

**MARKED SYNTACTICAL STRUCTURES
IN BIBLICAL GREEK
IN COMPARISON WITH BIBLICAL HEBREW**

A. Niccacci

Biblical Hebrew shows a rigid word order in the sentence with the predicate in the first position and the subject in the second, so that any deviation is significant. Hebrew is a verb–subject–complement (VSC) language.¹ Indeed, a VSC sentence is the normal, plain sentence. It conveys information in general terms because the finite verb is the highlighted element. When, however, a piece of information is to be highlighted, a marked sentence is used having the highlighted non-verbal element in the first position and the verb in the second.

1. The compound nominal clause in Hebrew

I have called the structure with a non-verbal element in the first place and the verb in the second, the compound nominal clause in Hebrew.² In French a marked structure of this kind is called “phrase coupée” and in English “cleft sentence”. Let us consider the English model.

i A faulty switch caused the trouble

ii It was a faulty switch that caused the trouble (...)

What is a single unit (a clause) in (i) is divided up into two distinct parts (assigned to different clauses) in (ii) (...) – hence the term ‘cleft’. (...) One of the two parts is put in a superordinate clause, the other in a subordinate clause,

1. Or verb–subject–object (VSO) language, as it is commonly labeled. See, among others, R.E. Longacre, “Two Hypotheses Regarding Text Generation and Analysis,” *Discourse Processes* 12 (1989) 413-460; *Storyline Concerns and Word Order Typology in East and West Africa*, Los Angeles 1990; and K. Jongeling, “On the VSO Character of Classical Hebrew,” in K. Jongeling - H.J. Murre-van den Berg - L. van Rompay, ed., *Studies in Hebrew and Aramaic Syntax Presented to Professor J. Hofijzer*, Leiden 1991, 103-111.

2. See my book, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, Sheffield 1990, esp. § 6; more recently, “Finite Verb in the second Position of the Sentence. Coherence of the Hebrew Verbal System,” to be published in ZAW.

Type (b) has a structure comparable to the English cleft sentence while types (a), (c) and (d) differ in that they constitute one sentence instead of two. Note that in biblical Hebrew a non-verbal element is highlighted by the simple fact of being placed in the first position.

2. Corresponding structures in Greek

Let us consider how the Hebrew sentences quoted above are translated into Greek.⁶

- (1) Jud 6:8 B (a) Ἐγώ (P) εἶμι ὃς ἀνήγαγον ὑμᾶς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου (S)
- (2) Jud 6:8 A (a) Ἐγώ (P) εἶμι ὁ ἀναβιβάσας ὑμᾶς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου (S)
It is I that brought you up (A: made you come up) from Egypt.
- (3) 1Chr 21:17 (a) Οὐκ ἐγώ (P) εἶπα τοῦ ἀριθμηῆσαι ἐν τῷ λαῷ; (S)
It is not I that ordered to number the people?

In the following diagram the full text of 1Chr 21:17 is compared to the parallel 2Sam 24:17, first in the MT and then in the Lxx version. From the comparison, a strong opposition emerges between David and the innocent people. Clearly, this opposition represents the point of the sentence and therefore the “subjects” involved are in fact the “predicates”.

<p>1Chr 21:17</p> <p>(P) הָלֹא אֲנִי</p> <p>(S) אֶמְרֹתַי לְמַנּוֹת בְּעַם</p> <p>(P) וְאֲנִי</p> <p>(S) הוּא אֲשֶׁר־חָטְאֵתִי</p> <p>—</p> <p>(S) וְהָרַע הָרַעוֹתַי</p> <p>(casus pendens) וְאֵלֶּה הַצֵּאן</p> <p>(P) בָּהּ</p>		<p>2Sam 24:17</p> <p>—</p> <p>—</p> <p>(P) הַנֶּה אֲנֹכִי</p> <p>(S) חָטְאֵתִי</p> <p>(P) וְאֲנֹכִי</p> <p>(S) הָעָרֹתַי</p> <p>(casus pendens) וְאֵלֶּה הַצֵּאן</p> <p>(P) בָּהּ</p>
--	--	---

6. In the examples quoted, letters (a), (b), (c) etc. are used to number complete sentences. The vocative is considered a sentence (it is an “incomplete sentence” according to H.W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, ed. G.M. Messing, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1956, § 904d); see, e.g., (18a).

<p>(S) יָשַׁע</p> <p>(3) 1Chr 21:17</p> <p>(a) Οὐκ ἐγὼ (P) εἶπα του ἀριθμηῆσαι ἐν τῷ λαῶ; (S)</p> <p>(b) καὶ ἐγὼ (P) εἶμι ὁ ἁμαρτῶν, (S)</p> <p>(c) — κακοποιῶν ἐκακοποίησα (S)</p> <p>(d) καὶ ταῦτα τὰ πρόβατα (casus pendens)</p> <p>(e) τί (P) ἐποίησαν; (S)</p>	<p>(S) יָשַׁע</p> <p>(4) 2Sam 24:17</p> <p>— —</p> <p>Ἴδου ἐγὼ εἶμι (P)⁷ ἠδίκησα (S) καὶ ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ ποιμὴν (P)⁸ ἐκακοποίησα, (S) καὶ οὗτοι τὰ πρόβατα casus pendens) τί (P) ἐποίησαν; (S)</p>
---	---

(3) Is it not I that ordered to number the people? And it is I the one who have sinned and have done a great evil, while these sheep, what have they done?

(4) Behold, it is I that have done wrong. And it is I, the shepherd, that have done a great evil, while these sheep, what have they done?

(5) 2Kgs 18:22 (a) οὐχὶ αὐτὸς (P) οὗτος, οὗ ἀπέστησεν Εἰσεκίας τὰ ὑψηλὰ αὐτοῦ; (S)

(6) Jos 24:17 (a) κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, (casus pendens)

(b) αὐτὸς (P) θεός ἐστιν· (S)

(c) αὐτὸς (P) ἀνήγαγεν ἡμᾶς καὶ τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν (S)

The Lord our God, he is God. It is he that brought us and our fathers up (from Egypt).

7. In sentences (4b) and (4c) we find the phenomenon of ἐγὼ εἶμι instead of simple ἐγὼ. This phenomenon, characteristic of the latest additions to the Lxx, has been explained as a pedantic translation of יָשַׁע as opposed to יָשַׁע which is rendered with simple ἐγὼ. See H. St J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, Cambridge 1909, 55. The same phenomenon is found with the second person personal pronoun (σὺ εἶ instead of σύ): 2Sam 7:29: ὅτι σὺ εἶ, κύριέ μου κύριε, ἐλάλησας, “because it is you, o my Lord o Lord, that have spoken.” The Hebrew original has a x-qatal structure here, i.e., a cleft sentence type (a).

8. The phrase ὁ ποιμὴν is an addition of the Greek, grammatically in apposition to the preceding personal pronoun.

From these examples it appears that the same types of sentence found in Hebrew are also found in Greek. They are as follows:

- Type (a) in (3a), (4) and (6c)
- Type (b) in (5)
- Type (c) in (1)
- Type (d) in (2), (3b) and (6b).

The main characteristic of these types is that in each case the personal pronoun functions as the predicate and the rest – both finite verb forms and noun phrases of different kinds – functions as the subject. This point requires some discussion.

3. On subject and predicate

To say that a personal pronoun is the predicate and the verb the subject amounts to a reversal of the normal roles in the sentence. The problem is, of course, what we mean by predicate and subject. If we accept that predicate is the new information and subject the given information, it is not difficult to understand my point.⁹ In plain sentences the verb is the predicate and the noun (or pronoun) is the subject. In marked sentences, however, such as the cleft sentence we are studying, the new information, or what is all about in the sentence, is not the verb but the subject – not the action itself but who did it. This means that, in reality, the personal pronoun is not the ‘subject’, or given information, but the ‘predicate’, or new information. We shall see later that not only the subject, but also the object, the complement and the adverb, can be highlighted and become the predicate (§ 6 below). We need, then, to be open to the possibility that every element in a sentence, be it verbal or non verbal, can function as the predicate. The analysis depends on the function of the sentence itself.

In order to illustrate this point let us consider an example quoted below in this paper (86), εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔστιν κεκαλυμμένον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν, ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἔστιν κεκαλυμμένον “Even if our gospel is veiled, it is for

9. For a recent discussion on given and new information see G. Brown - G. Yule, *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge etc. 1983, ch. 5.

those who are destined to perish that it is veiled” (2Cor 4:3), and Polotsky’s masterful treatment of this passage:

A ne considérer que la forme, on ne remarque aucune différence entre les deux verbes. Tous deux sont «prédicats» dans le sens attaché à ce terme par la grammaire scolaire, où il désigne tout simplement, en ce qui concerne la phrase verbale, ce que les Arabes appellent *fi’l* «action» par opposition au *fā’il* «celui qui exécute l’action» et au *maf’ūl* «objet ou résultat de l’action». Mais lorsqu’on en envisage la valeur logique, on constate qu’ils diffèrent du tout au tout. Nous voici en présence d’un cas typique où termes logiques et grammaticaux ne se recouvrent pas. Au point de vue logique le verbe n’est prédicat que dans la première phrase [i.e., εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔστιν κεκαλυμμένον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν]. Sa force prédicative s’y épuise toute. Une fois énoncé, il n’offre plus d’«intérêt» à l’auditeur. Si on le reprend dans la seconde phrase, «ce n’est que pour appuyer» le complément avverbial (ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις) qui est, lui, «la partie à laquelle on s’intéresse» de la proposition, autrement dit le prédicat; le verbe, «déjà connu de l’auditeur», est devenu le sujet logique.”¹⁰

This analysis is irrefutable. What raises the interest, or the new element, is the predicate; what is already known, or the given element, is the subject. For my part, I would rather speak of syntactical, instead of ‘logical’, predicate and subject in order avoid the impression that something of an extralinguistic nature is referred to here.¹¹ The reality intended is, however, exactly the same.

Indeed, a clear distinction is to be made between syntactical and grammatical predicate and subject, on the one hand, and between superordinate and embedded sentence, on the other, in order to understand our analysis. When we say, for instance, that in the examples (1)–(6) above the initial personal pronoun is the predicate and the rest is the subject, we mean that they are, respectively, the syntactical predicate and subject of the superordinate sentence. The syntactical subject can, for its part, consist of

10. H.J. Polotsky, *Etudes de syntaxe copte*, Deuxième étude: Les temps seconds, Le Caire 1944, 24-25 (= *Collected Papers*, Jerusalem 1971, 128-129). The expressions inside the quotation marks are taken from the Arab grammarian Ibn Ya’iṣ in his commentary of the *Mufaṣṣal*.

11. Because they are understood differently by grammarians, the terms “psychological and logical subject” are rejected by O. Jespersen, *The Philosophy of Grammar*, London - New York 1924, 147ff.

a complete clause. This clause with its grammatical subject and predicate is embedded in the superordinate sentence. In the following diagram I list the different structures of the cleft sentence found in the examples studied so far. Note the difference between syntactical and grammatical predicate and subject.¹²

SUPERORDINATE SENTENCE		
with personal pronoun in the first place		
SYNTACTICAL PREDICATE		SYNTACTICAL SUBJECT
(1)	Ἐγώ	εἰμι (cop.) ὄς (gS) ἀνήγαγον (gP)
(2)	"	εἰμι (cop.) ὁ ἀναβιβάσας (pC)
(3)	"	εἶπα (gP)
	"	εἰμι (cop.) ὁ ἁμαρτῶν (pC)
(4)	ἐγώ εἰμι	ἠδίκησα (gP)
	καὶ ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν	ἐκακοποίησα (gP)
(5)	αὐτὸς	οὗτος (subject), οὗ ἀπέστησεν (rel.)
(6)	"	θεός (pC) ἐστίν (cop.)
	"	ἀνήγαγεν (gP)

Different structures, both verbal and nominal, can fill the slot of the syntactical subject. This means that these structures, although different, play the same nominal function. In them the verb is not the main element.

Besides the personal pronoun, the interrogative pronoun is also found in the first place of the sentence; see (3e) and (4e). Taking into consideration the interrogative sentences quoted below in the present paper, we can draw the following diagram, parallel to the previous one for the personal pronoun.

12. Here are the abbreviations used in this and the following diagram: cop. = copula; gC = grammatical complement; gP = grammatical predicate; gS = grammatical subject; O = direct object; pC = predicative complement; rel. = relative clause.

SUPERORDINATE SENTENCE

with interrogative pronoun or adverb in the first place

SYNTACTICAL PREDICATE		SYNTACTICAL SUBJECT
(18b)	ποῦ	εἶσιν; (gP)
(20)	ἀλλ' οὐ τί	ἐγὼ (gS) θέλω (gP)
(24b)	τί	κύριος ὁ θεός σου (gS) αἰτεῖται (gP) παρὰ σοῦ; (gC)
(30a)	καὶ πῶς	γνωστὸν (pC) ἔσται; (cop.)
(95a)	Τί	τοῦτο (O) ἐποίησας (gP) μοι;
(96a)	Τί	τοῦτο; (gS)
(100a)	ποῖον	ἔθνος μέγα; (gS)
(107)	Τίς οὖν	ὁ θηρεύσας (gS) μοι (gC) θήραν; (O)

Again, the slot of the syntactical subject is filled by different grammatical units. We find a noun (96a), a noun phrase (100a), a participle with definite article (107), and a verb with its subject and/ or object and complement (18b; 20; 24b; 95a). This means that both a noun phrase and a whole sentence play the same function. In other words, the verb functions as a noun because it is the given, known element of the sentence (i.e., the syntactical subject).

A word of clarification is in order regarding the construction with the copula. Copulative verbs are incomplete predicates since they need a complement, called predicative complement, or supplement.¹³ In (18b) εἶσιν is not a copula but a complete verb. The copula is present, e.g., in (30a) where the grammatical predicate consists of the predicative complement γνωστὸν and of the copula ἔσται.

It is well known, however, that the copula can be omitted. Let us consider (7)–(9). The two main slots of the sentence are enclosed in a box. The first slot is for the syntactical predicate, the second for the syntactical subject.

13. Smyth writes: “The copula is strictly the predicate or is a part of the predicate with its supplements” (§ 918a). He adds that the copulative verbs “can also be complete predicates” (§ 918b). This is all right except for the assertion that “the copula is strictly the predicate.” As any verb, the copula is not always the predicate.

(7)	Gen 46:33	(a)	Τί	τὸ ἔργον ὑμῶν (S) ἐστίν; (cop.)
	Gen 47:3	(b)	Τί	τὸ ἔργον ὑμῶν; (S) —

What is your occupation?

(8)	Ex 16:15	(a)	Τί	ἐστίν (cop.)	τοῦτο; (S)
	Ex 13:14	(b)	Τί	—	τοῦτο; (S)

What is it?

(9)	2Sam 1:8	(a)	Τίς	εἶ (cop.)	σύ; (S)
		(b)	Ἀμαληκίτης	ἐγώ (S)	εἶμι (cop.)
	2Kgs 10:13	(c)	Τίνες	—	ὑμεῖς; (S)
		(d)	Οἱ ἀδελφοὶ Οἰχοζίου	—	ἡμεῖς (S)

(9ab) Who are you? (Reply) An Amalekite am I.

(9cd) Who are you? (Reply) The brothers of Ahaziah are we.

