Judg 19:17-18

Where are you going and where are you coming from ... We are passing through ... (ALW)

We therefore note the rule as formulated by Gross:

AUF FRAGE NACH INDIVIDUELM GEGENWÄRTIGEM SACHVERHALT MIT X-QIYTÔL ANTWORTET PZ FÜR INDIVIDUELM GEGENWÄRTIGEM SACHVERHALT.97

The (‘real’) answer resorts to the predicative participle indicating that the (‘unreal’) question’s qiytôl is associated with the (weak) ‘I don’t know’ element in the neustic of factual questions, which distinguishes them from (strong) ‘I say so’ statements.98

Interrogative qiytôl can further be seen in adverbial Interrogatives of purpose and time.

1 Sam 1:8

Why are you crying and why aren’t you eating and why is your heart down? (ALW)

1 Sam 1:14

FINDE UNSERE ERGEBNISSE.99

Finally, a good example of a rhetorical question with potentialis qiytôl comes from an unlikely source, Joshua Blau (a tense theorist), who comments:

[Gen] 43:7 בֵּן-יְדֵי יְהוָ֣ה referring to the past [1], perhaps because of the modal colour of the interrogation: “could we know”100

91 Walkie-O’Connor, Syntax, 503-4 §3.2c.
92 Eskhult, Studies in Verbal Aspect, 43.
93 Joosten, ‘The Predicative Participle’.
95 Joosten, ‘Biblical Hebrew w’qiytôl’, 14 n. 82.
97 Groß, W., ‘Das nicht substantivierte Partizip’, 46.
98 Though the Pt-S word order in Judg 19:18 corresponds to what Joosten calls the ‘constative or factual present’ as opposed to S-Pt ‘cursive or actual present’. This distinction is doubtless correct, but Joosten’s argument for Judg 19:18 is weak—he speaks of the ‘interpretative’ element in the Levite’s reply. Joosten, ‘The Predicative Participle’, 150.
99 See ch. 1.
100 Blau, Grammar, 86 §62.
It has been shown that Interrogative qiqtol corresponds not to the participle as a whole, but only to its cursive aspect (hā’ qqtēl as opposed to qqtēl hā’).

As is shown throughout the current work, conditionality shares with Interrogativity a modal nuance. We have already seen examples of ‘im as Interrogative conjunction (following hā’ with qiqtol (78:20 under 2.4.3.2.1. above). We can compare its conditional function:

1 Sam 1:11
If you look ... and you remember me ... and you don't forget ... and you give ... then I will give him ... will not go up. (ALW)

Even concessive uses of ‘im take qiqtol:

Though your sins are like scarlet, they will be white like snow. Though they are red like crimson, they shall be like wool. (ALW)

The Epistemic modality here might be brought out in English by use of the subjunctive: ‘Though your sins be ...’.

Some temporal expressions also have a conditional flavour:

1 Sam 1:22
Once he is weaned ... then I’ll bring him and he will appear and he will stay. (ALW)

It has now been shown that the three modal clause types of Negative, Interrogative and conditional require qiqtol in place of the participle. This strongly supports our thesis that, whilst the participle is Indicative Contemporary, qiqtol is modal.

2.4.3.4. Arguments against Modal qiqtol

I have shown throughout the above discussion how the examples of supposedly Indicative qiqtol presented by those who hold to a tense or aspect-based view of the Hebrew verbal system can be reanalysed as modal. Here I consider some more specific arguments against a modal view of qiqtol.

DeCaan’s relative tense theory of the Hebrew verbal system is highly susceptible to a modal interpretation of qiqtol. He describes qiqtol as ‘simple present tense’, then subclassifying into two Indicative functions (generic and narrative present) and two modal functions (irrealis and Epistemic/Deontic). His description of the generic present as ‘timeless’ already suggests a modal meaning, since the dislocation of a situation from real time (such as in subordinate clauses), like its ascription to an indefinite subject, makes it irrealis, i.e. modal. Each of the examples given invites a modal reading. All of DeCaan’s ‘narrative presents’ are further iterative, those in the background are relative future and those with ‘dā’ can also be reanalysed.

Khan has argued against the modal understanding of the Hebrew verbal system presented by Zuber. He writes, the form qiqtol ... is often used in contexts where it is most easily interpreted as expressing indicative mood. This applies particularly to the use of qiqtol to refer to the present tense.

Though I would have the same reservations as Khan about the kind of methodology used by Zuber (using the LXX and Vulgate), the above discussion should have demonstrated that there are a range of functions within the present (potentialis, Interrogative, Negative, conditional) which, though not normally shown to be such by Greek, Latin or English translations, are in fact ‘modal’ in a broader sense.

Finally, Joosten himself comments that there may be Indicative uses of qiqtol in ancient poetry. The example he cites is:

I see him ... I behold him ... a people living alone, and not reckoning itself among the nations! (NRSV)

It should be clear from what has been said above, however, about the relationship between mood and conditionality, that this sentence could easily be translated as temporal protasis followed by apodosis:

When I see him ... I behold him ... (Then ...) Behold a nation that will live apart, that doesn’t consider living among the nations! (ALW)

This translation accounts for the use of qiqtol forms, explains the use of kō, links the two bicola (καὶ, καί, ‘When I see ... Behold!’), and accords better with the context, since it reads the

---

103DeCaan, Placement and Interpretation, 257-66.
104DeCaan, Placement and Interpretation, 259.
105I Sam 5:5 vocation — the priests of Dagon will not / are not prepared to ...'; I Sam 16:7 potentialis — can see'; I Sam 19:24 relative future — for this reason they were to say ...'; I Sam 20:2 assumptive — my father wouldn't ... without telling me'; I Sam 24:14 relative future — as the old proverb was to say ...’ (authorial comment, showing 136 occurring in the proverb 14:ab-b).
106DeCaan, Placement and Interpretation, 261; just as his examples of the corresponding sequential form, waqqtol (290-91) and the Fada subjective (288-89).
107I Sam 12:31 ‘and thus he was to do to all the cities ...’; 1 Kgs 3:4 ‘he was to offer a thousand burnt offerings ...’.
108I Sam 6:3 conditional — ‘if then you’re healed, then we’ll know ...’; 1 Sam 20:12 Interrogative — will I not send to you ...?’; 2 Sam 5:24a jussive (Deontic!); 2 Sam 5:24b relative future — ‘will he be able to go out ...’.
110Zuber, B., Das Tempussystem des biblischen Hebräisch. Eine Untersuchung am Text (BZAW 164; Berlin de Gruyter, 1986).
second bicolon as referring to Israel’s claim to live in her own land (‘apart’), not remaining nomadic (‘among the nations’).

Having presented the evidence for modal yiqtōl, and having addressed several objections to this view, it must be acknowledged that other views are tenable, and that there are likely to be cases where yiqtōl appears to more naturally invite an Indicative reading. Nevertheless, in my view, reading qiqtōl as modal best accounts for the largest number of occurrences.

2.4.4. qāṭal as Perfect
The qāṭal form is usually understood in tense theories as [+PAST] and in aspectual theories as [+PERF]; these categories are particularly associated with the modal value [-MOD]. If, as has been argued above, yiqtōl forms the basis of a Hebrew modal system, qāṭal must form the basis of the non-modal system [-MOD]. But here we also find the predicative participle for contemporaneity, forcing the interpretation of qāṭal as [+PAST].

It should be emphasised at this point, however, that just as the participle is properly not present, but ‘Contemporaneous’, so qāṭal is not properly past, but ‘perfect’ or ‘Anterior’, that is, relative past.

The morphological and syntactic differentiation within yiqtōl (x-yiqtōl vs. apocopated yiqtōl-x) has been shown to be related diachronically to its dual origins in Proto-Semitic yaqūta and yuqāl, and synchronically to a dual function as Epistemic vs. Deontic. It has frequently been noted that the tree of functional types is unbalanced in that qāṭal is not subject to a comparable secondary distinction. This is explained by Gesenius as follows:

Das Perfekt hat nur eine Form, da es nicht in der Weise des Impl. zum Ausdruck von Modusverhältnissen dienen kann.

In fact, however, just as Epistemic x-yiqtōl contrasts with Deontic yiqtōl-x (so Niccacci), and Cursive hā’ qāṭāl with Constate qūṭāl hā’ (so Joosten), so qāṭal too has several alternative functions, governed sometimes by word order.

Within the reālūs-perfect function, qāṭal may cover a broad range. Past perfect (1 Sam 17:20 and passim), present perfect (Exod 4:21; 1 Sam 3:12; 12:14, 24; Jer 45:4) and future perfect (Gen 48:6; Lev 4:3; 1 Sam 8:18; 2 Sam 17:12) are distinguished by a shift in deictic centre. Within a subordinate clause, there may also be such a shift to the (present) speech act from a main clause reference point in the past (Deut 4:13) or future (1 Sam 3:12 / Exod 4:21, 1 Sam 12:24). Similarly, the ‘epistolary’ perfect function is governed purely by a shift in the deictic centre from Speaker/Writer to Addressee/Reader. The ‘prophetic’ perfect is clearly a secondary function—a ‘context-conditioned perfective’ of qāṭal. In Klein’s much-cited treatment several examples are Interrogative (and so modally marked at clause level); several are gnostic (see above on potentialis yiqtōl); the concept of performativity is not even mentioned, despite these utterances typically issuing from a bearer of authority (prototypically, of course, God Himself); and no consideration is made of the prothetic formula ויעל פתח, which may itself signal a shift of deictic centre to the time when the revelation being reported was first received. From a deictic centre in the present, present states may be expressed using a stative verb such as בַּיָּתָן in the qāṭal form; imminent future states may be expressed similarly (e.g. Num 17:27 אֲבֹהֲרוּהוּ, ‘we are going to die!’), as may future actions of which the starting point is perceived as in the past (e.g. 1 Sam 16:8 אֲבֹהֲרוּהוּ, ‘you are going to return’). The ‘precative’ perfect is treated below.

2.4.5. Performative Function
In this and the following two sections, we look first at a definitively Indicative function (Performative), then at the two varieties of modal function (Deontic or Epistemic) as we see how they may be fulfilled by different forms.

118But see Comrie, Tense, 77-82, who shows that the perfect is not fully congruous with future perfect and pluperfect.
120Kuryłowicz, ‘Verbal Aspect in Semitic’, 118; compare—less formally—Joosten-Muraoka, 363 §112b: ‘not a special grammatical perfect, but a rhetorical device.’; Bietenwieser, Psalms, 21, notes that it always occurs in alternation with yiqtōl.
122In earlier editions of his Grammar, Schneider, 205 §48.6.3, had attempted to explain the entire ‘prophetic’ perfect ‘als einen Sonderfall performativer Sprechformen’; this was retracted in the 5th edition in the light of criticisms of such as Talstra. Nevertheless, several of Klein’s examples (§142, 152, 154, 155) are in fact clearly performative.
123See further below. Klein, The ‘Prophetic Perfect’, 45, rightly notes that, despite the term ‘prophetic perfect’, the Speaker is not always God; it remains true, however, that authority is usually involved.
124Talstra, Text Grammar and Hebrew Bible, II, 28: ‘mr still has its past perspective function’, responding to the claim in Schneider, Grammaratik, 205 §48.6.3.2 (corrected in the 5th edition), that this is performative.
125On the relationship between Mood and Aspect, see Loprieno, Ancient Egyptian, 125, where he shows how in Egyptian, direct (main-clause) or indirect (subordinate) volitional modalities occur in ‘adjective verbs’—‘semantic shift’—from the static [‘be good’] to the dynamic meaning [‘become good’].
126See below, 2.4.6. On Deontic function, Mas Rogland, working under Professor Muraoka at Leiden University, is preparing a new study on qāṭal, including the ‘precative’ function.
Both Old and New Testament accounts of origins (Gen 1:3; John 1:1) suggest a certain power in divine words, so that Ewald could write of what we shall describe as 'performative qatal' that

... it is especially frequent in utterances of God, whose will is equivalent to his deed.127

Butenwieser uses similar terms to explain the 'prophetic' and 'precursive' qatal:

Its origin is primarily to be explained in terms of the primitive man’s belief in the magic power of the word. The primitive man reasoned that, if he spoke of his wish as already fulfilled, its fulfillment was bound to follow.128

Such comments, together with over-etymologising and over-theologising discussions of the word וּבָא as embracing both diaeonic and dynamic elements,129 have provoked justifiably strong attacks from such as James Barr130 and Anthony Thielton.131 However, this backlash should not be allowed to inhibit us from investigating Hebrew verbal usage in terms of the comparable categories of Speech Act Theory;132 such a discussion will not, of course, be characterised by theological claims about the unique effective power of divine utterances, but by a more general appreciation of the functioning of linguistic conventions and authority structures.133

The 'explicit' performative (English: 'I hereby name this ship ...') may be defined formally as:134

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Speaker (1st or self-referential 3rd person)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Object (optional)</td>
<td>Addressee (2nd person)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood</td>
<td>Indicative [-MOD]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tense/Aspect</td>
<td>present perfective [-PAST, -PEV]—English simple present / Hebrew qatal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarity</td>
<td>Affirmative [-NEG]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial marking</td>
<td>English 'hereby' Hebrew 'במען'136 (also אַחֲרֵיתֶם, אַחֲרֵיהֶם and אֵלֶּהוֹן)137</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The range of lexical items used in this way is governed by Austin’s first pair of felicity conditions for speech acts:

A.1 There must exist an accepted conventional procedure having a certain conventional effect, the procedure to include the uttering of certain words by certain persons in certain circumstances.

A.2 The particular persons and circumstances in a given case must be appropriate for the invocation of the particular procedure involved.138

That is to say, there must exist a verbal convention for specific acts in specific circumstances. A paradigmatic example of an explicit performative might be פָּרַע, בְּמַעְן, 'I hereby promise you', where there is an accepted convention of swearing (perhaps reflected in the etymology of בְּמַעְן), where an authority adduced in support of the oath is not invalid (such as in 'I swear by my head') and the Speaker has the power to fulfill what he promises (see Matt 5:34–36; Heb 6:13–16). Common performative verbs include בְּמַעְן and בַּעֲשָׂה.139

An important subclass of performative verbs, referred to by Benveniste as 'verbs délocutifs', consists of verbs not just referring to a Speech Act, but actually derived from the

128Butenwieser, Psalms, 24.
129E.g. Procksch, 'The Word of God in the Old Testament', in TDNT v. 6. Key. (1962) 91–100 (93): 'Only in the Heb. רָאָה is the material concept with its energy felt so vitally in the verbal concept that the word appears as a material force which is always present and at work, which runs and has the power to make alive'. 'Dialecic vs. dynamic' is analogous to 'propositional content vs. illocutionary force'.
132Phrastropic; compare also the terminology of communication theory (Referential/Interpersonal) and modality (propositional content/modality).
134Compare Schneider, Grammatik, 204 486.6. 1. der Sprecher ist Subjekt, 2. das Verb steht im Präsens, 3. die 2. Person kann als indirektes Objekt vorkommen, 4. es kann "hiermit" eingefügt werden, 5. der Satz ist nicht negativ; also, critiquing Schneider's application of Leech's second syntactic marker of a performative utterance (= Austin's grammatical condition), Talstra, 'Text Grammar and Hebrew Bible', II, 28: 'The verb is in simple present tense. In Hebrew: perfect tense. Similarly, Hendel, '156. Eskhult's "coincidence case" is also in fact performative (Eskhult, Studies in Verbal Aspect, 21); Gen 14:22 יָרֵעָה is an idiom, meaning "I hereby swear": Lus. J. ...'
135Austin's 'mark of a performative verb' was 'asymmetry between the first person singular present indicative active and other persons and tenses of the very same verb': Austin, How to do Things with Words, 63.
136Zatelli, 'huh as signal of a performative utterance'.
137These are not normally included in such a list. However, יָדִיעָה seems to have this function in Josh 1:9 and Judg 6:14; יָדִיעָה (compare also the topicalised Agent in Aramaic מַעְןָא בְּמַעְןָא in Gen 48:22; Num 3:12 (with יָדִיעָה) and Ps 2:6; יָדִיעָה in Deut 4:5 and in Ps 40:8.
138Austin, How to do Things with Words, 14–15.
139Hillers, D.R., 'Some Performative Utterances in the Bible', in Wright, D.P.; Freeman, D.N. and Hurvitz, A. (eds.), Pomegranates and Golden Belts: Studies in Near Eastern Ritual, Law, and Literature in Honor of Jacob Milgrom (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995) 755–66 cites: פָּרַע, בְּמַעְן, יָדִיעָה, בָּאָה, בָּאָה, בָּאָה, בָּאָה, בָּאָה, also adding בָּאָה meaning adopt (Ps 2:7), בָּאָה meaning declare 'leave' (Exod 21:5), and Aramaic אֲבֵּשֵׂ פָּרַע meaning 'divorce'. I would add יָדִיעָה (1 Chron 29:2), יָדִיעָה (Deut 4:5), יָדִיעָה (Num 3:12), יָדִיעָה (Gen 9:3; 23:11, 13; 48:22; 3 Kgs 3:12–13; 1 Chron 29:3; Jer 34:17–18 with copulative וַיְבֹא), יָדִיעָה (2 Sam 14:21; 1 Kgs 3:12), יָדִיעָה (Josh 1:9, though not 2 Sam 13:28); I would delete Hillers' examples of יָדִיעָה, which I read as epileiptical qatal, and replace them with Judg 6:14 (see below). Judg 1:12 יָדִיעָה seems highly problematic, since the GV word order suggests a non-volitional reading of יָדִיעָה יָדִיעָה, which in turn would tend to suggest reading יָדִיעָה יָדִיעָה as perfect, not performative. Many performative qalts are rightly rendered (and often marked with 'hereby') in NRSV, which, however, similarly renders several participles (see below). See also the list in O'Connor, Hebrew Verbs, 410.
characteristic form of its utterance.\textsuperscript{140} Thus, in English, ‘to welcome’ means ‘to say “welcome”’ (similarly ‘to hail’, ‘to sweetheart’ and Latin ‘sallutare’). In Biblical Hebrew, these have usually been incorrectly termed ‘declarative pi’el/hiphil’\textit{ī}l’. They occur especially in legal contexts: יְדַעַת וָאָמַרְתָּה (civil law); יָדָעַת וָאָמַרְתָּה (ritual law); יָדַעֲךָ וָאִמְרָתָה (non-legal context). Two non-legal terms are important for the present thesis: יָדַעֲךָ means ‘to say “you know”’, and יָדַעֲךָ means ‘to say “you said”’.

The last of these examples is questionable, since it may be non-determinative (נָכְרָךְ) rather than delocutive (נָכְרָךְ); for the same reason, לְכָּרָךְ is not delocutive.\textsuperscript{141}

Performativity function is important for the study of Hebrew verbal modality because it is by definition non-modal. If a Speech Act is ‘the performance of an act in saying something’, then the act becomes ‘real’ as the utterance is made, so \textit{irreals} forms cannot be used here. The qātal form is the obvious choice, since it is non-modal and perfective,\textsuperscript{142} but it is surprising, in the light of English and other European languages, that Hebrew should use a \textit{past} tense for this function. It cannot be right to understand these actions as obsecus äußerlich erst im Vollzug begriffen, doch als in der Verstellung bereits vorliegende hingestellt\textsuperscript{143} since this would be to rob the utterance of its very nature as token-reflexive (referring to itself).

It would seem better to say that,

\begin{quote}
\textit{Drei dem Perfekt somit eigene Perspektive ist auf Null verkürzt.\textsuperscript{144}}
\end{quote}

In other words, this is a strictly \textit{secondary} function of qātal, governed not by its inherent semantics, but pragmatically.\textsuperscript{145}

Austin himself drew attention to the inadmissibility of person, voice, mood and tense as definitive of performatives.\textsuperscript{146} A 3rd-person example is הָלַךְ וָאָמְרָת (הָלַךְ) spoken by Araunah himself (2 Sam 24:23). Amongst non-modal forms we find performatives expressed in nominal clauses.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[141] Waltke-O’Connor, 402-3 §24.2f cite Hillers, showing that their misunderstanding of Hillers lies in their taking ‘delocative’ as a \textit{functional} category, rather than (so Hillers) a reference to a particular formal derivation. They go on (p. 403 n. 25) to equate Hillers’ ‘delocative’ with Jenni’s ‘declarative’, causing great confusion among their examples.
\item[142] Or, rather, non-performative—as a perfect tense, it does not have its own aspectual value, but is subject to a ‘perfective default’ (so DeCaen, \textit{Placement and Interpretation}).
\item[143] Gesenius-Kautzsch, 322 §100i.
\item[144] Schneider, \textit{Grammatik}, 204 §48.6.2.3.
\item[145] Hendel, ‘In the Margins’, 156: ‘...the performatives ... in which an action is effected pragmatically by verbal declaration’; compare Joost-Muraoka, 363 §112h, on the ‘prophetic’ perfect.
\item[146] See ch. 1, section 2.1.2. above.
\item[147] Translation from Hillers, ‘Some Performative Utterances’, 764.
\item[148] Austin, \textit{How to do Things with Words}, 73.
\item[149] Talstra, \textit{Text Grammar and Hebrew Bible}, II, 28.
\item[151] Several of the following examples of performatives qātal are from Hillers, ‘Some Performative Utterances’, 761-4, and those of the constitutive participle are from Joosten, ‘The Predicative Participle’, 150-51.
\item[153] On 1 Chron 29:13, Joosten, ‘The Predicative Participle’, 151, goes further, saying ‘We thank you’ performs the act of thanking and informs about this performance’. Compare Gunkel’s comment that ‘Der ... Psalm beginnt in hymnischem Ton ...’—zwit ist nicht in der dafür üblichen Form der Aufforderzung zum Jubeln, aber in der schenener einer Beschreibung des Preisens I Sam 2:1; Ps 19.2; 1 Gunkel, \textit{Psalmen}, 327.
\item[154] The examples of ‘hā’ qātel here are my own.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Several of these forms have been read as performative by the translators of the NRSV, which reads, for example, 'I hereby grant him ...' (Num 25:12) and 'I hereby make a covenant' (Exod 34:10). But all these forms can be better understood within the normal function of the Contemporaneous Cursive as progressive, futurum instans or circumstantial.

Performative qōṭāl hū is explained by Joosten diachronically, as gradually replacing qātal in this function. But such a solution seems unnecessary in the light of reservations already expressed by Austin:

... sometimes, if somebody says 'I am sorry', we wonder whether this is just the same as 'I apologize'—in which case of course we have said it's a performative utterance—or perhaps it's to be taken as a description, true or false, of the state of his feelings. If he had said 'I feel perfectly awful about it', then we should think it must be meant to be a description of the state of his feelings. If he had said 'I apologize', we should feel this was clearly a performative utterance, going through the ritual of apologizing. But if he says 'I am sorry' there is an unfortunate hovering between the two. This phenomenon is quite common. We often find cases in which there is an obvious pure performative utterance and obvious other utterances connected to it which are not performative but descriptive, but on the other hand a good many in between where we're not quite sure which they are, ... on some occasions they seem positively to revel in ambiguity.

Thus there is a scale of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performative [+PROG]</th>
<th>Descriptive [+PROG]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'I apologize'</td>
<td>qōṭāl hū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'I am sorry'</td>
<td>qāṭal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'I feel perfectly awful about it'</td>
<td>qāṭal 'ānā'i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without compromising our theory, then, we can acknowledge that there is 'ambiguity' in qōṭāl 'ānā'i. There remain two further problems for the performative, both stemming from comparisons of Hillers's performative qāṭals and Joosten's qāṭals.

Firstly, the verb שולח is cited by both Hillers and Joosten as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שולח</td>
<td>send</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

154 The same examples of qāṭal are adduced by Pardee, 'The "Epistolary Perfect"', 37
155 Compare also the future perfect, 'I will have sent you' in Ex 3:12.
157 Williams, Syntax, 32 §173.
early legal texts,\textsuperscript{166} and is distinctive of Biblical apodictic law, being unknown in cuneiform texts.\textsuperscript{167} Long-form $x$-$yiqtol$ (even with markedly non-volitional $nun paragogicum$)\textsuperscript{168} is used in place of short-form $yiqtol$-$x$ (‘jussive’ and ‘cohortative’), ‘prohibitive’ $l$-$t$-$iqtol$ in place of ‘votive’ $al$-$t$-$iqtol$, and infinitive absolute in place of imperative.\textsuperscript{169} Hence, in the Decalogue for example, we find, for the Negative Deontic, the form $\textit{יִגְרָא}$ instead of $\textit{יִגְרֵא}$ (so also 81:10) and, for the Affirmative Deontic, infinitive absolute instead of imperative: $\textit{לָקְמָה}$.

In the same context, we also find forms with $nun paragogicum$ used Deontically, such as $\textit{יִנְדָּע}$ (v. 23). Lastly, we should perhaps also list here Deontic use of the E-system’s continuation form $\textit{אַחֲרוֹנִי}$,\textsuperscript{170} Duet 6:4-9.

Hear, O Israel: The LORD is our God, the LORD alone ...You shall love ... Keep in your heart ... Receive them ... and talk ... Bind them ... fix them ... and write them. (NRSV)

I am the LORD your God, so make yourselves holy; and be holy for I am holy: and do not make yourselves unclean with any swarming creature that crawls on the earth. (ALW)

All of these E-system forms occur Deontically in all three grammatical persons.\textsuperscript{171} A 1st-person example may be seen in Eve’s

“... we may eat of the fruit of the trees in the garden.” (NRSV)

Here, the Deontic force (also that of God’s original $\textit{לֹּא יִגָּרֶשׁ$ in 1:16) is not obligatory but permissive.\textsuperscript{172} It is this permissive function which is present in the Negative ‘prohibitive’ form (\textit{i.e.} ‘you cannot’, not ‘you don’t have to’).

This Deontic use of the E-system has generally perplexed grammarians. In the light of the above discussion of E-system $yiqtol$, however, it is not surprising—it is simply the Deontic counterpart (obligation/permission) to Epistemic (necessity/possibility) long-form $yiqtol$, as for example in ‘present potentialis’. This Deontic use of long-form $yiqtol$ may be compared with the use of English ‘may’ and ‘must’ both Epistemically and Deontically,\textsuperscript{173} and Deontic use of the infinitive absolute may be compared with the Deontic use of infinite forms in several other languages, e.g. Italian infinitive: $\textit{Non fare}$; English participle: $\textit{No smoking}$.\textsuperscript{174}

Most striking, however, is the use of the Indicative Anterior $qâ€™al$ [MOD] Deontically [+VOL]—the ‘precative [or more strictly, optative] perfect’,\textsuperscript{175} Just as Deontic use of the E-system is often restricted to address by $\textit{God to men}$ (strong neustic—command), so Deontic use of the Indicative Anterior form is most often restricted to address by $\textit{men to God}$ (weak neustic—request),\textsuperscript{176} it is characteristic of the Psalms.\textsuperscript{177} The context is always otherwise marked as Deontic, since this use is 

... invariably found alternating with the imperfect or the imperative; it is by this outward sign that the precative perfect may unfailingly be identified.\textsuperscript{178}

Between them, Buttenwieser\textsuperscript{179} and Dahood\textsuperscript{180} list up to 30 precative perfects,\textsuperscript{181} though many of these have been challenged.\textsuperscript{182} From the context, Buttenwieser argues quite convincingly:

‘is conceivable that any sane writer, when turning from the gloom of the present to the glory of the past, should fail to indicate the change of scene and leave it to the reader to divine what he means to say? We

\textsuperscript{166}This has been shown separately for $nun paragogicum$ (Driver, S.R., Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel, 2nd rev. edn. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913) 30-31) and the infinitive absolute (Finley, ‘The Proposal’, 9). It occurs also in human speech in Ruth 1:88 (Koiv).


\textsuperscript{169}The infinitive absolute shares the incompatibility with Negation exhibited by the imperative (Finley, ‘The Proposal’, 6). Voilational use of the infinitive absolute is also attested in Arabic qatali (Wright, Grammar 1, 62).

\textsuperscript{170}Joosten, ‘ Biblical Hebrew n paragogic’, 8.

\textsuperscript{171}Contra Finley, ‘The Proposal’, 9, suggesting that all Deontic uses of the infinitive absolute (also part of the E-system) ‘can be described as commands’.

\textsuperscript{172}See above ch. 1, section 2.1.3.2, Gesenius–Kautzsch, 329 §107r-s, similarly write of the ‘litiativ’ use of potentialis long-form $yiqtol$, though they generally confuse primary and ‘skewed’ functions of long-form $yiqtol$.

\textsuperscript{173}Palmer, Mood and Modality, 114.

\textsuperscript{174}The suffix conjugation is used Deontically also in Ugitarian, Aramaic, Syriac and Arabic; Moran, W.L., ‘The Hebrew Language in its Northwest Semitic Background’, in Wright, G.E. (ed.), The Bible and the Ancient Near East (FS Albright: London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1961) 54-72 (65). Waltke–O’Connor, 494 §30.5.4c, actually claim (following Ginsberg) that this is ‘one of the original functions of the perfect’. As I show below, it should better be seen as an obligatory secondary function.

\textsuperscript{175}Finley, ‘The Proposal’, 10; Hendel, ‘In the Margins’, 171.

\textsuperscript{176}Waltke–O’Connor, Syntax, 494-95 §30.5.4d.

\textsuperscript{177}Buttenwieser, Psalms, 21; Dahood, Psalms 1, 20.

\textsuperscript{178}Buttenwieser, Psalms, 18-25.

\textsuperscript{179}Dahood, Psalms 1, 20.

\textsuperscript{180}1813:8; 4:2, 8; 7:7, 9:14, 18; 17:22; 22:31; 36:10; 44:27; 54:9; 55:19; 56:9; 57:7; 61:4, 6; 63:3; 67:7; 73:23; 83:11; 85:5-2, 4, 94:4, 102:18, 110:3, 119:121. One further good example not cited by them is 1 Chron 17:27 

\textsuperscript{181}See the discussion in Finley, ‘The Proposal’, 7-8.
that is, more 'imperfective'. Similarly, it has also been suggested that Deontic uses of qātal (l-system) may be considered more 'perfective' Deontic than the D-system itself. In rhetorical terms, then, the most solemn, permanent legal pronouncements will be expressed with the E-system, the most urgent, panicky cries for help with the l-system, and everything inbetween with the usual D-system. Hence the following interpretation of the three alternatives for Deontic function:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E-system</th>
<th>D-system</th>
<th>l-system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forms:</td>
<td>Forms:</td>
<td>Forms:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long-form yiqtōl, lā' tiqṭāl, qāṭāl</td>
<td>short-form yiqtōl, al-tiqtól, qāṭāl</td>
<td>qāṭālā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'preceptive imperfect'</td>
<td>'jussive'</td>
<td>'preceptive perfect'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspect: Imperfective</td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst this interpretation fits the facts well, its weakness lies in that it introduces an aspecual parameter to the interpretation of forms which we have already shown to be modally distinguished. A more consistent interpretation may lie in noting from a sociolinguistic standpoint that the 'preceptive imperfect' is most often used by God to man and the 'preceptive perfect' most often by man to God. Thus one might profitably consider the distinction as modal—just as the formal systems (E-system, D-system, l-system) are distinguished in the 'tropic' ('sign of mood')—modal quality element, so the corresponding Deontic functions are distinguished in the 'neustic' ('sign of subscription'—modal force) element on a scale of command (directive) to request (preceptive):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal System (tropic):</th>
<th>E-system</th>
<th>D-system</th>
<th>l-system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use:</td>
<td>God to man</td>
<td>directive</td>
<td>man to God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal strength (neustic):</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>→</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between the Deontic force of lā' tiqtól (E-system) and al-tiqtól (D-system) is usually characterised as aspecual, the former expressing 'a more permanent prohibition'.

---

183 Buxtenwiser, Psalms, 22. Compare Aeijmelaeus's argument against emphatic kī that 'One should not impose the logical structure of one's own language on Hebrew and categorically regard it as impossible for a causal connective to appear in contexts like those where 'kī is found,... I... regard 'kī as a connective rather than an emphatic or aspective particle. In this statement I include the instances in the imperative hynms as well as those in complaint prayers.' Aeijmelaeus, A., 'Function and Interpretation of 'kī in Biblical Hebrew', JBL 105 (1985) 193-209 (205).

184 Dahood, Psalms 2, 404.

185 For a survey of views on emphatic kī, see Claassen, W.T., 'Speaker-Oriented Functions of kī in Biblical Hebrew', JNSL 11 (1983) 29-46 (29-36). Both Claassen and, later, Aeijmelaeus, 'Function and Interpretation of 'kī, argue against an emphatic interpretation.

186 See ch. 1, section 2.1.2.


188 Compare Aeijmelaeus’s comment that, 'Just as yā is used in narration [i.e. Narrative] as a universal connective to introduce clauses, 'kī appears in argumentative types of texts [i.e. Discourse] as a kind of argumentative coordinator'; Aeijmelaeus, 'Function and Interpretation of 'kī', 205.

189 Finley, 'The Proposal', 6; Williams, Syntax, 32 §173; Gibson, David's Syntax, 81 §66; Walke-O'Connor, Syntax, 567 §34.2.1b; most extensively, Bergsträsser, Einführung, 11-12: 'Gemeinsemitsisch ist, daß der Imperativ
This interpretation is confirmed by the co-occurrence of ‘weak’ modal particles with the ‘precative perfect’, such as optative ki (as shown above), desiderative nà and lāhī, precative mēn (Gen 40:14), ‘im·mān’ (Gen 18:3) and nāt,193 and Epistemic195,196

In all of the above cases, Deonotic function is still marked by verb fronting.

2.4.7. Epistemic Function

Just as the E-system was shown above to have Deontic function in certain (especially formal) contexts, so it appears that, as a politeness form in an informal context, the D-system can have Epistemic function:

Israel Abrahám Alpertis Éimin Émi-keloham

Then Abraham said to his young men, “Stay here with the donkey; the boy and I will go over there; we will worship, and then we will come back to you.” (NRSV)

Here it is clearly from the D-system morphologically, and is preceded by a topicalised subject (i.e. this is not the E-system x-yiqtol structure). Though volition is grammaticalised here, the cohortatives cannot be Directive–precative197 ‘request’ (since Abraham is addressing slaves), Directive–hortative (since the slaves are not going with him) or Expressive (since they refer to a future extra-linguistic act). They must therefore be Commissive–promissive, the point at which the D-system shades into the Epistemic, losing its volitional force.