Note, in (7)–(9), the functional equivalence of the noun phrase with and without the copula. This means that the copula clause is syntactically a two-slot pattern although it consists of three grammatical members.¹⁴ In other words, the interrogative sentence is a cleft sentence with the interrogative pronoun or adverb as the predicate and the rest as the subject.¹⁵

The reply to an ‘x-question’ can consist of one member only, that of the predicate. This confirms the assumption that the interrogative pronoun or adverb in the first place is indeed the predicate, just because the reply directly corresponds to it. In the following example, for instance, (10d) “Of your servant Jacob” corresponds to (10c) “Whose are...?”. In (10a,c) the slot of the predicate is filled by an interrogative pronoun, while in (10b) by an interrogative adverb. The slot of the subject is filled by a copula (10a), a

14. See J.C. Callow, “Constituent Order in Copula Clauses: A Partial Study,” in D.A. Black - K. Barnwell - S. Levinsohn, ed., *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation*. Essays on Discourse Analysis, Nashville, Tennessee 1992, 67-89. This author does not make any distinction between syntactical and grammatical elements of the sentence. He thinks, as it is generally assumed, that the copula clause is a tripartite structure and the interrogative pronoun is the predicative complement (or simply “complement” as he calls it). This analysis, however, does not take into consideration the fact that the copula can be omitted, and still the sentence has the same syntactical function while being different grammatically.

15. On the affinity between the so-called ‘WH-questions’ and the cleft constructions see, among others, T. Givón, *Syntax*. A Functional-Typological Introduction, vol. II, Amsterdam - Philadelphia 1990, § 18.4.2.4. See also § 5 below.

finite verb (10b), a noun phrase (10c), or is implied (10d). The Greek follows the Hebrew original closely. From now on, I quote the Greek first, then the Hebrew for comparison. I indicate the phrases filling the slots of the syntactical predicate and subject with P and S respectively. A sign “—” signals an empty, elliptical slot.

- (10) Gen 32:18 (a) Τίνος (P) εἶ (S)
 (b) καὶ ποῦ (P) πορεύῃ, (S)
 (c) καὶ τίνος (P) ταῦτα τὰ προπορευόμενά σου; (S)
 32:19 (d) Τοῦ παιδός σου Ιακωβ·(P) — (S)
 Gen 32:18 (a) (S) לְמַיִן (P) מִיֵּי
 (b) (S) מִיֵּי (P) מִיֵּי
 (c) (S) מִיֵּי (P) מִיֵּי
 32:19 (d) (S) — (P) לְעַבְדְּךָ לְיַעֲקֹב
 (Engl. Gen 32:17-18) Whose are you? And where are you going? And whose are these walking before you? (Reply) Of your servant Jacob.

Definitely, one has to agree that the copula is not always the predicate. The following (11) and (12) show clear clefted structures with a definite noun phrase both in the slot of the predicate and in that of the subject. Note that the copula is missing in the first case (11) while it is present in the second (12c).

- (11) Gen 45:12 (a) ὅτι τὸ στόμα μου (P) τὸ λαλοῦν πρὸς ὑμᾶς (S)
 Gen 45:12 (a) (S) כִּי־פִי הִנְדַּבֵּר לְיָכֶם (P)
 (Behold your eyes see ... that) it is my mouth that speaks to you.
 (12) Mar 7:15 (a,b) οὐδέν ἐστιν ἔξωθεν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς αὐτὸν ὃ δύναται κοινῶσαι αὐτόν,
 (c) ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκπορευόμενά (P) ἐστιν τὰ κοινῶντα τὸν ἄνθρωπον (S)

Nothing exists outside a man which can defile him by going into him; but it is the things that come out of a man that defile him.

4. Word order in Greek

The fact that the Lxx shows syntactical structures very much comparable to those of the MT suggests that in Lxx Greek, as in biblical Hebrew, the first place of the sentence is a favorite place of the predicate. The problem

arises, then, whether this situation also applies to classical Greek, or is Lxx Greek a translation language, heavily influenced by Hebrew. What I am saying about Lxx Greek also applies to NT Greek, which appears to be very much the same in this respect, as we shall see from the examples below.

In order to clarify this point I consulted a number of grammars available to me.¹⁶ From the outset I note that not a single grammar gives a definite picture of word order in classical Greek. This fact is not surprising since the grammars consulted are based on the sentence.¹⁷ Here follows an inventory of the different positions.

Kühner describes the normal and the inverted word order in classical Greek in general terms as follows.

[In normal word order] Das Subjekt nimmt die erste, das Prädikat (Verb, Adjektiv oder Substantiv mit εἶναι) die letzte Stelle ein. (§ 605, p. 595)

In der invertierten Stellung wird das Prädikat dem Subjekte (...) vorangestellt. (§ 606.1, p. 596)

Kühner also singles out the first and the last places in the sentence as being of a special importance:

Wenn das Subjekt besonders ausgezeichnet werden soll, so wird es an das Ende des Satzes gestellt; und wenn in Einem Satze zwei Wörter durch die Stellung hervorgehoben werden sollen, so tritt das eine an die Spitze des Satzes, während das andere die letzte Stelle einnimmt. (§ 606.2, pp. 596-597)

Überhaupt ist sowohl die erste als die letzte Stelle als eine Kraftstelle anzusehen, wenn sie von Satzteilen, die nach der gewöhnlichen Ordnung nicht hierher gehören, eingenommen werden. (§ 606.3, p. 597)

16. R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*, II.2: Satzlehre, Hannover - Leipzig 1898; A. Meillet - J. Vendryes, *Traité de grammaire comparée des langues classiques*, Paris 1927; E. Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik*, II: Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik, München 1950; Smyth, *Greek Grammar*; J. Humbert, *Syntaxe grecque*, Paris 1982.

17. No grammar of classical Greek based on text linguistics is known to me. Attempts of this kind on NT Greek are being done by members of the Summer Institute of Linguistics at Dallas. See Black - Barnwell - Levinsohn, ed., *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation*; and S. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of New Testament Greek*. A Coursebook, Dallas 1992. Another grammar aware of the discourse analysis is S.E. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, Sheffield 1992.

According to Meillet - Vendryes there is no definite word order in classical Greek but a certain tendency only.

En grec et en latin, comme en indo-européen, l'ordre des mots n'a aucune valeur grammaticale; c'est ce qu'on exprime souvent en disant qu'il est libre. (§ 816, p. 524)

En grec et en latin la phrase peut commencer par n'importe quel mot. Mais en général le mot mis en tête est un mot important. (§ 817, p. 525)

La seconde place de la phrase était réservée en indo-européen aux mots accessoires, souvent enclitiques. (§ 818, p. 526)

Il est manifeste par exemple qu'en grec le verbe tend à se placer au milieu de la phrase, encadré par le noms qui expriment le sujet, les régimes, les déterminations variées et dont la disposition est d'ailleurs variable. (§ 819, p. 527).

Having noted, with other grammarians, that in Greek the word order is free, yet a usual order is discernible, Schwyzler discusses the importance of the different places in the sentence – first, middle, final (pp. 689-698). He mentions that scholars disagree on determining the usual position of the verb – some say at the end, others in the middle. Their decision is based on statistical analysis of specific corpuses of the Greek literature. Schwyzler also comments on variations of the normal word order because of emphasis, parallelism and opposition. He also mentions that in Polybius and in the NT the verb usually comes in the first place.

Jede Abweichung von der habituellen Wortfolge, so im Affekt, in Parallelismus oder Gegensatz, hebt den davon betroffenen Satzbestandteil auf Kosten anderer hervor (...). Dies kann durch Umkehrung der Wortfolge im Satzinnern geschehen, besonders aber dadurch, daß ein Satzteil seine gewöhnliche Stellung mit dem Satzanfang oder Satzende vertauscht. Die Stellung am Satzanfang kann das besonders Wichtige in den Vordergrund rücken, die Stellung am Satzende Spannung erzeugen. (p. 691)

(...) aber bei Polyb und im NT ist das Präd. gegenüber dem Subj. und bes. gegenüber dem Obj. deutlich nach vorn gerückt. (p. 695)

Humbert gives perhaps the most precise description of word order. He too comments on the first and the last place in the sentence while trying to play down the importance of both.

On conçoit aisément que l'attaque de la phrase ait beaucoup d'importance, comme aussi sa fin, qui peut laisser dans l'esprit une impression durable; mais

en grec la fin de phrase, sauf en ce qui concerne le rythme, n'a pas beaucoup de signification (...). (§ 147, p. 93)

Ce serait une erreur de croire que la première place de la phrase soit toujours occupée par un mot que l'on veut mettre en lumière (...). On peut donc dire que, dans l'usage courant, le premier mot de la phrase a pour fonction de déterminer sa structure générale. (§ 148, pp. 93-94),

As we might expect from a French scholar, Humbert, alone among the authors consulted, accords special attention to the cleft sentence, or phrase coupée, although he does not use such designation (see §§ 154-157). This kind of sentence materializes in three ways – by putting the emphasized word in the first place of the sentence, or in the last one, or by separating elements of the sentence that are grammatically connected one from the other.

Trois moyens sont alors à la disposition de l'écrivain (...). Le premier consiste à frapper au plus tôt l'attention de l'auditeur en le mettant [i.e., the word] en tête de la phrase le plus qu'il est possible; le second, bien plus rarement employé seul, mais fréquemment associé à une disjonction, consiste à l'isoler comme dernier mot de la phrase; enfin, le moyen constant, quelle que soit la position du mot dans la phrase, le plus souple et le plus varié, qui est la disjonction des groupes de mots grammaticalement associés. (§ 154, p. 98)

Concerning the first way Humbert writes as follows.

N'importe quel mot peut être mis en vedette, même l'équivalent logique d'une particule qui, sans volonté d'insistance, serait à sa place normale, c'est-à-dire à la seconde: ce peut être un mot ou un groupe de mots, un verbe, le sujet, l'objet direct ou indirect, l'attribut, ou telles circonstances (surtout des circonstances de temps). (§ 155, p. 98)

As for the second way Humbert refers specifically to the Greek political eloquence and quotes passages of Demosthenes where one finds the personal pronoun ἐγώ in the last place of the sentence with a strong emphasis.

When we turn to grammars of biblical Greek – both NT and LXX – we find a much more explicit stance on the subject of word order and emphasis.¹⁸ We learn that, due to Hebrew influence, the verb usually comes

18. Levinsohn adopts a position difficult to define. On the one hand he writes that Greek is a language “in which the most common constituent order in narrative is with the verb first”

in the first place and emphasis is an important criterion for word order.¹⁹ I quote passages from the main expositions I found.

The position of the words in the N.T. is in the main subject to the same rules as are followed by the Greek prose writers (...). Especially in narrative, the N.T. writers avoid any great separation of the two main elements of the sentence, subject and verb (predicate); and, in accordance with the Hebrew mode of expression, (...) draw the verb nearer to the subject (...). (Winer, 684)

Emphasis does not require that the word which receives the stress should be placed first: it may even stand last (...), and indeed may occupy any place in which, according to the constitution of the particular sentence, a word will stand out from the main body with most marked prominence. (Winer, 684)

In Greek prose, where the rhetorical element has less play, the predicate very commonly comes first, simply because, as a rule, the predicate is the most important thing in the sentence. (...) [Emphasis] is one of the ruling ideas in the order of words. This emphasis may be at the end as well as at the beginning of the sentence, or even in the middle in case of antithesis. The emphasis consists in removing a word from its normal position to an unusual one. (Robertson, 417)

Word order in Greek and so in the NT is freer by far than in modern languages. There are, nevertheless, certain tendencies and habits (in the NT especially in narrative) which have created something like a normal word order. (1) The verb or nominal predicate with its copula stands immediately after the conjunction (the usual beginning of a sentence); then follow in order the subject, object, supplementary participle etc. (...) (2) These positions, however, are by no means mandatory. Any emphasis on an element in the sentence causes that element to be moved forward. (Blass - Debrunner - Funk § 472)

(*Discourse Features*, 22) – a position that in my opinion is true of biblical Greek but not necessarily of the classical language. On the other hand, he maintains that “in Greek, three of the six ways in which the subject (S), object (O) and verb (V) can be arranged conform the Theme–First Principle and they are all the more common than the orders that do not conform to it” (p. 75).

19. G.B. Winer, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek*, ed. W.F. Moulton, 3 ed., Edinburgh 1882; J. Viteau, *Etude sur le grec du Nouveau Testament comparé avec celui des Septante*. Sujet, complément et attribut, Paris 1896; H. St J. Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*; A.T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, 3 ed., New York 1919; M. Zerwick, *Graecitas biblica Novi Testamenti exemplis illustrata*, 5 ed., Roma 1966; F. Blass - A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, ed. R.W. Funk, Chicago - London 1961; G. Steyer, *Satzlehre des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Gütersloh 1979.

Hervorzuhebende Wörter stellt das Gr. gern an den Anfang oder in seine Nähe. Das Prädikat als seinem Wesen nach wichtigster Satzteil steht auch ohne Hervorhebung gern nahe am Anfang. Im NT ist das unter hebr. Einfluß noch häufiger als sonst in Gr. der Fall (...). (Steyer, 124)

Auch durch Endstellung kann ein Wort hervorgehoben werden, etwa wenn der Anfang durch ein anderes betontes Wort belegt ist. (Steyer, 125)

Some observations are now in order. We note a large incertitude among the scholars as to the importance of the different positions in the sentence – beginning, middle and end. No definite criteria are given to decide which position is more important and *ad hoc* solutions prevail. Many grammarians agree that the first place is one of prominence, and still the verb, that is the main element of the sentence, occupies that place only occasionally. Emphasis is frequently invoked to explain deviations of word order. However, normal word order is too loosely defined for anyone to be able to identify the deviations with certainty. In my opinion, the problem of word order in classical Greek remains unresolved for two main reasons: the vastness of Greek literature,²⁰ and the failure to distinguish historical narrative from direct speech.²¹ In fact, word order is likely to be different in these two main genres of prose. In a research on word order, statistical analysis does not help much unless one is able to identify the function of different sentence types in the text.²² In other words, if we do not look beyond the sentence into the text, we shall never be able to see any system and overall logic.

None of the scholars consulted identifies a cleft sentence in Greek (see, however, Rosén, § 5 below). Emphasis and variations in word order are thought to be a matter of style rather than of grammar or syntax. I am inclined to think, however, that in Greek, as in Hebrew and in any other comparable languages, the cleft sentence is a special structure grammatically and syntactically – not only stylistically. The main reason is that emphasis is connected with the function of the predicate and with a special place in the sentence. Therefore, it is not a question of style only. Elsewhere I have tried to show that this applies to biblical Hebrew

20. From the works quoted by scholars, only some corpuses of Greek literature seem to have been investigated in this respect.

21. It would seem to me that this distinction is basic to such an investigation in any language, as I tried to show for biblical Hebrew.

22. See D.R. de Lacey, "Word-Order and Emphasis: A Study of ΚΟΙΝῆ Greek," in *Actes du Second Colloque International Bible et Informatique: Méthodes, outils, résultats etc.*, Jérusalem 9-13 Juin 1988, Paris - Genève 1989, 223-242.

(see footnote 2). In the following paragraphs, I shall try to show the same for biblical Greek. In classical Greek the situation may be less definite because that language uses a larger variety of means to express emphasis besides the place in the sentence. Still, even this feature is likely to be significant to some extent. Extensive research is needed.

From the above survey of Greek grammars we gain, at least, a small point that shall be useful for the following analysis of texts. Practically all the grammars maintain that prominent places in the sentence are beginning and end. The middle is a place more difficult to evaluate. It is said to be a favorite place of the verb. However, different components of the sentence are also found there.

5. A preliminary note on stress

Topic, focus and stress are a subject – and a rather complicated one – of contemporary research while emphasis, a word used traditionally by grammarians, is usually avoided and criticized. I cannot pursue this point nor discuss the relevant literature.²³ However, a word of clarification is necessary to explain the terminology used in this essay.

A considerable difficulty while dealing with dead languages is that we do not have information on the stress applied to words in the act of speaking. For classical Greek, Kühner speculates on this point but hardly with sufficient criteria.²⁴ Because of this fact we are to leave aside the criterion of oral stress. A reliable criterion for our analysis is the word order, which is rather rigid in Hebrew and also in biblical Greek because of Semitic influence.

In languages like those mentioned with a VSC word order, every structure beginning with a non verbal element is noteworthy. However, this initial non verbal element is not always stressed. We need, therefore, at least an additional criterion. This comes from textual analysis of the sentences. In other words, we need to understand the function in the text

23. See a recent discussion by B.L. Bandstra, “Word Order and Emphasis in Biblical Hebrew Narrative: Syntactic Observations on Genesis 22 from a Discourse Perspective,” in W.R. Bodine, ed., *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew*, Winona Lake, Indiana 1992, 109-123.

24. Kühner speculates, e.g., that the predicate is more stressed than the subject and the attribute more than the noun (pp. 592-593). However, this is hardly sufficient, especially in many cases where it is not at all clear what is the predicate and what is the subject.

of the different structures having a non verbal element at the beginning in order to decide whether or not it is stressed.

These considerations permit us to specify our position in comparison to that of modern linguists with regard to stress and focus. Let us consider the following exposition by Givón.²⁵

At the very top of scale in English we find three devices, all characterized by strong contrastive stress on the focused constituent: Stress-focus, cleft and pseudo-cleft. Thus:

- | | | | |
|--------|----------------------|--|-------------|
| (6) a. | Neutral: | Joe will milk the goat | |
| b. | Stress-focus: | Joe will milk the goat | (subject) |
| | | Joe will milk the goat | (auxiliary) |
| | | Joe will milk the goat | (verb) |
| | | Joe will milk the goat | (object) |
| c. | Cleft: | It's Joe who will kill the goat | (subject) |
| | | It's the goat that Joe will kill | (object) |
| d. | Pseudo-cleft: | | |
| | | The one who will milk the goat is Joe | (subject) |
| | | What Joe will do to the goat is milk it | (verb) |
| | | What Joe will do is milk the goat | (VP) |
| | | What Joe will milk is the goat | (object) |

Stress-focus in English, as in (6b), is the most permissive in its application: It applies not only to nouns but also to verbs, not only to lexical but also to grammatical morphemes, not only to free morphemes but also to bound ones. In contrast, cleft constructions in English (and, as we shall see, also elsewhere) are the most restrictive, applying primarily to nominal arguments (subjects, objects).

Pseudo-cleft, seems to apply more permissively than cleft.

We cannot affirm the (6b) structures of the Givón's list in biblical Greek simply because it is normally impossible to identify them in written texts. We can affirm, however, the (6c) and possibly (6d) structures. From the examples below we shall see that not only the subject and the object can be stressed but also any complement and adverb.

25. Givón, *Syntax*, 704.

In my understanding stress characterizes the syntactical predicate of the sentence, as shown in § 3 above. The stressed constituent is, in fact, the reason why the sentence has been produced, i.e., its new information and its message.

Rosén is perhaps the only scholar who has identified the cleft sentence in Greek – a sentence where, as he puts it, the verb has the status of the subject (“Subjektsstatus”)²⁶ and, I would add, a nominal or adverbial element has the status of the predicate. Among the most clear criteria to identify this kind of sentence Rosén lists the following (see § 6 below):

1. In Satzteilfragen und Antworten hierauf, wobei natürlich das Fragewort bzw. der in der Antwort an seine Stelle tretende Satzteil das Prädikat darstellt; so hat z.B. der koptische Text für *Τίνα ζητεῖτε; ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον* Ev. Joh. 18, 4,5 ein zweites Präsens. Es ist hierbei bemerkenswert, daß das im Griechischem in der Antwort Weggelassene, weil selbstverständliche, also keinesfalls prädikative Verbum, im Koptischen auch in der Antwort, jedoch wie gesagt in der unprädikativen Formen eines zweiten Tempus steht (...).
2. In Antithesen, deren polare Teile nicht das Verbum oder die Verben sind (...).
3. In Sätzen, in denen sich das griechische Original für hervorhebende Inversion entschieden hat, z.B. *Ἡμεῖς ἐκ πορνείας οὐ γεγεννημέθα* Ev. Joh. 8, 41 (...).
4. In glossierendem Nachsatz, wie *εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔστιν κεκαλυμμένον τὸ εὐ-αγγέλιον ἡμῶν, ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις ἔστιν κεκαλυμμένον* II. Cor. 4,3, so wie im allgemeinen in erklärenden oder interpretierenden Angaben, wo das Verbum nicht die erläuternde Information darstellt, sondern eher in bezug auf Einzelheiten der Handlung erläutert wird. (pp. 304-305)

Similar criteria for the analysis of texts are put forward at the beginning of the next section.

26. H.B. Rosén, “Die «zweiten» Tempora des Griechischen. Zum Prädikatsausdruck beim griechischen Verbum,” in *East and West. Selected Writings in Linguistics* by Haiim B. Rosén, Edited for the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday by a Group of Friends and Disciples, Part One: General and Indo-European Linguistics, München 1982, 303-324 (originally published in 1957). Rosén was inspired, as I am, by the research of the late Prof. H.J. Polotsky on Coptic “Second Tenses” and “emphatic constructions” in Egyptian, where the verb has the status of a nominal subject both morphologically and functionally (see Polotsky’s *Etudes de syntaxe copte* quoted above). Unlike in Coptic and in Egyptian, in Greek and in Hebrew the verb with a nominal function is not morphologically different from the verb with a predicative function. Thus the need is felt of finding syntactic settings suitable to show the nominal function of the verb.

6. Non-verbal stressed elements becoming the predicate

I shall use two main criteria for the syntactical analysis of texts: the structure of the original Hebrew text, and the speech-situation. The speech-situation is determined by grammatical features and interpretation. The main grammatical features that I shall take into consideration are as follows: personal pronouns, interrogative pronouns, or any other non verbal element in the first position, and the finite verb in the second; contrastive sentences type ‘not this one but that one’. All this basically amounts to a two-slot structure with a stressed element, i.e., the predicate, in the first place and a verb in the second with the function of the subject, as shown in the following diagram.

First place = Predicate	+	Second place = Subject
personal pronoun	+	finite verb
interrogative pronoun	+	"
noun phrase	+	"
prepositional phrase	+	"
adverb	+	"

Specifically, I shall examine the following cases: grammatical subject (§ 6.1), grammatical object (§ 6.2) and grammatical complement or adverb (§ 6.3) – all becoming syntactical predicate of the superordinate sentence. I distinguish these three types for practical reasons. They are, however, one and the same basic structure with two slots – the predicate and the subject. The slot of the predicate is filled by different grammatical elements having the same function of conveying new information (see diagram above).

The examples taken from the Lxx will be checked against the Hebrew original. Examples from the NT, especially from the Gospel of John, will also be presented. The intention is to see whether or not the language remains the same in both literary corpuses of the Greek Bible with respect to this particular syntactical feature. I hope that useful elements shall emerge from this analysis for a better understanding of biblical Greek.

A remark is to be made at this point regarding two main objections that my analysis is likely to face. First, some will regret that I do not follow modern linguists in their subtle distinctions on the phenomenon

of prominence;²⁷ and second, others will not accept my identification of the stressed element with the predicate of the sentence.²⁸ I am convinced, however, that one is not on firm ground unless one relates stress to word order and to grammatical and syntactical structure of the sentence.²⁹ Much too often do modern linguists neglect the basic analysis of a sentence as consisting of subject and predicate, or whatever one may wish to call them. Yet, without such a basis, linguistic analysis runs the risk of floating in the air.³⁰

6.1. Grammatical subject becoming the syntactical predicate

Since (1)–(6) already illustrate this point, a few more examples are enough. In this paper I do not aim at collecting and analysing all the evidence, yet I am confident of having identified the basic structures. As before in this paper, P and S indicate the syntactical predicate and subject, respectively.

27. See the treatment of Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*, ch. 6. Following K. Callow, he mentions three kinds of prominence: focus, emphasis and thematic. Levinsohn rightly relates focus and emphasis to word order as he writes: “In Greek, both focus and emphasis within the sentence are achieved in the same way, by fronting: the constituent concerned, which typically is *anarthrous* (i.e., not introduced with a definite article) is fronted. An accompanying feature is that any pronominal or other anaphoric constituent of the comment precedes the verb” (p. 83). I would only object to this that it is not necessary for the fronted constituent to be without a definite article; see (11)–(12) above.

28. A position somewhat similar to the one adopted in this paper is found in Levinsohn, *Discourse Features*. Following B. Comrie, he distinguishes three principal “articulations” of the sentence, as he calls them: topic–comment, focus–presupposition and presentational (§ 1.2.1). These three types seem to correspond to what I would call ‘subject–predicate pattern’, ‘non-verbal predicate–subject pattern’, and presentative sentence, respectively. In my opinion, however, the basic, unmarked pattern of sentence in biblical Greek (as in biblical Hebrew) is ‘verbal predicate–nominal subject’, and not ‘topic–comment’. Strangely enough, precisely this kind of sentence remains unaccounted for in Levinsohn’s description.

29. This problem has been discussed historically in a survey of different authors (H. Weil, A. Blinkenberg, H. Kellenberger, and the Prague School) by C. Adjémian, “Theme, Rheme, and Word Order. From Weil to Present-day Theories,” *Historiographia Linguistica* 5 (1978) 253–273.

30. Levinsohn’s analysis is the best of which I had to read; see his *Discourse Features* §§ 5 and 6. Still, sometimes I do not see definite criteria behind his analysis; see, for instance, his comments on selected examples of rheme in Koine Greek (§ 5.2.5). Is there, in his opinion, any connection between rheme and highlighting, and between these two and comment in the sense of predicate?

- (13) Gen 43:9 (a) ἐγὼ δὲ (P) ἐκδέχομαι αὐτόν, (S)
 (b) ἐκ χειρός μου (P) ζήτησον αὐτόν (S)

And it is I that stand surety for him. From may hand require him.

- Gen 43:9 (a) (S) אֲנִי עֹשֶׂה בְּנֵי (P) מִיָּדְךָ
 (b) (S) מִיָּדְךָ שָׁמַרְתָּ (P) מִיָּדְךָ

It is I that shall stand surety for him. It is from my hand that you shall require him.

Clause (13b) makes it clear that in clause (a) the personal pronoun is stressed. The Hebrew original has twice a compound nominal clause type x–yiqtol with a stressed ‘x’ element.

- (14) 2Sam 7:5 (a) Οὐ σὺ (P) οἰκοδομήσεις μοι οἶκον τοῦ κατοικῆσαι με (S)
 2Sam 7:13 (b) αὐτός (P) οἰκοδομήσει μοι οἶκον τῷ ὀνόματί μου (S)
 2Sam 7:5 (a) (S) הַיְהוָה לְבֵיתִי לְשָׁבִי (P) הַיְהוָה
 2Sam 7:13 (b) (S) הַיְהוָה לְבֵיתִי לְשָׁבִי (P) הוּא

It is not you that shall build a house for me to dwell in (MT: Is it you that...?). (...) It is he (i.e., your son) that shall build a house for my name.

- (15) Num 11:12 (a) μὴ ἐγὼ (P) ἐν γαστρὶ ἔλαβον πάντα τὸν λαὸν
 τοῦτον (S)
 (b) ἢ ἐγὼ (P) ἔτεκον αὐτούς; (S)

- Num 11:12 (a) (S) הַיְהוָה כָּל־הָעָם הַזֶּה (P) אֲנִי יָרִיתִי
 (b) (S) אֲנִי יָרִיתִי (P) אֲנִי-אֲנִי

Is it I that have conceived all this people, or is it I that have born them?

- (16) Mat 3:14 (a) Ἐγὼ (P) χρεῖαν ἔχω ὑπὸ σοῦ βαπτισθῆναι, (S)
 (b) καὶ σὺ (P) ἔρχῃ πρός με; (S)

It is I that need to be baptized by you, and is it you that come to me?

- (17) Joh 13:14 (a) εἰ οὖν ἐγὼ (P) ἔνιψα ὑμῶν τοὺς πόδας (S)
 (b) καὶ ὑμεῖς (P) ὀφείλετε ἀλλήλων νίπτειν τοὺς πόδας (S)

If then it is I that have washed your feet (the Lord and the Master), you too have to wash one another’s feet.³¹

31. This we can call inclusive focus (‘If I ... you too’), as opposed to contrastive focus (‘Not you ... but x’). A similar case is found in John 13:15: ἵνα καθὼς ἐγὼ (P) ἐποίησα ὑμῖν (S) καὶ ὑμεῖς (P) ποιῆτε (S) “in order that exactly as I did to you, you should do in your turn.”

- (18) Joh 8:10 (a) Γύναι,
 (b) ποῦ (P) εἶσιν; (S)
 (c) οὐδεὶς (P) σε κατέκρινεν; (S)
 8:11 (d) Οὐδεὶς, κύριε. (P) — (S)
 (e) Οὐδὲ ἐγώ (P) σε κατακρίνω (S)

Woman, where are they? Has no one condemned you? (...) No one, o Lord.
 (...) Neither do I condemn you.

- (19) Gen 45:8 (a) νῦν οὖν οὐχ ὑμεῖς (P) με ἀπεστάλακατε ὧδε, (S)
 (b) ἀλλ' ἢ ὁ θεός (P) — (S)
 Gen 45:8 (a) (S) הַיְיָ יְיָ אֱלֹהֵיךָ (P) אֱשֶׁר־אֵלַי הַיְיָ
 (b) (S) — (P) אֲנִי אֲשַׁלְּחֶנּוּ

Now then, it is not you that have sent me here, but it is God.³²

- (20) Mar 14:36 (a) ἀλλ' οὐ τί (P) ἐγὼ θέλω (S)
 (b) ἀλλὰ τί (P) σύ — (S)
 Mat 26:39 (c) πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ (P) θέλω (S)
 (d) ἀλλ' ὡς σύ (P) — (S)
 Luk 22:42 (e) πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου (P) — (S)
 (f) ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν (P) γινέσθω (S)

(20ab) Yet not what I will, but what you (will). (20cd) Yet not as I will but as you (will). (20ef) Yet not my will but yours, let happen.³³

6.2. Grammatical direct object becoming the syntactical predicate

- (21) Gen 42:12 (a) Οὐχί, ἀλλὰ τὰ ἰχθυη τῆς γῆς (P) ἦλθατε ἰδεῖν (S)
 Gen 42:12 (a) (S) תִּישָׂרְלֵךְ אֶת־אֶרֶץ (P) יִרְדָּהְךָ תִּרְוַע־בֵּי אֶל
 No, it is the weakness of the land that you have come to see.