The Indicative qātāl form has Epistemic198 function especially in the form of waqātal,199 though this form may also function Deontically, sequential to an imperative,200 cohortative,201 or—most famously in the Samā‘, as above—to an Indicative nominal clause. The mutual form-to-function cross-matching of the sequential forms (I-system qātāl ... wayyiqtol vs. E-/D-system yiqtol ... waqātal) has been central to most recent study of the Hebrew verbal system, and, together with forms such as past yiqtol (after ‘lāt) and the ‘prophetic perfect’, the source of much speculation.202 It centres around the nature and origin of the form wa-.

To the range of past solutions reviewed by Kustâ203 has most recently been added, for waqātal,204 the radically anti-‘etymologizing’205 theories of Washburn (‘the prefixed is an inflection, not a conjunction’206) and Joosten (‘... w*qātal is not to be equated in any way with simple qātal; it should be considered as a separate formal category with its own function.’207) and, on the other hand, that of DeCaen (‘wayyPRE2 is subject to decomposition’,208 ‘the abstract formative [-t]- of the wayyPRE2 is analyzed as a COMP bearing the modal feature [-IMP]’209). The function of the particle(s) may be seen in comparative perspective to be ‘tense [more properly, mood] neutralizing’,210 indeed in DeCaen’s main example, Zulu, the ‘determining factor [is] the difference between realis and irrealis in the head of the neutralization chain’,211 prompting him to characterise wayyiqtol as ‘sequential realis’ and waqātal as ‘sequential irrealis’,212 thus supporting the modal (as opposed to his true-based) distinction between qātal/wayyiqtol and yiqtol/waqātal proposed here.213 The functional range of wayyiqtol for present214 and pluperfect216 is accommodated by this analysis, since it does not attribute to wayyiqtol any TA features.

202Consider, for example, a characteristic popular Jewish comment published recently: “In the Bible time is reversed,” said Steinsaltz, noting an odd quirk in the original Hebrew text of the Old Testament. “The future is always written in the past tense, and the past is always written in the future tense.” “Why?” I asked. “No one knows,” he said. “We may be moving against the stream of time,” said Steinsaltz, noting that the laws of physics are “time-symmetric,” that they run just as well backwards as forwards in time.”. Drosnin, M. *The Bible Code* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1997) 175.

203Cited in Wake–O’Connor, Syntax, 544-45 §33.1.2b.

204The case is not completely the same for waqātal and wayyiqtol, since the latter may begin an episode, whilst the former never does. Nicacci, Syntax, 82, considers this ‘proof that [waqātal] is always a continuation form.’


207Joosten, *Biblical Hebrew w*qātal*, 7. See also his arguments against other views, pp. 3, 6.

208DeCaen, *Placement and Interpretation*, 290.


210DeCaen himself refers to ‘the tense-mood neutralization in Zulu’; DeCaen, *Placement and Interpretation*, 2.

211DeCaen, *Placement and Interpretation*, 284-89; contra Joosten. Much work has been done recently, especially by SIL linguists working on formerly undescribed languages, on ‘serial verb constructions’ in which (as has often been claimed for Hebrew), the entire series bears the MTA-features of the head verb.


213DeCaen, *Placement and Interpretation*, 293.

214Still, the cross-matching can only be explained as ‘selectional restrictions’; DeCaen, *Placement and Interpretation*, 296.

215Groll, W. “wayyiqtol für die Gegenwart?”

This ‘mood neutralisation’ of the Indicative Anterior qātāl is not solely a feature of ‘consecutive’ wāw, however. Several other clause types involve mood neutralisation, including Deontic ‘ki etc. + qātāl’ (see above), unreal conditional ‘im + qātāl’, real conditional ‘lā + (D- or E-system) yiqtōl’218. It should be noted that these sequential forms under mood neutralisation bear the same feature of verb topicalisation as the D-system.

Our adoption of DeCaen’s argument for why the continuation forms should cross-match with the main-clause forms remains problematic. DeCaen does not show clearly how he has moved from mood-neutralisation to the ascription of new modal values to waqātāl and wayyiqtōl. It appears that, as is often done,219 he is identifying a feature of ‘remoteness’ in both modality and the [PAST] feature of qātāl. This fits well with my analysis, however the converse is not the case, since short-form yiqtōl is not marked for tense, but is simply modal (Deontic). The best solution we can suggest thus far is that after mood-neutralisation of qātāl and yiqtōl upon their being placed in a sequential position after the conjunction (as waqātāl and wayyiqtōl), the pastness of qātāl attracted waqātāl to the E- and D-systems, and wayyiqtōl then moved by analogy to accompany qātāl in the I-system.

Having now considered the two principal verbal forms in Biblical Hebrew (yiqtōl and qātāl), a definitely Indicative function (perfective) and the two types of modal function (Deontic and Epistemic), we are almost ready to draw up our conclusions on the verbal system. First, however, we must look at a pragmatic feature which is distinctive of Discourse such as the Psalter and which may often result in irregular usages.

2.4.8. yiqtōl and qātāl in Discourse

It has already been noted above that the ‘precative perfect’ is

... invariably found alternating with the imperfect or the imperative; it is by this outward sign that the precative perfect may unfailingly be identified.220

As Buttenwieser continues,

A similar alternation of the perfect and imperfect marks the use of the prophetic perfect; it is a sure sign by which true prophecies may be distinguished from vaticinia ex eventu. 221

Thus both precative (Deontic) and prophetic (Epistemic) functions of qātāl only occur where their secondary modal function is indicated by nearby yiqtōl forms. As has been noted above, the performative function of qātāl similarly tends to occur in context with forms from the D-system. There are two other major forces also at work in the Psalms, however, which bring together yiqtōl and qātāl.

Firstly, there is the alternation of qātāl and yiqtōl within a bicolon for purely poetic reasons. This may involve qātāl-(way)yiqṭūl or (way)yiqtōl-qātāl; the order of elements and the use of the wayyajutation does not appear to affect the meaning. This pattern is frequent in Psalms and appears in many cases to involve no semantic distinction between the cola—Dahood222 lists qātāl-yiqtōl alternations functioning as past, present, future and optative. It may even involve alternation with the same root (38:12; 93:3).223 A good example, where the time-frame is clearly past,224 is:

In distress you called (qātāl), and I rescued you (wayyiqtōl); I answered you (yiqtōl) in the secret place of thunder; I tested you (yiqtōl) at the waters of Meribah. Selah (RSV)

Kugel interprets this phenomenon as ‘completion or complementarity … the integration of A and B into a single whole’225 or ‘the sort of intermeshing represented in English by a subordination’,226 translating, for example:227

Translating, for example:

Giving food to his worshippers / he keeps his covenant forever // (Kugel)

In some cases, however, it might be argued that the opposition does carry semantic weight:

כִּינָעַתּ אלָ הָאָרֶץ נְכֹחֵי יְהוָה נַעֲשֶׂה רֵדָם אלֵי קֹדֶשׁם (Isa 63:16)

For you are our father, though Abraham does not know us and Israel does not acknowledge us … (RSV)

Read in the light of Kugel’s characterisation of synonymous parallelism as ‘A is so, and what’s more, B’,228 we might translate in a way which retains the non-modal/modal opposition:

… though Abraham does not know us (qātāl static), and even if Israel were not to acknowledge us (yiqtōl).

In the light of the references to צֶרֶם, אָבִיִּךְ, it appears that ‘Abraham’ is probably not to be understood as synonymous with ‘Israel’ here, but as a reference to the historical figure, so that one might in fact translate ‘Abraham did not know us’. Then the modal distinction lies in the

217DeCaen, Placement and Interpretation, iii: ‘Tense neutralization … involves a complex interaction between tense, mood and pragmatic-discourse factors.’
218Hendel, In the ‘Margins’, 172 and n. 82.
219Hendel, In the ‘Margins’, 171-72; Palmer, Mood and Modality, 209-10.
220Buttenwieser, Psalms, 21.
221That is, ‘prophecies after the event’—what others have termed ‘apophecy’ (e.g. Agrrippa d’Aubigné, Les Tragiques); Buttenwieser, Psalms, 21.
222Dahood, Psalms 3, 420-22.
224The view of short-form yiqtōl as organically a preterite (so Held, ‘The Qīṭ-Qīṭ (Qīṭ-Qīṭ) Sequence’, with reference to Ugaritic; see also Kienast, B., ‘Das Punktualthema *japrus und seine Modi’, Or 29 (1960) 151-67) is generally opposed in the present work, though it cannot be completely ruled out.
expectation that though hopes cannot be set on Abraham (past), they might have lain with Israel (present). ה and י may be read as functionally equivalent. 229

*Secondly,* there is the (closely related) adaptation of set formulas. This may be seen functioning within a Psalm:

... for as for me, I have walked in my integrity ... But as for me, I walk in my integrity ...

It also occurs across a major formulaic complex such as that consisting of ובנֵי and קרִים. 230

Verb forms represented here include yiqtōl, wayiqtol, wayyiqtol, qatal, qōdal, imperative, infinitive absolute; clause types include circumstantial, causal, adversative, purpose, result, consecutive. Such grammatical variation within a formula is analogous to the lexical variation which Culley highlights as the heart of oral formulaic composition. 231

There are therefore both grammatical and poetical forces at work within the Psalter which result in otherwise unexpected juxtapositions of qatal and yiqtōl forms. These account for the vast majority of forms in the Psalter which do not accord with the view of the verbal system presented here.

2.4.9. Conclusions on the Biblical Hebrew Verbal System

Modality in Semitic languages has often been described in terms of secondary functions or diachronic change:

The evolution from a semantic to a syntactic mood, from a verbal category whose choice depends solely on the speaker’s attitude to the predication to a form only used in a set of subordinate clauses, is known from

Ino-European and Afroasiatic languages and represents one of the features of syntaxization as a diachronic process, of “genesis of syntax ex discours.” 232 Similarly Joosten refers to the extended (present potentialis, past iterative, past prospective) and modally-qualified (present Negative, Interrogative, conditional) uses of yiqtōl, together with stative and performatives uses of qatal as ‘traces of an earlier stage of the language’. 233 He explains what DeCaen calls ‘the paradox of the imperfective ... excluding the progressive’ 234 diachronically:

At a certain moment in the history of the Hebrew language the present tense function was renewed through the use of the predicative participle. ... PC [yiqtōl] and SC [qatal] lost their present-tense functions almost completely ... The SC was pushed to one side to become a past tense (more exactly: a form expressing anteriority to the moment of speaking), the PC moved over to the other side to become a form expressing modality. 235

Though Joosten’s ensuing examples of continuing functional overlap are impressive, this diachronic perspective may weaken our appreciation of how the various elements function together in a synchronic system.

The system of Hebrew verbal inflection is tripartite, opposing by mood: qatal, long-form x-xiqtōl and short-form yiqtōl-x. 236 These form the basis for three systems, which also have associated person-unmarked forms and continuation forms: 237

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Paradigm forms</th>
<th>Supplementary forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-system</td>
<td>qatal ('perfective')</td>
<td>Negation: lō qōdal: 'ō qōdal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-system</td>
<td>long-form x-yiqtōl ('imperfective')</td>
<td>Continuation: wayyiqtol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-system</td>
<td>short-form yiqtōl-x ('passive')</td>
<td>Negation: 'al qatal ('vetoive')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The I-system has a perfective default, 238 so that qatal cannot bear further aspectual distinctions. 239 This has, however, led to the introduction of the participle (as in English) for

---

229 Lopez, *Ancient Egyptian*, 82
235 Joosten, 'The Indicative System'.
236 DeCaen, *Placement and Interpretation*, 184 etc. Similarly, Eskhult, *Studies in Verbal Aspect*, 20: ‘Being static, it is also atemporal, that is, there is no analysis of the verbal content in a continuum between given limits’.
237 See above on the relationship between [+PAST] and [+PERFECTIVE].
imperfective aspect in all time frames. Progressive aspect is expressed by the participle, which occurs, in the present, alone and after the subject (ḥa' qōtēl [PROG] cf. qōtēl hā' [PROG]), and in the Deontic system and the Indicative Anterior, together with the MT-marking 'placeholder' verb הָיָה (yahi qōtēl and hāyah qōtēl respectively).

The D-system is closely related to the E-system, and is characterised by verb-topicalisation (ṣiqīl-x vs. x-ṣiqīl) and vowel reduction (short-form ṣiqīl vs. long-form ṣiqīl; imperative vs. infinitive absolute).

Starting with the branching of functions given in 2.4.2 above, the system may be presented as in the diagram opposite. The most realis forms appear on the right—formally, a verbal noun lacking inflection in a subject-initial nominal clause, and functionally [-MOD]. The most irrealis forms appear on the left—formally, a fully inflected verb in a verb-final verbal clause, and functionally [+MOD, +VOL].

It should be clear from this presentation and the above discussion of MTA relationships how the Hebrew verbal system has come to be analysed differently. It is quite true that qōtēl is past [+PAST] and perfective (under a 'perfective default'), whilst x-ṣiqīl is future [+MOD, +VOL]. But both tense- and aspect-based theories err crucially in sometimes reading ṣiqīl as Indicative non-past [-MOD, -PAST] i.e. present. Hence the space devoted above to demonstrating the basically modal meaning of x-ṣiqīl.

The above discussion has presented an analysis of a formal system; it is not claimed that it accounts for all uses of the Hebrew forms. As Kuryłowicz comments in dismissing the category of aspect from Hebrew morphology:

It is of course not the possibility of expressing certain meanings and shades—they may be expressed in any language—but the existence of verbal categories which interests us here.

We have been looking for what he calls 'system-conditioned' (that is, primary) functions, rather than 'context-conditioned' (or secondary) ones, and it is in this sense that Joosten can say that

From the point of view of the system, the indicative functions of ṣiqīl are negligible.

It is a 'Morphocentric Fallacy' to suggest that MTA values are completely determined by verbal morphology. MTA values need to be understood in terms of both verbal morphology and features of the sentence, as is clear already from the above distinctions of modal system (x-ṣiqīl-x and x-ṣiqīl).

---

240 DeCaen, Placement and Interpretation; Joosten, 'The Predicative Participle'.

241 That is, in the presence of TA-features; see 2.1.1. above.

242 DeCaen, Placement and Interpretation, 222. It has been suggested that the use of the auxiliar is characteristic of spoken language: Rendsburg, Dictatorship, 145-49.

243 Kuryłowicz, 'Verbal Aspect in Semitic', 115.

244 Kuryłowicz, 'Verbal Aspect in Semitic', 115.

245 Joosten, 'Biblical Hebrew wqītēl', 14 n. 82.

246 DeCaen, Placement and Interpretation, 68.
yiqt³l vs. yiqt³l-x) and aspect (ha° qatêl vs. qatêl ha°), not to speak of other pragmatic factors.

Joosten argues from Benveniste’s ³nºpresentes de l’analyse linguistique:

A verbal form as such—meaning: a verbal form as one element in a verbal paradigm—expresses an abstract function which should be described in terms of tense, aspect and modality. With this basic, ‘margorical’ function, the verbal form can be deployed in several ‘text-linguistic’ or discourse functions.

These discourse functions are not to be played down: they are real, and they should be described in a grammatical treatment of BH [Biblical Hebrew]. From the point of view of the individual verbal forms, however, discourse functions are secondary, contextual applications of a more basic temporal, aspectual or modal function.

Discourse functions are not inherent to the verbal form, but to the clauses within which the verbal form is incorporated.247

Lyons comments similarly in cross-linguistic perspective:

It is an empirical fact … that tense, like person, is commonly, though not universally, realized in the morphological variations of the verb in languages. Semantically, however, tense is a category of the sentence.248

Thus the recognition of a broader functional range does call for explanation (as has been given above for yiqt³l), but does not necessarily affect the ‘system’.

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of this presentation by comparison with more traditional treatments is the crucial role played by word order. x-yiqt³l vs. yiqt³l-x distinguishes Epistemic and Deontic modal systems (Niccacci’s ‘Neglected Point in Hebrew Syntax’249) and ha° qatêl vs. qatêl ha° distinguishes Cursive and Constitute aspects in the Contemporaneous (Joosten’s great contribution250). We therefore turn now to consider word order.

2.5. Syntactical Morphemes

Moscati uses the term ‘syntactical morphemes’ to refer to ‘the order of words or … independent elements’.251 We have seen in the above how the copular verb niαî has come to function as just such an independent element—as an ‘auxiliary verb’ similarly to Moscati’s example, the Arabic future particle sawa. In this section, we will be principally concerned with syntactical clause modification in terms of word order (especially verb-subject [VS]).

The predominant view on Hebrew verb order is currently that it is VS. So, for example, Waltke-O’Connor:

For verbal clauses the basic Hebrew word order is verb + subject (VS). This verb-first word order usually obtains where a clause has no introductory material, where a clause begins with a was-relative (traditionally ‘wash-consecutive’) construction, or where a clause begins with adverbial materials.252

DeCaen has, however, drawn attention to the often neglected distinction between ‘basic’ and ‘dominant or statistically prevalent’ word order.253 which legitimates, via a theory of transformations, a view of the statistically less prevalent word order (SV) as basic. The SV view has been held most famously by Joüon (though this section of his grammar was changed to VS in Murasko’s revision), as well as Blau and, most recently, DeCaen; Loprieno considers VSO original in all Semitic languages, shifting to SVO in Arabic and Hebrew and to SOV in modern Ethiopic languages.254 Some of the strongest arguments in favour of SV are the clear modal distinction in dependent clauses between SV (coordinate, realis) and VS (subordinate, irrealis), and the link between this fact and the dependent nature of sequential wayyiqt³l.255 VS thus appears to be used only for Deontic main clauses (as above) or dependent clauses. The strange concepts of ‘inverted verbal clause’256 or ‘complex noun clause’ are thus no longer needed.

Since, then, word order distinguishes between the two modal systems (yiqt³l-x vs. x-yiqt³l) and between aspects in the Contemporaneous (Cursive ha° qatêl vs. Constitute qetêl ha°), and marks the ‘mood neutralised’ functions of yiqt³l and qatêl (wayyiqt³l and waqatêl), it is above all the pragmatic value of word order with which we are concerned here.257 This is acknowledged even from a VS perspective by such as Loprieno:

one of the main functions of a topicalized VP is precisely the definition of the diathetic, temporal or modal features governing the higher predication; in other words, since the thematized VP is assigned all the verbal features of the antecedent, the inevitable consequence of the concentration of semantic functions on the head VP is the pragmatic emphasis on the theme258 and (making an almost opposite point) Givón:

a VSO language is ‘pragmatically schizophrenic’, since the new information portion of the sentence is scattered on both sides of the topic/subject.259

The two principal VS structures in Biblical Hebrew (Deontic yiqt³l-x and sequential wayyiqt³l) are subject to this ‘pragmatic schizophrenia’.

247Joosten, Tilburg handout.
248Lyons, Semantics 2, 678; similarly Comrie, Tense, 12.
249Niccacci, A., ‘A Neglected Point’.
250Joosten, ‘The Predicative Participle’.
251Moscati, Comparative Grammar, 72.
252Waltke-O’Connor, Syntax, 129 §8.3b.
253DeCaen, Placement and Interpretation, 136.
254Loprieno, Ancient Egyptian, 3.
255Compare the general rule in Proto-Indo-European, that unaccented words are placed in second position in main clauses, and the verb is accented in subordinate clauses.
257See Ljungberg above on the ‘pragmatic’ nature of modality.
258Loprieno, Ancient Egyptian, 124.
A word should be added on auxiliary verbs. It has already been noted that 'דִּי be able to' is interestingly restricted to Negative, Interrogative and conditional clauses. יִשַּׁלֵךְ 'to have to' is often used in parallel with a modal יִשְׁלֵךְ form (e.g. Deut 1:9/12; 2 Sam 22:39 // Ps 18:39; Ps 78:20). Verbs such as יִשַּׁלֵךְ, יִשָּׁר, יֵשֵּׁר, יִשָּׁרֵי, יִשָּׁרֵי לְדוּ וְנַפְּלַת, and יִשָּׁרֵי לְדוּ וְנַפְּלַת, are often used in the imperative to modify modally another imperative. יִשָּׁרֵי לְדוּ וְנַפְּלַת represent modal modification only terms of the Speaker's attitude to an action. יִשָּׁרֵי, יִשָּׁרֵי לְדוּ וְנַפְּלַת have been described as 'relative verbs'.262 though requiring a complement like modal verbs, they are most often translated into English with an adverb.263

Finally, a similar function to that normally expressed in English by modal verbs may be expressed in Hebrew by means of the use of a cognate or synonymous infinitive (e.g. Num 17:28: 'וְיֵשַׁלְךָ לְךָ לְמוֹאֵדְתֵךְ, 'Must we all die?'); this function might alternatively be described as aspectual, as is clearly the case with the auxiliary verb יִשָּׁרֵי לְדוּ וְנַפְּלַת [+PFV].

2.5.1. Postverbal Syntax

Two main word-order types have been identified in the languages of the world: 1. those which tend towards Dependent–Head structures, and 2. those which prefer Head–Dependent structures.264 These two theoretical types can be characterised as either:

1. DH:
   
   SOV
   VP —> Object–Verb–Auxiliary
   PP —> Noun–Postposition
   NP —> Standard of Comparison–Adjective/Determiner/Relative Clause/Numeral–Noun

2. HD:

   (SV)(SO)
   VP —> Auxiliary–Verb–Object
   PP —> Preposition–Noun
   NP —> Noun–Adjective/Determiner/Relative Clause/Numeral–Standard of Comparison

When predominant structures are compared (DH/HD), no natural language corresponds consistently to one of these types (secondary structures are given in lower case):265

This is to say that Biblical Hebrew usually postposes an object to its governing verb (דִּי be able to) a noun to a governing preposition (דִּי be able to: יִשַּׁלֵךְ), a nomen regens to its nomen regens (דִּי be able to: יִשַּׁלֵךְ, יִשָּׁרֵי לְדוּ וְנַפְּלַת), an adjective to its noun (דִּי be able to: יִשָּׁרֵי לְדוּ וְנַפְּלַת), an adverb to its antecedent (דִּי be able to: יִשָּׁרֵי לְדוּ וְנַפְּלַת), and a standard of comparison to a comparative adjective (דִּי be able to: יִשָּׁרֵי לְדוּ וְנַפְּלַת). Biblical Hebrew can therefore be characterised as a surprisingly consistent Head-Dependent language.267

2.5.2. Word-Order Rules

A standard cross-linguistic inventory of particular classes of Word-Order Rules may help in characterising Biblical Hebrew.268

1. Relational word order rules:
   S, O, V
   2. Stylistic-presodic word order rules:
   stressed, heavy (usually second and final positions)
   3. Pragmatic word order rules:
   focus, topic (usually first position)
   4. Other word order rules:
   S
   Animate precedes Inanimate
   Agent
   Patient

We may apply these in turn:

1. SVO is the normal word order in independent Indicative main clauses, and VSO in dependent clauses (Epistemic and 'mood neutralising') or Deontic main clauses.
2. Heavy NPs (whether S or O) are frequently put in final position.
3. Object-topicalisation (OV) is common in Discourse, and verb-topicalisation (VS) in Narrative. OS is extremely rare (as in other world languages).269
4. Subject-topicalisation, in the form of an independent pronoun or a noun in casus pendens, is frequently employed in the Psalter, particularly, as a pragmatic-rhetorical feature to highlight shifts in topic. The topic is usually animate and is the Agent. Thus frequently waֹנִי or waֹנִי.

---

261Walke-O’Connor, Syntax, 574–5 §34.5.1a. See below ch. 6, section 2.3.
262Schneider, Grammatik, 220–21 §50.5–6.
263Formverben, ‘relatives Verbum’ or ‘ergänzungsbedürftige Verben’. Jenni, Lehrbuch, 255–6 §23.3.3.
264Harriss and Campbell, Historical Syntax, 196–239
265Harriss and Campbell, Historical Syntax, 230–32, give Latin, French and English; the analysis of Biblical Hebrew is my own.

266Preposed relative clauses: e.g. ‘Quod potiusimus, id fecimus.’ Also with no antecedent: ‘Qui numquam timet stultius est’.
267Walke-O’Connor, Syntax, 137 n. 49.1c. Similarly consistent HD languages include Samoan and Swahili; DH languages include Japanese and Turkish; Radford, A., Transformational Grammar. A First Course (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics: Cambridge: CUP, 1998), 39.
268Harriss and Campbell, Historical Syntax, 238.
269Harriss and Campbell, Historical Syntax, 238.
2.5.3. Traditional Word Order

Having considered some of the pragmatic and universal aspects of word order, we are now in a better position to look back to traditional treatments of Biblical Hebrew. The traditional view of Arabic grammar completely neglected any distinction between dominant (statistically-prevailing) and basic (systemic) word order:

any clause beginning with a verb is a verbal clause (VC); any clause beginning with a noun is a nominal clause.270

It was valuable, however, in that it concentrated on ‘theme-rheme’ or ‘known-new’ rather than ‘subject-predicate’. Here, we have seen that Verb-Subject is characteristic of Deontic or dependent clauses, and Subject-Verb of Epistemic main clauses and Indicative clauses. The Predicate–Subject order of the Contemporaneous Constative is not a problem for this classification, since the participle is not inflected and so does not qualify for full verbal status.

In any case,

Su-Pep (the actual present) is in Biblical Hebrew the normal sequence. Statistically it is about four times as frequent as Pep-Su.271

Deontic verbal modality corresponds to the ‘Imperative’ clause types discussed below in chapter 6. ‘Negative’ and ‘Interrogative’ ‘clausal modality involve transformations which make NEG or INT the head of the clause, to which the verb is then attracted. Thus all three types of clausal modality with which we are concerned in this thesis (also COND) involve verb-topicalisation and hence a strong pragmatic focus. This is a key element of the rhetorical force so often noted in the Psalms.

3. Subordination

Having considered the modification of main clauses, we now turn to the non-main, or ‘subordinate’ status of some clause types, which may be considered a kind of textlinguistic modification of the clause. It has been commented by many scholars that clausal dependency should not be seen in black-and-white terms; Loprieno, for example, distinguishes between parataxis, hypotaxis (semantic dependency), subordinate (syntactic dependency) and embedding (unmarked subordination—circumstantial/adverbal).272 It has even been argued that there is no true parataxis:

the mere fact that clauses are conjoined in discourse ipso facto makes them dependent on each other ... there [can] be no purely paratactic relationship between clauses, at least in the sense that neither
determine[s] the other, and ... the only possible conception of parataxis [is] that in which dependence between clauses [is] mutual.273

Thus the Hebrew continuation forms (wayyiqtol and waqatal) are properly hypotactic or ‘co-subordinate’,274 and probably (as argued above) will not bear their own MTA features.

Since we are here concerned primarily with main clauses, we will consider just one special type of clausal embedding which is particularly important for study of the Psalter—direct speech or ‘direct discourse’,275

3.1. Direct Discourse

Many modern European languages mark indirect (‘reported’) speech grammatically, with shifts in both reference (deictic pronouns and time and place adverbs) and mood (from realis to irrealis).

e.g. He said, ‘I will meet you here tomorrow’. —> He said that he would meet her there the next day.

Biblical Hebrew marks indirect speech with the referential shift alone, and even the complementiser (אֶת, אֶל, אֶפְתָּחָה, אֶלְכָּנָה, אֶלְכָּנָא) that is usually absent. This kind of indirect speech is not attested in the Psalms, though it is possible that kl after verbs such as יְרֵד is to be interpreted in this way:277

‘הַרָעַב הִיא הЉקְחָה, כִּי פָרְלָה הָרוּחַ’

136:1

Acknowledge before the LORD that He is good, for his covenant love is eternal. (ALW)

Direct speech, by contrast, is frequent in the Psalms, though both introductory particles such as בַּשֵּׁם (e.g. 71:11) and אֶלְכָּנָא (e.g. 35:27),278 and even introductory verbs of speaking are often omitted (11:1; 22:9; 46:10-12). Direct speech may be marked by preceding אֶלְכָּנָא in the Antecedent form: 12:5; 30:7; 35:2; 16:2; 31:15; also אֶלְכָּנָא: 10:6; 11:6; 13:15; 14:10. Speech may be marked by preceding אֶלְכָּנָא in a Deontic form: 35:3, 21, 25, 27

in yiqtol in a view of praise: 35:10

in yiqtol in a subordinate clause: אֶלְכָּנָא 13:5

אֶלְכָּנָא may also occur in the middle of the direct speech:

םֶשֶׁר פָּרְלָה

“Because the poor are oppressed, because the needy groan, I will now rise up,” says the LORD; “I will place them in the safety for which they long.” (RSV)

275See also O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 409-414 §8.1.1.
276Givón, ‘Evolution’. The use of ‘aret’ in these contexts (e.g. 2 Kgs 8:5) seems strange (or proves that ‘aret’ marks not the direct object, but focus), since the expression 2 לְכַּנְתָּא אֶלְכָּנָא shows that the complement of אֶלְכָּנָא is an adverbial (‘how!’), not a direct object (‘what?’).
277Similarly 54.8: בֶּן אֵל only ever occurs after verbs of speaking. Note Blau’s description of הבן “as a ‘completive clause’: Blau, Grammar, 82-3.
Certain other verbs appear to refer to specific speech acts (אָרָא קַרָה to questions and mands) and to the prayer 'Psalm:

To you, O LORD, I cried, and to the LORD I made supplication: “What profit is there in my death, if I go down to the Pit? Will the dust praise you? Will it tell of your faithfulness? Hear, O LORD, and be gracious to me! O LORD, be my helper!” (NRSV)

There are then many other ways of marking direct speech, such as:

- 'There is no God' is all his thoughts.
- which is, of course, equivalent to:

He has thought. 'There is no God'.

Very often, however, the speech is completely unmarked (e.g. 46:11), a distinctive feature of Biblical poetry. It is therefore to referential shift that we must look in order to distinguish direct speech.

In Psalm 2, for example, the shift from 3rd (v. 2) to 1st person (v. 3) marks a shift in Speaker, the Enemy moving from 3rd-person subject of v. 2 to Speaker of v. 3; similarly (though this time marked with הָרַד), God moves from 3rd-person subject of vv. 4-5 to Speaker of v. 6. The same shift may occur, however, between a 3rd-person subject (vv. 4-5) and a 1st-person Speaker-subject. The identification of Direct Discourse within the Psalms is therefore bound up with the question of subject shift considered in chapter 2 above. 1st-person Direct Discourse by the Psalmist may be distinguished for our purposes from Narrative (e.g. vv. 1-2) as involving 1st (e.g. v. 7a) or 2nd-person (e.g. v. 10-12a) reference. Thus Psalm 2 may be analysed as follows:

| vv. 1-2 | Narrative | subject = Enemy |
| v. 3 | Direct Discourse | Speaker = Enemy |
| v. 4-5 | Narrative | subject = God |
| v. 6 | Direct Discourse | Speaker = God |
| v. 7 | Direct Discourse | Speaker = Psalmist |
| vv. 7b-9 | Direct Discourse | Speaker = Psalmist |
| vv. 10-12a | Direct Discourse | Speaker = Psalmist |

In Psalm 31:23, we find a similar subject shift taking place:

I had said in my alarm, "I am driven far from your sight."

But you heard my supplications when I cried out to you for help. (NRSV)

It seems most likely that ἀρραία does not link the time of speaking with the expression in the preceding verse, otherwise (e.g. ὑπερέχει τὸ πάθος τοῦ πνεύματος, ἀρραία ἐμὴ μορφή, 31:23), but emphasizes the contrast (also frequently attested elsewhere) between ἀρραία and ἀσπασμός, so suggesting translation as ‘Though I’ or ‘While I…’ The special referential and temporal frame of the direct-speech colon αὐτοῦ (v. 22) locates it in the context described in v. 13a means firstly that God, who was referred to in the 3rd person in vv. 22-23a, (θεός) is here referred to in the 2nd person (ἐγώ), Secondly, the 1st-person subject of ἀρράω (the person being described in the past, and the Speaker/PSalmist in the present), Thirdly, the qatal forms in αὐτοῦ and αὐτή will be translated as English simple past, since they refer to the time/location of vv. 11-13 (ἐρυθρός) and vv. 14-18 (μπλε) respectively, whilst the qatal form in ἀσπασμός will be translated as English present perfect. None of these distinctions would apply to indirect speech. What is striking is that the 2nd-person reference to God is then continued into the next bicolon, in an almost imperceptible shift back to the present time frame:

| v. 22-23a | Mainline | 3rd person |
| v. 23b | Direct Discourse | 2nd person |
| v. 22b | Mainline | 2nd person |

Thus I translate:

Though I thought in my alarm, I have been driven out of your sight. In fact I heard the sound of my prayers when I called out to you.

A striking example of deictic shift may be observed in Psalm 11:

I have put my hope in the LORD, how can you (pl.) say to your (pl.) mountain like a bird? (ALW)

The direct speech takes the referential locus away from that of ἐννοεῖν, hence the plural καταβάω, which was perhaps a common battle taunt (addressed to a ‘representative’ plural). There is a

281 Is 49:4b; Jer 3:20; Zeph 3:7b; Ps 82:7; Job 32:8.
282 Walke–O’Connor, Syntax, 670-71 §39.3.5d.
283 Just as in 4:7-9: ‘I heard the voice of the angel of the Lord, where the 3rd-person YHWH and 1st-person YHWH have the same referents. Similar, Ps 39.
284 This reading renders the singular qere and emendations such as BHS the את unnecessary by reading כְָּרְשׁ as an adversative accusative; its lack of agreement with מָרָה is unproblematic with this interpretation.
285 Compare, for example, 124:7: ‘We have escaped like a bird from the snare of the fowlers; the snare is broken, and we have escaped.’ (NRSV). See also the discussion above in ch. 2, section 2.1.
special rhetorical effect in this displacement of the situation. It is ‘intertextual’ in that it evokes the military context in which it would normally be spoken.