32. Because of the contrastive focus on them, the two grammatical subjects, “Not you ... but the Lord,” become the syntactical predicates. Note that the verb, being the given element of the sentence, is not repeated in (19b).

33. Again, the verb is not repeated in the embedded clause in Mark (20b) because it is not the syntactical predicate but the grammatical one only. The main sentence (20a) is itself elliptical since the verb γινέσθω “let it happen” is implied; see Luk 22:42, where this verb form appears in (b) but not in (a). The parallel passages in Matthew and Luke show a similar structure as Mark.

- (22) Deut 4:12 (a) φωνήν ῥημάτων (P) ὑμεῖς ἠκούσατε (S)
 (b) καὶ ὁμοίωμα (P) οὐκ εἶδετε, (S)
 (c) ἀλλ' ἢ φωνήν (P) — (S)

- Deut 4:12 (a) (S) וְהָיָה שְׁמַעְכֶּם (P) וְרָאִיתֶם קוֹל
 (b) (S) וְרָאִיתֶם רֵאשִׁים (P) וְהָיָה שְׁמַעְכֶּם
 (c) (S) — (P) וְהָיָה קוֹל

It is the sound of the words that you have heard (MT: have been hearing); it is not the image that you saw (MT: have been seeing), but the sound only.

- (23) Deut 7:5 (a) ἀλλ' οὕτως (P) ποιήσετε αὐτοῖς· (S)
 (b) τοὺς βωμοὺς αὐτῶν (P) καθελεῖτε (S)
 (c) καὶ τὰς στήλας αὐτῶν (P) συντρίψετε (S)
 (d) καὶ τὰ ἄλση αὐτῶν (P) ἐκκόψετε (S)
 (e) καὶ τὰ γλυπτὰ τῶν θεῶν αὐτῶν (P) κατακαύσετε πυρὶ (S)

- Deut 7:5 (a) (S) וְעָשׂוּ לָהֶם (P) כִּי־אֲשֵׁרִים
 (b) (S) וְהָרָצוּ (P) מִזְבְּחֵיהֶם
 (c) (S) וְהִשְׁבִּירוּ (P) וּמַצֵּבֵיהֶם
 (d) (S) וְהִשְׂרִפוּ (P) וְהָאֲשֵׁרִים
 (e) (S) וְהִשְׂרִפוּ (P) וְהָאֲשֵׁרִים בְּאֵשׁ

On the contrary, this is how will you do to them: their altars will you destroy; their pillars will you break in pieces; their Asherim will you hew down; and their graven images will you burn with fire.³⁴

- (24) Deut 10:12 (a) Καὶ νῦν, Ἰσραηλ,
 (b) τί (P) κύριος ὁ θεός σου αἰτεῖται παρὰ σοῦ (S)
 (c) ἀλλ' ἢ φοβεῖσθαι κύριον τὸν θεόν σου (P) — (S)
 (d) καὶ ἀγαπᾶν αὐτὸν (P) — (S)
 (e) καὶ λατρεύειν κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου (P) — (S)

- Deut 10:12 (a) וְעַתָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל
 (b) (S) מָה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ שֹׂאֵל מֵעַמְּךָ (P)
 (c) (S) — (P) כִּי־אֲמַרְתֶּם לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ
 (d) (S) — (P) וְלֵאמֹר אֵת
 (e) (S) — (P) וְלַעֲבֹד אֱלֹהֵינוּ אֱלֹהֶיךָ

34. Note the equivalence, in the function of the predicate, between an adverb in (23a) and noun phrases in the following sentences (23b-e).

And now, Israel, what does the Lord your God ask of you, but to fear the Lord your God (...), to love him, to serve the Lord your God (...)?

- (25) Mar 9:37 (a) Ὅς ἂν ἔν τῶν τοιούτων παιδίων δέξηται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου,
 (b) ἐμέ (P) δέχεται (S)
 (c) καὶ ὅς ἂν ἐμέ δέχηται,
 (d) οὐκ ἐμέ (P) δέχεται (S)
 (e) ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με (P) — (S)

Whoever receives one such child in my name, it is me that he receives; and whoever receives me, it is not me that he receives but him who sent me.

The saying of Mar 9:37 is found in all the evangelists with a similar syntactical structure; see Mat 18:5; Luk 9:48; John 13:20. John 13:20 illustrates an interesting phenomenon of Greek syntax, viz. the interplay between first and last places in the sentence, in the sense that stressed elements are found in both. In fact, the apodosis in (26b) has a predicate–subject pattern while in (26d) the pattern is reversed. The same phenomenon (first, predicate–subject, then subject–predicate) is found in Luk 9:48 while in Mar 9:37 and Mat 18:5 (once only) the predicate is always found in the first place of the sentence.

- (26) Joh 13:20 (a) ὁ λαμβάνων ἂν τινα πέμψω
 (b) ἐμέ (P) λαμβάνει, (S)
 (c) ὁ δὲ ἐμέ λαμβάνων
 (d) λαμβάνει (S) τὸν πέμψαντά με (P)
- (27) Joh 15:20 (a) εἰ ἐμέ (P) ἐδίωξαν, (S)
 (b) καὶ ὑμᾶς (P) διώξουσιν· (S)
 (c) εἰ τὸν λόγον μου (P) ἐτήρησαν, (S)
 (d) καὶ τὸν ὑμέτερον (P) τηρήσουσιν (S)

If me they persecuted, you also will they persecute; if my word they kept, yours also will they keep.

6.3. Grammatical complement or adverb becoming the syntactical predicate

- (28) Num 14:35 (a) ἦ μὴν οὕτως (P) ποιήσω τῇ συναγωγῇ τῇ πονηρᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ ἐπισυνεσταμένη ἐπ' ἐμέ· (S)
 (b) ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ταύτῃ (P) ἐξαναλωθήσονται (S)

(c) καὶ ἐκεῖ (P) ἀποθανοῦνται (S)

Num 14:35 (a) תִּשְׁפָּטָה לְכָל־הָעֵדָה הָרָעָה הַזֹּאת (P) אֶם־לֹא זֹאת
(S) הַנּוֹעֲדִים עָלַי

(b) (S) בְּמִדְבַּר הַזֶּה (P) יִתְמוּ

(c) (S) וְשָׁם (P) יָמָתוּ

Surely thus will I do (MT: this will I do) to all this wicked congregation that have risen up (MT: have gathered together) against me: It is in this wilderness that they shall be consumed, and it is there that they shall die.³⁵

(29) Ex 16:8 (a) οὐ γὰρ καθ' ἡμῶν (P) ὁ γογγυσμὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν, (S)
(b) ἀλλ' ἢ κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ (P) — (S)

Ex 16:8 (a) (S) לֹא־עָלֵינוּ הַלְגִּיתֶם־כֶּם (P)
(b) (S) — (P) כִּי עַל־יְהוָה הִנְחָה

Not against us are your murmurings, but against the Lord.³⁶

(30) Ex 33:16 (a,b) καὶ πῶς (P) γνωστὸν ἔσται ἀληθῶς ὅτι εὗρηκα χάριν
παρὰ σοί, ἐγώ τε καὶ ὁ λαός σου, (S)
(c) ἀλλ' ἢ συμπορευομένου σου μεθ' ἡμῶν; (P) — (S)

Ex 33:16 (a,b) (S) וְיָדַע אִפְּסֹא כִי־מָצָאתִי חֵן בְּעֵינֶיךָ אֲנִי וְעַמְּךָ
(c) (S) — (P) הֲלֹא בְלִבְכֶם עָמְנָה

And how shall it be known that I have found favor in your eyes, I and your people, unless if you go with us? (MT: I and your people? Is it not by your going with us?)

(31) 1Chr 29:1 (a,b) Σαλωμων ὁ υἱὸς μου (...) νέος καὶ ἀπαλός, καὶ τὸ
ἔργον μέγα,
(c) ὅτι οὐκ ἀνθρώπων (P) ἢ οἰκοδομή, (S)
(d) ἀλλ' ἢ κυρίῳ θεῷ (P) — (S)

1Chr 29:1 (a,b) שְׁלֹמֹה בְּנִי נָעַר נְרָךְ וְהַמְלָאָה גְדוּלָה (...)
(c) (S) כִּי לֹא לְאָדָם הַבְּיָרָה (P)
(d) (S) — (P) כִּי לַיהוָה אֱלֹהִים

35. Note in the Hebrew text a functional equivalence between a grammatical object (a demonstrative pronoun) in sentence (28a), a prepositional phrase in (28b), and an adverb in (28c) – all with the function of the syntactical predicate. In Greek the object in (28a) is rendered with a demonstrative adverb. The demonstrative pronoun and adverb have a cataphoric reference while the prepositional phrase in (28b) and the adverb in (28c) are their specifications.

36. Several examples in this section show a strong contrastive focus, like this one here: “Not against us ... but against the Lord.” As already noted, in similar cases the grammatical complements become the predicates.

Solomon, my son (...) is young and tender, and the work is great; for not for a man is the edifice but for the Lord God.³⁷

- (32) 1Mac 3:19 (a) ὅτι οὐκ ἐν πλῆθει δυνάμεως (P) νίκη πολέμου ἐστίν, (S)
 (b) ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (P) ἡ ἰσχὺς (S)

Because it is not in the multitude of an host that the victory of battle stands, but it is from heaven that strength comes.

- (33) 2Mac 5:19 (a) ἀλλ' οὐ διὰ τὸν τόπον (P) τὸ ἔθνος, — (S)
 (b) ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἔθνος (P) τὸν τόπον ὁ κύριος ἐξελέξατο (S)

However, not because of the temple, the people, but because of the people did God choose the temple.³⁸

- (34) Joh 7:17 (a,b) εἰάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν, γνώσεται περὶ τῆς διδαχῆς
 (c) πότερον ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (P) ἐστίν (S)
 (d) ἢ ἐγὼ ἀπ' ἑμαυτοῦ (P) λαλῶ (S)

If someone wills to do his will, he shall know about this teaching whether from God it is or whether of my own I am speaking.

- (35) Acts 23:6 (a) περὶ ἐλπίδος καὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν (P) [ἐγὼ] κρίνομαι (S)
 Acts 24:21 (b) Περὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν (P) ἐγὼ κρίνομαι σήμερον ἐφ' ὑμῶν (S)

(35a) It is with respect to the hope and the resurrection of the dead that I am on trial.

(35b) It is with respect to the resurrection of the dead that I am on trial before you today.

37. (31a,b) are verbless presentative sentences (see § 7.3 below). We also find verbless sentences in (31c) and (31d) of both Greek and Hebrew. A similar contrastive focus “Not for a man ... but for the Lord” is found in 2Chr 19:6: “Consider what are you going to do, ὅτι οὐκ ἀνθρώπων ὑμεῖς κρίνετε, ἀλλ' ἢ τῷ κυρίῳ because it is not for a man that you judge, but for the Lord.” The Hebrew 2Chr 19:6 has a similar structure with a x-yiqtol compound nominal clause: $\text{הַיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ הוּא הַיּוֹדֵעַ בְּלִבְבְּנוֹתָיִם וְלֹא אִישׁ} \text{ } \text{בְּלִבְבְּנוֹתָיִם} \text{ } \text{וְלֹא אִישׁ} \text{ } \text{בְּלִבְבְּנוֹתָיִם} \text{ } \text{וְלֹא אִישׁ}$. Also compare 2Chr 20:15. Thus, contrastive sentences that are different grammatically – verbless in (31), with a finite verb form in 2Chr 19:6 – are equivalent syntactically and functionally.

38. Note one verb for two sentences coming at the end of the second sentence (33b), as in (20ef) above. Without a finite verb (33a) is a complete sentence exactly as (33b), since the complement is the predicate in both. Jos 14:2 shows an interesting correspondence between a verbless clause in Hebrew and a clause with a finite verb in Greek, while in both the initial complement is the predicate: (S) $\text{בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה} \text{ } \text{בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה} \text{ } \text{בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה}$ (P) $\text{בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה} \text{ } \text{בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה} \text{ } \text{בְּיַד מֹשֶׁה}$; $\text{κατὰ κλήρους} \text{ } \text{κατὰ κλήρους} \text{ } \text{κατὰ κλήρους}$ (P) $\text{ἐκκληροδόμησαν} \text{ } \text{ἐκκληροδόμησαν} \text{ } \text{ἐκκληροδόμησαν}$ (S) “It is by lot that their inheritance was determined (TM); It was by lots that they inherited (Lxx).”

6.4. Interplay of first and last place in the sentence

One of the results of the above inquiry on word order in Greek (§ 4) is that both the first and the last places are favorite location for a stressed element. In (26) we saw already a case of an interplay between first and last place in the sentence. The criterion of the last place must be applied with caution, however. As an exercise, in this section I study a few passages from the Gospel of John, the book where we find perhaps the finest literary artistry in the NT.

- (36) Joh 5:45 (a) μὴ δοκεῖτε
(b) ὅτι ἐγὼ (P) κατηγορήσω ὑμῶν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· (S)
(c) ἔστιν ὁ κατηγορῶν ὑμῶν (S) Μωϋσῆς (P)

Do not believe that it is I that will accuse you to the Father; the one who will accuse you is Moses.³⁹

- (37) Joh 12:26 (a) ἐὰν ἐμοί (P) τις διακονῇ, (S)
(b) ἐμοὶ (P) ἀκολουθείτω, (S)
(c) καὶ ὅπου εἰμι (S) ἐγὼ (P)
(d) ἐκεῖ (P) καὶ ὁ διάκονος ὁ ἐμὸς ἔσται (S)

If any one wishes to serve me, he must follow; and where am I, there shall my servant be also.

- (38) Joh 8:18 (a) ἐγὼ (P) εἰμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ (S)
(b) καὶ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμου (S) ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ (P)

It is I that bear witness to myself, and the Father himself who sent me bears witness to me.⁴⁰

- (39) Joh 7:7 (a) οὐ δύναται ὁ κόσμος μισεῖν (S) ὑμᾶς, (P)
(b) ἐμὲ δὲ (P) μισεῖ (S)

The world cannot hate you, but me it hates.

- (40) Joh 8:42 (a) Εἰ ὁ θεὸς πατήρ ὑμῶν ἦν
(b) ἠγαπᾶτε ἄν (S) ἐμέ, (P)
(c) ἐγὼ γὰρ (casus pendens)
(d) ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (P) ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἤκω· (S)

39. The contrastive focus on the grammatical subjects “Not I ... but Moses” suggests that they are the new element, i.e., the predicate. The rest of sentence (36b) is repeated in (36c) as a support for the predicate. A similar case is found in (38).

40. The opposition between the nominal constituents of sentences (38a) and (38b) is underlined by the chiasmic structure of the text and the similitude of the verbal constituents. Sentence (38a) is a cleft construction type (d); see § 2 above.

- (e) οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ (P) ἐλήλυθα, (S)
 (f) ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνός (P) με ἀπέστειλεν (S)

If God were your Father, me you would love, for I, it is from God that I proceeded and came forth; for it is not of my own that I came, but it is he that sent me.⁴¹

7. Non-verbal elements in the first place, not stressed

As in biblical Hebrew, in biblical Greek a non-verbal element found in the first place of a sentence is sometimes not stressed and the sentence not clefted. From the syntactical point of view, these cases fall under one of the following categories: they are either circumstantial clauses (§ 7.1) or antecedent constructions (§ 7.2), or presentative sentences (§ 7.3). Circumstantial and antecedent constructions are both dependent, while presentative sentences are independent from the syntactical point of view.

7.1. Circumstantial clauses with a fronted noun phrase

A quick inquiry among sentences with a fronted personal pronoun ἐγὼ in the Lxx of Genesis–Judges provided a list of cases where the phrase ἐγὼ δέ is used to introduce a circumstantial clause.⁴² These examples are quoted together with the original Hebrew text.⁴³ From the comparison the Lxx idiom appears to be an exact cast of the Hebrew. Not only a personal pronoun, but also any noun phrase has the same function; see (45)–(49) below.

41. The personal pronoun in (40c) is a casus pendens functioning as a protasis. See (83) and (90)–(91) below.

42. See I. Soisalon-Soininen, “Die Wiedergabe des hebräischen, als Subjekt stehenden Personalpronomens im griechischen Pentateuch,” in A. Pietersma - C. Cox, ed., *De Septuaginta*. Studies in Honour of John Williams Wevers in His Sixty-Fifth Birthday, Mississauga, Ontario 1984, 115-128. Precise syntactical analysis is hardly present in this investigation of all the instances of the ἐγὼ constructions in the Pentateuch. Among other things, Soisalon-Soininen compares sentences with a finite form of εἶναι – a verbal sentence according to him – and without such verb form – a nominal sentence.

43. NT examples seem not as clear as those of the Lxx, that can be compared to the Hebrew original. Because of that I do not quote any NT passages in this case. A thorough investigation on this point is needed.

- (41) Gen 18:27 (a) Νῦν ἤρξάμην λαλῆσαι πρὸς τὸν κύριον,
 (b) ἐγὼ δὲ εἶμι γῆ καὶ σποδός
 Gen 18:27 (a) הַגַּהֲבָנָא הוֹאֲלֵתִי לְדַבֵּר אֶל־אֱדֹנָי
 (b) וְאֲנִי עָפָר וְאֵשׁ

Now I have begun (TM: ventured?) to speak to the Lord, although I am earth and ashes.

- (42) Gen 22:5 (a) Καθίσατε αὐτοῦ μετὰ τῆς ὄνου,
 (b) ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ τὸ παιδάριον διελευσόμεθα ἕως ὧδε
 Gen 22:5 (a) שְׁבוּ־לְכֶם פֹּה עִם־הַחֲמֹר
 (b) וְאֲנִי וְהַיָּעַר גֵּלְכָה עַד־כַּּה

Remain here with the ass while I and the boy will proceed over there.

- (43) Jos 17:14 (a) Διὰ τί ἐκληρονόμησας ἡμᾶς κλῆρον ἕνα
 καὶ σχοίνισμα ἕν;
 (b,c) ἐγὼ δὲ λαὸς πολὺς εἶμι, καὶ ὁ θεὸς εὐλόγησέν με
 Jos 17:14 (a) מִדַּוַּע נִתְּתָה לִי נַחֲלָה גּוֹרֵל אֶחָד וְחֶבֶל אֶחָד
 (b,c) וְאֲנִי עַם־רַב עַד אֲשֶׁר־עַד־כַּּה בֵּרַכְנִי יְהוָה

Why did you cause us (MT: me) to inherit one share and one portion although I am a numerous people, since the God (MT: Yahweh) has blessed me (MT adds: that much)?

- (44) Jud 8:5 A (a) Δότε δὴ ἄρτους τῷ λαῷ τῷ μετ' ἐμοῦ,
 (b) ὅτι πεινώσιν,
 (c) ἐγὼ δὲ διώκω ὀπίσω Ζεβεε καὶ Σαλμανα βασιλέων
 Μαδιαμ
 Jud 8:5 (a) הַגִּידִי אֵלַי כִּכְרוֹת לֶחֶם לְעַם אֲשֶׁר בְּרַגְלִי
 (b) כִּי־עֵיפִים הֵם
 (c) וְאֲנִי רֹדֵף אֶחֱרֵי זָבָח וְצַלְמֻנֶעַ מִלְכֵי מִדְיָן

Give, I pray you, bread (MT: loaves of bread) for the people who follow me, for they are faint, while I am pursuing after Zebbee and Salman (MT: Zebah and Zalmunna), kings of Madian.

- (45) Gen 31:5 (a) Ὅρω ἐγὼ τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν
 (b) ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν πρὸς ἐμοῦ ὡς ἐχθὲς καὶ τρίτην
 ἡμέραν·
 (c) ὁ δὲ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἦν μετ' ἐμοῦ
 Gen 31:5 (a) רָאָה אֲנִי אֶת־פְּנֵי אָבִיכֶן
 (b) כִּי־אֵינְנִי אֵלַי כְּתֹבֵל שְׁלֹשׁ
 (c) וְאֱלֹהֵי אָבִי הָיוּ עִמָּדִי

I see the face of your father, that it is not toward me as before⁴⁴ whereas the God of my father was (MT: has been) with me.

- (46) Jud 6:40 (a) καὶ ἐγένετο ξηρασία ἐπὶ τὸν πόκον μόνου,
(b) ἐπὶ δὲ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐγένετο δρόσος⁴⁵

Jud 6:40 (a) וַיִּהְיֶה-רָב אֱלֹהֵי-הַגִּבּוֹר לְבָרָה
(b) וְעַל-כֵּן-לֹא-יָרַח הָאֵל הַזֶּה

It was dry on the fleece only, while on all the ground there was dew.

- (47) Jud 8:11 (a) καὶ ἐπάταξεν τὴν παρεμβολήν,
(b) ἡ δὲ παρεμβολὴ ἦν πεποιθυῖα⁴⁶

Jud 8:11 (a) וַיִּמָּחַק הַמַּחֲמֵה
(b) וְהַמַּחֲמֵה הָיָה כְּטַח

(Gideon) struck the camp (of Madian) while the camp felt secure.

- (48) Gen 4:2 (a) καὶ ἐγένετο Αβελ ποιμὴν προβάτων,
(b) Καὶν δὲ ἦν ἐργαζόμενος τὴν γῆν.
4:3 (c) καὶ ἐγένετο μεθ' ἡμέρας
(d) ἤνεγκεν Καὶν ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τῆς γῆς θυσίαν τῷ κυρίῳ,
4:4 (e) καὶ Αβελ ἤνεγκεν καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπὸ τῶν πρωτοτόκων τῶν προβάτων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν στεάτων αὐτῶν.
(f) καὶ ἐπέιδεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ Αβελ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ,
4:5 (g) ἐπὶ δὲ Καὶν καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς θυσίαις αὐτοῦ οὐ προσέσχευ
4:2 (a) וַיִּהְיֶה-בֶּל רֹעֵה צֹאן
(b) וַיִּקְנֶן הָיָה עֶבֶד אֲדָמָה
4:3 (c) וַיְהִי מִקֵּץ יָמַיִם
(d) וַיָּבֵא קַיִן מִפְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה מִנְחָה לַיהוָה
4:4 (e) וַהֲבִיל הַבְּיָא גַם-הוּא מִבְּכֹרוֹת צֹאנוֹ וּמִחֻלְבֵּהֶן
(f) וַיִּשַׁע יְהוָה אֶל-הַבֶּל וְאֶל-מִנְחָתוֹ

44. For the Semitic construction in (45a-b), with the subject of the subordinate clause anticipated as the object of the main sentence – i.e., instead of: “I see that the face of your father etc.,” see P. Jouon - T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, vol. II, Syntax, Paradigms and Indices, Roma 1991, § 157d.

45. Text B is slightly different in (b): καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐγενήθη δρόσος. This makes, however, no syntactical difference. The decisive factor is that the verb is in the second place in both versions.

46. Text B has in (b): καὶ ἡ παρεμβολὴ ἦν πεποιθυῖα. See previous footnote.

4:5 (g) אֱלֹהִים לִבְרִיתָא אֱבֶרֶת אֱבֶרֶת אֱבֶרֶת אֱבֶרֶת

Abel was a keeper of sheep, while Cain was a tiller of the ground. Moreover, after some time, Cain brought of the fruit of the land as an offering to the Lord, while Abel, for his part, brought of the firstlings of his flock and of their fat products. And the Lord looked with favor at Abel and his gifts (MT: offering), while to Cain and his offering(s) he did not pay attention (MT: at Cain ... did not look with favor).⁴⁷

(49) 1Mac 3:11 (a) καὶ ἔπεσον τραυματίαι πολλοί,

(b) καὶ οἱ ἐπίλοιποι ἔφυγον

3:24 (c) καὶ ἔπεσον ἀπ' αὐτῶν εἰς ἄνδρας ὀκτακοσίους,

(d) οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἔφυγον εἰς γῆν Φυλιστιμ

Many fell down slain, while the rest fled. (...) About eight hundred men out of them fell down, while the rest fled into the land of the Philistines.

7.2. Antecedent constructions

I call 'antecedent constructions' marked structures found at the beginning of a narrative with the function of communicating information previous to the actual start of the story. 'Antecedent information' is called in Italian 'antefatto' (*ante factum*). It is a frequent way of opening a drama or a novel. In Hebrew this antecedent information is conveyed by means of constructions of a subordinate line, having the verb in the second place, *w^eqatal*, or without any finite verb form. The Greek follows the Hebrew closely also in this point. The examples below show the difference between historical narrative, with *καί*-aorist (50a; 51a; 52a; 53a), and antecedent information, with *καί*-*x*-aorist or *x*-*δέ*-aorist, i.e., with a non-verbal 'x' element before the aorist (50b; 51b; 52b; 53b), related to the same event. Syntactically, an antecedent construction depends on the following narrative verb form. The antecedent construction is a kind of circumstance placed at the beginning of a text.

47. Gen 4:2-5 is one of the most appropriate texts to illustrate the function of first place vs. second place verb forms. Together they clearly signal an extended contrast between the two characters of the story, that are mentioned in a chiasmic order: Abel-Cain; Cain-Abel; Abel-Cain. The information conveyed with second position verb forms is given as background to the information with first place verb forms. The chiasmic order is a stylistic consequence of the syntactical function of foreground vs. background.

- (50) Gen 37:28 (a) καὶ κατήγαγον τὸν Ἰωσηφ εἰς Αἴγυπτον
 39:1 (b) Ἰωσηφ δὲ κατήχθη εἰς Αἴγυπτον
 Gen 37:28 (a) וַיִּבְיֹאוּ אֶת־יוֹסֵף מִצְרָיִמָּה
 39:1 (b) וַיֹּסֶף הוֹרֵד מִצְרָיִמָּה
 And they carried Joseph into Egypt. (...) Now *you should remember that* Joseph had been brought down to Egypt.⁴⁸
- (51) 1Sam 19:12 (a) καὶ ἔφυγεν καὶ σώζεται
 19:18 (b) Καὶ Δαυιδ ἔφυγεν καὶ διεσώθη
 1Sam 19:12 (a) וַיִּבְרַח וַיִּמָּלֵט
 19:18 (b) וַיִּדְרֹךְ בְּרַח וַיִּמָּלֵט
 And (David) fled and escaped. (...) Now *remember that* David had fled and escaped.
- (52) 1Sam 25:1 (a) Καὶ ἀπέθανεν Σαμουηλ
 28:3 (b) Καὶ Σαμουηλ ἀπέθανεν
 1Sam 25:1 (a) וַיָּמָוֶת שָׁמוּאֵל
 28:3 (b) וַשְׁמוּאֵל מָוֶת
 Samuel died. (...) Now *remember that* Samuel had died.
- (53) 2Sam 13:34 (a) καὶ ἀπέδρα Ἀβεσσαλωμ
 13:38 (b) Καὶ Ἀβεσσαλωμ ἀπέδρα
 2Sam 13:34 (a) וַיִּבְרַח אַבְשָׁלוֹם
 13:38 (b) וַאֲבָשָׁלוֹם בָּרַח
 But Absalom fled. (...) Now *remember that* Absalom had fled.

Unlike in (50)–(53), antecedent constructions are also used to convey bits of information that are not present earlier in the narrative. See the following examples.

- (54) Job 1:1 (a) ἄνθρωπος τις ἦν ἐν χώρᾳ τῆ Ἀυσίτιδι,
 (b) ὃ ὄνομα Ἰωβ,
 (c) καὶ ἦν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος ἀληθινός, ἄμεμπτος,
 δίκαιος

48. Stylistically, this is a way of resuming (*Wiederaufnahme*) the narrative concerning Joseph after the Judah–Tamar affair (Gen 38). The historical information of Gen 37:28 is resumed in Gen 39:1 as antecedent information to the following story. The same in (51)–(53).

- Job 1:1 (a) אִישׁ הָיָה בְּאֶרֶץ-עוּז
 (b) אִישׁ יָבֵשׁ
 (c) וְהָיָה הָאִישׁ הַהוּא תָם וְיָשָׁר

Now, there was a man in the Land of Ausis (MT: Uz) whose name was Job. This man was sincere (Lxx only), upright and just.

- (55) Jud 11:1 (a) Καὶ Ἰεφθαε ὁ Γαλααδίτης δυνατὸς ἐν ἰσχύϊ·
 (b) καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν υἱὸς γυναικὸς πόρνης

- Jud 11:1 (a) וַיִּפְתָּח הַגִּלְעָדִי הָיָה גִבּוֹר חַיִל
 (b) וְהוּא בֶן-אִשָּׁה זוֹנָה

Now, Jephthah the Gileadite was strong in force (MT: a doughty warrior), but he was the son of a prostitute.

- (56) Gen 21:1 (a) Καὶ κύριος ἐπεσκέψατο τὴν Σαρραν,
 (b) καθὰ εἶπεν

- Gen 21:1 (a) וַיְהִי וַיָּבֹא יְהוָה לְבַרְכֵּךְ אֶת-שָׂרָה
 (b) כַּאֲשֶׁר אָמַר

Now, the Lord visited Sarah as he had promised.

- (57) Gen 24:1 (a) Καὶ Ἀβρααμ ἦν πρεσβύτερος
 (b) προβεβηκῶς ἡμερῶν,
 (c) καὶ κύριος εὐλόγησεν τὸν Ἀβρααμ κατὰ πάντα

- Gen 24:1 (a) וַיְהִי בְּיָמָיו
 (b) אֲבִימָן
 (c) וַיְבָרֶךְ יְהוָה אֶת-אַבְרָהָם בְּכֹל

Now, Abraham was old, well advanced in years, and the Lord blessed Abraham in everything.⁴⁹

- (58) Gen 31:19 (a) Λαβαν δὲ ὤχετο κεῖραι τὰ πρόβατα αὐτοῦ·
 (b) ἔκλεψεν δὲ Ραχηλ τὰ εἶδωλα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς.
 31:25 (c) Ἰακωβ δὲ ἔπηξεν τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ὄρει·
 (d) Λαβαν δὲ ἔστησεν τοὺς ἀδελφούς αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ὄρει
 Γαλααδ.
 31:34 (e) Ραχηλ δὲ ἔλαβεν τὰ εἶδωλα
 Gen 31:19 (a) וַיִּלְכְּדוּ רַחֵל לְגִזְיוֹ אֶת-עֵדֻלָּהּ
 (b) וַתִּגְנֹב רַחֵל אֶת-הַתְּרָפִים אֲשֶׁר לְאָבִיהָ

49. (57b) is a sentence consisting of the predicate alone, having the same subject as the preceding sentence.