A fourth example of referential shift may be seen clearly in a conversational exchange:

"Come," my heart says, "seek his face!" Your face, LORD, do I seek. (NRSV)

The complex reference has resulted in textual problems, including the 2nd-person sg. \( \text{יָהוָה} \), the plural \( \text{יָהוָה} \) and the 1st-person \( \text{יִהוָה} \). The NRSV has emended to \( \text{יָהוָה} \), so that the Speaker of the a-colon (‘my heart’) is not the same as the Addressee of the b-colon (‘LORD’), and the use of direct speech involves person shift in the object of \( \text{יָהוָה} \) (‘his face’; ‘your face’).

These four examples have shown how direct speech is primarily governed by shifts in grammatical and rhetorical person, so that this particular element of clausal or textual modification is shown to be bound up with the referential texturing of the Psalms.

4. Scope

It has already been noted above that modal features such as Interrogative, Negative and Imperative do not carry over into subordinate clauses; this is because subordination itself involves a type of modality, as can be seen from the paradigmatic relationship of conditional with these three other features, and the suggested Interrogative origin of some types of subordination. In other words, the scope of modal features is standardly limited to the clause in which they occur.287 It is especially when modal features occur together that problems may arise, as can be seen from the English modal verbs:

The main problem of interpreting, in a regular way, negation with modals is that there is often no formal way of indicating whether it is the main verb or the modal that is negated. Thus in English can’t and may not, if used epistemically, negate the modal (no permission), while mustn’t negates the main verb (obligation not to).288

Among the features which may have extended scope289 or do ‘double duty’290 in the Psalter are prepositions (e.g. \( \text{לְ} \)).

Great is the LORD and most highly praised in the city of our God. His holy mountain (ALW)

the nomens regens in a construct relationship (e.g. \( \text{לְ} \)):

Keep me from the trap that they have laid for me, and from the snares of evildoers. (NRSV)

and the relative marker (\( \text{שֶם} \)).

287 Compare Weinrich’s use of the term ‘obstinate’ with reference to person-marking, the article and tense.

288 Palmer, Mood and Modality, 220.


290 See the many examples in Dahood and Penar, ‘Grammar of the Psalter’, 429-444.

O how abundant is your goodness that you have laid up for those who fear you, and accomplished for those who take refuge in you, in the sight of everyone! (NRSV)

There are also, of course, the characteristic ‘double-duty suffixes’.291

Extended scope may also be seen in the features with which we are concerned here. Interrogative force may extend over two cola:292

Why are you cast down, O my soul, and why are you disquieted within me? ... (NRSV)

The same is true of the Interrogative particle itself:

Do I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? (NRSV)

Is it for ever that the Lord will reject ... though on this see also the discussion of disjunctive questions in chapter 4. Negative force may also have extended scope:293

O LORD, do not rebuke me in your anger, or discipline me in your wrath. (NRSV)

Imperative force, lastly, is ‘obstinate’ (Weinrich)—it is almost always marked on the verb, and so is not subject to the same problem of scope.

5. Vocative

Vocatives are formally nominal—the naming or description of the Addressee; they have therefore been considered already in chapter 2 above. However, they are discussed here because their pragmatic force may be that of Directive or Expressive speech acts.294 First, we consider some problems with the form and typical occurrence of vocatives, then their rhetorical function.

291 See Dahood and Penar.

292 See also Dahood and Penar, 438-39. For another interesting example with the cohortative, see Jer 4:21.

293 See also Dahood and Penar, 437-39.

294 Funktionen, die ... zur Leistungsfunktion der Kundgabe gehören". Richter, Grundlagen 3, 159.
5.1. Syntactical Status

Two main contrasting proposals have been made for the syntactical status of vocatives. The first views them as often part of the clause, relating to a Deontic verb form like a subject to a non-Deontic verb form. The second views them as forming a clause in their own right.

5.1.1. Clausal Subject

Considering the form of vocatives, we may draw an analogy between:

- the minimal prayer: 'LORD, bless!' = vocative + Deontic verb [+VOL]
- the minimal sentence: 'The LORD will bless.' = subject + non-Deontic verb [-VOL].

Seen in this way, a vocative 'functions, from the standpoint of surface structure, as the subject.' However, this raises the question of the grammatical person of a vocative, since vocatives occur not only with Imperatives, but with 1st, 2nd and 3rd-person Deontic forms.

Vocatives do not function as subjects to 1st-person Deontics (cohortatives), since in Directive ('May I ...') and Expressive ('I will ...') cohortatives, the Addressee is not the same as the verbal subject, and in hortative cohortatives ('Let us ...'), the Addressee(s) constitute only a part, with the Speaker, of the inclusive 1st-person subject. Self-address is normally in the form of (3rd-person) psycho-physical substitutes such as רֶכֶם וְטָמֵא.

Vocatives do function as subjects to both Imperatives (despite their lack of person-marking) and to other 2nd-person Deontics (jussives).

- e.g. 'יהוה רבך' = 'LORD, bless!'
- 'יהוה רבך' = 'LORD, may you bless!'

Vocatives have been argued to function as subjects to 3rd-person Deontics (jussives) as in רֶכֶם וְטָמֵא. However, it seems strange to read רֶכֶם וְטָמֵא here as vocative at all, and I would refer to it rather as a normal subject within the D-system as discussed above.

- i.e. 'לֹא יָדַע' = Deontic
- 'לֹא יָדַע' = Epistemic

It should also be noted, however, that vocatives do have a further link with the 3rd person in that this is the person in which they are modified.

5.1.2. Minor Clause Predicate

In deep structure terms, 'vocatives occur with predicates, but are not related to them as arguments.' O'Connor therefore terms vocatives 'minor clause predicates' or 'the remnants of a predication', 'remnants of clauses which are uniformly reduced before they appear in an utterance', coinciding with their theoretical status (under the Performative Hypothesis) as governed by a higher clause of saying. He claims that this explains the (rare) vocative marker—as it is in fact the normal preposition 'to', which marks the Addressee of a higher clause of speaking and is normally deleted together with that higher clause. Thus Zeph 3:16b, יֵלֵדִים אֶלָּדוֹת מִשָּׁמֶךָ, for example, is to be read 'He says to Jerusalem, "Don't be afraid"'. Dahood presents a long list of examples from the Psalms, though many of these, like Zeph 3:16b, could easily be read as not vocative at all.

5.2. Rhetorical Function

Underlying the frequent occurrence of vocatives in the Psalter is an important theological consideration—specification of the divine Addressee in a polytheistic environment:

Diese Sitte erklärt sich aus einer Urzeit, da die Beieinander viele Götter kennen, und das Gebet daher zunächst den Namen des Gottes nennen muß, an dem es sich richtet, damit dieser es vernehme und herbeikomme.

For this reason, vocatives occur most often at the start of a Psalm. They also occur—perhaps for the same reason—at the start of new units of discourse, and thus signal a change of theme, a shift of Addressee or a greater intensity of address.

Vocatives may also occur medially, between 'relative' verbs and their complements:

- ...שְׁכַךְ יָדַע הַלֵּךְ בָּמוֹן... 6.5
- ...וָאֵלַכְּ לִבִּי לָמוֹן בַּעֲבוֹדָה... 57.8

My heart is steadfast, O God, my heart is steadfast...

---

299Finley, 'The Proposal', 9. Compare the development of the Egyptian vocative marker (referential) into an anaphoric deictic particle (relational) and then into a definite article: Loprieno, Ancient Egyptian, 68. Compare ch. 6, section 5.1 below.

297Contra Finley, 'The Proposal', 9.
296Finley, 'The Proposal', 9.
295Waltke-O'Connor, Syntax, 77 §4.7d.
294Reflected in passing by O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 80.
293Similar arguments apply to 'focus-markers' such as וּלְבָל (see ch. 2, section 2.2.3. above, and O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 79-82) and interjections (see Richter, Grundlagen 3, 158-59).
292O'Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 80-81.
291Nevertheless, this is a remarkable conjunction of synchronic and diachronic linguistics in addressing an otherwise unresolved problem.
292Gunkel, Einleitung, 121-22 §4.4. See also Begriff, 'Die Vertrauensäußerungen'.
or in the middle of a sentence:

49:50

Where are your former acts of covenant love, Lord, which in your faithfulness you swore to David? (ALW)

If I forget you, O Jerusalem, let my right hand wither! (RSV)

These latter types have been termed ‘double-duty vocatives’. They usually occur clause-final:

Rise up, O LORD! Deliver me, O my God! (RSV)

We have seen that, in its simplest form, a prayer may consist of just two components: an address (vocative) and an plea (imperative), e.g. “O God, help!” In the Psalms, vocatives and Imperatives do in fact most commonly co-occur. However, the minimal prayer may be even smaller—the Directive/Expressive function of an Imperative alone (“Help!”) can unter certain circumstances be effected by the vocative alone (“O God!”). Whilst an Imperative becomes a true prayer only when accompanied by a vocative, a vocative can be a true prayer by implying an Imperative. This implied function lies behind many vocatives in the Psalms. Thus, having considered the status of vocatives as clausal subjects or independent predications, and having seen how they define the Address see and structure discourse, it should be noted that they are most often loaded with the appeal to God for his attention and aid. Unencumbered as they are with the flattering epithets of babylonian psalms, the address of the biblical Psalms relies not on a captatio benevolentiae, but on the force of the vocative itself to move God to respond.

6. Conclusion

The major part of this chapter has been devoted to presenting an analysis of the Hebrew verbal system centred around three subsystems, distinguished by mood: I-system (qiṭāl), E-system (long-form qiṭūl) and D-system (short-form qiṭūl). This analysis, as well as the comments above on word order, vocative etc., will be fundamental to the following discussion of Interrogative, Negative and Imperative sentence-types in the Psalms.

---

310 By analogy with double-duty suffixes etc., for more examples, see Dahood and Penar, ‘Grammar of the Psalter’, 439-41.


312 Vocatives also co-occur with other Deontic forms such as cohortatives and jussives (see below) and Interrogatives. It has been suggested that vocatives are most easily identified by their juxtaposition with a second-person pronoun or an imperative; Waltke–O’Connor, Syntax, 130 §8.3d.

313 Felicity conditions; see ch. 1 section 2.1.2, above.

314 Anturi, ‘How Do the Psalms mean pray?’, 5 n. 18.

As can be seen from the top-right and bottom-left corners of this table, there is some 'skewing' of terms. Adjectival 'ël' functions nominally in combination with a qualified pronoun (יהיו)\footnote{Loprieno, *Ancient Egyptian*, 70, reads the Egyptian correspondent, *ꜣꜣ, as focalising and translates with a cleft sentence: 'which messenger is the one who came to you?'.}, whilst nominal m- functions adverbially when governed by a preposition. Each of the three primary morphemes, הֶל, m- and 'ël- may also function as a complementiser, as is predictable from both the Performative Hypothesis (see above, chapter 1) and cross-linguistic studies which have shown that object and relative clauses tend always to derive from Interrogatives.\footnote{Harris and Campbell, *Historical Syntax*, ch. 10.}

2. Clausal: *ha, 'im*

Clausal Interrogation is known variously as 'yes-no', 'polar' or 'nexus' questions. It is usually marked with הֶל, though 'im may also be used (especially in Interrogative coordination), or there may be no marking.

הֶל may be formally criticised to a Noun Phrase [subject]:

Don't the ear-planter hear?

Noun Phrase [object];

... can he give even bread?

a Prepositional Phrase [time]:

Is it for ever that you will be angry with us?

Is it for the dead that you do wonders?

a Verb Phrase:

Will dust acknowledge you?

an Adverb Phrase:

Do you indeed decree what is right, you gods?

or an existential particle:

... to see if there are any who are wise, who seek after God.

Interrogative function is not thereby attached to the particular phrase, but is most often linked to the entire clause. This may be seen in the repetition of the particle before the subject and (with אלי) before the verb:

He who planted the ear, does he not hear? He who formed the eye, does he not see?

He who disciplines the nations, he who teaches knowledge to humankind, does he not chastise? (RSV)

In contrast to this marking of both subject and verb, the particle may have extended scope, leaving a second Interrogative clause unmarked:

Must the Lord reject for ever and not again be favourable? (ALW)

2.1. Syntactic Functions

In addition to the independent main-clause function of Interrogation, Interrogative morphemes may function as complementisers and in Interrogative coordination.

2.1.1. Complementiser

It is clear in many languages that relative and object clauses are related to questions. In English:

**Question:** Who's been sitting on my chair?

**Relative clause:** He suddenly saw Goldilocks, who was sitting in his chair.

**Object clause:** He asked who'd been sitting on his chair.

The marker of clausal Interrogation may also be related to that for an object clause. In colloquial German:

**Question:** Oh du noch fertig bist?

**Object clause:** Sie fragte ihn, ob er noch gebraten sei.

She asked him if he was ready yet.

In Hebrew, both הֶל and 'im may have this function after verbs of perceiving:

The LORD looks down from heaven on humankind to see if there are any who are wise, who seek after God. (RSV)

See if there is any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting. (RSV)

2.1.2. Coordination

Double questions may be formally conjunctive or disjunctive. We may compare conjunctive and disjunctive forms for affirmative, Negative and Interrogative sentence-types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Conjunctive</th>
<th>Disjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affirmative</strong></td>
<td>Y X (Both) X and Y</td>
<td>Y X (Either) X or Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative</strong></td>
<td>Y X (Both) X but Y</td>
<td>Y X (Either) X or Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interrogative</strong></td>
<td>Y X (Both) Y or X</td>
<td>Y X (Either) X or Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Psalter, within a line, the disjunctive pattern is used (יהו ... איך ...), or a single question with internal conjunction (יהו ... והא ...); between lines, apposition is used (יהו ... יהו ...).

There may be form-to-function 'skewing', with the disjunctive pattern having conjunctive function:

Doppelfragen [führen] mit (DM) ־ נל nicht notwendig Gegensätze ein; vielmehr dient die Disjunktion (so namentlich in dichter. parallelismus membrorum ...) häufig nur dazu, dieselbe Frage mit anderen Worten zu wiederholen und auf dieser Weise nachdrücklicher zu gestalten.

There are no functionally disjunctive Interrogatives in the Psalter.

The longest string in the Psalter consists of six5 full questions:

The second longest string in fact contains only one biclausal sentence.

Here, we see Negation occurring in just one of two coordinated questions (v. 8), apposition within the scope of Interrogative (v. 9) and a disjunctive form with conjunctive (in fact appositive) function.

The second section conceptually results out of the first, it might be suggested that the verse be translated with a purpose clause:

Is it for the dead that you do wonders? Or do the shades rise to acknowledge you?

Here, we see a subject-shift within a conjunctive sentence of disjunctive form. Since the second action conceptually results out of the first, it might be suggested that the verse be translated with a purpose clause:

It is for the dead that you do wonders, and the shades rise to acknowledge you.

It is for the dead that you do wonders, so that the shades (will) rise to acknowledge you.

These alternatives exist because of the close relationship between sequential and result clauses.

The second concerns the modality of the a-colon (��ר יתנמש עצמאית, which appears to be potentialis (Epistemic: 'Can you do wonders for the dead?'), shading into volition (Deontic: 'Do you want to do wonders for the dead?'), Similarly, the b-colon may have alternative readings as Epistemic ('Or do [i.e. can] the shades rise to acknowledge you?') or Deontic ('Or do you intend the shades to rise to acknowledge you?'); read as subordinate: 'so that the shades (will) rise to acknowledge you?).

The remaining Interrogative strings in the Psalter exhibit a number of these features:

Here, we see Negation occurring in just one of two coordinated questions (v. 8), apposition within the scope of Interrogative (v. 9) and a disjunctive form with conjunctive (in fact appositive) function.

The second section conceptually results out of the first, it might be suggested that the verse be translated with a purpose clause:

Is it for the dead that you do wonders? Or do the shades rise to acknowledge you?

Here, we see a subject-shift within a conjunctive sentence of disjunctive form. Since the second action conceptually results out of the first, it might be suggested that the verse be translated with a purpose clause:

It is for the dead that you do wonders, and the shades rise to acknowledge you.

It is for the dead that you do wonders, so that the shades (will) rise to acknowledge you.

3Gesenius-Kautzsch, Grammatik, 497 §150b; similarly, Andersen, Sentence, 149. This is what Andersen, Sentence, 57, describes as apposition; when all the following material is new, he terms it 'asyndetic coordination'.

4Sapir, Syntax of Biblical Poetry, XXIX.

5Somehow Watson, Classical Hebrew Poetry, 339, sees seven.

6Irrespective of the origins of the oath formula, it should be noted that in most oaths, 'im could be replaced by יהו.
2.2.2.1. Potentials of Ability

Subjectively-based potentialis of personal ability was discussed above as an important secondary function of E-system yiqtōl and in terms of a distinct ‘Dynamic’ modality. It may also be lexicalised in the modal verb בָּעָל, יִרְבָּה יַעֲשֹׂהוּו אֶרֶץ הָיוֹכֵךְ אֶל כָּרוּךְ שִׁלַּחַם. (78:19-20)

The context is the question of God laying out a table in the wilderness (Num 11:14) and the questioned possibility of his also providing food and water (Num 11:31). The three potentialis clauses have similar structure:

Verb Phrase | Modal Verb | Verb Form | Interrogative
---|---|---|---
יכל לָעָל | yiqtol | 19b | 19b
כָּל מָנָח | yiqtol | 20a | 20a
כָּל כִּרְאוּ | yiqtol | 20b | 20b

Thus בָּעָל is parallel to הָיוֹכֵךְ and means ‘can provide’—potentialis force is carried by the yiqtol form alone. Between these clauses, there appears to be some fluctuation in the focus of the Interrogation—in vv. 19b and 20b, the verb is initial, showing that the community are questioning God’s ability (the modality of the clause); in v. 20a, the object is topicalised and marked with gam. Thus there is both modal contrast between a realis past action (הָיוֹכֵךְ + qātal) and a potentialis question (בָּעָל + gam + yiqtol), and referential contrast between מָנָח and כִּרְאוּ.

Further examples include:

1. Cannot God perceive this?! For he knows heart-secrets. (ALW)

2. Can dust acknowledge you? Can it declare your truth? (ALW)

2.2.2.2. Potentials of Liability

Objectively-based potentialis of liability or logical possibility is particularly related to inanimates.

Can an evil throne be allied with you …? (ALW)

2.2.3. Epistemic Necessity (‘must’)

Must the Lord reject for ever and not again be favourable? (ALW)

2.3. Pragmatic Functions

Most Interrogative sentences in the Psalter are rhetorical, that is, they have an Expressive rather than Social communicative function—they do not expect an answer. Their pragmatic–rhetorical function is usually related to their semantic function.

2.3.1. Interrogative

True Interrogative is only attested in an Indicative existential clause:

The LORD looks down from heaven on humankind to see if there are any who are wise, who seek after God. (NRSV)

2.3.2. Negative Epistemic

Interrogative Epistemic Possibilitive sentences (‘Can?’) function pragmatically as Negative Epistemic utterances (‘Cannot’; equivalent to לֹא): Can dust acknowledge you? Can it declare your truth? (ALW)

2.3.3. Negative Deontic

Interrogative Epistemic necessitative sentences (‘Must?’) function pragmatically as Negative Deontic utterances (equivalent to ‘al- when addressed to the subject (‘Doesn’t have to’, implying ‘Don’t let it happen!’).

Must the Lord reject for ever and not again be favourable? (ALW)

Ch. 3, section 2.4.3.2.1.

Ch. 1, section 2.1.3.4.
This pragmatic function is not prescribed by the modal verb form yiqtol—it may also be
effected by qatal:

הָשָׁכַךְ יְהוָה לֹא אָסְפָּהָו בְּאֵרָה הָרָוָיו מִלָּה: 77:10
Has God forgotten what being gracious is? Or has he in anger shut up his compassion? (ALW)
= ‘... yiqtol ... הָשָׁכַךְ יְהוָה לֹא אָסְפָּהָו בְּאֵרָה הָרָוָיו מִלָּה ’
= Do not forget what being gracious is! Do not in anger shut your compassion!

2.4. Negative: הַרְרָא
dSince Interrogative is in many cases rhetorically equivalent to Negative, when combined with
lo, it is susceptible to the ‘Law of Double Negation’. 9
רְרָא leitet rhetorische Fragen ein, die den Charakter einer bekraftigenden Behauptung annehmen
können. 10
i.e. 77:8 ꝕ + 아 + 되 = 되 or INT x NEG = AFF
This strong Affirmative function of הַרְרָא’, which we have also seen as marking a speech act, 11
has been suggested by some to be optional, e.g. Eskhult:
The particle הַרְרָא’ vacillates between being interrogatory (=nomne) and asseverative. 12
Usually, as in the case of Eskhult, this view that it ‘vacillates’ is based upon a suspicion that
some occurrences of הַרְרָא’ are ‘a remnant of a Hebrew interjectory hal’. 13 Such a conjecture is
unnecessary in the light of the quite predictable interaction of Negation and Interrogation to
produce an affirmative force.

Brongers’s survey of the functions of הַרְרָא’ distinguishes in a similar way to Eskhult: 14
1. nomne; genuine questions expecting an affirmative answer
2. hinne: asking attention
(Brongers’s further suggestions should mostly be subsumed under these two.)

2.4.1. Affirmative Indicative
Examples of Brongers’s hinne meaning of הַרְרָא’ might be:

You have kept count of my tossings; put my tears in your bottle. Are they not in your record? (NRSV)
= ‘... qatal ... You have kept count of my tossings; put my tears in your bottle. Are they not in your record? ’
= ‘... yiqtol ... You have kept count of my tossings; put my tears in your bottle. Are they not in your record? ’

For you have delivered my soul from death, and my feet from falling, so that I may walk before God in
the light of life. (NRSV)

2.4.2. Affirmative Deontic
Interrogative Negative Epistemic sentences function pragmatically as affirmative Deontic
utterances when addressed to the subject:

 matière הָאֲדֹנֶה יִנָּאָה רֹאשׁ תּוֹמֶךָ תְמוֹנָה: 85:7
Will you not revive us again, so that your people may rejoice in you? (NRSV)
= ‘... qatal ... Will you not revive us again, so that your people may rejoice in you? ’

2.4.3. Negative Deontic
Interrogative Negative Indicative sentences function pragmatically as Negative Deontic
utterances (equivalent to ‘al-’) when addressed to the subject:

matter הָאֲדֹנֶה יִנָּאָה רֹאשׁ תּוֹמֶךָ תְמוֹנָה: 60:12
Have you not rejected us, O God? You do not go out, O God, with our armies. (NRSV)
= ‘... qatal ... Have you not rejected us, O God? You do not go out, O God, with our armies! ’

This is the Negative equivalent to 77:10 above:

matter הָאֲדֹנֶה יִנָּאָה רֹאשׁ תּוֹמֶךָ תְמוֹנָה: 77:10
‘Have you not rejected us?’ = ‘Do not reject us!’

2.4.4. Exclamative
Brongers’s Interrogative nomne examples are almost all exclamative, as in:

The ear-planter, doesn’t he hear, or the eye-former, doesn’t he see?! (ALW)
The discipliner of nations, doesn’t he punish, the teacher of knowledge to men? (ALW)
The ‘undertone of some reproach’ 15 to which Brongers refers may be seen when הַרְרָא’ occurs
in a motivation for divine intervention, protesting the Psalmist’s righteousness:

Do not hate those who hate you, O LORD? And do I not loathe those who rise up against you? (NRSV)
The reproach may be directed to an absent Enemy:

Have they no knowledge, all the evildoers who eat up my people as they eat bread, and do not call upon
the LORD? (NRSV)

2.5. Unmarked
Under some circumstances, a clausal Interrogative may be unmarked:

Eine Frage braucht nicht durch ein besonderes Fragewort (Pron. oder Adverb) eingefügt zu werden.
Häufig genügt schon die entsprechende Betonung der Worte, einen Fragewort als solchen zu kennzeichnen.
... So besonders, wenn der Fragewort durch an einen vorhergeh. Satz angeknüpft ist ... oder wenn er ...
ein negativer ist (אֵֽלֶּה אַלְּאֵֽל = אלֵֽל = אלֵֽל = אלֵֽל = אלֵֽל = אלֵֽל).

15Brongers, ‘Some Remarks on the Biblical Particle הַרְרָא’, 179.
16Gesensius-Kautzsch, Grammatik, 495 §150a.
An example from the Psalter (with Epistemic necessitative יִדְרֹד) is:

What did I not steal must I now restore? (NRSV)

3. Nominal: mA, mi

Nominal Interrogatives are often referred to as 'wh-' or 'x-questions', and are marked in Biblical Hebrew with the m- or 'i' morphemes. mA refers to an indefinite non-human; mi refers to an indefinite human.

3.1. Non-Human: mA

In addition to its nominal uses, mA may function adverbially as equivalent to lammā (purpose) or kamānā (manner);17 related to this is the non-occurrence of 'et-ma and (in the Psalter at least) of mA as a verbal subject.18

It may function as a complementiser after verbs of knowing (יִדְרֹד וְכַּנֵּר; 89:48), hearing (מִן, מִן 85:9) and fearing (אָרָי 56:5, 12; 118:6), for example:

In God I praise his word!), in God I have put my trust—I do not need to be afraid of what flesh can do to me.

3.1.1. Interrogative

mA clearly functions as a true factual question when followed by an answer (even if given by the same Speaker):

And now, O Lord, what do I wait for? My hope is in you. (NRSV)

What shall be given to you? And what more shall be done to you, you deceitful tongue?

A warrior's sharp arrows, with glowing coals of the broom tree! (NRSV)

Aside from the adverbial Interrogatives below, there is one example of mA within a prepositional phrase:

How can young people keep their way pure? By guarding it according to your word. (NRSV)

3.1.2. Negative Indicative

It may function as equivalent to a Negative Indicative (equivalent to 'én) in both nominal clauses and verbal clauses:

What profit is there in my death, if I go down to the Pit? Will the dust praise you? Will it tell of your faithfulness? (NRSV)

There is no profit. (NRSV)

If the foundations are destroyed, what can the righteous do? (NRSV)

The righteous can do nothing.

What can I give back to the LORD for all his benefits to me? (ALW)

I can't give back anything.

mA with 'lamed of interest'19 may be equivalent to a rhetorical question or to Negation:

Why is it, O sea, that you flee? O Jordan, that you turn back? (NRSV)

But to the wicked God says: 'What right have you to recite my statutes, or take my covenant on your lips?' (NRSV)

You have no right

The construction ... ci [NP] mi is equivalent to English 'nothing' (compare ... ci [NP] below):20

Humans are nothing that you should ... 8:15

What are human beings that you are mindful of them, mortals that you care for them? (NRSV)

Unlike mA, mi can also occur marked by 'et- (אַלְכָּפֶד). It may function as a complementiser after verbs of knowing (יִדְרֹד 39:7), for example:

Surely everyone goes about like a shadow. Surely for nothing they are in turmoil; they heap up, and do not know who will gather. (NRSV)

3.2. Human: mi

mi clearly functions as a true factual question when followed by an answer. The answer may be given by the same or another Speaker in the context of an entrance liturgy:21

What is there that ... 39:7

Surely everyone goes about like a shadow. Surely for nothing they are in turmoil; they heap up, and do not know who will gather. (NRSV)

17 See below, sections 4.4. and 4.5.

18 In comparative Semitic perspective, the particle may have a very wide range of functions. For Arabic, Baalbaki, R., 'Reclassification in Arab Grammatical Theory', JNES 54 (1995) 1-13 (2), lists nominal functions: interrogative, exclamative, conditional; fully definite, relative; qualified indefinite; and particle functions: otiose, compensatory, restringent, verbal noun, negation.

19 Walkie-O'Connor, Syntax, 323 §18.3b.

20 Also 144:3.

**3.2.2. Indefinite Epistemic**

*m* may have indefinite function, equivalent to English ‘whoever’;

*Who are they that fear the LORD? He will teach them the way that they should choose.* (NRSV)

= Whoever fears the LORD will be taught the way he should choose.

*Which of you desires life, and covets many days to enjoy good? Keep your tongue from evil, and your lips from speaking deceit.* (NRSV)

= Whoever desires life ... should guard his tongue ....

**3.2.3. Negative Indicative**

It may function as Negation in nominal clauses (equivalent to ‘*en*):

*Who shall ascend the hill of the LORD? And who shall stand in his holy place? Those who have clean hands and pure hearts, who do not lift up their souls to what is false, and do not swear deceitfully.* (NRSV)

*Who is this King of glory? The LORD of hosts, he is the King of glory.* (Selah NRSV)

... besides me there is no god. Who is like me?...

... Is there any god besides me? There is no other rock; I know not one. (NRSV)

*m* may also function as Negation in verbal clauses (equivalent to ‘*en*), especially with *potentialis ytq tōl* (Possibility):

*For who in the skies can be compared to the LORD? Who among the heavenly beings is like the LORD?* (NRSV)

= No one in the skies can be compared to the LORD.

This structure may be used by the Psalmist to lament human frailty: *Who can stand?* (76:8; 130:3; 147:17; similarly 19:12; 89:9; 90:11; 106:2); the Enemy may boast, ‘Who can see?’ (64:6; similarly 59:8). The modality may also be Epistemic necessity:

*The LORD is my light and my salvation—whom need I fear? The LORD is the stronghold of my life—of whom need I be afraid?* (ALW)

= I need not be afraid of anyone.

**or even Deontic:**

*I will not sit down in the company of the ungodly, nor will I sit in the assembly of the wicked.* (NRSV)

= No one is prepared to rise up for me ... No one is prepared to stand up for me ...

**Interrogatives and *en* may occur in synonymous parallelism:**

*For in death there is no remembrance of you; in Sheol who can give you praise?* (NRSV)

= ... in Sheol no one can give you praise.

**3.2.4. Affirmative Deontic**

Desiderative *m* occurs most perhaps famously in David’s

*O that someone would give me water to drink from the well of Bethesda that is by the gate!* (NRSV)

This case is particularly interesting because it shows how easily Expressive—desiderative force can be mistaken for Directive—David’s mighty men do in fact fetch him some water, to his great displeasure.\(^{25}\) Examples in the Psalter are:

*Who will bring me to the fortified city? Who will lead me to Edom?* (NRSV)

\(^{22}\)Similarly 107:43.

\(^{23}\)Similarly 35:10; 71:19; 89:9; 113:5.

\(^{24}\)Similarly 73:25 with ellipsis.

---

\(^{25}\)See also 2 Sam 15:4: אִֽנֵּ֣י נַשְׁנָ֤ה שְׁמַ֣ם בָּאָ֣רֵר יִרְבְּגָּהֹלָ֔י "If only I were judge in the land!"
Modality, Reference and Speech Acts in the Psalms

4. Adverbial

4.1. Time: màtay, 'ad-màtay, 'ad-ànà, 'ad-mà, kamà

màtay may be a complementiser after a verb of desire (אַֽאַֽמָּֽרָֽהּ) in:

O that deliverance for Israel would come from Zion! (NRSV)

And I say, 'O that I had wings like a dove! I would fly away and be at rest.' (NRSV)

4.1.1. Affirmative Deontic: màtay

màtay occurs with Permissive yiqtòl (markedly E-system e.g. 42:3; 94:8) in all grammatical persons (1st-person 42:3; 94:8; 3rd-person 42:3; 101:2; imperative 94:8). It often occurs in parallel with a D-system form (cohortative 42:3; 101:2; imperative 94:8). 28

Understand, O dullest of the people: fools, when will you be wise? (NRSV)

I will study the way that is blameless. When shall I attain it? I will walk with integrity of heart within my house (NRSV)

... may it come to me!

4.1.2. Negative Deontic: 'ad-màtay, 'ad-ànà, 'ad-mà, kamà

Other temporal Interrogatives occur with necessitative yiqtòl (markedly E-system e.g. 43:13; 94:8) in all grammatical persons (1st-person 43:13; 94:8; 2nd-person 79:5 ... 3rd-person 94:8). Their pragmatic function is that of a Negative Deontic (equivalent to 'al-):

How long, O Lord, is the end of the earth? When will you punish us? (NRSV)

How long, O God, is the foe to scoff? Is the enemy to revile your name forever? (NRSV)

How long, O Lord, will you look on? Rescue me from their ravages, my life from the lions! (NRSV)

The same function is shown once by qàtal:

O Lord God of hosts, how long will you be angry with your people’s prayers? (NRSV)

4.1.3. Exclamative

'ad-màtay may be used alone as an interjection:30

K will the Lord of hosts long be angry with his people? (NRSV)

My soul also is struck with terror, while you, O Lord—how long? (NRSV)

4.2. Manner: 'èk, 'èkkà

4.2.1. Negative Indicative

'èk with qàtal functions as a Negative statement, 'Surely not!' (equivalent to lò):

And they have said, 'How does God know?' and 'Is there knowledge in the Most High?' (NRSV)

4.2.2. Negative Epistemic

Deuteronomy 1:12: 'And I, the Lord, spoke it to Mount Sinai, to all the prophets of the Lord: 'I'

28Lande, Formelle tige Wendungen, 91.
29Also 13:2; 62:4; 82:2; 89:4; 119:84. Compare 1 Sam 16:1, where the verb is in the Contemporaneous Cursive form (futurum instans) in the alternative form 'How long are you going to grieve over Saul?'
30Ch. 3, section 2.4.3.2.1.
cannot carry’. These two texts show the equivalence not only of yiqtol and the modal verb יָדַע, however, but also of ‘ָּכַּל and lō’. An example from the Psalms with Possibilistic modality is:

אַלָּ תְּעִיְּנָהּ רַעְתְּנָהּ. 137:4

How could we sing the Lord’s song in a foreign land? (NRSV)

= אַלָּ תְּעִיְּנָהּ רַעְתְּנָהּ. We can’t sing ... 137:4

4.2.3. Negative Deontic

’ָּכַּל with yiqtol addressed to the subject may have Negative Deontic force (equivalent to ‘af-):

קִנֵּי. בְּעָרָיָה, יָדַע. וַיִּקְרָא צְרָאָה. 111:1

In the LORD I take refuge; how can you say to me, “Flee like a bird to the mountains”? (NRSV)

= אַלָּ תְּעִיְּנָהּ רַעְתְּנָהּ. Don’t say to me ...

4.2.4. Exclamative

Exclamative function may be borne by ָּכַּל in a way similar to komma: 73:19

אַרְּךָ נְאָפָה עַד הָעָלָה, הָעָלָה. 73:19

How they are destroyed in a moment, swept away utterly by terror! (NRSV)

Most famously, of course, this occurs in Lamentations.