- 31:25 (c) וַיֵּשְׁבּוּ בְקֶרֶב אֶת־אֱסֹדֹתָיו בְּהָר
 (d) וַלְבָן תִּקַּע אֶת־אֹהֶיוּ בְהָר הַגִּלְעָד
 31:34 (e) וַרְחַל לְקַחֵהָ אֶת־הַתְּרָפִים

Now, Laban had gone to shear his sheep. Then Rachel stole her father's idols. (...) Now, Jacob had pitched his tent on the mountain, while Laban placed his brothers (MT: and Laban, too, pitched [his tent] together with his brothers) on the mountain of Gilead. (...) Now *remember that* Rachel had stolen the idols.⁵⁰

- (59) 1Mac 6:1 (a) Καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος διεπορεύετο τὰς ἐπάνω
 χώρας
 6:18 (b,c) Καὶ οἱ ἐκ τῆς ἄκρας ἦσαν συγκλείοντες τὸν Ἰσραηλ
 κύκλῳ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ζητοῦντες κακὰ δι' ὄλου καὶ
 στήριγμα τοῖς ἔθνεσιν

Now, king Antiochus was traveling through the upper countries. (...) Now, those of the Acra were shutting up the Israelites all around the sanctuary and seeking (their) evil all the time and the strengthening of the heathen.

Note that Greek (just as Hebrew) does not express anteriority with a special verb form but by simply placing the aorist (the qatal in Hebrew) in the second place of the sentence; see (50b), (51b), (52b), (53b), (58). This fact seems to agree with the classical Greek usage.⁵¹

On the basis of the examples quoted we can draw the following list of antecedent constructions in Greek, with corresponding constructions in Hebrew. As usual, 'x' designates a non-verbal element, qatal the so-called 'perfect' in Hebrew, and w^eqatal the so-called 'inversive perfect'.

50. Clauses (58a,c,e) mark off new episodes of the story by conveying a fresh setting for each of them.

51. As Smyth puts it, "In subordinate clauses the pluperfect is rarely used to mark an action as anterior to an action already past" (*Greek Grammar* § 1954).

GREEK	Examples	HEBREW
καί-x (or x-δέ) –aorist	(50b), (51b), (52b), (53b) (56a), (57c), (58c-e)	waw-x-qatal, or x-qatal
x- (or καί-x) –imperfect of (54a)	(54a), (57a) verb εἰμί ⁵²	x (or waw-x) –qatal of פָּקַד or of a verbal adjective (57a)
x-δέ–imperfect of οἴχομαι	(58a) ⁵³	waw-x-qatal
καί-x–imperfect	(59)	—
καί–imperfect	(54c)	w ^c qatal

Note that the imperfect appears in antecedent constructions both in the second place and in the first place of the sentence (only preceded by καί). The aorist, on the contrary, always appears in the second place. This fact strongly confirms the conclusion reached elsewhere that the imperfect is *per se* a verb form of a secondary line in narrative, while the aorist is used for the main narrative line, or storyline.⁵⁴ Only when found in the second place, becomes the aorist a secondary line verb form. This Greek usage is a cast of the Hebrew. Hebrew wayyiqtol corresponds to the aorist and qatal corresponds to the imperfect or to the aorist in the second place of the sentence.

7.3. Presentative sentences

As I have shown elsewhere, presentative is opposed to predicative as description is opposed to evaluation.⁵⁵ In a predicative sentence the speaker affirms something on a given topic. In a presentative sentence, on the contrary, he describes a person or an event to the listener. No syntactical predication exists in presentative sentences although they consist of grammatical subject and predicate.

52. This verb form is implied in (55a).

53. Imperfect ᾤχετο is used for pluperfect (Smyth, *Greek Grammar* § 1906).

54. A. Niccacci, "Dall' aoristo all' imperfetto o dal primo piano allo sfondo. Un paragone tra sintassi greca e sintassi ebraica," *LA* 42 (1992) 85-108.

55. See my paper, "Simple Nominal Clause (SNC) or Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew Prose," *ZAH* 6 (1993) 216-227.

Givón lists the “existential-presentative constructions” under the general title of “marked-topic constructions”.⁵⁶ He describes them as follows.

Existential-presentative constructions (EPCs), also known as indefinite subject constructions, are typically used to introduce new referents into the discourse. Not only do they introduce new referents, but in particular new *important* referents.⁵⁷

While Givón concentrates on the morphology of the existential constructions (§ 17.3.2.2),⁵⁸ I focus on the presentative sentences because they show a subject–verb pattern in Hebrew, and in Greek, which is the topic of the present paper.

A typology of the presentative sentences comprises the following speech-situations: someone introducing himself to the listener (the so-called “self-presentation formulas”) (60)–(62), or introducing a third party to the listener (63), or describing what he sees or what happens in reality or in a dream (64)–(65), or announcing an event (66)–(67), and (71), or submitting to the listener a consideration, a decision or a promise (72)–(74). Certain examples show a clear difference between historical narrative (68a), (69a) and (70a), on the one hand, and oral report (68b), (69b) and (70b), on the other. In biblical Hebrew the particle וְיָבִיחַ – ἰδοὺ or ἰδέ in Greek – is frequently found in presentative sentences.

- (60) Gen 17:1 (a,b) καὶ ὤφθη κύριος τῷ Ἀβραμ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ
(c) Ἐγὼ εἶμι ὁ θεὸς σου

56. Givón, *Syntax II*, ch. 17. Under the heading “existential-presentative constructions” Givón lists constructions that seem different to me, such as left and right dislocation; see § 8 below.

57. Givón, *Syntax II*, 741.

58. It is quite possible that existential and presentative sentences belong together, but the morpho-syntax of each type is to be carefully examined before any decision can be reached. The large spectrum of languages examined by Givón, as is usual among linguists today, runs the risk of a superficial treatment. See, for instance, the way Givón illustrates biblical Hebrew in pp. 755-756. He takes for granted that “in Early Biblical Hebrew (...) the subject position is flexible (SV/VS).” This is true in the sense that sentences with both verb–subject and subject–verb patterns are found, but it ignores the fact that they are completely different types of sentence. This means that word order is not flexible at all in biblical Hebrew.

Gen 17:1 (a,b) וַיֵּרָא יְהוָה אֶל-אַבְרָם וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו
(c) אֲנִי-אֱלֹהֵי שָׂדֵי

The Lord appeared to Abram, and said to him: I am your God (MT: God Almighty).⁵⁹

- (61) Joh 10:11 (a) Ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός·
(b) ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν
προβάτων

I am the good shepherd. The good shepherd lays down his life for the sheep.

- (62) Acts 22:3 (a) Ἐγὼ εἰμι ἄνηρ Ἰουδαῖος
I am a Jew.

- (63) Gen 24:65 (a) Τίς ἐστὶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος ὁ πορευόμενος ἐν τῷ
πεδίῳ εἰς συνάντησιν ἡμῖν;
(b) Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κύριός μου
Gen 24:65 (a) מִי-הָאִישׁ הַלֹּךְ בַּשָּׂדֶה לִקְרֹאתָנוּ
(b) הוּא אֱדֹנָי

(Rebekah said to the servant) Who is that man that is walking in the field to meet us? (He answered) He is my master.

- (64) Gen 41:17 (a) Ἐν τῷ ὕπνῳ μου ὤμην ἐστάναι παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τοῦ
ποταμοῦ
41:18 (b) καὶ ὥσπερ ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ἀνέβαινον ἑπτὰ βόες
καλαὶ τῷ εἶδει καὶ ἐκλεκταὶ ταῖς σαρκί
(c) καὶ ἐνέμοντο ἐν τῷ ἄχει
41:19 (d) καὶ ἰδοὺ ἑπτὰ βόες ἕτεραι ἀνέβαινον ὀπίσω αὐτῶν
ἐκ τοῦ ποταμοῦ πονηραὶ καὶ αἰσχροὶ τῷ εἶδει καὶ
λεπταὶ ταῖς σαρκί
Gen 41:17 (a) בַּחֲלֹמִי הִנְנִי עֹמֵד עַל-שֵׁפֶת הַיָּאָר
41:18 (b) וַהֲנֵה מִן-הַיָּאָר עֹלֹת שֶׁבַע פָּרוֹת בְּרִיאֹת בְּשָׂר וַיִּפֹּת תֹּאֵר
(c) וַתִּרְעַנְנָה בְּאַחֻוּ
41:19 (d) וַהֲנֵה שֶׁבַע-פָּרוֹת אֲחֵרוֹת עֹלֹת אֲחֵרִיָּהֶן דְּלוֹת וַרְעוֹת תֹּאֵר
מֵאֵד וַרְקוֹת בְּשָׂר

59. The difference between this ἐγὼ εἰμι of “self-presentation” and the ἐγὼ εἰμι of “self-vindication” as, e.g., in (1), ‘It is I, and nobody else, that did so and so’, is unmistakable. The first is presentative, the second is predicative.

In my dream, I thought to be standing (MT: behold I was standing)⁶⁰ on the bank of the river (MT: the Nile); and as it were (MT: and behold) from the river (MT: the Nile) there were coming up seven cows, good-looking and choice-fleshed (MT: fat and sleek) and they fed in the reed grass. And behold seven other cows were coming up after them from the river (Lxx only), poor and very desolate-looking and lean-fleshed.

- (65) Joh 10:12 (a) ὁ μισθωτὸς καὶ οὐκ ὢν ποιμήν,
 (b) οὗ οὐκ ἔστιν τὰ πρόβατα ἴδια,
 (c) θεωρεῖ τὸν λύκον ἐρχόμενον
 (d,e) καὶ ἀφίησιν τὰ πρόβατα καὶ φεύγει,
 (f,g) καὶ ὁ λύκος ἀρπάζει αὐτὰ καὶ σκορπίζει

The hireling, precisely because he is not a shepherd and the sheep are not his own, sees the wolf coming and leaves the sheep and flees; and the wolf snatches and scatters them.

- (66) Num 11:27 (a) Ελδαδ καὶ Μωδαδ προφητεύουσιν ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ
 Num 11:27 (a) הַלֵּלְדָד וּמֹדָד בְּמַחֲנֵהם בְּמַחֲנֵהם
 (A young man reported to Moses) Eldad and Modad (MT: Medad) are prophesying in the camp.

- (67) Gen 27:6 (a) Ἴδὲ ἐγὼ ἤκουσα τοῦ πατρός σου λαλοῦντος πρὸς
 Ησαυ τὸν ἀδελφόν σου λέγοντος

Gen 11:27 (a) הִנֵּה שָׁמַעְתִּי אֶת־אֲבִיךָ מְדַבֵּר אֶל־עֵשָׂו אֶת־הָאָמֵר לְאִשָּׁר

See, I heard your father speak to your brother Esau saying.

- (68) Gen 40:2 (a) καὶ ὠργίσθη Φαραω ἐπὶ τοῖς δυσὶν εὐνούχοις αὐτοῦ
 Gen 41:10 (b) Φαραω ὠργίσθη τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ
 Gen 40:2 (a) וַיִּקְצֹף פַּרְעֹה עַל שְׁנֵי סְרִיטָיו
 Gen 41:10 (b) פַּרְעֹה קָצָף עַל־עֲבָדָיו

(Narrative) Pharaoh was angry with his two officers. (The chief butler reports) Pharaoh was angry with his servants.⁶¹

60. The Lxx sometimes disregards the participle ‘(and) behold’ of the original.

61. (68)–(70) are examples of “qatal for reporting”; see my *Syntax* §§ 22–23. The opposition between wayyiqtol for historical narrative (sentence a) and x–qatal for oral report (sentence b) concerning the same event is striking. In Greek there correspond *kaiv* + aorist, i.e., first place aorist, and *x* + aorist, i.e., second position aorist, respectively. In Hebrew this “qatal for reporting” also appears in the first place of the sentence. In this case, too, the Greek translates with the same word order, employing the aorist (e.g., 2Sam 12:26–27; 1Kgs 16:9–10,19; Num 22:5,10) or the perfect (1Sam 4:10,17; 1Kgs 21:13,14). Note, in (70), the difference between “they came” for historical narrative and “they have come” for oral report. This difference is even more evident in languages, such as French, Spanish and Italian, that have separate sets of tenses for historical narrative proper, that uses the third person, and for oral report in direct speech, that mainly uses the first and second persons.

In my opinion these two slots are the only essential constituents of the sentence at the syntactical level although at the grammatical level complements, both direct and indirect, and adverbs are present. Complements and adverbs are, in fact, optional constituents of the sentence unless they are promoted to the role of syntactical predicate (see §§ 6.2 and 6.3 above).

A third slot can be added to the two essential ones either before or after them, so that the two are not divided. The slot added before the slot of the predicate is that of the *casus pendens*, or protasis (§ 8.1); the slot added to the end is that of the apposition (§ 8.2).

“*Casus pendens*”, a term found in traditional Hebrew grammars, is not used by modern linguists who rather speak of “topicalization” and “left-dislocation”,⁶² more rarely of “extraposition”.⁶³ In Foley - van Valin’s words,

The difference is that in left-dislocations but not in topicalizations there is a pronoun in the clause which refers to clause-initial NP [i.e. noun-phrase]. (p. 300)

Foley - van Valin give the following examples to show the difference:

- (42) a. Teheran, I don’t care for much
 b. Trevor, I haven’t seen today
 c. As for Alan’s car, he tried to drive it today
 d. That paper, it was a total loss
 e. As for the wombat, it eats roots, shoots and leaves

(42) presents examples of both types of construction. (42a,b) are topicalization and (42c,d,e) are left-dislocations. (p. 300)

I do not think that this difference applies to biblical Hebrew and to biblical Greek as far as it follows biblical Hebrew. As I have tried to show

62. W.A. Foley - R.D. van Valin, Jr, “Information Packing in the Clause,” in T. Shopen, ed., *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, vol. 1, Cambridge 1985, 282-364, § 3.1. See, in the same volume, A. Andrews, “The Major Functions in the Noun Phrase,” 62-154, § 2.1 (“External functions”); and also Givón, *Syntax* II, ch. 17 (“Marked-topic constructions”).

63. Huddleston, *Introduction*, § 14.3.

elsewhere,⁶⁴ the fronted element can be a noun phrase, a prepositional phrase or an adverb. In all these cases it functions as the protasis of a double sentence composed of a circumstance, or protasis, followed by the main clause, or apodosis. This is proved by the observation that the slot of the protasis can be filled not only by a conjunction + finite verb, but also by a simple circumstance as described above.

The equivalence between the *casus pendens* and the protasis has been expressly affirmed by Bally for French, and in my opinion it applies to corresponding structures in every language. In Bally's terminology the double sentence is called "phrase segmentée".

Cette dernière [i.e. the subordinate clause, or protasis] peut être explicite: «*Quant il pleut, je reste à la maison*» – «*Si vous désobéissez, vous serez punis*», etc. Ou bien on peut la mettre en lumière par échange fonctionnel: «*Il fait froid, nous ne sortirons pas*» (= «*Puisqu'il fait froid*»); «*Par ce moyen, je réussirai*» (= «*En procédant ainsi, si je procède ainsi*»); «*Lentement, il avançait sur la route*» (= «*En marchant lentement, pendant qu'il marchait lentement*») (...) «*Cet élève, je l'aime bien; cet élève, je lui ai donné un livre; etc.*»; ce cas a été appelé *nominativus pendens* (...) mais (...) il est lui aussi assimilable à une subordonnée (= «*Pour cet élève, quant à cet élève, puisqu'il est question de..., s'il est question de..., etc.*»).⁶⁵

In biblical Hebrew and Greek, then, the phenomenon of a fronted element playing the function of the protasis can hardly be described as left-dislocation.⁶⁶ It could be described as topicalization. However, I still prefer to use the foreign term "casus pendens" in order to avoid any possible confusion, because the syntactical function of the topicalization is

64. My *Syntax*, ch. 8, gives a full description of the different types of the so-called "two-element syntactic construction", a construction that afterwards I have called more simply "double sentence". I have avoided the traditional designation of "waw apodoseos" because the waw is not always present and is not significant for the structure of the sentence; see below in this paragraph. A syntactical evaluation of the different constructions playing the function of the protasis is given in my *Syntax* §§ 106-112.

65. C. Bally, *Linguistique générale et linguistique française*, 2 ed., Berne 1944, 65.

66. According to Zerwick, "Nominativus «pendens», qui appellatur etiam vel «absolutus» vel «relationis» (scil. pro «quod attinet»), est anacoluthon valde frequens in omni sermone vulgari et consistit in eo, quod subiectum logicum (quod non simul sit subiectum grammaticale) emphatice in initio ponitur et quidem in nominativo, quasi adhuc extra constructionem propositionis. In ipsa propositione deinde ille conceptus anticipatus resumitur per pronomen in debito suo casu" (§ 25). Unlike this analysis, which is held by

described differently by modern linguists. The confusion referred to here is actually found in the following addition by Muraoka to the Joüon's grammar in § 156, where the case of "*casus pendens* before a nominal or verbal clause" is illustrated:

In contemporary general linguistics it is customary to discuss these issues in terms of 'topic' and 'comment' (...): the 'topic' would correspond to what is, in traditional Hebrew grammar, called *casus pendens*, and the 'comment' to what follows it. (p. 586, § 156a, note)

I would object to this that 'topic' + 'comment', if they refer to what are traditionally called subject and predicate, constitute one sentence, while *casus pendens* + what follows make up two distinct, although related, sentences (see below).

We can further note that in biblical Hebrew and Greek it makes no difference whether or not the fronted element is resumed in the main clause by a pronoun, or otherwise,⁶⁷ so that a distinction similar to the one illustrated above between topicalization and left-dislocation is not significant from the syntactical point of view.

The fact that the so-called "waw apodoseos" is sometimes missing in biblical Hebrew makes a double sentence with a fronted nominal protasis look like a compound nominal clause type *x-qatal* or *x-yiqtol* (§ 1 above). I cannot discuss this issue here,⁶⁸ yet something needs to be said because this kind of construction is externally identical to the one studied in this paper, consisting of a noun phrase + a verb. In sum, the difference is that the one construction is a double sentence and the fronted nominal element (*casus pendens*) constitutes a clause by itself, while in the other the fronted element is a constituent of the sentence (§§ 6-7 above).

many grammarians, I think, first, that *casus pendens* is not a form of anacoluthon in the sense of grammatical inconsistency; second, there is no question whatsoever of logical or grammatical subject; third, the fronted element carries no emphasis; and fourth, the fronted element by itself constitutes a complete clause with the function of a protasis. Indeed, a function type "as far as x is concerned", correctly seen by Zerwick ("quod attinet," in his terms), is equivalent to the function of the protasis. See the analysis by Bally just quoted.

67. See my discussion in *Syntax* §§ 123-125.

68. See my paper, "The Stele of Mesha and the Bible. Verbal System and Narrativity" (forthcoming in *Orientalia*), § 5.

8.1. Casus pendens + non-verbal predicate + subject

A few sentences with a ‘pendens + non-verbal predicate + subject’ pattern have already been quoted; see (3de), (4de), (6), (25), and (26ab). Other examples are presented here in order to illustrate different configurations of the same pattern. Since this pattern is rather frequent in biblical Greek while it is rare in the classical language, it is likely to be a Semitism.⁶⁹

- (75) Gen 3:12 (a) Ἡ γυνή, ἣν ἔδωκας μετ’ ἐμοῦ, (casus pendens)

(b) αὕτη (P) μοι ἔδωκεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου (S)

Gen 3:12 (a) (casus pendens) יְמַדַּעַתְּ עִתְּךָ עִתְּךָ שָׁרַחַתְּ הַשָּׁרַחַתְּ

(b) (S) יְעַדְּךָ מִן־הַיְּבִרְתְּךָ (P) הִיא

The woman that you put with me, it was she that gave me the fruit of the tree.

- (76) Lev 21:14 (a) χήραν δὲ καὶ ἐκβεβλημένην καὶ βεβηλωμένην καὶ πόρνην, (casus pendens)

(b) ταύτας (P) οὐ λήμψεται, (S)

(c) ἀλλ’ ἢ παρθένον ἐκ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ (P) λήμψεται γυναῖκα (S)

Lev 21:14 (a) (casus pendens) וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם

(b) (S) וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם (P) וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם

(c) (S) וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם (P) וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם

But (Lxx only) a widow, and one divorced, and one who has been defiled, and a harlot, it is these that he shall not take; but it is a virgin of his own people that he shall take to wife.

- (77) Gen 15:4 (a) Οὐ κληρονομήσει σε (S) οὗτος, (P)

(b) ἀλλ’ ὅς ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ σοῦ, (casus pendens)

(c) οὗτος (P) κληρονομήσει σε (S)

Gen 15:4 (a) (P) הַיְּ (S) וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם

(b) (casus pendens) וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם

(c) (S) וְיָתֵם וְיָתֵם (P) וְיָתֵם

69. However, such a view, held, e.g., by Viteau, *Etude* § 54, p. 45, is not supported by modern grammarians such as Blass - Debrunner - Funk § 466 and Zerwick § 25. E.C. Maloney, *Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax*, Chico, California 1981, 86-90, thinks that if the resumptive pronoun is stressed, the construction is normal Greek, otherwise is not.

Not this man shall be your heir; but the one who shall spring from your loins, it is he that shall be your heir.⁷⁰

- (78) 1Mac 2:66 (a) καὶ Ἰουδᾶς Μακκαβαῖος ἰσχυρὸς δυνάμει ἐκ νεότητος αὐτοῦ, (casus pendens)

(b) αὐτὸς (P) ἔσται ὑμῖν ἄρχων στρατιᾶς (S)

As for Judas Maccabeus, mighty and strong from his youth, it is he that shall be your chief of the army.

- (79) Deut 12:14 (a) ἀλλ' ἢ εἰς τὸν τόπον, ὃν ἂν ἐκλέξῃται κύριος ὁ θεός σου αὐτὸν ἐν μιᾷ τῶν φυλῶν σου, (casus pendens)

(b) ἐκεῖ (P) ἀνοίσεις τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματά σου (S)

(c,d) καὶ ἐκεῖ (P) ποιήσεις πάντα, ὅσα ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαί σοι σήμερον (S)

- Deut 12:14 (a) הַיְהוֹדֵהוּ בְּכָל־מְקוֹמֵי־בְרִיתֵנוּ כִּי־יִבְחַר־יְהוָה־לְּעַלְתָּהּ בְּאַחַד־הַשְּׁבֵטִים
(casus pendens)

(b) (S) תִּעֲלֶה־עָלֶיךָ (P) שָׁם

(c,d) (S) כָּל־מִצְוֹתַי־אֲשֶׁר־אֶמְצַוְךָ־עָלֶיךָ־הַיּוֹם (P) שָׁם

(Take heed that you do not offer your burnt offerings at every place that you see.) But at the place that the Lord will choose in one of your tribes, it is there that you shall offer your burnt offerings, and it is there that you shall do all that I am commanding you today (Lxx only).

- (80) Gen 50:5 (a) Ἐν τῷ μνημείῳ, ᾧ ὤρυξα ἐμαυτῷ ἐν γῆ Χανααν, (casus pendens)

(b) ἐκεῖ (P) με θάψεις (S)

- Gen 50:5 (a) (casus pendens) בְּקִבְרִי אֲשֶׁר־כָּרַתִּי־לִי בְּאֶרֶץ־כְּנָעַן

(b) (S) תִּקְבְּרֵנִי (P) שָׁמָּה

In the (MT: my) tomb which I dug for myself in the land of Canaan, it is there that you shall bury me.

- (81) Joh 12:48 (a) ὁ λόγος ὃν ἐλάλησα (casus pendens)

(b) ἐκεῖνος (P) κρινεῖ αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (S)

The word that I have spoken, it is it that will judge him on the last day.

- (82) Joh 12:49 (a) ὅτι ἐγὼ (casus pendens)

(b) ἐξ ἐμαυτοῦ (P) οὐκ ἐλάλησα, (S)

(c) ἀλλ' ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ (casus pendens)

70. This is God's reply to the following Abram's complaint: "a son of my house (i.e., a servant) is going to be my heir." The point of the reply, that is the predicate, is therefore the phrase "not this man ... but the one who shall spring from your loins."

(d,e) αὐτός (P) μοι ἐντολήν δέδωκεν τί εἶπω καὶ τί
λαλήσω (S)

Because, as for me,⁷¹ it is not of my own that I have spoken, but the Father who sent me, it is he that has given me commandment what to say and what to speak.

- (83) Joh 14:10 (a) τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λέγω ὑμῖν (casus pendens)
(b) ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ (P) οὐ λαλῶ, (S)
(c) ὁ δὲ πατήρ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων (P) ποιεῖ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ (S)

The words that I am saying to you, it is not of my own that I have spoken, but the Father who dwells in me, it is he that does his works.

- (84) Joh 14:26 (a) ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὃ πέμψει ὁ
πατήρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, (casus pendens)
(b) ἐκεῖνος (P) ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα (S)

But the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, it is he that will teach you all things.

The parallel passage in John 15:26 has a seemingly different structure. Instead of the casus pendens (84a) it has a protasis (85a). It is clear, however, that the protasis fills the same slot and functions exactly as the casus pendens. In my opinion this is an additional proof that the casus pendens is equivalent to a protasis. The noun phrase in (85b) is in apposition to clause (a). Note that even without clause (85a) the sentence would be complete, since it would have the same structure as (84). See also (86).

- (85) Joh 15:26 (a) Ὄταν ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν παρὰ
τοῦ πατρὸς,
(b) τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ὃ παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς
ἐκπορεύεται,
(c) ἐκεῖνος (P) μαρτυρήσει περὶ ἐμοῦ· (S)

When the Paraclete will come, whom I shall send to you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father, it is he that will bear witness to me.

71. The personal pronoun in (82a) is shown to be a casus pendens by the parallelism with clause (82c). Further examples of this kind are (90)–(91). See also (40c) above and discussion in § 8.3 below.

- (86) 2Cor 4:3 (a) εἰ δὲ καὶ ἔστιν κεκαλυμμένον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἡμῶν,
 (b) ἐν τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις (P) ἔστιν κεκαλυμμένον (S)
 Even if our gospel is veiled, it is for those who are destined to perish that it is veiled.⁷²
- (87) Acts 17:23 (a) ὁ οὖν ἀγνοοῦντες εὐσεβεῖτε, (casus pendens)
 (b) τοῦτο (P) ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν (S)
 What therefore you worship without knowing, it is this that I proclaim to you.

In the following example we find a miniature double clause, composed of a casus pendens (protasis) (88a), and the apodosis (88b). This miniature double clause is embedded in a superordinate double sentence composed of protasis (88ab), and apodosis (88cd). Note also that in (88d) the verb is implied because it functions as the subject, the predicate being the contrastive couple ‘not I, but sin’. In (89) the embedded miniature double sentence, composed of clauses (89b) and (89c), functions as the apodosis, while clause (89a) is the protasis.

- (88) Rom 7:20 (a) εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ θέλω [ἐγὼ] (casus pendens)
 (b) τοῦτο (P) ποιῶ, (S)
 (c) οὐκέτι ἐγὼ (P) κατεργάζομαι αὐτὸ (S)
 (d) ἀλλὰ ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἀμαρτία (P) — (S)
 Now if what I do not want, it is this that I do, it is no longer I that do it, but sin which dwells within me.
- (89) Joh 14:12 (a) ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ (casus pendens)
 (b) τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ (casus pendens)
 (c) κάκεινος (P) ποιήσει (S)
 (d) καὶ μείζονα τούτων (P) ποιήσει (S)
 As for the one who believes in me, the works that I do, he will do (them) too, and even greater ones than these will he do.

Finally some cases are presented where the initial noun phrase is not resumed in any way in the following main sentence and still it is most likely a casus pendens. See (40c), (82a) and discussion in § 8.3 below.

72. See Polotsky’s analysis of this passage quoted in § 3 above.

- (90) Joh 17:9 (a) ἐγὼ (casus pendens)
 (b) περὶ αὐτῶν (P) ἐρωτῶ, (S)
 (c) οὐ περὶ τοῦ κόσμου (P) ἐρωτῶ (S)
 (d) ἀλλὰ περὶ ὧν δέδωκάς μοι (P) — (S)

As for me, it is for them that I pray; it is not for the world that I pray, but for those whom you gave me.

- (91) Acts 21:13 (a) ἐγὼ γὰρ (casus pendens)
 (b) οὐ μόνον δεθῆναι (P) — (S)
 (c) ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποθανεῖν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ (P) ἐτοίμως ἔχω
 ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (S)

Because as for me, it is not only to be imprisoned, but also to die at Jerusalem that I am ready for the name of the Lord Jesus.

- (92) 1Mac 2:54 (a) Φινεες ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν (casus pendens)
 (b) ἐν τῷ ζηλωσαὶ ζῆλον (P) ἔλαβεν διαθήκην ἱερωσύνης
 αἰωνίας. (S)
 2:55 (c) Ἰησοῦς (casus pendens)
 (d) ἐν τῷ πληρῶσαι λόγου (P) ἐγένετο κριτῆς ἐν
 Ἰσραηλ. (S)
 2:56 (e) Χαλεβ (casus pendens)
 (f) ἐν τῷ μαρτύρασθαι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ (P) ἔλαβεν γῆς
 κληρονομίαν. (S)
 2:57 (g) Δαυιδ (casus pendens)
 (h) ἐν τῷ ἐλέει αὐτοῦ (P) ἐκληρονόμησεν θρόνον
 βασιλείας εἰς αἰῶνας. (S)
 2:58 (i) Ηλιας (casus pendens)
 (j) ἐν τῷ ζηλωσαὶ ζῆλον νόμου (P) ἀνελήμφθη εἰς τὸν
 οὐρανόν. (S)
 2:59 (k) Ἀνανίας, Ἀζαρίας, Μισαηλ (casus pendens)
 (l) πιστεύσαντες (P) ἐσώθησαν ἐκ φλογός. (S)
 2:60 (m) Δανιηλ (casus pendens)
 (n) ἐν τῇ ἀπλότητι αὐτοῦ (P) ἐρρύσθη ἐκ στόματος
 λεόντων (S)

Phinees our father, it was by being very zealous that he received the covenant of an everlasting priesthood. Jesus, it was by fulfilling the word that he became a judge in Israel. Caleb, it was by bearing witness in the congregation that he received the inheritance of the land. David, it was by his mercy that he inherited the throne of kingship forever. Elias, it was by being very zealous for the law that he was taken up into heaven. Ananias,

Azarias, and Misael, it was by believing that they were saved from the flame. Daniel, it was by his innocence that he was delivered from the mouth of lions.