4.3. Place: ָּכַּל, me’ayin, ָּכַּל

ָּכַּל may be a complementiser to a verb of seeing in:

כִּי בָּא עַל יְשֵׁנָהּ, אָזַת דָּעַת. 121:1-2

I lift up my eyes to the hills [to see] where my help might come from.

My help is from the LORD, maker of heaven and earth. (ALW)

4.3.1. Interrogative

This same text is most often read as a direct question:

כִּי בָּא עַל יְשֵׁנָהּ, אָזַת דָּעַת. 121:1-2

I lift up my eyes to the hills—from where will my help come?

My help comes from the LORD, who made heaven and earth. (NRSV)

4.3.2. Negative Indicative

The common taunt ָּכַּל (42:4, 11: 79:10; 115:2) is pragmatically equivalent to ָּכַּל—hence the question is not where he is, but whether he really exists:

הִיְמֹנָה, כֹּפָס וְיִשְׁרֵי נִקּוּל אַל-שְּנֵי אַּל-אָרֶץ. 42:4

My tears have been my food day and night, while people say to me continually, “Where is your God?” (NRSV)

= אַל-אָרֶץ. Your God doesn’t exist.

4.3.3. Negative Epistemic

With possibilistic yiqtol, a locative Interrogative functions as ‘Not anywhere’ (equivalent to lō):

אָלָּ תְּעִיְּנָהּ רַעְתְּנָהּ. 139:7

Where can I go from your spirit? Or where can I flee from your presence? (NRSV)

= אָלָּ תְּעִיְּנָהּ רַעְתְּנָהּ. I cannot go away from your spirit. I cannot flee from your presence.

4.3.4. Affirmative Deontic

The nominal clause structure of 42:4 above may be used as a challenge to reveal something by questioning its presence. It thus gains Deontic force:

אַל-שְּנֵי אַל-אָרֶץ. 89:50

Lord, where is your steadfast love of old, which by your faithfulness you swore to David? (NRSV)

4.4. Purpose: lâmā, mā, ָּכַּל

Various functions of ‘Why’ in Biblical Hebrew have been discussed at length by James Barr.32 Here, we do not need to consider maddāh, since it does not occur in the Psalter.33

Interrogatives of purpose occur with necessitative yiqtol (markedly E-system e.g. 68:17) in all grammatical persons (1st-person 49:6; 2nd-person 10:1; 3rd-person 79:10) (לֶמֶנְתָּ, לֶמֶנָּה). 3rd-person 79:10)

4.4.1. Negative Epistemic

lâmā can have Negative Epistemic force (equivalent to lō):

לָמֶנֶנֶנֶת. 49:6

Why should I fear in times of trouble, when the iniquity of my persecutors surrounds me? (NRSV)

= אָל-שְּנֵי אַל-אָרֶץ. I do not need to fear. (so 56:5 etc.)

4.4.2. Negative Deontic

lâmā can have Negative Deontic force (equivalent to ‘af-) when addressed to the subject—James Barr refers to these as ‘hypothetical deprecations’.34 Examples include:35

לָמֶנֶנֶת. 44:25

Why do you hide your face? Why do you forget our affliction and oppression? (NRSV)

= אָל-שְּנֵי אַל-אָרֶץ. Don’t hide your face! Don’t forget ...

לָמֶנֶנֶת. 10:13

Why do the wicked renounce God, and say in their hearts, “You will not call us to account”? (NRSV)

= אָל-שְּנֵי אַל-אָרֶץ. Let not the wicked renounce God ...

32Barr, ‘Why!’.
33See also the comments of O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 304.
35Also 2:1b; 10:1; 42:6, 10b; 43:2b, 5; 44:24, 52:3, 68:17; 74:1b, 11; 79:10; 88:15; 115:2.
5.2 q 40

The last of these shows its relation to Deontic force by the parallel imperative.

kammā + qātal has the same Negative Deontic function, and almost always occurs parallel to a clause with E-system qītāl: 36

אכָּשָׁה 42:10
I say to God, my rock, “Why have you forgotten me? Why must I walk about mournfully because the enemy oppresses me?” (NRSV)

kammā (nm) ... LORD, do not cast my soul off! Don’t hide your face from me! (ALW)

God, why have you cast us off for ever? Why must your anger smoke against the sheep of your pasture? (ALW)

This latter text may be compared with an equivalent with qītāl:

kammā, mà 88:15
LORD, why must you cast my soul off? Why must you hide your face from me? (ALW)

4.5. Quality: kammā, mà

Though kammā might be thought to be an Interrogative of Manner, it does not in fact refer to quality, but only to quantity. This is show most clearly by its collocation with terms such as רבים (92:6), פָּנָיו (92:6), וב (3:2) and comparative מִן (119:103).

4.5.1. Exclamative

kammā may qualify a verb, in which case it is usually qātal: 37

םִדְרֵכלָל בֵּעַר קַיִּים אֲלֵהֶם. 92:6

How great are your works, O LORD! Your thoughts are very deep! (NRSV)

kammā may occur with qītāl: 38

יהָוָה בֹּשֵׂם יִשְׁרְאֵל בֵּרוֹשׁ פֶּתַח מַעֲשֹׂי. 21:2

LORD, in your strength a king can be happy and in your salvation how greatly he can rejoice! (ALW)

kammā may also qualify a predicative adjective: 39

O LORD, our Sovereign, how majestic is your name in all the earth! You have set your glory above the heavens. (NRSV)

כִּי יְשִׁירָה בָּלָה, יִשְׁרְאֵל. 133:1

How very good and pleasant it is when kindred live together in unity! (NRSV)

kammā qualifies a noun within a Prepositional Phrase:

רָאִים מִיִּתְרוֹן לָעֲשֹׂי פֵּרוֹת אֶל חֶגֶל אֵשׁ. 89:48

Remember how short my time is—for what vanity you have created all mortals! (NRSV)

5. Conclusion

In this chapter, we have considered all the questions in the Psalter. Distinct syntactic functions of Interrogative morphemes include use as a complementiser and in Interrogative coordination. However, it is as the pragmatic level that we find a wide range of distinct functions, springing, in particular, from the Epistemic modality of qītāl.

Interrogative force was found in:

אֶלָ֖א נָשִׁים 14:2
Is there a wise person...

לְהוֹדָ֑ע לְמִלָּ֔ה 39:8
What do I wait for...

הַעֲשֹׂי בַּרְכָּה 24:3
Who shall ascend the hill of the LORD...

שָׁמַ֖שׁ לָ֑א מִאֲבָר 121:1
From where will my help come?

Affirmative Indicative force (equivalent to bàn̂nē) was found in:

אֶלָ֖א נָשִׁים 56:9
Are they not in your record?

Negative Indicative force (equivalent to "en or lō") was found in:

אָמַ֖ר לְמִלָּ֑ה 30:10
What profit is there in my death?

אָמַ֖ר לְמִלָּ֑ה 71:19
Who is like you?

אָמַ֖ר לְמִלָּ֑ה 73:11
Acacia is they?

אָמַ֖ר לְמִלָּ֑ה 42:4
Where is your God?

Indefinite Epistemic force was found in

אָמַ֖ר לְמִלָּ֑ה 34:13
Who is it that desires life?

Negative Epistemic force (equivalent to lō) was found in:

אָמַ֖ר לְמִלָּ֑ה 30:10
Can dust acknowledge you?

אָמַ֖ר לְמִלָּ֑ה 137:4
How could we sing?

אָמַ֖ר לְמִלָּ֑ה 139:7
Where can I go from your spirit?

אָמַ֖ר לְמִלָּ֑ה 139:7
Why should I fear?

36Also 2:1; 22:2; 43:2; 80:13.
37Also 3:2; 104:24; 119:97, 119:103.
38Also 78:40, though not possible but past habitual qītāl.
39Also 8:10; 31:20; 36:8; 66:3; 84:2.
Affirmative Deontic force (equivalent to ‘im, lā or kā) was found in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vāqīl</td>
<td>Will you not revive us again?</td>
<td>85:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kā + vāqīl</td>
<td>Who will show us good?</td>
<td>4:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lā + vāqīl</td>
<td>When will you be wise?</td>
<td>94:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hā + vāqīl etc. + nom. cl.</td>
<td>Where is your steadfast love?</td>
<td>89:50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative Deontic force (equivalent to ‘al-) was found in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vāqīl</td>
<td>Must the Lord reject for ever?</td>
<td>77:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hā + qātal</td>
<td>Has God forgotten what being gracious is?</td>
<td>77:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lā + qātal</td>
<td>Have you not rejected us, God?</td>
<td>60:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lā + vāqīl etc.</td>
<td>How long, God, is the enemy to scoff?</td>
<td>74:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rāḥemāh li-hāyīn</td>
<td>How long will you be angry?</td>
<td>80:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ēdār</td>
<td>How can you say?</td>
<td>11:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣāḥab</td>
<td>Why must you hide your face?</td>
<td>44:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lā + qātal</td>
<td>Why have you forgotten me?</td>
<td>42:10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exclamatory force was found in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vāqīl</td>
<td>The ear-planter, doesn’t she hear?!</td>
<td>94:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rēdār</td>
<td>How long?!</td>
<td>64:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rēdār</td>
<td>How they are destroyed!</td>
<td>73:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bāḥē</td>
<td>How great are your works!</td>
<td>92:6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Negative Deontic is clearly the most frequent function of Interrogative forms in the Psalter and, together with the equivalent Negative Deontic form in ‘al-, it cuts across several formulae.

So with בָּאַ:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>27:9; 69:18; 102:3; 143:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative [purpose]</td>
<td>44:25; 88:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative [time]</td>
<td>13:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative [time]</td>
<td>89:47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with בָּאַ:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>44:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative (marked)</td>
<td>44:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirmative (unmarked)</td>
<td>89:39; 60:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative [purpose] + vāqīl</td>
<td>88:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative [purpose] + qātal</td>
<td>43:2; 74:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative [clausal]</td>
<td>77:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative [clausal]—Negative</td>
<td>60:12; 108:12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At several points, both vāqīl and qātal forms have been listed, whilst it has at the same time been commented that the pragmatic force is particularly associated with the modal potential of vāqīl. A solution to this apparent problem may lie in noticing that many of the qātal forms are of verbs of stative character, which have no vāqīl option (vāqīl, rēdār, drēš, ṣāḥab). This suggestion is clearly partially right, though it is belied by parallel texts such as 74:1 ṣāḥab ḫāṭir and 88:15 ḫāṭir, as well as the general frequency of ḫāṭir and לְהַעֲרָבָה in the vāqīl form.

Amongst the various forms discussed above, it is striking that Negative Indicative force is most often carried by nominal Interrogatives ml and mā, whilst Negative Deontic force is most often carried by verbal Interrogatives (ḥālē, ‘ad-māṭay, ‘eḵ and ṭāmāṭ). There is clearly more work to be done on this. The fact that Interrogatives can also carry affirmative force has earned this type the name ‘queclaratives’.

The term ‘rhetorical question’ has been avoided in the above discussion. It has become clear that there is a wide range of pragmatic functions which can be fulfilled using Interrogative morphemes—many more than is commonly assumed. To refer to these as all ‘rhetorical questions’ would be to misrepresent their overwhelming preponderance over the very few real (‘unskeded’) Interrogatives in the Psalter. It would also be to neglect the significance of clausal modality for the interpretation of such ‘skewed’ forms.

---

40 Wolter Rose, pers. comm.
41 Levinson, 373.
42 Surveyed in Beekman and Callow, Translating the Word of God, ch. 15; see also O’Connor, Hebrew Verse Structure, 12.
Chapter 5
NEGATIVE

Negative particles are discussed above in the context of Interrogative הוי לוד (ch. 4) and below in the context of jussive 'אל-טיגא and cohortative 'אל-אטייגא (ch. 6). Here, we briefly consider the interrelationship of different types of Negation and how they relate to modal verbal forms.

1. Introduction

Hebrew appears to have a full system of Negation for nominal clauses ('en), non-Deontic verbal clauses (lo), Deontic verbal clauses ('al-), and final clauses, both finite (pen) and infinite (labili).¹ In the Psalms in particular there is also the mood-unmarked bal. These morphemes exhibit significant differences in syntactical status, though not in semantic load.²

1.1. Basic Morphemes

There is no unifying basis for the Negative morphemes comparable to that which we have seen for Interrogative morphemes. 'en and 'al- appear to be related to the Interrogative 'aay morpheme, 'al- may be read as 'a compound of *aay with asseverative *la ... before a jussive verb',³ bal and labili may be related to *bal.⁴

2. Syntactic Function

2.1. לֹ and 'al-

In verbal clauses, non-Deontic modality takes the adverb לֹ:

... שנחרְרַה לְאַבְרָהָם טֹומֶץ.

There they shall be in great terror, in terror such as has not been…. (RSV).

Deontic clauses take the proclitic⁵ 'al-:

אל־אֵל מְשָׁרַת יְשֵׁם רַב עֶשָּׁב אָבָדְתֵּנִי.

May there be no one to do him a kindness, nor anyone to pity his orphaned children. (RSV)

These particles have different syntactic status, Negating quite different parts of the predication.

¹Compare the extensive system in Egyptian, covering contradiction, non-existence and contrariety, and attaching Negation to verbs ('Negative verbs'), complement infinitives ('not to hear'), conjunctions ('that not') and even relative pronouns ('who/which not'—functionally equivalent to a positive relative pronoun controlling a negative predication); Loprieno, Ancient Egyptian, 70, 73, 89-90, 101, 126-28.
³Faber, 'The diachronic relationship', 422.
⁵Like the monosyllabic prepositions and particles לארשי, עֵד, יַעֲרֶה, יָנוּר, תַּנְא. Wallke-O'Connor, Syntax, 64 §4.2.1a.
We will start by looking at Latin. It is well known that Latin purpose (functionally modal) and result (functionally non-modal) clauses are in the affirmative formally indistinguishable, taking 'ut + subjunctive'. In the Negative, however, we see the following pattern:

**Purpose**
non ne + subjunctive

**Result**
non ut non + subjunctive

In other words, ne (Greek μη; Hebrew 'al-) is Deontic (D-system), as against non (Greek οὐ; Hebrew lō'), which is non-Deontic (E-I-system). As a modal particle, ne also appears with the subjunctive for a prohibition, postclitically in Interrogatives and preclitically with some verbs (e.g. nescire, to not know; nelle, to not want). The Negative Deontic in Latin or Greek with the subjunctive/optative corresponds to the Hebrew jussive. Thus we can distinguish between the syntactic roles of 'al- and lō'.

'al- is a proclitic particle for propositional Negation. It relates to the propositional content of the verb in the same way as agreement (person, gender, number), mood (modal verbs or verbal modality) and aspect marking. In phrase-structural terms, 'al- is a functional term, and appears in the INF(lection) position.

lō is an adverb for clausal Negation. It relates to the clause in the same way as adverbs of time, manner, place. In phrase-structural terms, lō is a lexical term, and appears in the Adjunct position.

This distinction is similar to that made in Greek:

μη... is the negation of will, wish, doubt. If οὐ denies the fact, μη denies the idea.

Though there are some surprising positions of 'al-', what is not normally attested is the collocation of E-system lō with D-system forms or D-system 'al- with E-system forms. The Negators belong consistently to their respective formal paradigms. This coherence of formal systems is seen also in the non-occurrence of D-system -nä with the infinitive absolute (E-system) or preterite perfect (I-system).

### 2.2. Non-Negatables

Certain forms in Biblical Hebrew resist Negation. These are the person-unmarked imperative (D-system) and infinitive absolute (E-system) and the continuation forms wagqal (D/E-systems) and wawqiqal (I-system).

---

6Interestingly, μη also occurs with Interrogative; e.g. John 8:53.
7See Shlonsky, *Clause Structure and Word Order in Hebrew and Arabic: the functional layer*.
9Though see section 4.3.1. below.

---

3. Argumental: lō'

The Negation of clausal elements other than the Verb Phrase does not usually interact with modality, and so is not particularly significant for the present study. However, it is interesting for its variety of syntactical structures and their relationship to Interrogation.

A Negative Noun Phrase may appear within a Prepositional Phrase:

Thee Péék ýo má-ál Yóh-hâh. 44:13

You have sold your people for a trifle, demanding no high price for them. (RSV)

We saw a similar phenomenon in Interrogation [nominal]:

ỷ-éey, yi-te-yá a’t-sfít ýo ‘se qe’eh. 11:9

How can young people keep their way pure? By guarding it according to your word. (RSV)

Within a Prepositional Phrase, the Negator is moved outside of a construct phrase:

‘eéyy, yi-te-yá a’t-sfít ýo ‘se qe’eh. 17:1

Hear a just cause, O LORD; attend to my cry; give ear to my prayer from lips free of deceit. (RSV)

An oblique Noun Phrase may also be Negated with lō':

‘eéyy, yi-te-yá a’t-sfít ýo ‘se qe’eh. 59:4

Even now they lie in wait for my life; the mighty stir up strife against me. For no transgression or sin of mine, O LORD (RSV)

An Adverbial or Prepositional Phrase may be Negated with lō'. The deictic adverb lō is Negated in 1:4 (לֲאָלָם הַרְשִׁיָּמָו). Negation is further attached to Prepositional Phrases of time (לֹא לַעֲלוּ, לֹא לַמְסַפֵּר 44:4; לֹא לַמְסַפֵּר 75:7) or cause (לֹא לְבָרֵב 50:8).11

An Adjective Phrase may be Negated with lō':


4. Clausal

#### 4.1. Nominal: 'ên, lō'

Existential clauses were considered as an example at the beginning of chapter 3 above. Unlike the Affirmative yēf, the Negative 'ên can take subject clitics and occurs with both existential/locative clauses and copular nominal clauses.12

‘eéyy, yi-te-yá a’t-sfít ýo ‘se qe’eh. 14:3

They have all gone astray, they are all alike perverse; there is no one who does good, no, not one. (RSV)

27:36

Again I passed by, and they were no more; though I sought them, they could not be found. (RSV)

---

11See section 4.3.1. below.
lō sometimes appears in this function.¹³

We do not see our emblems; there is no longer any prophet, and there is no one among us who knows how long. (NRSV)

O my God, I cry by day, but you do not answer; and by night, but find no rest. (NRSV)

For you are not a God who delights in wickedness; evil will not sojourn with you. (NRSV)

4.2. I-System Verbal: ‘ēn, lō

The Indicative Anterior is Negated with lō:

A king is not saved by his great army; a warrior is not delivered by his great strength. (NRSV)

One might compare with this latter example the way in which Deontic passivity is also usually expressed using the qōtel form.

4.3. E-System Verbal: lō

The relationship between Negation and modality is shown clearly by the large number of occurrences of lō with modal verbs in the Psalter, including Possibilitive (e.g. 18:39; 36:13; 40:13; 101:5; 129:2; 139:6; compare Interrogative in 78:19-20) and Permissive (e.g. 16:10; 66:9; 121:3; 140:9). The structure is also related to Negation, since it involves Affirmativeness (e.g. 41:9; 77:8).

Possibilitive yiqtol occurs with lō:

They have mouths, but cannot speak; they have eyes, but cannot see.

They have ears, but cannot hear; they have noses, but cannot smell.

They have hands, but cannot feel; legs, but cannot walk; they cannot make a noise in their throats. (ALW)

It is not the dead that can praise the LORD, nor anyone that goes down into silence. (ALW)

This latter text may be compared with one of our Interrogative examples:

Can dust acknowledge you? Can it declare your truth? (ALW)

Necessitative yiqtol occurs very frequently with lō, especially with 1st-person forms of אָ֣דָ֑ם ‘I need not be afraid’ (e.g. 56:5; 56:12; 118:6; 26:1; also 27:3; 91:5; 112:7-8), הבַּעַתָּא ‘I need not be shamed’ (e.g. 119:6, 46, 80; also 127:5) and הבש ‘I need not stumble’ (e.g. 62:3, 7; 118:17; also 112:6; 125:1).

If a camp should set up against me, my heart does not need to be afraid. If a battle should rise up against me, I am going to trust in this. (ALW)

4.3.1. ‘Skewing’: Deontic lō

The Deontic use of the E-system, especially in apodictic legal texts, was noted in chapter 3 above. It was also shown that the difference between the ‘vetoive’ al-+ jussive, and the ‘prohibitive’ lō-+ long-form yiqtol is not one of urgency vs. permanence, but of strength of Directive force.

There are most surprisingly also instances where lō occurs with the jussive.¹⁴ This mixing of E-system and D-system forms must be considered quite exceptional.

Neither of these types is attested in the Psalter.

4.4. D-System Verbal: ‘al-

The non-Negation of the imperative and complementary distribution of imperative and ‘al-+ 2nd-person jussive’ may be explained with reference to the distinction between ‘not necessary’ and ‘necessary not’.

... denial of permission is equivalent to giving instructions not to act, since ‘Not-possible’ is equivalent to ‘Necessary-not’ in a logical system. ... The imperative thus expresses ‘necessity’, but the negated subjunctive, jussive, etc., ‘no possibility’.²⁶

In Deontic terms, ‘Not Permitted that p’ is equivalent to ‘Obligated that not p’. Since Negation tends to attach itself to the modality of the clause (‘neustic’—Permission/Obligation) rather than to the propositional content (‘phrastic’—p), it is therefore the former pattern which is

¹³Suppan, Syntax of Biblical Poetry, XXXII.


¹⁵I rely in the following on Palmer, Mood and Modality, passim and Lyons, Semantics 2, 725-849.

¹⁶Palmer, Mood and Modality, 113, referring to Latin, Greek, Syrian Arabic and Amharic. Some proviso must be made, however. As Palmer writes, ‘... it would be a mistake to emphasize these logical relations too much, for there is a difference ...’ In purely logical terms, ‘not possible’ (may not) is equivalent to ‘necessary not’ (mustn’t), but denying permission is not the same as obliging someone not to act. We only deny permission if we are in a position to grant it, but can lay an obligation not to act when it is not normally up to us to give permission.’ (Palmer, Mood and Modality, 99); similarly: ‘There is clearly a complementary relationship between possibility and necessity in epistemic modality (possible that not = necessary not = possible that not possible that = necessary that not), and possibility forms (may, can) are primary, since they are used in both kinds of Negation in both possibility and necessity. By contrast, in deontic modality, there is no complementary relationship (not permitted that not), and the default appears to be necessity (must, need).’ (Palmer, Mood and Modality, 58, 98.)
preferred. This can be best illustrated in languages where the modality is lexicalised in a modal verb:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>tu ne peux pas faire</th>
<th>tu dois ne pas faire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>du darfst nicht tun</td>
<td><em>du mußt nicht-tun</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English\textsuperscript{17}</td>
<td>you cannot do</td>
<td><em>you have to</em> not do</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the Biblical Hebrew prohibition *'al-tiqtol* is in fact ‘Negative + Permissive’. This Permissive understanding of the jussive explains the infrequent occurrence of the affirmative 2nd-person jussive (since the imperative will be preferred for Obligative). It also supports our view of the Hebrew verbal system, since the Epistemic equivalent of Deontic Permission is Possibility, and this (in the form of present potentialis) we showed to be key to understanding long-form yiqtol.

Detailed discussion of Negated cohortatives and jussives is saved until we have considered affirmative equivalents.\textsuperscript{18}

\textbf{4.4.1. ‘Skewing’: Non-Deontic Function}

‘*al-\textsuperscript{2} appears in some unexpected contexts. Joïon-Muraoka comment,

In poetry we encounter some cases where ה is used instead of ב, whether in order to give a more energetic nuance or for stylistic embellishment.\textsuperscript{19}

Their examples include:

\begin{quote}
        The LORD protects them and keeps them alive; they are called happy in the land. You do not give them up to the will of their enemies. (NRSV)

        Our God comes and does not keep silence, before him is a devouring fire, and a mighty tempest all around him. (NRSV)
\end{quote}

Both of these could be debated, especially in the light of our distinction between E- and D-systems, however, Joïon-Muraoka may be right that the ‘vocative’ nature of *al-\textsuperscript{2} is here used for ‘a more energetic nuance’. This might be compared with our description of *ma-\textsuperscript{3} as a ‘vocative intensifier’.

Even more strikingly, *al- occasionally ... occurs before a strongly emphasized member of the sentence other than the verb.\textsuperscript{20}

\textsuperscript{17}Strangely, the prototypical English examples, ‘may’ and ‘must’, permit both readings—‘You may not do’=’You must not do’!

\textsuperscript{18}See ch. 6 below.

\textsuperscript{19}Joïon-Muraoka, 604 §160f, also 377 §114k.

\textsuperscript{20}Walke-O’Connor, 367 §34 2.1c.

\textbf{4.5. D-System Final: }\textit{pen}

Although the present work is primarily concerned with main-clause functions, it is worth commenting on the Negative Deontic final conjunction \textit{pen}, which marks a Negative purpose. \textit{pen} standardly occurs with E-system yiqtol following an imperative:\textsuperscript{22}

\begin{quote}
        Consider and answer me, O LORD my God! Give light to my eyes, or I will sleep the sleep of death, and my enemy will say, ‘I have prevailed’; my foes will rejoice because I am shaken. (NRSV)

        On their hands they will bear you up, so that you will not dash your foot against a stone. (NRSV)
\end{quote}

In two cases, however, \textit{pen} appears to stand at the head of a Deontic main clause, where we would normally expect *al-:\textsuperscript{21}

\begin{quote}
        For I pray, ‘May they not rejoice over me!’ Whenever my foot stumbles, they boast. (ALW)

        To you, LORD, I cry. My rock, do not keep silent from me! Do not be quiet from me lest I become like those who go down to the pit. (ALW)
\end{quote}

This should not be as surprising as is often suggested. We saw in chapter 4 above how the Interrogative/conditional subordinating conjunction *im can function as an Interrogative complementiser or coordinating conjunction. Similarly here, we find a subordinating conjunction taking a main-clause function.


\textsuperscript{22}Also 2:12; 7:2; 13:4; 50:22; 59:12;
4.6. Unmarked Verbal: bal

Almost half of all Biblical occurrences of bal are to be found in the Psalter (31 out of 68); the remainder are nearly all in Isaiah and Proverbs. Two particular uses should be mentioned. Firstly, bal occurs very frequently with the verb ובש, more frequently, in fact, than the otherwise more frequent לֹ"ו (10:6; 17:5; 21:8; 30:7; 46:6; 93:1; 96:10; 104:5; with לֹ"ו: 15:5; 112:6). Secondly, it occurs at four points in the Psalter where it should almost certainly be emended to הביא (44:15; 57:10; 149:7; 108:4). Thus this particle is unusually restricted in both the idiom to which it belongs and its syntags.

At the same time, however, bal is in fact the most multi-functional of all the Negative particles—it can stand in place of 'ên, לֹ"ו, 'al- or pen.

4.6.1. Nominal: 'ên

And the Lord says: “You are my Lord; I have no good apart from you.” (NRSV)

4.6.2. I-System: לֹ"ו

You have given him his heart's desire, and have not withheld the request of his lips. Selah (NRSV)

4.6.3. E-System: לֹ"ו

bal occurs within the full range of the E-system, from possible:

The LORD has become king—he has clothed himself in majesty; the LORD has clothed himself—he has guided himself with strength. Surely the world is established—it cannot move. (ALW)

You set a boundary that they may not pass, so that they might not again cover the earth. (NRSV)

to necessary:

As for me, I said in my prosperity, “I can never be moved.” (ALW)

4.6.4. D-System: 'al-

This reading seems convincing in the light of the preceding, though the cohortative is unmarked.

23Tromp, 'The Hebrew Particle bal', 277-78.
24Culley's formula 46.
Chapter 6

IMPERATIVE

The term ‘Imperative’ in this chapter refers not only to the verbal form qatal (‘imperative’), but also to its lengthened form qetil (‘adhortative’) and to the entire D-system, centred on short-form qatal-x (‘jussive’) and also including: ’erqtal (‘cohortative’), the Negative ‘al-qatal (‘veritive’) and the continuation form waxtal (more properly germane to the E-system). The chapter begins by considering those morphemes which are often considered to mark Deontic force and ends by looking at Deontic uses of nominal clauses.

1. Introduction

In his comparison of Babylonian, Egyptian and Old Testament psalms, Westermann writes:

Während in den ägyptischen Psalmen die Vokabeln des Lobens ganz überwiegend indikativisch sind, also schildern, sind sie im Alten Testament in ihrer ganzen Fülle fast nur imperativisch. In den ägyptischen Psalmen wird ständig in der betrachtenden Haltung das Loben und Preisen der Götter als geschehen beschrieben; in den Psalmen des Alten Testaments wird fast nur dazu gerufen. Dort ist es Faktum, hier Forderung; dort das Gott Gegebene, hier das Gott geschuldet; dort ist Gott der, der das Lob bekommen hat und bekommt; in Israel ist Gott der, dessen Tun immer neu zum Lob ruf.¹

This should alert us to the primary rhetorical importance of this grammatical type in the Psalter, and it is in the light of this functional importance that we consider the various Deontic forms of expression.

Longacre-style² formal identification of main- and off-line clauses necessitates the establishment of a ‘verb-rank cline’. These clines must be text-type-specific, however, and none have been offered yet for poetry. Dawson suggests it will not be possible:

poetic concerns displace text-type features sufficiently that text-type identification of highly poetic passages is nearly impossible, or at best, irrelevant.³

However, some attempts can be made at identifying a main line in the grammar of the Psalms. I would begin by considering imperatives a likely candidate for the role of main-line verb forms. This is supported by the suggestions, considered in chapter 1 above,⁴ that the imperative might be considered ‘deontically non-modal’, and that the main line of discourse is Deontic. Thus Discourse would have a Deontic main-line (Searle’s Directives) for which the unmarked form is the imperative, whilst Narrative has an Indicative main-line (Searle’s Assertives) for which the unmarked form is qatal. Support comes from Michel, who, having rejected narrative texts as a guide to the meaning of the tenses in Hebrew, looks to the Psalms, ‘deren Handlungen in

²Longacre, Joseph; see also ch. 1, section 2.2.3.2. above.
³Dawson, Text Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew, 191 n. 69.
⁴Section 2.1.3.5, following Palmer, Mood and Modality, 29.
Allen drei Zeistufen liegen. It is just this fact that the Psalms are in many ways not temporarily framed that suggests the primacy of Deontic forms.

Three terms used in this chapter, almost synonymously, for both forms and functions are:

- **Deontic**
  - formally, the D-system, as distinct from E-system and I-system; functionally [+MOD.
  - [+VOL.] as distinct from Epistemic [+MOD. [-VOL.].
  - (from Greek ἔθνη, 'there is need')

- **Imperative-al**
  - chosen as a Latein counterpart to Interrogative and Negative; lower case 'imperative' refers to the form qatol, the morphological imperative.
  - (from Latin imperus, 'to command')

- **volitional**
  - a less technical equivalent
  - (from Latin volo, 'to want')

Terms used as full or partial equivalents by other scholars (but not here) include:

- **volitive**
  - DeCao, Gibbon, 5 Joüon–Muraoka, 9 Niccaci, 10, here used to refer to a sub-type of Deontic modality analogous to Expressive illocutionary force, including in particular optative, deontative, and intensional clauses.

- **voluntative**
  - Gesenius–Buhl 12 for 'cohortative', Brown–Driver–Briggs 13 for 'cohortative or jussive': not used here.

- **Directive**
  - here used to refer to a type of illocutionary force corresponding to the utterance type 'Mand', a sub-type of Deontic modality.

- **desiderative**
  - Gesenius–Kautzsch–Cowley 14 from the German Wünschbar, 15, here, a subclass of volitive.

### 1.1. Formal Types

It has already been shown that Biblical Hebrew has a distinct D-system, centering on short-form yiqtol. This provides 2nd and 3rd-person 'jussive' forms directly, and the 1st-person 'cohortative' by addition of a paragoge -d syllable. The 'imperative' may be understood synchronically as also stemming from short-form yiqtol, with apharesis of the initial person-marking; however, it is most likely the reverse which is true diachronically, since a range of cross-linguistic observations indicate the primacy of the imperative form itself. The imperative may be lengthened by the same paragoge -d syllable that we see in the coherative, to form the 'adhortative'. Here, we therefore consider the 'volitional class' to consist of the D-system, supplemented by the imperative and adhortative forms. The class may therefore be presented as follows (together with E-system counterparts): 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Derivation from short-form yiqtol</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>D-system</th>
<th>E-system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>cohortative paragoge</td>
<td>'qatol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2j</td>
<td>jussive</td>
<td>yiqtol</td>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3j</td>
<td>jussive</td>
<td>yiqtol</td>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2i</td>
<td>imperative aphaeresis</td>
<td>qatol</td>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>adhortative aphaeresis, paragoge</td>
<td>qatol</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus the class has three distinct forms for the 2nd-person: with person-marking ('jussive'), without person-marking ('imperative') and without person-marking but with lengthening ('adhortative'). 20

This presentation of the Deontic forms treats them as a distinct 'volitional class', as distinct from the several other forms which may in particular contexts be used with Deontic force (e.g. 'precipitve perk', 'precipitive imperfect'). One important recent contribution to the study of Biblical Hebrew in Deontic function (Finley, 'The Proposal') has suffered from its lack of a

---

16 See Wright, Grammar 1, 61: 'The Imperative ... may be described as formed from the Jussive by rejecting the prefix of the 2d pers. sing.;' similarly Finley, 'The Proposal', 5: 'From a synchronic perspective, it is convenient to describe the imperative form as consisting of the PC base plus endings without the personal prefix'; similarly Bravmann, cited in Wake–O'Connor, Syntax, 567 §3.2.2. a n. 9.
17 For some of these, see ch. 1 and the discussion below. Wake–O'Connor, Syntax, 567 §3.2.2. a n. 9 describe the yiqtol-first view as dominant, but this is certainly not true in cross-linguistic perspective. Compare Brockelman, Syntax, 1 §2; who considers the infinitive absolute 'die älteste Form des Belechts!' Similarly Finley, 'The Proposal', 5: 'From a diachronic viewpoint, the Hebrew imperative developed from an infinitival form which had no prefixes'. Such suggestions of a relationship between the imperative and the infinitive absolute support the present view of there being distinct D- and E-systems, with often parallel functions.
18 So also Wake–O'Connor, Syntax, 565 §3.4.1b; DeCao, Placement and Interpretation, 112; Kennett, R.H., A Short Account of the Hebrew Tenses (Cambridge: CUP, 1901) 24.
19 Four forms are considered here. all of which can be considered in some sense volitional. They are all based on the yiqtol forms and all take the yiqtol forms of pronominal suffixes.
20 On the relationship between person-marked and person-unmarked forms, see Palmer, Mood and Modality, 109, 111.
21 Finley, 'The Proposal'.
clear view of the system. By failing to distinguish between short-form *yiqtol* and long-form *yiqtol*, he fails to notice the several pairings of true D-system forms with Deontic azer of forms from the E-system (‘preceptive imperfect’) and I-system (‘preceptive perfect’). These pairings include, for example, the person-unmarked, non-Negatable forms—imperative (D-system) and infinitive absolute (E-system)—and the Negation forms—‘vetitive’ ‘al-*yiqtol* (D-system) and ‘prohibitive’ ‘lo’ *yiqtol* (E-system).

Drachman, based especially on Arabic, sees in this variety of forms three distinct Proto-Semitic Deontic conjugations—hortative (as distinct from ‘cohortative’, which refers to the 1st person only), imperative and jussive, which stand alongside the indicative forms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Conjugation (Characteristic)</th>
<th>Proto-Semitic (B-L/Moran)</th>
<th>Arabic correspondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>yiqtol</em></td>
<td>hortative (paragogic he)</td>
<td>Affekt-Aorist/emphatic juss.</td>
<td>subj. yaqutu, energ. yaqulanna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qatal</td>
<td>imperative (person-unmarked)</td>
<td>Kurz-Aorist/jussive</td>
<td>jussive yaqatal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long <em>yiqtol</em></td>
<td>prefix conj. (person prefix)</td>
<td>Voll-Aorist/durative</td>
<td>indicative yaqulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wayyiqtol</td>
<td>w-prefix conj. (waw + juss.)</td>
<td>Waw-Aorist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qatal</td>
<td>suffix conj. (person suffix)</td>
<td>puncual</td>
<td>qatal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This view may be supported by the presence in Biblical Hebrew of occasional 1st-person jussives and 3rd-person cohortatives (e.g. 20:4). It is clear, however, that jussive and cohortative were later, at least, perceived as belonging to one class, since it is the lengthened form of the cohortative which is used to form the 1st-person of wayyiqtol in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Though Biblical Hebrew usage is otherwise preserved in Qumran, by the time of Mishnaic Hebrew, cohortative and adhortative had died out completely, as well as jussive in all but a few cases.

1.2. Syntactic Function and Argument Structure

The two basic formal types considered here (person-marked cohortative and jussive, and person-unmarked imperative and adhortative), in conjunction with the categories of person and number, produce a great variety of different argument structures, involving a range of thematic roles (syntactic functions), and affecting agreement relations and participant reference. Basic formal distinctions, and the conventional distinction between cohortatives of resolve and request, yield the following five standard types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Thematic role of Addressee (God)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1c resolve-cohortative</td>
<td>‘I acknowledge you!’</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c request-cohortative</td>
<td>‘I will not be put to shame!’</td>
<td>‘Causer’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2i imperative</td>
<td>‘Save!’</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2j 2nd-person jussive</td>
<td>‘May you not hide your face!’</td>
<td>Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3j 3rd-person jussive</td>
<td>‘May my heart rejoice!’</td>
<td>‘Causer’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the examples given here, it should be noted that these are all fairly common formulaic phrases (reflecting the high frequency of all five types), that the Negative form has been chosen for the request-cohortative and the 2nd-person jussive (since both of these rarely occur in the affirmative form), and that the translations with ‘May’ locate the modal force outside of the clause (showing that the Addressee is not necessarily identical with the subject).

The argument structure of a verb is normally dictated by its inherent valency, that is, whether it has a direct object, indirect object, location etc. (hence here, in order to simplify discussion, only active or stative examples have been chosen). However, there may be participants in an action who are not explicitly referred to (not realised at surface structure) but nonetheless require the assignment of a thematic role. This is the case of the Addressee with some D-system forms.

The Addressee is grammaticalised as the subject of the verb in all 2nd-person forms irrespective of person-marking (i.e. both imperative and jussive) and mood (i.e. also in the Indicative), and in the resolve-cohortative, where Addressee=Speaker=1st person. In such cases, the Addressee simply bears the thematic role of Agent.

In the case of request-cohortatives and 3rd-person jussives, however, there is no reference to the Addressee in the surface structure of the text. We know that אָלַי אָדָם אֶלּוֹ and נָנָעַ נָאֲדָם are addressed to God, and in fact, that he is expected to act in order to ensure that these things happen, but
there is no explicit reference to him.\(^{33}\) We may therefore say that the Addressee in such cases has a pragmatically-determined thematic role.\(^{34}\)

I term this thematic-role ‘Causer’ to correspond with the ‘causative’ relationship which it represents,\(^{35}\) and leave it in inverted commas to indicate that it is pragmatically assigned. The ‘Causer’ of a stative qal or passive niph'al request-cohortative corresponds to the Agent of a hiph'il 2nd-person Deontic:\(^{36}\)

| binui
| function | form | God | Psalmist | Example |
|----------|--------|-----|------|---------|---------|
| qal      | stative | 1c (req) ‘Causer’ | Experimenter | גַּ֥לְפֵ֥ד אֲמֹאָּרֵ֖ה | 31:2 |
| hiph'il  | causative | 2j | Agent | פִּלְּפֵ֥ד אֲמֹאָּרֵ֖ה | Patient | 119:31 |

Both may be present in one verse in synonymous parallelism, both when the cohortative is passive:

> יַחֲלְלֵ֥תִי אֶת הַמַּשָּׂאֵ֖ב נַעֲמַ֖א אֲמֹאָּרֵ֖ה נָשְׂא קְשֵׁ֖ר

Save me from mine so that I don’t sink; may I be saved from those who hate me and from depths of water. (ALW)

and when it is stative:

> רַחֲמֵ֥י יְהֹוָֽהֲכֵּ֣ם לְאֵֽלִי אֱמֹֽאָּרֵ֖ה נַעֲמַ֖ר

Let me know, LORD, my end and what the measure of my days is! May I know how fleeting I am! (ALW)

Similarly, the ‘Causer’ of a fientive qal 3rd-person jussive corresponds to the Agent of a hiph'il 3rd-person Deontic:

| binui
| function | form | God | Enemies | Example |
|----------|--------|-----|-------|---------|---------|
| qal      | fientive | 3j ‘Causer’ | Experimenter | יַפְּרִ חֲזֵ֖ק בִּמְּשָׂאֵֽב | 5:11 |
| hiph'il  | causative | 3j | Agent | פִּלְּפֵ֥ד אֲמֹאָּרֵ֖ה | Patient | 140:137 |

A good example of the interplay of syntactic and pragmatic thematic roles can be seen in 5:11:

> יָפֵ֥רָה אֶת הַמַּשָּׂאֵ֖ב נַעֲמַ֖ר בָּֽאָֽזִּי יַפְּרִ חֲזֵ֖ק בִּמְּשָׂאֵֽב

Make them bear their guilt, O God; let them fall by their own counsel; because of their many transgressions cast them out, for they have rebelled against you. (NRSV)

\(^{33}\)Further, the subjects of these verbs are not Agents (as in the resolve-cohortative), but Experiencers—the prayer is not that God would make the Psalmist himself or his heart do something (This would require a 3-place predicate), but that he would make them experience something.\(^{34}\)

\(^{34}\)For this addition of arguments to an utterance beyond those of its lexical verb, I refer to Grice’s idea of non-natural meaning or meaning on, which distinguishes a speaker-meaning from the inherent sentence-meaning; Levinson, Pragmatics, 16-17. See also below on ‘Competence roles’.\(^{35}\)

\(^{35}\)Halliday comes to a similar conclusion in a very different way through his discussion of ergativity in modern English; Halliday, ‘Language Structure and Language Function’, 157. In affirmative request-cohortatives (i.e. requests for permission), it is better termed ‘permission’.\(^{36}\)

\(^{36}\)See Walter-O’Connor, Syntax, 355-57 §21.2.2d-m.\(^{37}\)

\(^{37}\)The textual questions often raised here do not affect our discussion, since this is undoubtedly a possible form. It has seemed advantageous to take an example of the same verb, יַפְּרִ, since it must have the same argument structure.

Whether or not הבש is considered as having an implicit active sense (Gesenius-Buhl: ‘billion’), its basic meaning is stative (‘to be guilty’), thus the object of הבש is in fact an Experimenter and the subject of the hiph'il form is an Agent of the state. The subject of the verb הבש is not an Agent, but an Experimenter, since this verb is not truly fientive but ‘middle’, like intransitive ‘break’ in English (e.g. ‘The window broke’ as against causative ‘He broke the window’). Thus the variation in the verb types of 5:11 from stative הבש to middle הבש to fientive הבש in involves a variation in the thematic role of God (the Addressee) from Agent of a hiph'il imperative (ביבש) to ‘Causer’ of a 3rd-person jussive (ב bipolar) to Agent of a hiph'il imperative (ב הד), and of the Enemies from Experimenter of a state (‘being guilty’) to Experimenter of an action (‘falling’), to Patient of an action (‘causing to go away’). It interacts with variation in prepositional phrase types (ב, ב, ב), forms of 3rd-person reference (including possessive suffixes and two forms of object suffix), and—most distinctly—alternation in subject from 2nd person (God) to 3rd person (Enemies) to 2nd person (God) to 3rd person (Enemies). This is an aspect of the rhetorical dynamic of the Psalms that has not been given systematic treatment before.

It should be noted that the thematic role ‘Causer’ is consistently assigned to the Addressee in request-cohortatives and 3rd-person jussives, irrespective of the voice of the form. The subject may be an Agent when the verb is active (e.g. ‘May he kill ... ’), an Experimenter when the verb is passive (e.g. ‘May he be ashamed!’) or a Patient when the verb is passive (e.g. ‘May he be killed!’).

In terms of conventional rhetorical analysis, this use of a thematic role of ‘Causer’ can be helpfully compared to the use of the ‘passivum divinum’ or ‘passivum theologicum’, defined as: die Meinung des Gottesnamens durch Gebrauch einer passiven Konstruktion, bei welcher der Agens nicht genannt wird, der aber nach dem Kontext nur Gott sein kann.\(^{38}\)

This is the primary use of the passive in Wright’s discussion of Arabic.\(^{39}\) An example from the Psalter can be found in the a-colon of:

> יכָּל הַדְּמִינָם הָשַּׁבֵּרָתָּם תָּשִׁיתָם רָצוּ שָׁם יְהֹוָֽהֲכֵּ֥ם 37:17

For the arms of the wicked shall be broken, but the LORD upholdeth the righteous. (NRSV)

I therefore refer to the grammaticalising-away of reference to God in the request-cohortatives and 3rd-person jussives as the rhetorical figure of ‘causativum divinum’.

\(^{38}\)Paz cited in Bühmann and Scherer, Stilfiguren der Bibel, 85.

\(^{39}\)Wright, Grammar, 50.
1.3. Semantic Function

We have already considered the imperative as ‘unmarked’ or ‘neutral’ with respect to the D-system. It is formally unmarked in that, in Hebrew as in most known natural languages, it is the shortest verbal form and has no person marking.40 Though—probably mistakenly—considering the person-marked forms earlier, Driver offers a characteristic non-technical explanation of why the imperative should be the shortest verbal form:

The parallelism of form between the jussive and the imperative ... makes it probable that the origin of this abbreviation or apocopeation is to be traced to the quickened and hasty pronunciation of a person issuing a command: the curtness and compactness of the form corresponding to the abrupt and peremptory tone with the language of one in such a situation would naturally assume.41

In fact, in the light of the present view of the Hebrew verbal system, we may think in terms of a progression:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Long-form</th>
<th>Short-form</th>
<th>Unmarked Deontic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-system</td>
<td>sigi̩l</td>
<td>sigi̩l</td>
<td>qal̩al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[stress-shift]</td>
<td>[apharesis]</td>
<td>[paragogic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-system</td>
<td>qal̩al ('jussive')</td>
<td>qal̩al ('imperative')</td>
<td>qal̩al ('adhortative')</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though, as has been noted, it is unlikely that this reflects a historical progression, it does both rightly reflect the formal relationships with which we are concerned, as well as corresponding to some of functional features. It has already been seen above42 that Deontic use of the E-system tends to be directive, whilst that of the I-system tends to be preceptive; the D-system itself covers the whole range. Here, we can compare the directive formality at the top of the scale (‘preceptive imperfect’) with the urgency at the bottom (paragogic ḥd in cohortative and adhortative; -nā). Further, we may note the rhetorical effect of person-marking—person-unmarked forms topicalise the action more fully than D-system forms with their person-marking prefix.43

The putative primitive nature of the imperative form coincides with claims by many scholars that Deontic function is primitive:

... the imperative, as the principal mood of will and desire, is ontogenetically more basic than the indicative, the mood of statement.44 Many authors refer to this as the instrumental function of language and think of it as being especially basic or primitive.45

It should be noted, however, that this function is not concerned only with commands, but with ‘will and desire’ (Expressive communication) and ‘instrumental’ function (Vocative/Conative communication).46

The ‘core’ of the Deontic system is Directive. A Directive is an utterance by means of which the speaker gets the listener to do something for him.47

It involves much more than straightforward commands, however:

The imperative seems to do no more than express, in the most neutral way, the notion that the speaker is favourably disposed towards the action. He merely ‘presents’ a proposition, just as with the declarative, but for action, not merely for acceptance as true, by the hearer.48

Thus recent descriptions offer listings such as the following:

command, prohibition, permission, request, exhortation, entreaty49
command, specific or general, ... advice or admonition, ... giving permission or an invitation, ... making a request or entreaty.50

Such descriptions are rarely formalised, since the factors which result in one form (whether imperative, cohortative or jussive) having this range of meanings belong to a field which has only quite recently received formal description—that of ‘pragmatics’.

Starting with the assumption of ‘univocality’ (the principle of ‘one form—one meaning’), it should be the case that,

... for each ... grammatical category, lexical item, and perhaps syntactic construction ..., one can establish a set of necessary and sufficient conditions such that every permitted use of the form will be allowed by these conditions, and every rejected use of the form will be disallowed by these conditions. In different contexts, the form in question might be given different interpretations, but these would always be predictable on the basis of the interaction of the meaning of the item (as given by the necessary and sufficient conditions) with features of the context, i.e. the meaning itself would be variable.51

Lyons lists six such ‘features of the context’, which he terms ‘different kinds of knowledge or competence which have a bearing on the situational appropriateness of utterances’.52 The first of these is key to the interpretation of Hebrew Deontic forms:

(i) Each of the participants must know his role and status.

44Lyons, Semantics 2, 746.
45Lyons, Semantics 1, 130. Similarly, ‘giving commands, rather than making statements, is the more ‘basic’ function of language’; Lyons, Introduction, 307.
46For these terms, see ch. 1, section 2.1.1.
47Lyons, J., Semantics 1, 130.
48Driver, Tenses, 52.
49See above ch. 3, section 2.4.6.
50This is not to say that is in any sense ‘more urgent’ (contra Walske-O’Connor, Syntax, 571 §34.4a).
'Role' and 'Status' were discussed in informal terms above in chapter 2; here, they need to be specified in more detail.

By 'Role', Lyons means two distinct features:
1. **Deictic roles** are those of Speaker and Addressee as represented by the grammatical feature of person.
2. **Social roles** are culture-specific, institutionalised functions which affect the use of, for example, the 'Royal we', politeness forms, or the tautus distinction.

By means of Deictic roles it is indicated who is issuing a Mand (the Speaker) and who is expected to hear it (though this is not necessarily the same as the one expected to act upon it—it may be the Speaker himself). Social roles do not affect the interpretation of Deontic forms, though they do affect certain linguistic features of the Psalms such as the *pluralis majestatis*, the *passivum divinum* and what I have termed the *causativum divinum*.53 We also need to specify a third feature for our purposes here:
3. **Competence roles** are concerned with the ability or inability of an agent to realise the proposition expressed.

It is this latter feature which has already been used tacitly to distinguish between 'request-cohorts' (Addressee is competent) and 'resolve-cohorts' (Speaker is competent); it also distinguishes between the function of a 3rd-person jussive ('May my heart rejoice'—Addressee is competent) and its Epistemic counterpart ('My heart will rejoice'—3rd-person subject is competent). It is this competence which results in the Addressee being assigned the thematic role 'Causer' in the case of 1st and 3rd-person Deontic forms as shown above.

'Status' is the relative social standing of the agents—the Speaker is a superordinate, subordinate or peer with respect to the Addressee.

These two features put us in a position to distinguish between several types of Directive force. Firstly, directive (command) and preceptive (request) utterances are those in which the Addressee is competent; they are usually distinguished by status—superordinate Speakers use directives and subordinate Speakers use precepts. Second, in the case of hortative (exhortation) utterances, both Speaker and Addressee are competent, and there is no reference made to status. Thirdly, obligatory (demand) and permissive (permission) utterances54 are the Deontic equivalents of Epistemich necessary and possible;55 obligatives are Speaker-oriented (disregarding Hearer volition), whilst permissive are Hearer-oriented (disregarding Speaker-volition).56 Lastly, prohibitive (prohibition) is the Negative form of permissive (i.e. 'you may not', *not* 'you don't have to') and—it should be noted—is Speaker-oriented.

53 See above, ch. 2.
54 Compare here causativity, which may similarly be permissive or obligatory—'let me' or 'make me'. On the relationship between causative and the D-system, see above on argument structure.
55 I.e. just as English 'must' and 'may' can have Epistemic and Deontic functions (see ch. 1, section 2.1.3.2. above), so also Hebrew *yiqtol*.
56 See the discussion with binary parameters in Warren, 'Did Moses permit Divorce?'. 52.

Alongside Direcitivity, Deontic function also includes Commissive and Expressive speech acts. Commisives include promises and threats (often expressed in Hebrew with 'resolve-cohorts'). Expressives include volitives, that is, optative (realisable hopes), desiderative (non-realisable wishes), and expressions of fear and purpose (intentional); and also evaluatives, that is, predictions/warnings, and some expressions of surprise and regret.

2. **Modification**

There are certain types of clause modification specifically associated with volitional modality, including syntactical morphemes such as the modal clitics -nā (Affirmative) and -al- (Negative); grammatical morphemes such as stress-shift and apocopeation in the jussive (short-form *yiqtol* from long-form *yiqtol*), aphaeresis in the imperative, and paragogic *hē* in the cohortative and adhortative; and syntactical morphemes such as the use of particular auxiliary verbs. Most of these are dealt with elsewhere in the present work; here, we are concerned with the clitic -nā, paragogic *hē*, and the use of modal auxiliaries.

2.1. **The Affirmative Modal Clitic -nā**

The clitic -nā is generally accepted as having broadly Deontic force, and it is often commented that it occurs almost always in the context of Deontic force.58 Its distribution in the Psalter raises some interesting questions, however, since it occurs cliticised to cohortative (122:8):

> הָיוּ הַקְּצֵי אָדָם אֵז לֶמֶנָּה אֶל שִׁלְוַּנֵה נָה: 122:8

For the sake of my relatives and friends I will say, 'Peace be with you.' (NRSV)

Imperative (50:22; 80:15; 118:25 [2x]; 119:108):

> בִּכְרִיתֵנִי וּוּסְכְּתִּי אָדָם פְּרִיאַסָּר וּאֵז מְלַל: 50:22

Mark this, then, you who forget God ... (NRSV)

3rd-person jussive (7:10; 118:2-4 [3x]; 119:76; 124:1; 129:1):

> נִמְקַרְנֵךְ וְרֵשֻׁת הַכֹּסֶחְכָּךְ קְרָא וּרְאָי: 7:10

O let the evil of the wicked come to an end, but establish the righteous ... (NRSV)

Interrogative (115:2):

> קִלְקַל אֵין הָנְךָ נֶסֶכָּה אֲדֹנָי הָלַיָּהוּ: 115:2

Why should the nations say, "Where is their God?" (NRSV)

Negative (116:4, 16; 118:25 [2x]—in the form אֵלַא אֲדֹנִי, a contraction of אֲדֹנִי אֵל);

> אֲדֹנִי אֵל: 118:25

Save us, we beseech you, O LORD! O LORD, we beseech you, give us success! (NRSV)

53 Palmer, Mood and Modality, 116.
54 Hawley, 'The Proposal', 8.
55 The full form אֵל־יָדֵה is common elsewhere in the Old Testament (especially Genesis and Numbers). Some have suggested, however, that אֵלָה in fact originates from אֲדֹnִי.
and prepositions (116:14, 18)

I will pay my vows to the LORD in the presence of all his people. (NRSV)

Thus 13 of the 20 occurrences are clearly volitional, as well as the 4 Negative occurrences (since they are bound with ‘al- and occur in context with adhortatives); it can also be seen that throughout the Old Testament, רַעֲנָא, רַעֲנַא and רַעֲנָא always precede an explicit or implicit request. However, it cannot be simply stated that -nâ‘ is an all-purpose volitional particle. Firstly, it occurs in the clearly non-volitional contexts of רַעֲנָא and רַעֲנָא. Secondly, it has cooccurrence restrictions with Deontic uses of E-system forms such as the infinitive absolute (‘preceptive imperfect’) and of the Indicative Anterior (‘preceptive perfect’); these cooccurrence restrictions of the Affirmative particle might be compared with those of the Negative particle ‘al- with the imperative and Deontic use of its E-system counterpart, the infinitive absolute.

This remarkable distribution of ‘nâ‘ invites questions as to its meaning. Standard grammars tend to describe it as having

a usually weak entreaty nuance, which is roughly equivalent to a stressed and lengthened Please in English.61

Variations on this traditional view of ‘nâ‘ as preceptive are held by Jouion-Muraoka, Gibson,62 Blau,63 Finley64 and Wilt,65 the latter having quite convincingly repudiated Lambdin’s66 and Walke-O’Connor’s67 more recent and quite unusual view of ‘nâ‘ as a logical particle. However, further analysis of the function of this particle is required, and we will therefore consider in detail two recent sociolinguistic discussions before turning to a treatment in terms of speech-acts.

2.1.1. Sociolinguistic Treatments: Finley and Wilt

In his broader discussion of ‘the proposal’,68 Finley comments that whilst ‘nâ‘ may be preceptive,

N is often translated ‘please’: 1) a request ... 2) an exhortation ... 3) an entreaty,69

it is rarely directive.

61Jouion-Muraoka, Grammar, 350 §105c.
62Gibson, Davidic’s Syntax, 80 §65: ‘impart[s] a mild preceptive nuance which scarcely needs to be represented in Engl!.
63Blau claims that ‘nâ‘ has the same function as רַעֲנָא, Blau, Grammar, 87 n. 1-2.
65Wilt, ‘A Sociolinguistic Analysis of NÅ‘.
67Walke-O’Connor, Syntax, 578 §34.7a.
68Finley, ‘The Proposal’.

Only rarely does N indicate a command, in which case it stresses resignation on the speaker’s part to something not really desired ... or displeasure.70

Normally, of course, Deontic function will be preceptive when the Speaker is subordinate to the Addressee, and directive when the Speaker is superordinate. However, the particle ‘nâ‘ may, he suggests, subvert this:

The post-positive N and the pre-positive ‘n‘ or ‘nh either deflect attention from the authority of the speaker if the listener is subordinate, or stress submissiveness if the listener has greater authority. The prepositive form could be called a particle of exhortation. ... When the speaker has greater authority, the particle N perhaps indicates close identification with the listener, almost in an empathetic sense.71

Thus Finley is suggesting that ‘nâ‘ is essentially preceptive, irrespective of the speech situation in which it is used. It is definable semantically and not susceptible to reinterpretation by sociolinguistic factors such as Speaker-Addressee relations.

More recently, Wilt has argued that the meaning of ‘nâ‘ is definable, though only within the sociolinguistic dimension. Though he makes no reference to Finley, and his viewpoint is very different, his conclusion is remarkably similar. What Finley viewed as preceptive/exhortation, even to the point of ‘deflect[ing] attention from the authority of the speaker’, Wilt describes as ‘redress’ or ‘giving face’ to the Addressee.

Like the present study, Wilt’s paper is concerned above all with the relationships pertaining between the primary actants in the speech situation, and the factors he identifies are ‘relational desires, power relationships, emotional duress, and minimal threat to face’.72 A request is a ‘Face Threatening Act’, since it threatens the Addressee’s face by exerting power over him. A ‘bald’ request is therefore made only:73

1. in situations of particular urgency or strong emotion, disputes and warnings.
2. in (inherently non-threatening) oﬀers, suggestions etc., particularly ‘approval of a request made by H’, and
3. where S is ‘vastly superior’ to A, particularly when God addresses mortals and when a political (though not domestic) head addresses his subjects.

In other words, a request is made without redress only when there is no threat to the face of the Addressee (2), or where the question of face-threatening is obscured by particularly great strength of Deontic force (1) or Speaker status (3). On the other hand, ‘redress’ may be made, that is, ‘face’ given to the Addressee; this may be achieved by means of ‘nâ‘ or, for example, self-denigrating or יָטָרַע (e.g. 116:16; 1 Sam 11).75 In Wilt’s corpus, this happens almost always when man addresses God, and—because of 3 above—very rarely when God

73Wilt, ‘A Sociolinguistic Analysis of NÅ‘. 244-46.
75See the discussion of deixis in ch. 2 above.
addresses man. It has been commented elsewhere that this exceptional divine use of -ná may be restricted to requests to do something 'that transcends human comprehension'.

Wilt finds that 42% of the occurrences of -ná and 16% of the non-occurrences function to 'enhance the relationship' between Speaker and Addressee, that is, for the benefit of both. This category includes reconciliation, comfort and offers of and requests for a blessing; it corresponds roughly to Finley's 'preceptive'. Many of the remaining occurrences of -ná involve requests which exceed 'the normal expectations/obligations of the relationship'; these may be summarised as those which disadvantage the Addressee, benefit the Speaker considerably more than the Addressee, or test the Addressee's commitment to the Speaker.

An interesting application of Wilt's finding can be seen in his treatment of cohortatives:

- ná is used generally, if not always, with exclusive cohortatives and never with inclusive ones. ... The exclusive cohortative is inherently a positive face appeal that minimizes face threat: "I want you to do X but, don't worry, I'll do it with you." The exclusive cohortative, however, in proposing a group action that excludes the addressee, would encourage use of a politeness marker in order to minimize the threat that the addressee might feel.

Expressed in my terms, then, hortatives (inclusive cohortatives) have inherently weak Deontic force, whilst directives (exclusive, request-cohortatives) may require redress in the form of the particle -ná.

Wilt concludes:

That ná is indeed a politeness marker seems evident from the above analysis. ... "please" would probably be an appropriate rendering in most, if not all, of the occurrences that we have considered.

This is an impressive conclusion to a very persuasive paper; however, it does not go far enough for our purposes here. In considering modality, giving translational equivalents is not sufficient, since we can easily sense the difference between English 'please' in:

- Please leave the room at once! (directive—a command by a superordinate),
- Please can I have a biscuit? (preceptive—a request by a subordinate), and
- Please take a seat! (permissive—an invitation by a superordinate)

Further, the occurrences of -ná with 3rd-person jussives cannot be idiomatically translated into English with 'Please' (which is restricted in English to directives where Addressee = agent):

> ná — ['let the evil of the wicked come to an end, please'

This may be because 3rd-person jussives are formally expressive (not directive), in that they do not grammaticalise the Addressee.

We therefore now turn to consider the occurrences of -ná in the Psalter in terms of their Deontic force, whether strong (directive) or weak (preceptive).

2.1.2. Directive

In the Psalms, -ná is most often used with 3rd-person jussives, calling the community to praise, and following a plural imperative, which presumably has the same referent as the jussive's own collective singular subject, yirÁ£ yirÁ£. The subsequent plural jussives refer to sub-groups of the whole—Israel's priests and God-fearers:

Number of subject/verb
pl. —
sg./pl.
sg.
pl./pl.

O give thanks to the LORD, for he is good; his steadfast love endures forever!
Let Israel say, "His steadfast love endures forever."
Let the house of Aaron say, "His steadfast love endures forever."
Let those who fear the LORD say, "His steadfast love endures forever." (NRSV)

The options of singular and plural reference to Israel are both used similarly in the Psalms of Ascent:

If it had not been the LORD who was on our side—let Israel now say ...
Let the house of Aaron say — let Israel now say ...

"Often have they attacked me from my youth"—let Israel now say ...

The occurrence of the formula yirÁ£ yirÁ£ only at the beginning of Psalms necessitates a Deontic, rather than logical, understanding of -ná, consistent with the probable culic origin of the formula. However, the preceptive 'entreating nuance' seen by Jouon–Muraoka is not present, but rather an authoritative directive force. This is supported by the particle's only other use in the Psalms by a superordinate—here, God is speaking to the Enemy:

> ná — ['let a sheer path of peace be yours' — (NRSV)

Mark this, then, you who forget God, ...

---

76Wilt, ‘A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Ná’ 245.
78Some others, such as 'S asks H to disguise H's identity' (Wilt, 'A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Ná'), 248 are not relevant to the present discussion. Wilt's note that bargaining is usually hard can be best explained in modal terms—these clauses are efectively conditional protases, followed by an apodosis, and are so not marked for vocation.
79Wilt, 'A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Ná' 250.
80Contra Lambdin, Introduction, 170.
2.1.3. Precative

In lament contexts, the particle appears to have an entreating tone much like that described by Jośuon-Muraoka. It occurs always in combination with a ‘Beweggrund des göttlichen Einschreitens’, an element which

{soll} auf HWH Eindruck machen, sie {soll} aber zugleich, indem sie ausgesprochen werden, des Kluges Herz tristen und der Hilfe Gottes versichern. 81

Examples are:

... יִנָּחָה אֶת רַעְשָׁנָיָתָם יָ֣שְׁרֵי

O let the evil of the wicked come to an end, but establish the righteous… (RSV) 7:10

... יַעֲנוּ אֲלֵהֶם בְּשָׁלוֹם בִּנְבָאָרָה

Turn again, O God of hosts… (RSV) 80:15

... יָנֵץ עַל תָּשְׁרִי

Let your steadfast love become my comfort… (RSV) 119:76

... יָנֵץ עַל תָּשְׁרִי

Let your steadfast love become my comfort… (RSV) 119:108

Accept my offerings of praise, O LORD… (RSV) 118:25

It can be combined with the free-standing particle אֲנָא to further intensify the appeal

Save us, we beseech you, O LORD! O LORD, we beseech you, give us success! (RSV)

This precative tone is quite distinct from the strongly directive nature of the examples in the previous section.

2.1.4. Vocative

We have seen that the force of -nā7 is neither in itself directive nor precative (that is, it has no inherent semantic value), though it appears to intensify the directive or precative force of the clause to which it is attached. I therefore borrow a term from communication theory82 and refer to the force of -nā7 as that of a ‘vocative intensifier’, that is, it intensifies not the type of Deontic modality, but the act of communication itself.

This may related interestingly to the question of grammatical number. It is striking that, both in commands and requests, only about 18% of Old Testament occurrences of -nā accompany a plural Agent/Causer. 83 Though there are more singular than plural Deontic forms in the Old Testament anyway, this still indicates a stronger tendency to use -nā with a singular

Agent/Causer. This may support our argument for a ‘vocative intensifier’ understanding of -nā, since the vocative force cannot be so strong when distributed to a plural Addressee.

To take an example, then, יַעֲנוּ אֲלֵהֶם (80:15, cited above) is not intensified action like adhortative יִנָּחָה (6:5) and some uses of the D-stem and figura etymologica, 84 nor is it emphatic personal reference like some uses of the vocative or 3rd-person jussive, but an intensified Deontic. It is not the nature of the modality which is affected but its intensity. Thus it is perhaps Seow who comes closest of the grammarians to the true meaning of -nā when he describes it as occurring ‘for emphasis or to express urgency or immediacy.’ 85 His non-technical terminology corresponds to the ‘vocative intensifier’ analysis presented here.

2.1.5. Expressive

When -nā occurs in conjunction with resolve-cohortatives, interpersonal force can play no part, since the Speaker and Addressee are identical. Therefore, it may be best viewed as performing an intensifying function similar to that of figura etymologica (see also below), שֶׁיְּקַלֵּץ אֶלָּאָבְךָ אֵלֶּהָ בֵּךָ בֵּרֹז (Isa 61:10)

I will greatly rejoice in the LORD, my whole being shall exult in my God… (RSV)

The intensification lies with the volition itself (propositive), rather than with the vocative force.

וַיְקַלֵּץ אֵלֶּהָ בֵּךָ בֵּרֹז בֵּךָ בֵּרֹז (122:8)

For the sake of my relatives and friends I will say, ‘Peace be within you.’ (RSV)

In the psalms, pleonasm is often used to the same effect, especially in the expression אַשְׁרֵיהוּ אָסַר וּפְרָשַׁת

57:8

My heart is steadfast, O God, my heart is steadfast. I will sing and make melody. (RSV)

סֶחֶר תָּמִשׁ אָסַר וּפְרָשַׁת (101:1)

I will sing of loyalty and of justice: to you, O LORD, I will sing. (RSV)

Similarly simple repetition and the feature of parallelism itself:

... וַיְקַלֵּץ אֵלֶּהָ בֵּךָ בֵּרֹז הָרֹז הָרֹז (1 Sam 2:1)

1 Sam 2:1

My heart is triumphant in the LORD, my head is raised in the LORD; my mouth laughs over my enemies (ALW86)

2.1.6. Conclusion

The present interpretation of -nā as a ‘vocative intensifier’ explains several of the problems mentioned above.

81Gunkel, Einleitung, 231 n. 18.
82As introduced in ch. 1, section 3.1.1. above.
83Gen 19:2; 7; 37:6; 40:8; 45:4; 47:4; 50:4; Ex 10:11; 12:9; Num 12:6; 16:8; 26; 20:10; 22:19; Josh 2:12; 22:26; Judg 8:5; 9:2; 11:19; 19:23; 1 Sam 14:7; 29; 16:17; 22:7; 23:22; 2 Sam 2:14; 13:17; 28; 20:16; 24:14; 1 Kgs 20:7; 2 Kgs 4:10; 5:7; 6:2; 7:13; 9:34; 18:19; Isa 1:18; 3; 5; 7; 13; 19; 12:36; 47:13; 51; 21; 7:12; 18:11; 18:13; 25:5; 27:18; 30:6; 35:15; Ezek 18:25; 33:30; Mic 3; 1; 9; 6:1; Hag 2:15; 18; Zech 1:4; Mal 1:8; 9; 3:10; Job 6:29; 13:6; 17:10; Cant 7:9; Lam 1:18; Ezra 10:14; Neh 5:10; 11; 1 Chr 29:20. (In Ex 3:18; 5:3; Num 20:17; 2 Sam 13:25; Jos 1:14, the subject is plural, but he permitted is singular. Further, in the case of a plural cohortative, the fact that one thing is being said by everyone means that there is not really a plural focus.)
Firstly, it explains the otherwise inexplicable אֲשֵׁרָה (11:5:2) and נִכְנָסִי (116:14, 18) cited at the beginning of this discussion. אֲשֵׁרָה is an example of vocative intensification of an Interrogative. נִכְנָסִי may be described as a b-colon modal intensification of an Epistemic a-colon — righteousness becomes sacrifice, as relationship to God becomes relationship to the community; in more specific terms, the vocative force of -nâ in here might be read as part of the call for witnesses to the repayment of his vow.

Secondly, it explains the clause-initial use of וָאֶלֶה, which almost always in the Old Testament occurs with the imperative. Since Negative 'al- cannot appear with the imperative, -nâ is to be interpreted here as a placeholder for 'al- in an exclamation:

“No, LORD! Save my life!” (ALW)

Similarly, Finley has discovered that the adhortative is especially common with ‘weak verbs, especially middle-weak roots’. This phenomenon may also account for the much more frequent use in the Psalter of the imperative of הָשָׁה (hiph’îl), which is usually apocopated.

With respect to function, Waltke–O’Connor claim that

116:16

“No, LORD! For I’m your servant, the son of your servant girl! Loose my fetters!” (ALW) 88

3rd

Thirdly, my interpretation is compatible with Wilt’s sociolinguistic analysis. It should be noted that the English “Please!” can also have the function of a vocative intensifier, standing alone as an appeal for the Addressee’s attention, rather like the expression, “Excuse me!”

Fourthly, since a vocative intensifier is compatible with a range of modal functions, we can see how it functions within an entire speech turn rather than restricted to the clause. Hence it may be criticized in principle to any part of speech, including prepositions, for example.

Lastly, it becomes clear that the incompatibility of -nâ with the infinitive absolute or precative perfect 89 is for the same reason as the incompatibility of 'al- with these forms. The Affirmative clitic -nâ and the Negative clitic 'al-, though not having inherently Deontic meaning, both belong to the Linguistic Attitude of Discourse, that sphere of language in which participant reference is determined by the roles of Speaker and Addressee, and which admits both Deontic and vocative functions (unlike Narrative). In terms of the linguistic system, the E-system and I-system forms which lie behind the ‘percepet imperfect’ and the ‘perceptive perfect’ belong to the Linguistic Attitude of Narrative.

2.2. Paragogic -nâ

The paragogic -nâ in the cohortative (where it distinguishes E-system and D-system forms) and in the adhortative (where it appears simply to strengthen the Deontic force) appear to be related functionally/synchronically, albeit not necessarily formally/diachronically. 90

2.2.1. Adhortative

The adhortative ending occurs approximately as often in Tsevat’s psalmic corpus as in prose, which is, as he notes a very much higher level of occurrence proportionate to amount of text: הָשָׁה is relatively more than eight times more frequent in the psalms as it is in the rest of the Bible. Moreover, it occurs in the psalms more often than the simple form הָשָׁה. For the psalms, הָשָׁה is the normal imperative. 92

Though this is true statistically, it should be noted that the figures are offset by a number of verbs which occur very frequently in the Psalter in the longer form. As Gibson says, in some verbs the longer form has become fixed, as הָשָׁה, הָשָׁה, awake, הָשָׁה bring near, swear, and others. 93

Particularly in the light of Tsevat’s observations on the distribution of adhortatives in the Psalter, this would seem to be a correct observation. Several suggestions have been made as to the function of the suffix: לָעֳשָׁה—Muraoka alone mention ‘emphatic honorific euphony’. 97 It therefore seems likely that paragogic -nâ has a similar function to that we have established for -nâ, as a ‘vocative intensifier’, unspecified with regard to type of Deontic force.

2.2.2. Cohortative

Within the D-system it is striking that the 1st-person form (cohortative) should be lengthened and the 2nd and 3rd-person forms apocopated. This may be explained diachronically, but there are also clear reasons on the synchronic level why a ‘vocative intensifier’ should be systematically added to 1st-person expression of volition — there is a significant interplay here between reference and questions of modality.

A question is raised in the first place by 1st-person Epistemic forms for the future, since it will often be the case that 1st-person futurals (especially of finite verbs) will carry an element of volition. By analogy, it is natural that 1st-person expressions of volition, where the Speaker

88 Reading as ‘precative perfect’.
91 See, however, Waltke–O’Connor, Syntax, 568 §34.2b: ‘The cohortative, like the alternative Qal imperative with הָשָׁה, suffix, is derived from an earlier Canaanite yaspâl volitional conjugation.’
92 Tsevat, Language of the Biblical Psalms, 24-25 no. 159.
93 Gibson, Davidson’s Syntax, 81 §66 Rem. 1. Waltke–O’Connor, Syntax, 571 §34.4.
96 Waltke–O’Connor, Syntax, 571 §34.4.
97 Muraoka, Grammar, 143 §48d.
is also the subject, whether they be preceptive, directive, optative etc., should attract forms for vocative intensification such as paragogic hê. In this perspective, the cohortative and jussive truly do form a ‘volitional class’ or D-system.

2.3. Deontic Auxiliaries

As has already been noted, there are various types of auxiliary verb functions in Biblical Hebrew, some of which are specifically related to Deontic modality. In particular, there is the use of the imperative of a verb of motion functioning ‘[f]ormalhaft und als eine Art Tempuszeichen [i.e. mood marker],’ or ‘as an auxiliary or interjection’, followed by another verb in a Deontic form. The dependent verb may be joined syntactically (e.g. 66:5 יָשָׂר וַיִּפְקֹד), or asyndetically (e.g. 46:9 וַיִּשָּׁר), though in the Psalter asyndesmos is much more common. Such auxiliary verbs include, most commonly, וַיִּנֵּח and וַיִּיַּכְר and יֵלַכ in the singular addressed to God, and ויִרְאוּ and ויִלּוּ in the plural addressed to the community; they are most often translated with adverbial expressions.

Since the auxiliary is most often in the imperative, the dependent verb may be in any other Deontic form which has a Deontic element, though it is in fact most often another imperative: 

...יקד וְיָשָׂר, יָשָׂר וַיִּפְקֹד הָאָרֶץ. 143:7

Answer me quickly, O LORD; my spirit fails. (NRSV)

תִּנָּא אֲנִי חֲרֵיהַ כִּי כְּשָׁמַע עָשָׂר שָׂרֶשׂ. 31:3

Incline your ear to me; rescue me speedily. Be a rock of refuge for me, a strong fortress to save me. (NRSV)

There may be ‘gapping’ across two cola, especially where there is an enclitic interjection:

...יָשָׂר וַיִּפְקֹד הָאָרֶץ. 3:8

Rise up, LORD, to save me, my God! May you strike all my enemies on the cheek, may you break the teeth of the wicked! (ALW)

הַלְּךָ יִרְאוּ אֲנִי חֲרֵיהַ כִּי כְּשָׁמַע עָשָׂר שָׂרֶשׂ. 34:12

Come, O children, listen to me; I will teach you the fear of the LORD. (NRSV)

The dependent verb may be an inclusive (hortative) cohortative:

...וַיִּנְחַ֣וּ הָאָרֶץ. 95:1

O come, let us sing to the LORD; let us make a joyful noise to the rock of our salvation! (NRSV)

וַיַּעֲנִ֖הוּ תּוֹרָה; יִנְחַ֣וּ הָאָרֶץ. 95:6

We will return to the land of our ancestors, to the land of our fathers. (NRSV)

O come, let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before the LORD, Maker! (NRSV)

אֶ֖פְּרֵ֣י לָ֑נוּ יִנְחַ֖וּ הָאָרֶץ. 83:5

They say, “Come, let us worship them as a nation; let the name of Israel be remembered no more.” (NRSV)

or a 3rd-person jussive:

...יָשָׂר וַיִּפְקֹד הָאָרֶץ. 98:8

Do not remember against us the iniquities of our ancestors; let your compassion come speedily to meet us, for we are brought very low. (NRSV)

There are a few examples of the auxiliary occurring in the jussive:

...יָשָׂר וַיִּפְקֹד הָאָרֶץ. 71:20-21

הֲתֹמַר וְיָשָׂר וַיִּפְקֹד הָאָרֶץ. 46:9

Just as you have shown me many difficulties and evils, (so now) revive me again, and from the depths of the earth, bring me up again!

Increase my greatness and comfort me again. (ALW)

The dependent verb may sometimes appear in the form of a lamedised infinitive or even a nominalisation103 under (i.e. לוּ יִנְחַ֣וּ הָאָרֶץ)→ לוּ יִנְחַ֣וּ הָאָרֶץ. 40:14

Both of these alternatives occur in one verse:104

Graciously, LORD, deliver me; LORD, hurry to my aid! (NRSV)

A further alternative involves ‘hê-locativum’ in place of the preposition ל:105

םַעַ֥ק לְהָאָ֖רֶץ יִנְחַ֣וּ הָאָרֶץ. 44:27

Rise up to our help! And redeem us for the sake of your steadfast love! (NRSV)

These structures appear to have three main functions.

Firstly, auxiliaries such as וַיִּנְחַ֣וּ הָאָרֶץ and מְדָר in addressing God appear to express urgency.106

Secondly, auxiliaries such as וַיִּנְחַ֣וּ הָאָרֶץ in addressing the community appear to express exhortation. The fact that these can be distinguished from לְהָאָ֖רֶץ, וַיִּנְחַ֣וּ הָאָרֶץ etc. in address of God belies Andersen’s claim that,

The first verb becomes semantically empty, functioning merely as a hortatory particle.107

Thirdly, there are certain auxiliaries which function as politeness forms.108

...יָשָׂר וַיִּפְקֹד הָאָרֶץ. 40:14

Graciously, LORD, deliver me; LORD, hurry to my aid! (NRSV)

---

103 Reading the E-system long-form יִנָּחֵל in v. 20 as jussives too.
104 A nominalisation is defined as a NP with the argument structure of a verb. E.g.
105 A dependent verb is normally a passive genitive, e.g. Ps 22:2. (i.e. גְּדוֹלָה לַמַּעֲמַתָּה הָאָרוֹן)→ לוּ יִנְחַ֣וּ הָאָרֶץ. 40:14
106 The external thematic role is absorbed as in the case of a passive verb—by the raising of the object to the genitive position.
107 Compare 106:1-5.
108 Both לְהָאָ֖רֶץ and מְדָר appears to have both לְהָאָ֖רֶץ and this additional הֵא.
109 Interestingly, these occur only very rarely together with מְדָר. Witt, ‘A Sociolinguistic Analysis of מְדָר’ 239-40.
10a Andersen, Sentence, 56-57 §3.10.1.
10b Compare 119-188.
now therefore may it please you to bless the house of your servant ... (NRSV)

Of the use of לְאַלָּמֶה, it has been said,
Man umschreibt ... den blossen Imperativ mit einem Ausdruck, der den Gedanken enthält, dass das Verlangte dem Andern vielleicht nicht angenehm sein könnte, und erhöht dadurch den Wert des Gewählten. 110

Thus this is the best equivalent in Biblical Hebrew to English ‘please’.

3. Imperative

The minimal form of the imperative has already been noted. Like the English imperative, it lacks both mood-marking (such as paragogic hè) and person-marking (such as within the yiqtol paradigm), retaining only number- and—in cross-linguistic perspective, quite distinctively—gender-marking. With only one full vowel in the Ö-marked masculine singular form, the imperative is the shortest verbal form in the language, as is also the case in most other inflected languages (including all the Semitic languages).

3.2. Syntactic Function and Argument Structure

The imperative has certain characteristic features in its argument relations.

Firstly, it should be noted that 2nd-person objects will not be attested. Imperative forms are inherently 2nd-person themselves and so express a 2nd-person object by means of a reflexive stem (hippa’el; e.g. שְׁמַחְתָּם, ‘sanctify yourselves’) or metonymy (e.g. יָרְשֵׁנִים לַבַּכֶּם, ‘sanctify your hearts’).

The occurrence of the particular verbal forms in the G- (qal, niph’al) and corresponding D-stems (pi’el, pu’al) at all is purely a question of lexis, even in the case of those verbs which occur in both. Of syntactical importance is whether passivity (niph’al, pu’al, hoph’al), causativity (hiph’al, hoph’al) and reflexivity (hippa’el) can occur together with volitional modality.

True passivity is inherently incompatible with directivity, since the former is patient-oriented and the latter agent-oriented. Nevertheless, there are niph’al Deonitics in the Psalter.

Now therefore, O kings, be wise; be warned. O rulers of the earth. (NRSV)

Certain verbs in the niph’al in fact have stative meaning:

109 With a parallel in 1 Chron 17:27 which appears to be ‘precative perfect’.
110 Lane, Formelhaufen Wendungen, 106.

Impressive

9:3 Turn, O LORD! How long? Have compassion on your servants! (NRSV)

And the verb אָדָם occurs in the niph’al several times:

rise up, LORD, in your anger; be lifted up at the fury of my enemies; and wake up, my God; may you appoint a judgment. (ALW)

Be lifted up, judge of the earth; give the proud back what they deserve! (ALW)

Lift up your heads, O gates! and be lifted up, O ancient doors! that the King of glory may come in. (NRSV)

The parallel between אָדָם and בָּשָׂם in the last of these examples shows that there may not be a great difference in meaning between the qal and niph’al forms of some verbs. 112

In fact, the form for true passive directivity in Biblical Hebrew is the passive participle in a Deontic nominal clause. 113

Causativity is fundamental to the semantics of certain verbs which often occur in Deontic forms in the Psalms, such as עָשָׂה, עָלָם and כְּלָל. Others verbs which occur most often in the qal also occur in the hiph’al, such as, from the ה- stanzas of Psalm 119, יָדָה, יָקָר, רָפָא, יָרְשֵׁנִים, לַבַּכֶּם, etc. In these eight verses, there are three 1st-person objects (vv. 33-35) and two metonymous 1st-person references (v. 36-37), several of which could equally have been expressed with cohabitatives. 114

Reflexivity is unattested with Deontic modality in the Psalter, however certain terms are common in other forms of Old Testament literature, e.g. שְׁפִּיקָה.

Finally, even stativity is occasionally compatible with Deontic modality:

Be to me a rock of refuge, a strong fortress, to save me, for you are my rock and my fortress. (NRSV)

Hear, O LORD, and be gracious to me! O LORD, be my helper!” (NRSV)

However, it could well be argued that these forms are better read as ingressive aspect: ‘become ...’.

3.3. Semantic Function

The imperative can fulfil most Deontic functions. For example, Finley shows that it fulfils five out of his six Directive functions (the only exception being Negative). 115

111 Reading as ‘precative perfect’.
112 Middle or reflexive readings are possible; see also the question of ergativity in Biblical Hebrew.
113 See section 6 below.
114 See the above discussion on the relationship of cohabitative to causative.
115 Adapted from the table in Finley, The Proposal, 11.
Here, we consider the use of the imperative form within the modal categories we have established above, making Directive and Expressive speech acts.

3.3.1. Directive, Precautionary and Hortative

Directive, precautionary and hortative utterances equate Addressee and Agent; they are therefore the natural realm of the imperative form.

It has already been noted that directive utterances will tend to be made by a superordinate, precatives by a subordinate and hortatives by an equal (also that there are ‘face-saving’ strategies such as the use of the particle -nā which, in the opinion of some scholars, subvert this). Thus most imperatives addressed to the Enemy will be directive:

Depart from me, all you workers of evil, for the LORD has heard the sound of my weeping. (NRSV)

Thus most imperatives addressed by the Psalmist to God will be precautionary:

Turn, O LORD, save my life; deliver me for the sake of your steadfast love. (NRSV)

Most imperatives addressed by the Psalmist to the community will be hortative:

O come, let us worship and bow down, let us kneel before the LORD, our Maker! (NRSV)

There are certain situations in which normal Speaker–Addressee relations are subverted. This happens, for example, when the Psalmist speaks directly to God:

Rouse yourself! Why do you sleep, O Lord? Awake, do not cast us off forever! (NRSV)

In this case, it is the semantics of the verb which have determined our reading as directive—the Psalmist has arrogated the right to call God to wake up. There are many other cases too, however, where the Psalmist appears to attempt to exercise authority over God (threatening his ‘face’). The basis for this is the covenant relationship which exists between God and the Psalmist, and it is by means of ‘motivations for divine intervention’ that the Psalmist reminds God of his responsibilities:

Uphold me according to your promise, that I may live, and let me not be put to shame in my hope. (NRSV)

Thus terms referring to God’s responsibilities, such as תְּרֵךְ, תְּרֵךְ, and תְּרֵךְ, express the Psalmist’s sense of entitlement to a hearing. The Deontic force of the utterances which they modify is therefore best termed directive. There are other forms of ‘motivation for divine intervention’ which accompany precautionary utterances, however, in particular, references to the Psalmist’s distress:

 bağır (!) lâlātkī, mā ḥāruwānī ḥaḥārātūnī mī ḥāruwānī ṭīrāqī. 142:7

Give heed to my cry, for I am brought very low. Save me from my persecutors, for they are too strong for me. (NRSV)

A second situation in which normal Speaker–Addressee relations are subverted is where God speaks hortatively (that is, for the Addressee’s benefit), making an invitation to the community:

Ask of me, and I will make the nations your heritage, and the ends of the earth your possession. (NRSV)

or to the King:

Ask of me, and I will make the nations your heritage, and the ends of the earth your possession. (NRSV)

The LORD says to my lord, “Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies your footstool.” (NRSV)

In many such cases, the hortative is followed by a apodosis (as here,רוּחֲא and וּתְרוּחֲא) which shows how the action of opening, asking etc. will work to the Addressee’s benefit.

3.3.2. Obligatory, Permissive and Prohibitive

Obligatory, permissive and prohibitive utterances all allow an Agent other than the Addressee. They are therefore normally expressed in English with ‘must’, ‘may’ or ‘must not / may not’ rather than an imperative, and in Hebrew they are proper the domain of the jussive (D-system; of course, prohibitive force cannot be expressed using the imperative). However, it is possible to use the imperative to express the granting of permission:

(Go ahead and) search me, O God, and know my heart; (go ahead and) test me and know my thoughts. (ALIV/AV/RSV)

Walke–O’Connor’s ‘sarcastic’ imperatives belong to this category.117

3.3.3. Optatives

Optative and desiderative utterances may occur in any grammatical person. Like obligations, permissions and permissions, they allow an Agent other than the Addressee, and are therefore properly the domain of D-system forms, rather than imperatives.

116 Also the infinitive absolute, from the E-system.

117 Walke–O’Connor, Syntax, 571 §34.4b.
2nd-person optative imperatives occur especially where the verb is stative or in the niph'al, since the subject of such forms is not an Agent.

Be exalted, O God, above the heavens. Let your glory be over all the earth. (NRSV)

Even dynamic, transitive imperatives may have optative force when the ultimate deep-structure Agent—in fact, in the terms introduced above, a ‘Causer’—is other than the Addressee.\(^{118}\)

May you see your children's children. Peace be upon Israel! (NRSV)

May the LORD send out from Zion your mighty sceptre! May you rule in the midst of your enemies! (ALW)

In the latter of these two examples, both Waltke-O'Connor\(^ {119} \) and Gibson\(^ {120} \) read רָדָה as 실ל, which they read as future. Hence the imperative is described as an example of ‘heterosis’\(^ {121} \) or ‘equivalent to a strong subjective expression of fut.’\(^ {122} \) I instead read 실ל as גָּאוֹן (with topicalized object) and the imperative as Deontic-volitive. Jośuâ–Muraoka come close to this interpretation:

the imperative, along with the jussive and cohortative, is essentially a form for expressing the speaker's will, wish or desire. Thus רָדָה ... signifies: 'I want you to be incarcerated.'\(^ {123} \)

However, in this example (spoken by Joseph to his brothers, Gen 42:16) there is a further important element present, namely the authority of the Speaker to effect changes in the world merely by expression of his will. In other words, these are performative utterances. Thus 'be incarcerated!' in fact means 'May you be incarcerated!', which in the context of Joseph's authority means 'I hereby incarcerate you!' Similar to, turning to the New Testament, we may say that Jesus's 'Be healed!' (Mark 5:34)\(^ {124} \) in fact means 'May you be healed!', which in the context of Jesus's authority means 'I hereby heal you!'. Looking back to the above examples from the Psalter, these optatives are performative in the context of the Psalmist's own authority to bless, even to bless a superordinate such as the king himself.\(^ {125} \)

The use of the imperative with optative function (not only the jussive, as is often assumed) explains one question in the Psalms which has drawn much comment—address of the personified natural world.\(^ {126} \) Psalm 148 provides an extended example. The הַלֵּל calls to praise in this psalm are addressed consecutively to:

(unspecific)-angels-earth, heaven and sea-elements-flora-fauna-people-(unspecific)

At several points, it could be argued that literal vocal expressions of praise are expected from animals, or (under metonymy) from the human or other animate inhabitants of the earth, sea etc. However, in the light of the jussive הַלֵּל in vv. 5 and 13, and what has been shown here of the optative use of the imperative, it would seem better to understand as optative: 'Let them praise the LORD'. In the above examples, we saw that since Joseph had power to incarcerate, Jesus to heal and the Psalmist to bless, these were also Declarative speech acts. This is not the case here, since the Psalmist does not have power to declare the LORD praised by the creation.

Psalm 148 is therefore Expressive-optative, as should already have been clear from the unspecified Addressee in vv. 1 and 14.

This conclusion contrasts with those of many grammarians, who discuss personification as a particular characteristic of imperatives or jussives.\(^ {127} \) In fact, there is personification here, but it consists solely in the reference to inanimates praising, not in their being addressed. The Psalmist in Psalm 148 is not addressing anyone, but expressing his desire that the whole creation should praise the LORD. In the words of Finley,

... imperative forms can sometimes be used in a rhetorical way. That is, even as a rhetorical question is not really asking for information, so the "rhetorical imperative" is not really making a proposal [i.e. Directive utterance].\(^ {128} \)

4. Cohortative

Having considered the person-unmarked imperative form, we now turn to the person-marked D-system forms. The view of the Hebrew verbal system presented in chapter 3 above is foundational to the present discussion, in particular its demonstration that נָתַן is properly an Epistemic form and the basis of a 'E-system', whilst בָּשְׁלֹם is properly a Deontic form, the basis of a 'D-system'. The cohortative belongs to this D-system, though not strictly to the same paradigm as 2nd and 3rd-person jussives, since it has the paragogic הַט suffix (discussed above, section 2.2.).

\(^{118}\) Further examples: 119:115; 139:19.

\(^{119}\) Waltke-O'Connor, Syntax, 572 §3.4.c.

\(^{120}\) Gibson, Davidhouse’s Syntax, 81 §66 Rem. 2.

\(^{121}\) Waltke-O'Connor, Syntax, 572 §3.4.c.

\(^{122}\) Gibson, Davidhouse’s Syntax, 81 §66 Rem. 2.

\(^{123}\) Jośuâ–Muraoka, Grammar, 379 §114.a.

\(^{124}\) Another passive example; for a stative example, see Matt 8:3: 'Be clean!'.

\(^{125}\) This analysis may also explain the highly debated מָלְאָךְ הָיָה נָשִׁים אֶל הָעָזוּב. See 8:2.

\(^{126}\) Gibson, Davidhouse’s Syntax, 81 §66 Rem. 2.

\(^{127}\) Gibson, Davidhouse’s Syntax, 81 §66 Rem. 2; 82 §67 Rem. 4; Waltke-O’Connor, Syntax, 570 §3.4.d: 572-73 §3.4.e.

\(^{128}\) Finley, 'The Proposal', 12.
4.1. Form

The cohortative is distinct from its E-system counterpart in all stems and weak-verb types except III-י (except אביו, אביך, אביך 119:117; Isa 41:23) and III-י verbs (except אביו). Attested irregular forms include:

1. Paragogic ה is replaced by segol instead of qamaq ('Atbsaumf) in Pn 2:4 and 1 Sam 28:15
2. 2nd-person cohortative: no examples, despite earlier suggestions.

Upon object elicitisation, the cohortative becomes indistinguishable from its E-system counterpart. Therefore, many common forms such as אדרך cannot appear in the present discussion, although it is likely that, by analogy with forms such as אדרך, והוראה hides a cohortative form.

4.2. Syntactic Function and Argument Structure

Like the imperative, the cohortative may occasionally occur (contrary to expectations) in a passive form.130 The synonymous 'save' verbs, נברא and יברא, which usually occur in the hiphil stem, occur occasionally in the niphal with passive meaning:

ארחיי, יברא ונברא 80.4

Restore us, 0 God; let your face shine, that we may be saved. (NRSV)

טברא ואברא יברא מברא 119:117

Hold me up, that I may be saved and have regard for your statutes continually. (NRSV)

As the NRSV translations show, these are both result clauses. There is one apparently main-clause passive (niphal) cohortative in the Psalter:

לבראoten המברא מברא 69:15

Save me from mine so that I don’t sink; may I be saved from those who hate me and from depths of water.

(ALW)

Even this example, however, is shown to be subordinate by Hald’s argument for a set facitive-passive sequence in Hebrew and Ugaritic poetry.131 Thus the only three examples of passive cohortatives occur in subordinate clauses. Though this is striking, it is probably not significant, since Deontic force occurs in the passive voice in several passive imperatives (see above) and in Deontic nominal clauses (see below). The type of Deontic force which is compatible with passivity is optative, since this does not equate Addressee and Agent; the forms most commonly used will therefore be request-cohortatives and 3rd-person jussives (as shown above, section 1.2.), as well as nominal clauses, where the Addressee is ‘Causer’.

130Gesenius-Kautzsch, Grammatik, 137 §46d.
131Contra Gesenius-Kautzsch, Grammatik, 137 §48c.

4.3. Semantic Function

4.3.1. Introduction

The term ‘cohortative’ is derived from the Latin ‘cohortor ut + subjunctive’, meaning ‘to encourage, exhort’; this is properly just one of several types of cohortative force.

According to Driver, paragogic ה in the cohortative

has the effect of marking with particular emphasis the concentration of the will upon a particular object—let us go, we would fain go, the idea being expressed with more keenness and energy, and with a deeper personal interest or emotion, than by the mere imperfect ה—132

Similarly, recently, Walitke-O'Conor:

The cohortative expresses the will or strong desire of the speaker.133

Similarly, in diachronic perspective, Bauer-Leander:

Der Affekt-Aorist [i.e. cohortative] … entstand vielleicht durch das Zusammensetzen der Verben mit der (im Arab. in.aussufizien häufig gebrauchten) Interjektion *a, die zum Ausdruck der Absicht oder der beabsichtigten Folge diene.134

A ‘weaker’ view of paragogic ה as an optional emphatic particle added to long-form yiqtol has been gradually replaced since Gesenius and increasing comparative study of Semitic languages (especially Arabic) with an appreciation of it as marking a distinct verbal conjugation.135 Thus Driver is in fact referring to a function of Deontic modality which is given full grammatical expression in Hebrew verbal morphology. It remains debated whether the cohortative originates from the Proto-Semitic subjunctive yqatala, or from the 1st-person singular ethical dative -ja suffix136 which produces the Akkadian ventive137 and Arabic energetic yaqtiluna.138 This possible ‘ethical dative’ origin is instructive in that it demonstrates the subjective, Speaker-oriented force of the suffix.

132Driver, Tenses, 51 §45.
133Walitke-O’Conor, Syntax, 573 §34.5.1a.
135Driver, Tenses, 61-2 §§58 Obs. 1. See also above, 2.2.
136From Latin venire, ‘to come’, i.e. direction towards (originally ‘towards me’). ‘Energetic’ is the etymological term for what in Assyriology is called, from one of its functions, the ventive.; Bergstrasser, G., Introduction to the Semitic Languages: Text Specimens and Grammatical Sketches, tr. P.T. Daniels (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1983) 27 §2.1.1. n. e.
137Probably related to egpophetic (‘energetic’) nun in Hebrew, particularly since energetic nun does not normally occur with short-form yiqtol or wayyiqtol, associated by some with the particle -na’.
All the various views of the cohortative reviewed in the following have in common an understanding of its basic meaning as optative, nuanced pragmatically according to role and status as discussed above.  

4.3.1.1: Main Clauses

Gibson distinguishes three main-clause cohortative uses by the Speaker’s freedom to act:

When the speaker is free the cohort expresses intention or resolve [1] . . . When he is dependent on others it expresses a wish or entreaty [2] . . . In the plur. a note of mutual encouragement is often present . . . Especially if preceded by, as a kind of auxiliary, the plur. imper. of a verb of motion [3].

The ‘resolve-cohortative’ [1] is referred to variously as ‘I will ...’, ‘intention or resolve’, ‘Selbststauforderung’, ‘Affekt-Aorist’ expressing ‘Absicht oder ... Wunsch’, ‘optative’, ‘where the speaker has the ability to carry out an inclination’, ‘we promise ...’; I refer to it in terms of its illocutionary force: ‘Commissive’ when it involves an Addressee-oriented promise (such as in ‘a vow of praise’):

תִּהְיֶה נֶפֶשׁ לְמִקְרָבָּה אֶל הַשָּׁמַיִם. 35:18

Then I will acknowledge you in the great assembly; in a great multitude I will praise you. (ALW)

or a Speaker-oriented purpose (indirect volition):

פָּרַע הָעָם בְּבֵית בָּאָרֶץ אָשֶׁר רָבָּם: 39:2

I said, “I will keep my ways from sinning with my tongue; I will keep a muzzle over my mouth as long as there’s a wicked man before me.”

or ‘Expressive’ when it involves a Speaker-oriented utterance with no referential function (purely Interpersonal communication):

אִישׁ אָדָם יָדַע בְּפִסְקָתוֹ אֶלָּו מִלָּה יִתְנַהֲגוּ. 9:23

I acknowledge the LORD with all my heart, I recount all your miracles.

I am happy and I rejoice in you. I make music about your name, Most High. (ALW)


אֲלֵיך֒ בְּעַשְׂפָּה אֲרָמִי אֲנָאִי לְעַל אֱלֹהִים. 25:2

My God, in you I trust—may I not be ashamed, may my enemies not rejoice over me. (ALW)

The inclusive plural 1st-person Deontic [3] is referred to as ‘mutual encouragement’, ‘exhortation’, ‘cohortative’; ‘de[n] Redende[n] [mit dem Gesprächspartner] zu gemeinsamer Tätigkeit verbinden[d]’, where ‘the speakers usually seek to instigate or encourage each other to some action’; The plural subject includes both Speaker and Addressees. I term it ‘Directive—hortative’.

עֹלֶה לָהֵם אַלּוֹר הַשָּׁמַיִם. 34:4

Magnify the LORD with me and let us exalt his name together. (ALW)

Thus the main-clause schema looks as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech act (Searle)</th>
<th>Modality</th>
<th>English rendering</th>
<th>Hebrew example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Directicve</td>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>May I not be ashamed</td>
<td>לאָנָאִי לְעַל אֱלֹהִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>precative (request)</td>
<td>Let us exalt his name together</td>
<td>אֲרָמִי לְעַל אֱלֹהִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Commisive (resolve)</td>
<td>promissive</td>
<td>I will acknowledge you</td>
<td>אֲרָמִי לְעַל אֱלֹהִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purposive</td>
<td>I will keep my ways from sin</td>
<td>אֲרָמִי לְעַל אֱלֹהִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Expressive (resolve)</td>
<td>expressive</td>
<td>I rejoice in you</td>
<td>אֲרָמִי לְעַל אֱלֹהִים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these functions stems from the basic optative meaning of the cohortative:

---

139 See above, section 1.3.
140 Gibson, *Davidson’s Syntax*, 82 §68.
141 Driver, *Tenses*, 53-54 §49.
142 Gibson, *Davidson’s Syntax*, 82 §68.
144 Bauer-Leander, *Grammatik*, 274 §36m.
145 Williams, *Syntax*, 34 §184.
146 Walke-O’Connor, *Syntax*, 573 §34.5.1a.
147 Niccacci on Exod 20:19 at Tilburg.
149 Gibson, *Davidson’s Syntax*, 82 §68.
151 Brockelmann, *Syntax*, 4 §6b.
153 Walke-O’Connor, *Syntax*, 573 §34.5.1a.
154 Gibson, *Davidson’s Syntax*, 82 §68.
156 Williams, *Syntax*, 34 §185.
158 Walke-O’Connor, *Syntax*, 573 §34.5.1a.
usually Deontic English modal verb ‘should’ in a conditional protasis: ‘Should I make my bed in Sheol ...’. Temporal clauses after נא also occasionally use the cohortative.\(^{171}\)

As with main-clause uses, there are a number of occurrences after וו-consecutive\(^{172}\) where, it is claimed, the cohortative [konkurrirt] mit dem Imperf. cons.,\(^{173}\) and is ‘funktionslos geworden’\(^{174}\). Since וו-choose itself has a measure of final force, these occurrences are not as problematic for a coherent theory of the cohortative as are apparently functionless main-clause uses (‘pseudo-cohortative’).

Thus the subordinate-clause schema looks as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English rendering</th>
<th>Hebrew example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Final Purpose</td>
<td>נא עכנתי את הביתה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result/Cond. apodosis</td>
<td>Do good to your servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Expressive Conditional protasis</td>
<td>And I'll keep your word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>מעריב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Until I understood their end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This presentation may also be seen in terms of binary parameters:

\[\text{optative} \quad \text{SUBORDINATION} \quad \text{FOLLOWING MAIN CLAUSE} \quad \text{MAIN CLAUSE DEONTIC} \quad \text{UNREAL} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English rendering</th>
<th>Hebrew example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Final Purpose</td>
<td>נא עכנתי את הביתה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result/Cond. apodosis</td>
<td>Do good to your servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Expressive Conditional protasis</td>
<td>And I'll keep your word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal</td>
<td>מעריב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Until I understood their end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, one distinctive structure which deserves mention here is Held’s ‘factitive-passive’ sequence of identical verbs. Since the second verb ( niphal  ) expresses passively the same action as the first (usually, niphal  ), and the object of the first is the subject of the second, there is a very close relationship between the two clauses.


\[\text{160}\] Walkie-Ó’Connor, *Syntax*, 575 §34.5.2b.


\[\text{163}\] Broekelmann, *Syntax*, 165 §178c.

\[\text{164}\] Walkie-Ó’Connor, *Syntax*, 575 §34.5.2b.

\[\text{165}\] Contro Walkie-Ó’Connor, *Syntax*, 573 §34.5.2a, who treat use in protasis and apodosis.

\[\text{166}\] Walkie-Ó’Connor, *Syntax*, 573 §34.5.2a.

\[\text{167}\] Meyer, *Grammatik*, 114 §122.3c.

\[\text{168}\] Gibson, *Davidson’s Syntax*, 83 §68 Rem. 2; Walkie-Ó’Connor, *Syntax*, 573 §34.5.2a. Blau claims there are just three examples in the Old Testament, Ps 139:8; Job 16:6; Job 19:18; cited in Walkie-Ó’Connor, *Syntax*, 575 §34.5.2b n. 23.


\[\text{170}\] Broekelmann, *Syntax*, 156-57 §164b.\]
Save me from mine so that I don’t sink; may I be saved from those who hate me and from depths of water. (ALW)

This pattern may also explain many other texts, however, in which a imperative is followed by a cohortative of related meaning. The pattern may be fientive-passive (e.g. מָלֵא מִימֶנָי אָלְמָן, fientive-stative, ‘Help me and may I be saved!’ 119:117), fientive-stative (דָּרֹּךְ אֲבֹאֵל, fientive-stative, ‘Open my eyes and may I see’ 119:18), causative-passive (e.g. נָשְׁבֹּל נַעֲפָּה, causative-stative, ‘Restore us … and May we be saved!’ 80:4, 8, 20) or causative-stative (e.g. רָאִית נַעֲפָּה, causative-stative, ‘Let me know … May I know!’ 39:5; similarly 119:125). Held refers to this as an ‘Action-Result’ sequence; I would prefer to view it in terms of synonymous parallelism. Though the level of subordination (if there is any) is therefore debatable, it should be noted that these uses agree with our patterns for both main and subordinate clauses.

Only main-clause uses of the cohortative are considered in the following, since these subordinate uses are related to questions of the wayyiqtol, which has not been treated here.

4.3.1.3. Comparative Studies

4.3.1.3.1. Byblian

By far the most important comparative material for the study of the Hebrew cohortative comes from Byblian as presented by Moran. Byblian shows the cohortative to be, rather than ventive in origin, in fact ‘a remnant of the earlier “subjunctive”’, since ‘the use of the cohortative is substantially identical with that of qaṭila in Byblus’. Like Arabic, then, Byblian has a prefix-conjugation mood pattern of u-a-Ø representing indicative-subjunctive-jussive. There is also an energetic in -na, which occurs most frequently in questions.

‘Almost two-thirds’ of occurrences have a ‘jussive-purposive’ sense, whether ‘direct volitive’ (optative, precative, directive) or ‘indirect volitive’ (purpose or intended result)182, and about 15% occur in conditional sentences (in either protasis or apodosis). Purpose clauses consistently have ‘modal congruence’—either:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main clause</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>indicative</td>
<td>ative [i.e. Expressive], precative [i.e. Directive]</td>
<td>‘He is gathering [u] … that he may [u] take [u]’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>purpose, intended result</td>
<td>‘Let him not gather [u] … that he may [u] take [u]’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is Moran’s primary evidence for the ‘volitive’ (i.e. Deontic) nature of qaṭila. He concludes that the use of qaṭila in purpose clauses ‘must … reflect Canaanite idiom’ and that the perfect correspondence with Hebrew usage ‘proves conclusively that … we are dealing with a specifically Canaanite morpheme’. On the use of qaṭila in conditional protases, Moran comments:

In [Hebrew], exactly as in Amarna, cohortative and jussive are frequently employed in conditional sentences of the real type; in [Arabic], the jussive is regular in the same type, and the subjunctive is also possible, though with the restriction that it appears only in the second member of a compound protasis, the first member containing a jussive.

In Byblian, therefore, we see a pattern of uses:

| main clause | optative [i.e. Expressive], precative [i.e. Directive] |
| subordinate | purpose, intended result |
| conditional | protasis or apodosis |

In Moran’s own words,

The use of qaṭila in the Byblus letters is almost without exception that of a volitive, that is, in a main clause it is virtually equivalent to a jussive; in a subordinate clause dependent on a volitive it expresses purpose or intended result. Other uses [conditional, after verbs of fearing etc.] can be paralleled by the use of the subjunctive in Arabic.

Hence the following schema:

1. Directive | precative |
2. Expressive | optative, conditional protasis |
3. Final | purpose, result, conditional apodosis |

4.3.1.3.2. Arabic

Until Moran’s work on Byblian, there was considerable debate as to whether the Hebrew cohortative corresponded formally to the Arabic subjunctive qaṭila or to the energetic qaṭilanna. It now seems clear that the energetic is represented in Hebrew morphology only by
the particle -mā'. Functionally, however, it remains the case that the Hebrew cohortative shares much of the semantic range of the Arabic emphatic.

1. *vaqūla* subjunctive, i.e. the grammatical reflex of logical dependence.

2. *vaqūlānna* emphatic future used in:
   a. aseverations (Commissive)
   b. commands, prohibitions, wishes, and questions [Directive, Expressive, Interrogative]
   c. conditionals: apodosis of correlative clauses introduced by *la* (Commissive)
   d. protasis after *innāl* [conditional]

4.3.2. Directive-precative ('request-cohortative')

'Request-cohortatives' are Directive in that it is the Addressee who is competent to fulfill the proposition; they are precative in that they are only ever spoken by a subordinate. Because they do not grammaticalize the Addressee, they involve him pragmatically, requesting that he act as a 'Causer' to realise a state in the life of the Speaker, to cause something to happen to him, or to cause him to act in some way. It may be this thematic role of 'Causer' which prevents 'request-cohortatives' and 3rd-person jussives from having directive force—the focus remains on the 1st-person Speaker. Alternatively, it may concern politeness forms—just as the Psalmist often avoids reference to God by using 1st and 3rd-person Deontic forms, so God may deliberately avoid reference to himself.

It was shown above (1.2) how 'request-cohortatives' and Directive 3rd-person jussives share a particular argument structure ('May I be ...?' / 'May they be ...?'). The force of these forms is that of indirect speech acts—Expressive forms ('May X happen!') used with Directive function ('Make X happen!'). Thus these forms may be compared with the optative use of the subjunctive in Romance languages: 'Que j’habite ...' 61:5, 'que soit dévasté ...' 69:26;191 since this is not available idiomatically in English, English normally uses distinct causative verbs such as 'to tell' הורה, 'to guide' ידיע, 'to guide' ידיע.

In direct speech in narrative parts of the Old Testament, the request-cohortative occurs frequently as a politeness form on the lips of a subordinate. There are relatively few examples in the Psalms, perhaps owing to the forceful, direct tone of this genre.

As for me, may I see your face in (my) righteousness! May I receive satisfaction, when I awake, in your likeness! (ALW)

The preceding v. 14 and the a-colon here are both Directive, and in fact there is a clear contrast made between *אֲשֶׁר בָּהָן*, 'may they be satisfied', in v. 14 and *אֲשֶׁר בָּהָן* here. Therefore it seems right to read *אֲשֶׁר בָּהָן* as Directive. Further, *אֲשֶׁר בָּהָן* is translated in terms of an experience, not just an attitude (which might have supported a Commissive reading: 'I will take satisfaction in ...').

How good it is for the one you choose and draw near so that he can live in your courts! May we receive satisfaction in the goodness of your house, the holiness of your temple!

Again, *אֲשֶׁר בָּהָן* is ambiguous. Kraus and Gunkel read Epistemically 'Laben dürfen wir uns ...', Dahood Directively 'May we be fully imbued ...' and AV and NRSV Commissively 'We shall be satisfied'. My Directive reading is related in part to the term *אֱוָן*. Unlike the *בָּהָן* formula, which is normally Declarative ('I hereby bless you!') or Expressive ('May you be blessed!'), the *אֱוָן* formula is exclamatory ('How good it is ... !') but also conditional ('... for the man who ...'). Thus it has implied Directive force—it is a prompt to a particular kind of action. In 65:5, this background may support our reading of *אֲשֶׁר בָּהָן* as Directive—the Psalmist is asking to be included in the good experienced by one who is 'chosen'.

May you be a refuge to me, a strong tower against the enemy!
May I live in your tent forever, take refuge in the shelter of your wings. Selah (ALW)

Here, *אֱוָן* is read as Directive in the light of the preceding 'precative perfect' and, indeed, the entire surrounding context, which is precative.

And may I walk in freedom, for I have pursued your precepts. (ALW)

Here again, I read Directive because it is in God’s hands where the Psalmist walks—the Addressee is competent.

Save me from mire so that I don’t sink; may I be saved from those who hate me and from depths of water. (ALW)

Let me know, LORD, my end and what the measure of my days is! May I know how fleeting I am! (ALW)

These forms, parallel with causative imperatives, appear to be clear main-clause Directives, however, they may be subordinate according to Held’s ‘factitive–passive’ sequence.192

Three further main-clause cohortatives are cited as optative (and thus implicitly Directive) by Michel193—*תִּקְרֵץ* 20:6, דָּבָר 35:18; *דָּבָר* 69:31. However, one of our main criteria for distinguishing Directive forms has been the competence of Speaker or Addressee, and verbs of praise such as these usually refer to actions within the Speaker’s competence, and so are

189 Wright, *Grammar 2*, 24 §14; 43 §19d.

190 The relationship of the ‘Causer’ to the subject of a causative (*hiphil*) imperative has already been noted (39:5; 69:15).


192 See section 4.3, 1.2. above.

Commissive. Nevertheless, there are a few cases where verbs of praise appear in context to be used Directively:

May I rejoice and be happy in your love, that you have perceived my affliction, you have known it from the affections of my soul. (ALW)

Here, rejoicing is understood as the natural consequence of the main request, which is that God would ‘perceive’ and ‘know’. It should also be noted that the preceding colon, רואים אלוהים, אברכים, is normally followed by a request form such as אמר אלוהים.

Finally, there may be some further complication of Speaker-Addressee relations:

May we shout for joy over your victory, and in the name of our God set up our banners. May the LORD fulfill all your petitions. (NRSV)

3rd-person jussives are normally addressed to God (‘Causer’), with the Enemy as subject (Patient or Experiencer) of a passive or stative verb: ‘May they be destroyed!’; in Psalm 20, however, 3rd-person jussives are addressed to the king (Experiencer), with God as subject (Agent): ‘May he answer you!’ Similarly, request-cohortatives are normally addressed to God (‘Causer’), with the Speaker as subject (Patient or Experiencer) of a passive or stative verb: ‘May I be saved!’; in Psalm 20:6, however, the request-cohortative is addressed to the king (‘Causer’), with the Psalmist as subject (Experiencer), though we know that it is in fact not the king who is understood as the final ‘Causer’, but God. These three thematic roles are related in that a desire is expressed before God that he will cause a victory to be experienced by the king with the result that the people rejoice.

4.3.3. Directive–hortative (true ‘cohortative’)

True hortative cohortatives are ‘inclusive plural’ forms, that is, those in which both the Speaker(s) and the Addressee(s) are competent.

e.g. Caroline said to Justine, “Let’s go out to dinner!” The Hesses said to their cell group, “Let’s go punting!”

They are therefore not the same as the ‘exclusive plural’ Expressive or Commissive ‘resolve-cohortatives’, where the action is effected solely by the Speakers.

e.g. Caroline and Justine said, “Let’s go out to dinner!” The Hesses said, “We’d like to take you out punting!”

The presence of two distinct parties (Speaker(s) and Addressee(s)) is often made explicit by the use of an auxiliary imperative, often of a verb of motion: 198

They say, “Come, let us wipe them out as a nation; let the name of Israel be remembered no more.” (NRSV)

O come, let us sing to the LORD; let us make a joyful noise to the rock of our salvation! Let us come into his presence with thanksgiving; let us make a joyful noise to him with songs of praise! (NRSV)

The Directive force of these cohortatives is marked not only by paragogic הָדוֹ, but also by their dependence on the modal verbs of motion יָדַע and עִדָּה.

O magnify the LORD with me, and let us exalt his name together. (NRSV)

Here, the inclusive cohortative is paralleled by an imperatival with רָאֵי.

This is the day that the LORD has made; let us rejoice and be glad in it. (NRSV)

That this is hortative is shown by the context of 1st-person praise together with imperative and 2nd-person jussive calls to the community to praise:

Finally, an example where a linguistic explanation improves on cult-functional and etymological answers:

He turned the sea into dry land; within the river, they went over on foot. Therefore let us rejoice in him! (ALW)

Unless we amend with most translations to read יָדוֹ rather than יָדוֹ (AV, NRSV), we might have to consider either Kraus’s theory of a Jordan festival (for which יָדוֹ is most unusual) or Dahood’s reading of יָדוֹ and יָדוֹ as a parallel pair (so Byblian) and יָדוֹ as ‘behold!’ (so Akkadian). Instead, it is worth noting that many languages take (exophoric) place-deictic terms for use in (endophoric) text-deixis. This is most probably the case here, with יָדוֹ meaning ‘in this fact’; the English ‘therefore’ is, of course, also derived from place-deictic ‘there’.

4.3.4. Commissive/Expressive (‘resolve-cohortative’)

Up to this point in the discussion, I have usually referred to ‘resolve-cohortatives’, where the Speaker is competent, as ‘Commissive’ utterances, that is, those which ‘commit the Speaker to some future action’ (Searle). In form-critical terms, this is the ‘vow of praise’:

Identify the key points in the text about Directives and Cohortatives.

The text discusses the use and nature of Directives and Cohortatives in the context of biblical.positive. It explains how 3rd-person jussives are normally addressed to God as the 'Causer', while 3rd-person jussives are addressed to the king as the Experiencer. Additionally, the text points out that 3rd-person jussives are not always consistent, with examples from Psalms illustrating the usage. The text further elaborates on true hortative cohortatives, which are inclusive plural forms, and their role in directing both the Speaker and Addressee. It also touches upon the difference between Commissive and Expressive cohortatives and their implications for translation and understanding the text.
Modality, Reference and Speech Acts in the Psalms

18.50 For this I will extol you, O LORD, among the nations, and sing praises to your name. (RSV)

With a freewill offering I will sacrifice to you; I will give thanks to your name, O LORD, for it is good. (NRSV)

Place reason (דָּאָ֣רְכָּהּ) and manner (עַלְּקֵדָּו) deixis strengthen this interpretation.

In other cases, especially at the beginning of a Psalm, there is clearly no future reference:

אַרְבָּאֵ֣ת יִהְיֶ֔ה קֹלַ֖ו הַיַּ֣דַּלְתּוּת אֲסֶפֶּֽרַ֑יּו

I will extol you, O LORD, for you have drawn me up, and did not let my foes rejoice over me. (NRSV)

I will extol you, my God and King, and bless your name forever and ever. (NRSV)

Here, then, and in the absence of contextual indications to the contrary, it would seem better to choose an Expressive interpretation, translated as an explicit performative:

אַרְבָּאֵ֣ת יִהְיֶ֔ה קֹלַ֖ו הַיַּ֣דַּלְתּוּת אֲסֶפֶּֽרַ֑יּו

I acknowledge the LORD with all my heart, I recount all your miracles.

I am happy and I rejoice in you, I make music about your name, Most High. (ALW)

This ambiguity between Commisive (‘vow of praise’) and Expressive (‘call of praise’) has been noted by several scholars.200


аспера פמורפיה מודל לותר

im is nicht die Formel eines Gelübdes, das der Klagende in seinem Lied ablegt, sondern bereits der Einsatz des Dank- und Lobliedes (Ps 66:16; 109:30; 107:32; Kraus on 22:23201)

… das Lobgelübde, das dann oft übergeht in Gotteslob. (Westermann202)

In other words, as the Psalmist makes his vow of future praise, he ‘overflows’ with an expression of praise in the present. Frost terms this ‘Asseveration by Thanksgiving’. 203

The form of this quite ambiguous utterance is as follows:

Die Form des Gelübdes ist, da der Beter selbst hier zu handeln gedenkt (i.e., future vow), natürliches ein Satz, dessen Verb in der ersten Person steht. Der Modus ist entweder das Imperfekt oder der Koptonom.204

This characterisation from Gunkel bears striking similarities to Austin’s initial grammatical definition of explicit performatives:

201Kraus, Psalmen, 330.
202Westermann, Lob und Klage, 44.
203Frost, ‘Asseveration by Thanksgiving’.
204Gunkel, Einleitung, 248.

… what we should feel tempted to say is that any utterance which is in fact a performative should be reducible, or expandable, or analysable into a form, or reproducible in a form, with a verb in the first person singular present indicative active…205

Thus though Gunkel is describing the ‘vow of praise’, his definition fits perfectly the grammatical conditions at least for explicit performatives. Thus we may borrow Austin’s first contextual criterion for performatives in order to distinguish between Commisive vow and Expressive call:

If ‘I apologize’ is to be happy, the statement must be true that:

(a) I am apologizing 206

The language of speech acts has thus been useful in analysing formally what has previously only received rather vague informal description. However, it may be objected to an Expressive translation of רומאאי as ‘I exalt you’ that the normal form for this reading should be qatal, since it was shown above that performativity is by definition Indicative and therefore takes the qatal form [-MOD].207 The answer lies in the fact that we are here concerned with an Expressive, not a Declarative. Declarative utterances such as נָבָטֵּבּ (nabs-tev) usually occur in the explicit performative form (here, qatal), and have been said to effect immediate changes in the institutional state of affairs and tend to rely on elaborate extra-linguistic institutions.

By contrast, Expressive utterances such as רומאאי may occur in any form (especially interjections or volitional forms), and are concerned with:

Adopting of an attitude; attitudes and social behaviour; express a psychological state in S.

Thus, though an expression such as רומאאי is often thought to impart a blessing, it in fact only expresses a blessing, since unlike in the case of qatal, there is in fact no ‘extra-linguistic institutions’ for blessing. The existence of speech acts in qatal and yiqtal forms of the same verb therefore seems problematic—it is possible that whilst the quite frequent רומאאי is Expressive, those few occurrences of רומאאי (Gen 17:20) or נָבָטֵּבּ (nabs-tev) (118:26) refer to specific ritual context.

Looking back now to our example above (9:2-3), we can see that these verbs fit well with Searle’s paradigmatic expressives (thank, congratulate, apologise, condole, deplore, welcome).

These are the social (דרשין) and expressive (רומאאי) terms of Psalmic praise, the substance of ‘declarative praise’ (Westermann).

Finally, the problem of translation into English remains, since ‘I will exalt’ sounds future (despite its being derived from German volitional wollen, ‘to want’) and—as we have seen—’I

205Austin, How to do Things with Words. Of course, he goes on to include many passive utterances as well as 2nd and 3rd-person forms. It is this definition that is formalised by the performative hypothesis (initially by Austin himself) into a matrix clause for all utterances: I (hereby) YP that (S); Levinson, Pragmatics, 244.
206This is elsewhere referred to as the functional test for explicit performatives: ‘To say x was to do y’.
207Ch. 3, section 2.4.5 above.
208Lyons, Semantics 1, 50-1.
exalt’ sounds performative. Whichever form is chosen, its Expressive force should be remembered.

4.3.4.1. Commissive–promissive (‘vow of praise’)

Moran comments that,

[In Byblian, Hebrew and Arabic], it is only in the context of a conditional sentence that we find yenula with the force of a future aseverative [i.e. Commissive] This may be seen functioning within one colon:

... answer me, O L ORD. I will keep your statutes. (NRSV)

This is related to the fact that vows of praise tend to occur at the end of a lament. This is the vow of praise to the name of God, the Most High. (NRSV)

I will praise the name of God with a song; I will magnify him with thanksgiving. (NRSV)

There may be explicit reference to the vow:

I will give to the LORD the thanks due to his righteousness, and sing praise to the name of the LORD, the Most High. (NRSV)

69:31

So I will always sing praises to your name, as I pay my vows day after day. (NRSV)

61:9

A vow in the middle of a Psalm may attest the Psalmist’s ‘Gewißheit der Erhörung’. Then I will thank you in the great congregation; in the mighty throng I will praise you. (NRSV)

Then I will go to the altar of God, to God my exceeding joy; and I will praise you with the harp, O God, my God. (NRSV)

35:18

To what God has done:

Then I will teach transgressors your ways, and sinners will return to you. (NRSV)

Psalm 101 appears to be a royal pledge of obedience (Kraus: ‘eine von der Intention des Bekenntnisses durchzulegte Loyalitätserklärung’, though only a few 1st-person forms are marked as Deontic.

Finally, promises may also be made by God himself:

I will instruct you and teach you the way you should go; I will counsel you with my eye upon you. (NRSV)

4.3.4.2. Commissive–purposive (true ‘resolve’)

As should be clear from the flow-chart above, purposive is distinguished from promissive by the lack of Addressee-orientation. Though a commitment is made to the Addressee, it is not for the Addressee’s benefit, but purely issuing from the volition of the Speaker. These could be said to be true ‘resolve’ coheratives, since they are ‘resolutions’ or ‘promises to the self’.

The resolve is perhaps made most clear by the term לָעַל (l̄al), ‘I said to myself’ or ‘I decided’:

I will keep my ways from sinning with my tongue; I will keep a muzzle over my mouth as long as there’s a wicked man before me.” (... then I spoke with my tongue ...)

73:15

If I had said, “I will talk on in this way,” I would have been untrue to the circle of your children. (NRSV)

The Psalmist may resolve to meditate, הָשָּׁם (hāšām), ‘may I meditate an evening of the Lord’, (NRSV)

I will meditate on your precepts, and fix my eyes on your ways. (NRSV)

119:15

On the glorious splendor of your majesty, and on your wondrous works, I will meditate. (NRSV)

145:5

or to praise

I will bless the LORD at all times; his praise shall continually be in my mouth. (NRSV)

The community may resolve to worship God:

Let us go to his dwelling place; let us worship at his footstool.” (NRSV)

122:7

The Enemy may resolve to break free from the dominion of God’s king:

Let us burst their bonds asunder, and cast their cords from us. (NRSV)

2:3

The Enemies’ resolve may be marked with מְקַבֵּל (mekabbeł), ‘to accept’:

Let us take the pastures of God for our own possession.” (NRSV)

83:13

Finally, God himself may express his resolve

God has promised in his sanctuary: “With exultation I will divide up Shechem, and portion out the Vale of Succoth.” (NRSV)


211Similarly 45:18.

212Kraus, Psalmen, 858.

213Similarly, 119:48.
4.3.4.3. Expressive ('call of praise')

Finally, Expressive utterances are those which have no Addressee, but are solely an expression of the Speaker's attitude.

Most typically, Expressive utterances occur at the beginning of a Psalm, in an initial expression of praise. In songs of thanksgiving (Westermann's 'declarative' praise), this has been considered by Gerstenberger (following Crisemann) as an offertery formula ('I am giving thanks to you'). This cannot be correct, since it interprets Indicative forms which are markedly Deontic.

I praise the LORD with all my heart, I recount all his miracles.

The song of thanksgiving may begin with the formula אַלָּקוֹ הַכְּפַלָּק פָּרַסְׂכָּה לְעָלָּתוֹ: 108:2-4

My heart is steadfast, God; I sing and make music, even my glory.

In hymns ('descriptive' praise), an expressive cohortative form appears to stand in a similar place to an imperative:

Praise the LORD! Praise the LORD, my soul! I praise the LORD throughout my life; I make music to my God as long as I live.

I sing the loving acts of the LORD forever; to every generation I recount your faithfulness with my mouth. And may the heavens acknowledge your wonder, LORD, and your faithfulness in the assembly of holy ones.

For this, see the discussion of 'הַלְוָעָה' above (section 3.4.1.) and that on the relationship between calls to praise and vows to praise below (section 7.1.).

Meditation may also be the subject of an Expressive utterance:

I contemplate all your work, and on your deeds I meditate. (ALW)

Or the declaration of a formal statement:

... but now I rebuke you, and lay the charge before you. (RSV)

4.3.5. Epistemic Functions

It was argued in chapter 3 above that long-form קַגּוֹל forms the basis of an Epistemic system, whilst short-form קַגּוֹל ('jussive'), together with 'םָאָתָלְכָּא ('cohortative'), forms the basis of a Deontic system. 'Skewed' forms were noted, such as the Deontic 'precative perfect' and 'preceptive imperfect', and the Epistemic 'prophetic perfect' and waqqlal. One unusual use of a D-system form was noted—לְּאֵלֶּה, we will go' in Genesis 22:5, and it was commented that this was related to the Commissive-promissive function, though 'shading into' the Epistemic.

Here, we consider two Epistemic functions of the cohortative, possibility and necessity. Gibson comments that,

... it is not likely that notions of obligation, compulsion or possibility are present in the form itself.

This may be well illustrated by considering his examples of can (Exod 32:30; Jer 6:10) and must (Isa 38:10, Jer 4:21), all of which in some way express lexically the subjunctive context, two of them being Interrogative. They all further involve an external possibility or necessity, showing them to be Epistemic.

The relationship between Deontic and Epistemic systems was considered in chapter 1, where it was shown that Deontic permission and obligation are related to Epistemic possibility and necessity respectively. This fact underlies the 'skewed' functions considered in chapter 3, as well as those considered here—since short-form קגּוֹל has been shown to cover the entire range from permission to obligation, it is to be expected that its 'skewed' uses will cover possibility to necessity.

4.3.5.1. Possibility ('can')

Epistemic Possibility is mentioned briefly in most treatments of the cohortative. In the present work, it has already been considered at length in our discussion of the verbal system.

217Similarly 119:55
218Also 2:7 יִכְּפַלָּק; 42:10 אַלָּקוֹ הַכְּפַלָּק פָּרַסְׂכָּה ... אָתָלְכָּא ... לְּאֵלֶּה. See also Driver, Tenses, 59 §55.
219Compare 122:8 אָתָלְכָּא; 122:9 אָתָלְכָּא.
220See also Driver, Tenses, 59 §55. See also Driver, Tenses, 59 §55.
221See also Driver, Tenses, 59 §55. See also Driver, Tenses, 59 §55.
though under a different name—potentialis as a present Epistemic function of long-form yiqtol. The same term is used by Moran in his treatment of Byblian yaqtila, noting that several of its forms which are not otherwise accounted for occur in questions:

In all of these occurrences a potential meaning would fit perfectly.224

Waltke-O'Connor describe this function as ‘when the speaker’s will involves dubiety, an indefinite potentiality’.225

It was shown for long-form yiqtol that the present potentialis function can cover not only ability,226 but also liability, and this is also the case in Gibson’s examples:

Perhaps I can atone for your sin. [ability]

Against whom shall I speak and testify, that they may hear? [liability]

Jeremiah 6:10 is not concerned with the prophet’s ability to speak, but with the liability that when he speaks, people will listen; this is a further example of the conditional element in Epistemic Possibility.

Since, as has been mentioned, Possibility is the Epistemic equivalent of Deontic Permission, it is to requests (for Permission) that this use of the cohortative is most closely related. This is the reason for Waltke-O’Connor’s incorrect description of Possibility as ‘optative’. One good example from the Psalter is in fact conditioned by the optative modality of the preceding clause:

So that I say, “O that I had wings like the dove! I could fly away and rest.” (ALW)

Another is in fact formally unmarked:

How could we sing the Lord’s song in a foreign land? (NRSV)

4.3.5. Necessity (‘must’)

Necessitative ‘must’ is discussed at length by Driver,227 who describes cohortative must as ‘the vexatissima quaeesto of Hebrew syntax’. He characteristically gives a good pre-scientific explanation of the relationship between Deontic and Epistemic function:

... the intention or wish [volition] which the cohortative properly expresses, appears to be so limited and guided by external conditions imposed upon the speaker that the idea of impulse from within seems to disappear before that of compulsion from without.228

However, he then goes on, on the assumption that the cohortative must always be Deontic, to argue weakly that there is in fact an element of volition present in these cases. Finally, in any examples where no volition is arguable, he refers to the cohortative as having lost its meaning.229 This is of course not the view taken here—the cohortative of necessity does not involve volition, but is an Epistemic function of this D-system form.230

The cohortative of necessity occurs most frequently in the Psalms with the verbs יִשָּׁהוּ, ‘to moan’ and אָמָה, ‘to mumble’:231

... I have to moan. (ALW)

... I have to moan and mumble ... (ALW)

It may refer to other expressions of mourning:

I say to God, my rock, ‘Why have you forgotten me? Why must I walk about mournfully because the enemy oppresses me?’ (NRSV)

I am wretched and have been on the point of death from my youth. I have been weighed down with fear of you and (had to) despair. (ALW)

Or to situations of danger:

I have to lie down among lions ... (ALW)

4.3.6. Negative

The Negated cohortative occurs principally in one formulaic expression:232

O my God, in you I trust; do not let me be put to shame; do not let my enemies exult over me. (NRSV)

It is usually part of an expression of trust, usually with בָּעָל, בְּעָלִים (31:2; 71:1), which may be inverted בְּעָלִים לְבָעָל, לְבָעָלִים (31:18). Other elements which may take the place of the Negated cohortative in this position are jussive, imperative (31:18), which may be inverted לְבָעָלִים לְבָעָל (31:18), imperative (31:15-16), suggesting that לְבָעָלִים לְבָעָל should be read as precative, ‘May I not be ashamed!’. The ‘unmarked cohortative’ לְבָעָלִים לְבָעָל may occur in the same position:

O guard my life, and deliver me; do not let me be put to shame, for I take refuge in you. (NRSV)

Most striking, however, is the occurrence of E-system forms in this position:

222See ch. 3, section 2.4.3.2.1. above.
224Waltke-O’Connor, Syntax, 573 §34.5.1a.
225See also Jer 20:10.
226Driver, Tenses, 55-58 §51-3.
228Driver, Tenses, 55-56 §51.
229For an E-system example, see 81:6.
230Also 77:4, 7. This has sometimes been referred to as the ‘emphatic indicative’ use of the cohortative.
231Culley’s formula 37}. Other forms are precative (69:15) and subordinate (119:158).
It appears that authors of late books of the OT were attracted to the cohortative as an eminently archaic feature, but often used it wrongly as it was no longer an integral part of their language. 235

Of Gibson’s examples, 66:6 has already been argued above to be hortative. 55:3, 18; 57:5, 77:4, 7; 88:16 have been classed as Epistemic necessity. This leaves only 42:5, which may be read as Expressive of formal statement:

This brings to remembrance and pour out my soul, how I used to go along with the crowd, I used to lead them to the house of God with the sound of shouts of joy and thanksgiving, a multitude celebrating a feast. (ALW)

There are undoubtedly rare cases where the cohortative does appear to lack Deontic force. This occurs especially where the cohortative stands in poetic parallelism with non-D-system forms such as wayyiqtol (e.g. Prov 7:7), qaqtal (e.g. 119:55) or long-form yiqtol (e.g. 73:17; 75:10; 77:12). Descriptions of these as ‘in poetry to give a vivid representation of the past ... indicating ... energy or impulse’236 may be appropriate, as well as considerations of the relationship to the subordinate functions of the cohortative (such as final) as considered briefly above.237 The present view has succeeded in integrating many problem cases, however.

5. Jussive

5.1. Form

The jussive is distinct from its E-system counterpart only in singular unsuffixed forms of the hiph’īl stem and of weak verbs II-γ, II-γem. and III-γ.238 It only regularly exists in the 2nd and 3rd persons, though attested 1st-person forms include:

1. אֱלֹהִים Deut 18:16; Ezek 5:16; Hos 9:15; Zeph 1:2-3.
2. נָּשָׁה Hos 11:4; Job 23:11.
3. Other apocopated III-γ forms Job 23:9; Neh 1:4; Isa 41:23, 28 (prob. cs.).
4. Reduced hiph’īl forms: 1 Sam 14:36 (parallel with cohortatives?); Isa 42:6 (prob. cs.).

The jussive (short-form yiqtol) has already been discussed in terms of its relation, as the basis of the D-system, to long-form yiqtol and the E-system (ch. 3 above). In many (even very recent) treatments, no distinction is made between the D-system and E-system forms (e.g. Finley); in others, the presence of modal markers such as ’al- is used to distinguish. Only

237Meyer, *Grammardiss.*, 47 §100.4b.
238Except: Isa 35:4; Deut 32:7.
relatively recently have clear criteria been established for the distinction. In his review of Schneider’s Grammatik, Talstra clearly formulated the rules for a jussive reading of yiqtōl, including most importantly that clause-initial yiqtōl is to be read as Deontic. This has been more amply illustrated by Niccacci’s paper, ‘A neglected point of Hebrew syntax’, where it is stated:

1.1. A Yiqtol in the first position of a sentence is always jussive; on the contrary, indicative Yiqtol always occupies the second position.

Niccacci therefore refers to x-yiqtōl and yiqtōl-x. The first belongs to our E-system, and the second to our D-system. Though this result may seem facile, it should be noted that in a case such as Psalm 72, it has completely revolutionised interpretations—whilst KJV and NIV had rendered almost the entire Psalm in the future (‘He will judge …’), NRSV reads optative (‘May he judge …’).

The jussive shares this feature of verb-topicalisation on the one hand with the continuation form wayyiqtōl, which also exhibits the same apocopation, and on the other with the remainder of the D-system. The jussive can thus be compared with Deontic uses of the subjunctive or modal verbs in modern European languages.

In fact, the topicalisation of Deontic forms has been shown to operate in cross-linguistic perspective. Givón explains this pragmatically:

The more presuppositional a clause is, the more likely it is that the subject would be known to both hearer and speaker and thus high in topicality.

Topicalisation of Deontic forms has been described as reflecting an intention ‘daß der Ausdruck des Befehls auf eine einzige Silbe konzentriert erscheint’. In syntactical terms, it is the realisation of modality at the head of the clause, as shown by our argument for MTAV in chapter 3 above. Because topicalisation is so key to the correct interpretation of jussives, it must also be noted that:

1.3. Jussive Yiqtol can also occupy the second position in a sentence.

This is the normal feature of subject-topicalisation, as discussed in chapter 2 above:

May the LORD give strength to his people! May the LORD bless his people with peace! (NRSV)

O send out your light and your truth; let them lead me; let them bring me to your holy hill and to your dwelling. (NRSV)

Naturally, it may cause confusion, but it should be noted that the same ambiguity exists in English, where the imperative is identical in form to the present simple indicative (except in the 3rd person singular). Hence a form such as

Cyclists dismount

is usually most likely to be read as indicative iterative, i.e.

What do people do at zebra crossings?

Well, mothers take their children’s hands, and cyclists dismount.

In the context of a sign at a crossing, however, the expression is easily understood as a vocative followed by an imperative. The force may be strengthened by an exclamation mark, as in Biblical Hebrew often by -nā, 'al- or other Deontic particles.

Though it is standard practice that ‘der Begriff “Jussiv” wird nur dann gebraucht, wenn es sich wirklich um eigene Formen handelt’, we have now shown that we are in fact concerned here with the features of:

1. apocopation (when visible)
2. topicalisation (in the absence of subject-topicalisation)
3. the absence of nun paragogicum and nun eneporicum, which only occur with long-form yiqtōl (see ch. 3)
4. the presence of vocatives, and Deontic particles such as -nā and 'al-

In the following, we will distinguish between ‘marked jussives’ (those with apocopation), ‘unmarked jussives’ (those forms which cannot be apocopated, but which may be argued to be Deontic from context) and ‘pseudo-jussives’ (apocopated forms with non-Deontic function).

5.2. Syntactic Function and Argument Structure

We considered above how the argument structures of the five basic Deontic types relate together. It was shown that 3rd-person jussives have a similar argument structure to request-

241On the functional relationship between short-form yiqtōl and wayyiqtōl, see Givón, ‘Drift’.
242Gibson, Davidson’s Syntax, 80 §65.
243See similarly ch. 3, section 2.4.6. above on the ‘preceptive perfect’ with ki.
244Givón, ‘Drift’, 184.
245Gesenius-Kautzsch, Grammatik, 137 §48f.
246See also Hopper and Traugott, Grammaticalization, 142-43.
247Niccacci, ‘A Neglected Point’, 9; similarly, Gibson, Davidson’s Syntax, 80 §65; DeCaen, Placement and Interpretation, 280.
248In fact, it also tends diachronically to promote a shift from VS to SV syntax; Givón, ‘Drift’, 195.
cogitatives, requiring the pragmatic assignment of a thematic role ‘Causer’ for the Addressee. We may consider this in terms of the referential triangle, since in the Psalms, as we have seen, grammatical person and rhetorical person typically coincide (1st person = Psalmist, 2nd person = God, 3rd person = Enemy).

![Referential Triangle Diagram]

In terms of this triangle, a request-cogitative is addressed up the Psalmist–God axis and functions back down the same axis. A 3rd-person jussive is addressed up the Psalmist–God axis and functions down the God-Enemy axis. Any force inherent in the imprecation or curse (that is, and performative function) is based upon a common assumption that God will in fact hear and act (the same is, of course, true for blessings etc.251).

2nd-person jussives include reference to the 2nd-person alone, and up to this point, they have been considered equivalent to imperatives. A first question, though, is the complementary distribution of imperatives and Negated 2nd-person jussives; this has been considered above (ch. 5). A second question is posed by the quite restricted occurrence of affirmative 2nd-person jussives.

Those grammarians who want to be able to view the 1st-person cogitative, 2nd-person imperative, 2nd-person Negated jussive and 3rd-person jussive as ‘work[ing] together to form a volitional class’252 tend to consider affirmative 2nd-person jussives as historical remnants, to be disregarded in the same way as we are here disregarding 1st-person jussives and 2nd and 3rd-person cogitatives.253 Even if an attempt is made to include affirmative 2nd-person jussives, their role is described in such a way as to render them equivalent to Negative imperatives (which of course do not exist!):

Because of the mutually exclusive relationship between the imperative and the prohibitive [properly, ‘votive’], the former is unskewed [i.e. unmarked] when it appears on the surface for a positive proposal, while the latter is unskewed for a negative proposal.254

Deontic 2nd-person yiqtol is shown by Givón to gradually gradually fall out of use during the time period of Biblical Hebrew—though in Early Biblical Hebrew (Genesis), yiqtol occurs in 27% of 2nd-person Deontics (as against the imperative in 73%), it is then ‘on the wane from here onward’,255 occurring in only 3% of cases in 2 Kings,256 and having died out completely by the time of the book of Esther.257 Givón’s lack of differentiation between long and short-form yiqtol means that his sample includes many ‘skewed’ E-system ‘preceptive imperfects’, rather than true jussives. Nevertheless, the occurrence of such ‘skewed’ forms in a particular function suggests the simultaneous (or earlier) existence of ‘unskewed’ forms in that function. Thus the jussive (and—especially on God’s lips—the Deontic function of its E-system counterpart), whilst dying out, frequently occurs alongside the imperative; in the Psalter, there are probably about as many affirmative 2nd-person jussives as there are Negated cogitatives or Negated 3rd-person jussives. The view of the system held here is therefore that the D-system consists of cogitative and 2nd and 3rd-person jussive forms, supplemented by the imperative (which is ‘Deontically non-modal’).

Finally, the argument structure of 2nd-person jussives is different from that of imperatives. An imperative topicalises the VP itself, assigning the 2nd-person Agent only pragmatically; a jussive, on the other hand, topicalises the 2nd-person subject of the verb. Both 2nd and 3rd-person jussives usually have a Patient or Experimenter as subject, and 3rd-person jussives pragmatically assign a ‘Causer’.

The relationship between 2nd and 3rd-person jussives can be seen in:

... כי טוב.rating רמה בבראשיך. 7:10

O let the evil of the wicked come to an end, but establish the righteous… (NRSV)

Both clauses are unquestionably addressed to God, though he is ‘Causer’ in the first and Agent in the second. Whilst the Enemies’ evil is raised in the first clause to the position of subject of a stative verb, the righteous person is in the second the object of a transitive verb.

The relationship between imperatives and 3rd-person jussives can be seen in:

... ימער פсалמך לcommended. 102:2

Hear my prayer, O LORD; let my cry come to you. (NRSV)

and in the mixing of forms in:

... ימער פсалמך לcommended. 107

Interestingly, forms are also mixed in translation. 117 reads השבחתי בבייכך, but is rendered in Romans 15:11 oivitès ἐπαυγάζων, ‘Praise (2nd-person imperative) … let them praise (3rd-person imperative)’.

251 See Bruder, ‘A pragmatics for human relationship with the divine’.
252 Waltke–O’Connor, Syntax, 565 §34.1b. Similarly DeCauw, Placement and Interpretation, 112: ‘a single “votive” conjugation’ and Lambdin, Introduction, 118: ‘In meaning these three form a single paradigm’.
253 They are not considered at all by Gesenius–Kautzsch, Grammatik; Waltke–O’Connor, Syntax; Gibson, Davidson’s Syntax.
257 Givón, ‘Drift’, 221.
5.3. Semantic Function

The term ‘jussive’ is derived from the Latin ‘ubihe at + subjunctive’, meaning ‘to order’; this is one of its relatively minor functions, and its full range is more restricted than what we have seen of the cohortative. Like the cohortative, the ‘basic meaning’ of the jussive is optative, and it is by its address that it becomes a Directive utterance. Then it is sociolinguistic factors such as Speaker–Addressee relations which distinguish between directive and preceptive.258

Gibson refers to the 3rd-person jussive as used to express a command, ... to give advice, encouragement, or permission, ... to express a wish, request, or entreaty ... Or in pronouncing a benediction or malédiction.259

Walke-O’Connor lists the following:

Subordinate to subordinate command, exhortation, counsel, invitation or permission
Subordinate to superordinate urgent request, prayer, request for permission

Such lists are, of course, very similar to those usually given for the cohortative, as well as (as we have seen above) for the imperative.

In the following, we will consider 2nd and 3rd-person jussives separately, in first their affirmative, then their Negative forms.

5.3.1. 2nd-Person Jussive

5.3.1.1. Affirmative

The affirmative 2nd-person jussive is scarcely mentioned by most grammars, as it is so rare. As we have seen above, however, it is clearly present in Biblical Hebrew, albeit ‘on the wane’.

There are only four marked jussives in the Psalter, all of which are rendered as non-Deontic in most translations.

השומתין האיריא תקוט

The markers we have established for Deontic function are very irregular in this Psalm. The Psalm is undoubtedly primarily Deontic, with a marked 3rd-person jussive in v. 2b and verb-subject word-order in vv. 4-5. However, the subject-verb word-order in v. 2a (which I read as subject-topicalisation) and qātāl form in v. 7a (which I read as ‘preceptive perfect’) have caused some confusion amongst scholars. Here in v. 5, I read כ ב as a Deontic marker (despite its usual occurrence with qātāl) and v. 5b as optative, since the address to God is not clear enough to really call it directive.

The past form of the Deontic marker is קב. 90:3

You turn man back to dust, and say, “Turn back, mortals.” (ALW)

Since this form is followed by the 1-system continuation-form, wayyiqtol, and reports in the hiph‘il what appears in direct speech in a Deontic qal, it seems likely that this is in fact a ‘pseudo-jussive’ as should be translated non-Deontically.

When you bring down the darkness, it becomes night; it is then that all the forest wildlife are out. (ALW)

After reclamation to רותי (which seems almost certain), it would appear to be the conditional context which has procured use of the jussive form.260

Amongst unmarked forms, we see some better examples. ‘Permissive’ function is clearly seen in:

The function has already been shown to be fulfilled by the E-system ‘preceptive imperfect’ (as in Gen 2:16 קב יבכ; it is the Deontic counterpart to Epistemic possibility (potentiālis—‘may’).

Directive function is seen in:

As smoke is blown away, so blow them away; as wax melts before fire, let the wicked be destroyed before God. (ALW)

Some other forms which have been suggested as 2nd-person jussives are susceptible to emendation (e.g. 49:20).

5.3.1.2. Negative (‘retive’)

As has been mentioned, Negated 2nd-person jussives occur in complementary distribution with imperatives. Their combination with the Deontic Negative clitic ‘al-’ marks them as Deontic,

258Eskhult, Studies in Verbal Aspect, 25. Compare also his comments on Negation: ‘when the verbal content is presented as but contingent, the contrast between the cursive [short form qātāl] and the constitutive [long-form qātāl] form fades away. The opposition is neutralized.’ (Eskhult, Studies in Verbal Aspect, 29).


260Eskhult, Studies in Verbal Aspect, 25. Compare also his comments on Negation: ‘when the verbal content is presented as but contingent, the contrast between the cursive [short form qātāl] and the constitutive [long-form qātāl] form fades away. The opposition is neutralized.’ (Eskhult, Studies in Verbal Aspect, 29).

258Compare Walke-O’Connor’s terms: ‘directed from a superior to an inferior’ (such as commands, e.g. divine jussives) and ‘directed to the divine realm (explicitly or implicitly)’, which can be benedictions or malédictions; Walke-O’Connor, Syntax, 568 §34.3a.

259Gibson, Davidson’s Syntax, 81-2 §67.
hence there are many forms clearly marked as jussive outside of those few which exhibit apocopeation. The combination is referred to as the ‘vetitive’.

Negated 2nd-person jussives occur especially in two formulaic expressions, עָלַיְךָ, ‘do not hide your face’ and אָסִירֵךְ, ‘do not get anxious’.

Do not hide your face from me. Do not turn your servant away in anger, you who have been my help.

The formula עָלַיְךָ is often associated with the prayer, ‘answer me’ (69:18; 102:3; 143:7). It is adapted in 119 into עָלַיְךָ אַבֵּךְ מַגֵּד, ‘do not hide your precepts from me’.

Do not fret because of the wicked; do not be envious of wrongdoers (NRSV)

This formula only occurs in 37 (vv. 1, 7, 8), though it is used similarly to the analogous and extremely common (though morphologically unmarked) אָסִירֵךְ (e.g., in a similar context, 49:17).

These two formulas show the use of the Negated 2nd-person jussive as both preceptive and directive. The preceptive function may concern not doing bad to the Psalmist (119:43; 132:10; 138:8; 141:8) or not doing good to the Enemy (140:8).

A Permissive function may be seen in:

Do not turn my heart to any evil, busy myself with wicked deeds in company with those who work iniquity; do not let me eat of their delicacies. (NRSV)

A more explicit Permissive rendering of the jussive form might be ‘Do not allow my heart to incline …’, understanding הָנָה as having some causative implication. In other words, the Psalmist is not suggesting that God would ever make him incline to evil (Obligative), but that he might allow him to (Permissive). This is the point made by Carmignac in his reading of the New Testament parallel as not Obligative (‘Do not cause us to go into temptation’) but Permissive (‘Cause that we do not go into temptation’).

5.3.2. 3rd-Person Jussive

5.3.2.1. Affirmative

As has already been noted, the structure of the 3rd-person jussive is familiar from Deontic use of the subjunctive and optative in classical languages, que + subjunctive in French, and certain modal verbs in English and German. Like the ‘request-cortitative’, it has a pragmatically-assigned argument structure which lends itself particularly to preceptive rather than directive use. So Finley:

The skewing [pragmatically-assigned argument structure] that takes place with PC3 [3rd-person jussive] highlights the stress on the interiority of the speaker, though in rare instances it can occur for a command or prohibition.263

Of those uses which he terms ‘command’, Finley comments:

The PC3 with the command seems usually to be associated with a surface structure subject that is inanimate, either for rhetorical effect or for divine creation [e.g. Gen 1:3].264

In fact, 3rd-person jussives may have as subject the community, the Enemy, God or elements of the creation.

By metonymy, the Psalmist himself may be the subject in an Expressive utterance analogous to Expressive cohortatives:

I will sing to the LORD, because he has dealt bountifully with me. (NRSV)

He may be the subject in a Directive--preceptive utterance:

Let me live that I may praise you, and let your ordinances help me. (NRSV)

or of a Commissive–promissive (‘vow of praise’):

As for me, I have trusted in your love. My heart will rejoice in your salvation! I will sing to the LORD because he has been generous to me! (ALW)

The community may be the subject of a ‘call to praise’:266

As for all the nations you have made, may they come and worship you, Lord, and may they glorify your name. (ALW)

or the king of a blessing:

May his name endure forever, his fame continue as long as the sun. May all nations be blessed in him; may they pronounce him happy. (NRSV)

By metonymy, the community may be the subject of a call to faithfulness:

Be strong, and let your heart take courage, all you who wait for the LORD (NRSV)

---

265 Also 119:80.
267 Also 27:14.
The **Enemy** may be the subject of a curse against him:

63:10

The Hebrew of the text is ambiguous, but as for those who are seeking me, let them go the depths of the earth! (ALW)

Other imprecations against the Enemy are aimed at things ‘possessed’ by him (35:6; 37:15; 69:26; 109:13). The Enemy may also be the subject of a self-imprecation by the Psalmist:

7:6

let the enemy pursue and overtake me, trample my life to the ground, and lay my soul in the dust. Selah (NRSV)

**God** may be the subject of blessings of the Self:

67:2

May God be gracious to us and bless us and make his face to shine upon us. Selah (NRSV)

(Here, we must consider—as above for the cohortative—whether the plural 1st person is inclusive or exclusive). Blessings of the king:

72:8

or blessings of the community:

269

May be have dominion from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth. (NRSV)

May be remember all your offerings, and regard with favor your burnt sacrifices. Selah (NRSV)

25:9

May be lead the humble to justice and teach the humble his way. (ALW)

(In this latter case, NRSV reads ‘He leads ...’, failing to note that the proper form for such descriptions is the participle [as in 25:8 and, prototypically, 113]). God may also be subject in curses against the Enemy:

12:4

May the LORD cast off all flattering lips, the tongue that makes great boasts (NRSV)

By metonymy, God may also be subject of blessings of Him Himself:

113:2

May the LORD be gracious to you and multiply your numbers. (NRSV)

Elements of the creation may, as Finley says, be the subject of a 3rd-person jussive. In the Psalms, this occurs in (Expressive) ‘calls of praise’:

96:11

Let the heavens be glad, and let the earth rejoice; let the sea roar, and all that fills it (NRSV)

Finally, other common subjects of 3rd-person jussives are the Psalmist’s prayer:

88:3

let my prayer come before you; incline your ear to my cry. (NRSV)

and God’s blessing:

274

Let your steadfast love, O LORD, be upon us, even as we hope in you. (NRSV)

Many other subjects occur in the making of blessings, curses and prayers, as well as expressions of Permission:

275

May God, through your blessing and the blessing that is upon you, which you have sent forth (NRSV)

(Lift up your heads, gates! and lift up, eternal doors! And the King of glory may enter. (ALW)

(This reading fits much better than the standard translations with the scenario of a procession arriving at the gate of the city.)

5.3.2.2. **Negative**

Negated 3rd-person jussives are not particularly more rare than Negated cohortatives or 2nd-person jussives. They occur especially in curses of the Enemy:

109:12

May there be no one to do him a kindness, nor anyone to pity his orphaned children. (NRSV)

but also in prayers for the Self or the community:

119:133

May my years come to an end in peace. (NRSV)

(Here, we note again the relationship between 3rd-person jussives and causative imperatives).

5.3.2.3. **Metonymy**

Primarily responsible for the large number of 3rd-person jussives in the Psalter is the referential skewing effected by metonymy. Metonymy was discussed above, particularly in terms of ‘psychophysical substitutes’. Thus the Psalmist may say ‘וְהָשִּׁים כֹּלָּ֣הּ נִינָ֣שׁ הֶ֑לֶּבֶּֽשׁ’ instead of ‘וְהָשִּׁים כֹּלָּ֣הּ נִינָ֣שׁ הֶ֑לֶּבֶּֽשׁ’ (69:31) instead of וְהָשִּׁים כֹּלָּ֣הּ נִינָ֣שׁ הֶ֑לֶּבֶּֽשׁ instead of וְהָשִּׁים כֹּלָּ֣הּ נִינָ֣שׁ הֶ֑לֶּבֶּֽשׁ (13:6) instead of וְהָשִּׁים כֹּלָּ֣הּ נִינָ֣שׁ הֶ֑לֶּבֶּֽשׁ instead of וְהָשִּׁים כֹּלָּ֣הּ נִינָ֣שׁ הֶ֑לֶּבֶּֽשׁ (20:6) or וְהָשִּׁים כֹּלָּ֣הּ נִינָ֣שׁ הֶ֑לֶּבֶּֽשׁ (34:3) instead of וְהָשִּׁים כֹּלָּ֣הּ נִינָ֣שׁ הֶ֑לֶּבֶּֽשׁ instead of וְהָשִּׁים כֹּלָּ֣הּ נִינָ֣שׁ הֶ֑לֶּבֶּֽשׁ instead of וְהָשִּׁים כֹּלָּ֣הּ נִינָ֣שׁ הֶ֑לֶּבֶּֽשׁ 57:2

Be merciful to me, God, be merciful to me, for in you my soul takes refuge; in the shelter of your wings I take refuge until the troubles pass. (ALW)

The use of such substitutes may even be accompanied by an imperative, such as in וְהָשִּׁים כֹּלָּ֣הּ נִינָ֣שׁ הֶ֑לֶּבֶּֽשׁ (146:1). As Walke-O’Connor write,
Constructions that differ in grammar on the surface level of the language (e.g., 'May I …', first person; 'O my soul, may you …', second person; 'May my soul …', third person) are at a deeper level semantically equivalent.

Though metonymous forms are usually semantically equivalent to deictic forms, it should be noted that they are structurally distinct in terms of the verbal forms which they select, and often rhetorically distinct, since they distinguish at surface structure between the Speaker and parts of his person ('soul', 'heart', 'lips' etc.).

5.3.3. 'Skening' ('pseudo-jussive')

As for the cohortative above, it has been shown that many jussive forms otherwise read non-Deontically are in fact Deontic in force. There remain however several examples of what one might call the 'pseudo-jussive'.

The 'pseudo-jussive' may be shown by a non-Deontic marker such as לַא: 89:23

The enemy shall not outwit him, the wicked shall not humble him. (NRSV)

by a parallel text:

יָשָׁהוּ הָנוֹסָה מְרֹרָה מְרֹרָה לֹא שִׁבֵּעוּ מְרֹרָה גֶּפֶן יֵצֵא

He made darkness his covering around him, his canopy thick clouds dark with water. (NRSV)
(2 Sam 22:12 reads חָדִיד לֵאמֶר). Or by the context: 283

You turn man back to dust, and say, “Turn back, mortals.” (ALW)

Since this form is followed by the I-system continuation-form, wayyiqtol, and reports in the high'il what appears in direct speech in a Deontic qal, it seems likely that this is in fact a 'pseudo-jussive' as should be translated non-Deontically.

Several 'pseudo-jussives' occur in subordinate clauses (e.g. 58:5) or questions (e.g. 121:1). 284 The reasons for this have been mooted above, but certainly bear further investigation.

6. Deontic Non-Verbal Clauses

Having considered here the D-system of Deontic verbal forms, and the related imperative, and having made brief mention of other forms which may have Deontic function in chapter 3

above, we now turn to the Deontic use of non-verbal clauses. This is a particularly common feature in the Psalter and in all Discourse. 285

In Deontic non-verbal clauses with a prepositional predicate, word order distinguishes between modal functions. 286 Directives have predicate-subject word order:

יְבַדֵּל לְהוֹדוּ הַשְּׁבוֹת: 3:9

Deliverance belongs to the LORD; may your blessing be on your people! Selah (NRSV)

יִקָּחֶה יְהוָה אֶלָּת לְרַגְלֶיהוּ, 57:6 = 108:6

Be exalted, O God, above the heavens. Let your glory be over all the earth. (NRSV)

while optatives have subject-predicate:

םְאַבִּיק הָאָדָם בְּקַח בְּלִילָה 128:6

May you see your children’s children. Peace be upon Israel! (NRSV)

קָבֻּלֵה לְךָ הַמָּרָדֶשׁ הַדָּלֵית הַקָּהל יִתְנַע בָּרָד 34:2

May I bless the LORD always! May his praise always be in my mouth! (ALW)

וַיֹּאמֶר רַעַב 2:4

May the LORD be with you! (ALW)

A non-verbal clause with a passive participial predicate is the most common way of expressing volition in the passive voice. Most common forms are אַל־הַעֲשֵׂי and אֲלֵּךְ. The subject may be 2nd-person (וֹדֵר אַל־הַעֲשֵׂי 119:12; or יָרֵד אַל־הַעֲשֵׂי 115:15) or 3rd-person (וֹדֵר אֲלֵּךְ רָעָה 72:19; or יָרֵד אֲלֵּךְ אֱלֹהִים 118:26). Though it is usually clear that the sense of these clauses is Deontic (in fact, optative), there are some debatable cases. 113.3 is clearly optative, as can be seen from the preceding imperative דַּלְיָא forms.

שָׁם יִתְגַּלְגֵּל יְהוָה 113:3

From the rising of the sun to its setting the name of the LORD is to be praised. (NRSV)

What put together with the 'will be' (וֹדֵר or יָרֵד אַל־הַעֲשֵׂי) 48:2; 96:4; 145:3, it is normally translated: 'Great is the LORD and greatly to be praised!' (NRSV). This seems highly problematic, since the first predicate must be understood as Indicative, whilst the second is here understood as Deontic. The solution lies perhaps in the idea that passive participles have an inherent modal meaning of potentialis, as we see in attributive uses, such as יִשָּׁר כָּלָה (102:19; יִשָּׁר כָּלָה (19:22) 'yet to be born') 76:8. 287 Thus we can read:

וַיַּעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה גְּדֹל 96:4

For great is the LORD, and greatly to be praised; he is to be revered above all gods. (NRSV)

וַיַּעֲשֶׂה יְהוָה גְּדֹל 18:47

The LORD lives! Blessed be my rock, and exalted be the God of my salvation (NRSV)

281 Walkte-O'Connor, Syntax, 565 §34.1b. Compare also Tschat on Indicative praise: ‘The difference between “He” and “Thou” psalms is merely a stylistic one’; Tschat, Language of the Biblical Psalms, 76 n. 8. In defense of this, misappropriates Gunkel, who in fact makes both chronological and attitudinal distinctions between 2nd and 3rd-person forms; Gunkel, H., Einleitung.

282 Gesenius-Kautzsch, Grammatik, 335 §§109-114: 25.9; 47.4; 90:3; 107:29.

283 Also 11:6.

284 On the jussive in deliberative questions in Amharic, see Palmer, Mood and Modality, 111.


286 Compare Gibson’s comments on word order; Gibson, Davidson’s Syntax, 54-55 §49 Rem. 2.

In all of these examples, the clause may be understood as having an underlying short-form yiqtol form of מהב. In languages such as English, ‘to be’ and ‘to have’ are not true verbs, simply placeholders for MTA features; in Hebrew, no placeholder is needed, though it is occasionally present:

Let your steadfast love, O LORD, be upon us, even as we hope in you. (NRSV)
Blessed be the name of the LORD from this time on and forevermore. (NRSV)

7. Calls to Praise and Calls of Praise

The two most common functions of Deontic forms in the Psalter are in ‘calls to praise’ (Directive imperatives and jussives) and ‘calls/vows of praise’ (Expressive and Commissive cohortatives). These two functions largely share a common lexis in בִּרְכֹת, פְּנֵי, מַעֲשֶׂה, מָשָׁה, and מְלָל. The most common calls to praise are בִּרְכֹת and מַעֲשֶׂה, and the most common calls/vows of praise are מַעֲשֶׂה and מַעֲשָׂה. This community and the Self are called upon to do the same thing, with the exception of those forms which predominate in one category due to formulaic use. The most striking pair is מַעֲשֶׂה and מַעֲשָׂה:

Thus there is some evidence that ‘calls to praise’ and ‘calls of praise’ may have become in some measure functionally equivalent. Consider, for example:

For I will proclaim the name of the LORD; ascribe greatness to our God! (NRSV)
I will bless the LORD at all times; his praise shall continually be in my mouth.
My soul makes its boast in the LORD; let the humble hear and be glad.
O magnify the LORD with me, and let us exalt his name together. (NRSV)
I will give thanks to you...
Give thanks ... call ... make known ... proclaim ... Sing praises ... Shout aloud and sing for joy (NRSV)

In each of these cases, there is a progression from Expressive cohortative to Directive imperative. The comparison may be seen also in two Psalms which are otherwise very similar in theme and, we may assume, place in the cult:

O come, let us sing to the LORD a new song; let us enter his courts with praise. (NRSV)
Sing aloud ... shout for joy ... Raise your voice ... Blow. (NRSV)

A synchronic answer to this question is given most eloquently by a non-Hebraist, C.S. Lewis, in his Reflections on the Psalms. He asks, why ... did praising God so often consist in telling other people to praise Him? Even in telling whales, snowstorms, etc., to go on doing what they would certainly do whether we told them or not?

He answers his own question in part:
I had not noticed ... that just as men spontaneously praise whatever they value, so they spontaneously urge us to join them in praising it: “Isn’t she lovely? Wasn’t it glorious? Don’t you think that magnificent?” The Psalmists in telling everyone to praise God are doing what all men do when they speak of what they care about.

In other words, these Directive utterances might in fact be better described as Expressive—as exclamations rather than commands. As we have seen above in our discussion of the optative function of the imperative, this accounts for the use of imperatives in apparent address of the natural world.

Considering the question diachronically, we may look at two formulaic expressions which, though based on an imperative and so apparently Directive (‘call to praise’), appear to be used Expressively (‘call of praise’): דָּוִדְאָרְאֵל and דָּוִדְאָרְאֵל יִהְיֶה יִשְׂרָאֵל. It seems to me quite likely that the cult-functional school is correct in describing יִהְיֶה יִשְׂרָאֵל as spoken by a choir-leader (such as Kenaniah, מַעֲשֶׂה הַמְּשָׁרִים, ‘leader of the music of the singers’ 1 Chr 15:27, also v. 22):

It is in fact the precentor’s exhortation to the choir which re-echoes in this “introit”.

Even Mowinkel, however goes on to say that:
Occasionally the exhortation is inclusive: “O come, let us sing”, or still more personally: “I will praise the Lord”, and similar expressions. The “I” may originally have meant the leader of the choir or the cultic act, the spokesman of the congregation. But it was also appropriate to express the poet’s personal and emotional relation to his theme, his identification of himself with what he had to say.

Thus the ‘call to praise’ function may be fulfilled by a variety of forms, including Directive–hortative and Expressive cohortatives. On the other hand, the imperative form may have other

---

280Dawson, Text-Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew, 193: ‘the Verbless clause ... presupposes a Jussive form of מָטָר.’
281A most striking feature here, though not significant for the present work, is the way in which מַעֲשֶׂה is usually followed by ? whilst מַעֲשָׂה is not.
282Also 32:5 unmarked cohortative.
functions—Mowinckel refers at one point to the responsory "Hallelujah".296 A progression in use of the term may be seen in at least four stages:

1. Directive מָּשָּׁאֵל as a call to praise integrated within a Psalm (e.g. start of 113; 117: 135; 146; 148; 150; End of 115).

2. Expressive מָּשָּׁאֵל as: 1. optative utterance in address of non-humans (see section 3.4.1. above), and 2. a formulaic expression with little meaning at the start and end of many Psalms: taken up as a structuring device in the books—and then book—entitled מָּשָּׁאֵל (104-106; 111-113; 115-117; 146-150).

3. Formulaic הַלְלוּיָה כָּלָה with little meaning (since not translated) in LXX and NT (Rev 19: 3, 4, 6). There may be some residual awareness of its meaning in Rev 19:5: שָׁמַעְתָּ בְּעַדְתָּ הַיָּד הַיָּדִים מַעַדְּחֵי עַדְּחֵי הָעַדְּחֵי, 'Praise our God, all you his servants' ... (though this may simply originate from LXX Ps 113; 134; 135).

4. Formulaic Hallelujah with little meaning (since not translated) in many modern churches. A recent popular book on Christian praise has offered an excellent treatment of Psalmic praise language, and of the term מָּשָּׁאֵל in particular, whilst failing to even refer to its formal nature as a call to praise.297

The term מָּשָּׁאֵל occurs occurs only once in the Psalter (118:25), and is then used in the Greek transliteration οὐσίων at Jesus's 'triumphal entry' into Jerusalem (Matt 21:9, 15; Mark 11:9, 10; John 12:13). It seems likely that it underwent a similar process to that we have seen for מָּשָּׁאֵל, and that,

the waving of palm-branches and the cries of Hosanna which welcomed Jesus were a spontaneous gesture of religious exuberance, without any reference to a particular festival and without the supplicatory meaning of the original phrase in Ps. 118.298

Again, there may be some residual awareness of its meaning in οὐσίων ἡμῶν, εἰς δόξαν, 'Have mercy on us, son of David!' (Matt 9:27; 20:30), and it is striking that the Greek transliterates not a Hebrew form, but an apparently Aramaic one.

These two terms show quite clearly a diachronic tendency for a Directive utterance ('call to praise') to become Expressive ('call of praise'). This fits with the synchronic description by E.S. Lewis above, with the occasional optative function of the imperative (section 3.3.3. above) and the similar tendency for Commisive cohortatives ('vow of praise') to become Expressive ('call of praise') (section 4.3.4. above). This tendency is highly distinctive of the Biblical tradition of worship, and it has been argued to set it apart from that of other religions.299

296Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship, 82.


299E.g. contrasting with the Qur'ān: 'The Biblical phrase "Praise ye the Lord." 'ḥallātā yadb' implies personal responsibility, gratitude, activity; the Moslem phrase ['alhumdu lillāh, "the Praise is God's"] expresses submission, inevitability, passivity, fatalism; 'Zwemer, S.M., The Moslem Doctrine of God: An Essay on the Character and Attributes of Allah according to the Koran and Orthodox Tradition (Boston, New York and Chicago: American Tract Society, 1905) 99.

Chapter 7

CONCLUSION

This thesis began by considering Collins's description of the Psalter in terms of 'variation of the modes of discourse'. It has gone on to consider the range of different forms of participant reference (ch. 2), the relationships between three distinct verbal subsystems (Indicative, Epistemic and Deontic; ch. 3) and the broad functional range and frequent pragmatic equivalence of the sentence types Interrogative, Negative and Imperative (chs. 4-6). Key points in the analysis have been the discussions of: E-system yiqtāl as a key to the reanalysis of the verbal system; the 'skewed' realisation of Performative, Deontic and Epistemic functions; the pragmatic functions of Interrogative sentences; and the functional range of the Deontic particle nā' and the cohortative.

I have argued, on the one hand, for the univocality of many basic morphemes, that is, that short-form yiqtāl, long-form yiqtāl, qātāl, each set of Interrogative morphemes, the particle nā', paragogic hē etc. each has a single basic meaning from which others are derived. On the other hand, a great pragmatic overlap has been shown between, for example, all three verbal subsystems being used Deontically ('preceptive imperfect', 'precative perfect') or between Interrogatives and Negative Deontics.

It is hoped that Biblical scholars will take up the two main challenges of this work. Firstly, it is neither tense nor aspect nor discourse function which lies at the heart of the Hebrew verbal system, but modality, and an appreciation of yiqtāl as basically Epistemic is essential. Secondly, the field of linguistic pragmatics has much to teach us about how to differentiate between distinct contextually-governed functions of a given form; if Biblical scholars will learn to use the language of speech acts, implicatures and conversation analysis, the description of Biblical Hebrew grammar will gain greatly in precision.

Finally, it is hoped that linguistic work such as this will inform appreciation of the rhetorical artistry of the Psalms, which are in any case so open to misunderstanding due to their disputed Sitz im Leben and many obscure concepts. Linguistics can then better serve, and give authority to, our understanding of the Psalmists' true spirituality.
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