8.2. Non-verbal predicate + subject + apposition

The term apposition is used here in a traditional way. As Huddleston puts it,

Apposition is used for a variety of constructions where one form (an NP in the central cases) is ‘placed alongside’ another, to which it is in some sense equivalent. Such equivalence puts apposition at the margin of the dependency, subordination relation – and in some cases, perhaps, beyond it.⁷³

A sentence pattern ‘predicate + subject + apposition’ is found in the compound nominal clause, or cleft sentence, type (b); see §§ 1-2 above. The syntactical settings more suitable for this pattern to appear in are as follows: sentence with a demonstrative pronoun with a cataphoric reference (93-94), and with an interrogative pronoun (95-103).

- (93) Gen 9:12 (a) Τοῦτο (P) τὸ σημεῖον τῆς διαθήκης, (S)
 (b) ὃ ἐγὼ δίδωμι ἀνὰ μέσον ἐμοῦ καὶ ὑμῶν (apposition)
 Gen 9:12 (a) (S) אִתְּהֶבְרִית (P) אֵת
 (b) (apposition) אֲשֶׁר־אֲנִי נֹתֵן בֵּינִי וּבֵינְכֶם

This is the sign of the covenant that I am establishing between me and you.

- (94) Gen 11:9 (a) διὰ τοῦτο (P) ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς Σύγχυσις, (S)
 (b) ὅτι ἐκεῖ (P) συνέχεεν κύριος τὰ χεῖλη πάσης τῆς γῆς, (S) (apposition)⁷⁴
 (c) καὶ ἐκέλευεν (P) διέσπειρεν αὐτοὺς κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ πρόσωπον πάσης τῆς γῆς (S)
 Gen 11:9 (a) (S) עַל־כֵּן אֲשֶׁר שָׁמָּה בָּבֶל
 (b) (apposition) (S) בְּלִל יְהוָה שִׁפְתַי כָּל־הָאָרֶץ (P) בִּי־שָׁם
 (c) (S) וּמָשָׁם הֵפִיצָם יְהוָה עַל־פְּנֵי כָל־הָאָרֶץ (P)

This is why its name was called Confusion (MT: Babel), viz. because it was there that the Lord confused the language(s) of all the earth; and it is

73. Huddleston, *Introduction*, 262.

74. This apposition is composed of predicate (P) and subject (S).

from there that the Lord God (MT: Yahweh) scattered them over the whole face of the earth (MT: the face of all the earth).

- (95) Gen 12:18 (a) Τί (P) τοῦτο ἐποίησάς μοι, (S)
 (b,c) ὅτι οὐκ ἀπήγγειλάς μοι ὅτι γυνή σου ἐστίν
 (apposition)

Gen 12:18 (a) (S) מִהֵנָּה עָשִׂיתָ לִּי (P) מֵהֵנָּה
 (b,c) (S) לְמַה לֹּא־הַגַּדְתָּ לִּי כִּי אִשְׁתְּךָ הִיא (P) לְמַה

Why have you done this to me, viz. that you did not tell me that she is your wife? (MT: What is this-you-have-done to me? Why did you not tell me that she is your wife?)⁷⁵

- (96) Gen 27:20 (a) Τί (P) τοῦτο, (S)
 (b) ὃ ταχὺ εὗρες, ὃ τέκνον; (apposition)

Gen 27:20 (a) (S) מָה הִנֵּה (P) מָה
 (b) (apposition) מְהֵרָה לָמַצְתָּ בְּנִי

What is this, that you have found quickly, o son? (MT: What is this, viz. you have found quickly, my son?)

- (97) Ex 52 (a) Τίς (P) ἐστίν (S)
 (b) οὗ εἰσακούσομαι τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ; (apposition)

Ex 5:2 (a) (S) מִי הִוא (P) מִי
 (b) (apposition) אֲשֶׁר אֶשְׁמַע בְּקוֹלוֹ

Who is he (MT: Yahweh), that I should heed his voice?

- (98) Ex 18:14 (a) Τί (P) τοῦτο, (S)
 (b) ὃ σὺ ποιεῖς τῷ λαῷ; (apposition)

Ex 18:14 (a) (S) מֵהֵנָּה הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה (P) מֵהֵנָּה
 (b) (apposition) אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה עוֹשֶׂה לְעַם

What is this, viz. what you are doing for the people?

- (99) Ex 17:3 (a) (S) ἵνα τί (P) τοῦτο
 (b) ἀνεβίβασας ἡμᾶς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου; (apposition)

Ex 17:3 (a) (S) לְמַה הִנֵּה (P) לְמַה
 (b) (apposition) הֲעָלִיתָנוּ מִמִּצְרָיִם

Why did you bring us up from Egypt? (Literally: Why is this, viz. you brought us up from Egypt?)

- (100) Deut 4:7 (a) ὅτι πόλον (P) ἔθνος μέγα, (S)
 (b) ὃ ἐστίν αὐτῷ θεὸς ἐγγίζων αὐτοῖς; (apposition)

75. Note a difference in the structure of the Greek and of the Hebrew. In the Greek, clause (95b) is introduced by ὅτι, which is an explicative apposition to the initial interrogative pronoun, while in the Hebrew (95b) we find a second, coordinated interrogative clause.

- Deut 4:7 (a) (S) גֹּי גָדוֹל (P) כִּי מִי־
 (b) (apposition) אֱלֹהִים קְרִיבִים אֵלָיו
- For who is a great nation, that has gods near to them?
- (101) 2Sam 7:18 (a,b) Τίς (P) εἶμι ἐγώ, κύριέ μου κύριε, (S)
 (c) καὶ τίς (P) ὁ οἶκός μου, (S)
 (d) ὅτι ἠγάπηκάς με ἕως τούτων; (apposition)
- 2Sam 7:18 (a,b) (S) מִי אֲנִי אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה (P) מִי
 (c) (S) וְמִי בֵּיתִי (P) כִּי
 (d) (apposition) כִּי הֵבִיאֲתָנִי עַד־הַלָּאָה
- Who am I, o my Lord Lord (MT: my Lord Yahweh), and what is my house, that you have loved (MT: brought) me thus far?
- (102) 2Chr 2:5 (a) καὶ τίς (P) ἐγὼ (S)
 (b) οἰκοδομῶν αὐτῷ οἶκον; (apposition)⁷⁶
- 2Chr 2:5 (a) (S) וְמִי אֲנִי (P)
 (b) (apposition) אֲשֶׁר אֶבְנֶה־לּוֹ בַּיִת
- And who am I, that I should build a house for him?
- (103) 1Sam 26:14 (a) Τίς (P) εἶ σὺ (S)
 (b) ὁ καλῶν με; (apposition)
- 1Sam 26:14 (a) (S) מִי אֲתָהּ (P)
 (b) (apposition) קָרָאתָ אֵלַי־הַמֶּלֶךְ
- Who are you who are calling me (MT: Who are you, viz. you have called the king)?
- (104) 2Chr 22:9 (a) Υἱὸς Ἰωσαφατ ἐστίν, (P) — (S)
 (b) ὃς ἐζήτησεν τὸν κύριον ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ
 (apposition)
- 2Chr 22:9 (a) (S) בְּנֵי־יְהוֹשָׁפָט (P) הוּא
 (b) (apposition) אֲשֶׁר־דָּרַשׁ אֶת־יְהוָה בְּכָל־לִבּוֹ
- A son of Jehoshaphat is he (Lxx: the pronoun is implied) – (Jehoshaphat) who sought the Lord with all his heart.

In several cases we witness a change in the structure of the sentence since the Greek translates the Hebrew personal pronoun הוּא with the verb ἐστίν. As a result the Hebrew shows a pattern ‘predicate + subject הוּא + a אֲשֶׁר clause in apposition’ (105ab), while the Greek a pattern ‘predicative

76. Note a circumstantial participle in (102b) functionally equivalent to a ὅτι clause in (101d).

complement + copula + relative clause functioning as the subject' (105a).⁷⁷ The predicative complement and the copula are placed in the same slot (105a) because they together make up the predicate.⁷⁸ Vice versa, in (106) the Greek adds a slot for the apposition (106b) that is missing in the Hebrew.

(105) Ex 34:10 (a) ὅτι θαυμαστά ἐστίν (P) ἃ ἐγὼ ποιήσω σοι (S)

Ex 34:10 (a) (S) אִי־הוּא (P) אֲנִי־עֹשֶׂה

(b) (apposition) אֲנִי־עֹשֶׂה עֲמָךְ

For terrible are the things that I will do to you (MT: For terrible is this, viz. what I am doing to you).

(106) Ex 4:2 (a) τί (P) τοῦτό ἐστίν (S)

(b) τὸ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ σου; (apposition)

Ex 4:2 (a) (S) הַזֶּה - (P) -הוּא

What is in your hand? (LXX, literally: What is this, viz. what is in your hand?)⁷⁹

It also happens that the Greek disregards the Hebrew personal pronoun. In this case, the Greek has a cleft sentence type 'predicate + subject' instead of the tripartite pattern with the apposition in the third place. See the following example.

(107) Gen 27:33 (a) τίς οὖν (P) ὁ θηρεύσας μοι θήραν (S)

Gen 27:33 (a) (S) הוּא־הוּא (P) מִי־אֶחָד

(b) (apposition) הַזֶּה־הוּא

Who then hunted game for me? (MT: Who was it then, viz. the one who hunted game?)

77. In my opinion the copula does not exist in biblical Hebrew since neither verb הָיָה behaves as such, nor does the personal pronoun הוּא play that role. See my papers, "Sullo stato sintattico del verbo *hāyā*," *LA* 40 (1990) 9-23, and "Simple Nominal Clause (SNC)."

78. This fact does not contradict what is said in § 3 above, that in the cleft, marked sentence the copula occupies the slot of the syntactical subject. In fact (105) is a plain, unmarked sentence and the copula is part of the syntactical predicate.

79. The interrogative and the demonstrative pronouns are written as one word, הַזֶּה, but the second pronoun is to be placed in the slot of the subject together with הַזֶּה. Note that the reply to the question, "What is in your hand?," consists of a single word, i.e., the predicate: "A rod" (Ex 4:2); that is, "It is a rod (predicate) that is in my hand (subject)."

(108a) is a presentative sentence with word order grammatical subject + predicate (§ 7.3), and no stress falls on the initial nominal phrase. In (108c-e), however, a change occurs: the grammatical subject of (108a) becomes the syntactical predicate, and the stress falls on it. In fact, the point of those sentences is the identity of the betrayer. The parallel passage in Matthew, after a presentative sentence (109a), has a construction with the casus pendens (109c) instead of the apposition. We see, then, an interplay between the two syntactical structures with casus pendens and with apposition in passages of parallel tradition.

- (108) Mar 14:18 (a) εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν (S) παραδώσει με (P)
 (b) ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ (apposition)
 14:19 (c) Μήτι ἐγώ (P) — (S)
 14:29 (d) Εἷς τῶν δώδεκα, (P) — (S)
 (e) ὁ ἐμβαπτόμενος μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὸ τρύβλιον (apposition)

One of you will betray me, one who is eating with me. (...) Is it I? (...) It is one of the twelve, one who is dipping bread into the dish with me.

- (109) Mat 26:22 (a) εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν (S) παραδώσει με (P)
 (b) Μήτι ἐγώ (P) εἰμι, κύριε; (S)
 26:23 (c) Ὁ ἐμβάψας μετ' ἐμοῦ τὴν χεῖρα ἐν τῷ τρυβλίῳ,
 (casus pendens)
 (d) οὗτός (P) με παραδώσει (S)

One of you will betray me. (...) Is it I, o Lord? (...) The one who has dipped his hand in the dish with me, it is he that will betray me.

Finally, (110) shows both the casus pendens (a) before the 'predicate + subject', and the apposition (d) afterwards.

- (110) Joh 18:37 (a) ἐγώ (casus pendens)
 (b) εἰς τοῦτο (P) γεγέννημαι (S)
 (c) καὶ εἰς τοῦτο (P) ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον, (S)
 (d) ἵνα μαρτυρήσω τῇ ἀληθείᾳ (apposition)

As for me, it is for this that I was born, and it is for this that I have come into the world, viz. to bear witness to the truth.

8.3. Discussion on the additional slot

In the forenamed examples we saw how an additional slot can be added to the two main slots of the sentence, that of the predicate and that of the

subject, either before or after them. It is not easy to indicate clear-cut criteria to identify the additional slot. A general criterion is that the two main slots are already taken and the sentence is complete without the additional slot from a syntactical point of view, although, of course, it is incomplete from a semantic point of view.

A practical criterion to identify the *casus pendens* is as follows. When a stressed non-verbal element is found in the second place of a sentence, the additional non-verbal element coming before it is a *casus pendens*. In most cases the stressed element is a personal or a demonstrative pronoun. The basic pattern is as follows: (unstressed) non-verbal phrase (= *casus pendens*) + (stressed) non-verbal element (= syntactical predicate) + verb and eventually different grammatical complements (= syntactical subject).

A practical criterion to identify the apposition is that after the subject phrase something is found that is not a complement of the predicative nexus but is rather equivalent to, or an explanation of, one of the main constituents, i.e., the predicate or the subject. Such is, among others, the cataphoric demonstrative pronoun, e.g., διὰ τοῦτο → ὅτι “this is why → because” in (94), or the interrogative pronoun, e.g., τί → ὅτι “why → that” in (95), and τίς → ὅτι “who/ what → that” in (101).

From the syntactical point of view, it makes no difference whether or not the fronted element (*casus pendens*) is resumed explicitly in the main sentence (apodosis); see (83). Again, no difference exists from the syntactical point of view whether or not the fronted element is grammatically marked. Grammatically marked means that the fronted element takes on the grammatical status of the resumptive element, i.e., it is governed by the preposition (Hebrew) and/ or is in the case it would be in if it would appear in the main sentence (Greek). In (76), for instance, the fronted element is marked in Greek (it is in the accusative) but not in Hebrew. In the examples quoted in § 8.1, however, markedness prevails.

9. Conclusion

I have investigated biblical Greek with the same criteria used for the syntax of the Hebrew verb. Greek examples have been compared to and evaluated against the Hebrew original.

Different marked structures have been analysed having a non-verbal element in the first place and the verb in the second in both biblical Greek and Hebrew. In several cases the initial non-verbal element is not

the subject, direct object or complement (according to its grammatical nature) but is promoted to the role of the predicate because it contains the new information of the sentence and is stressed. The verb, on the contrary, is demoted to the role of the subject because it represents the given information, or the already known. This kind of sentence corresponds to what is called the cleft sentence in English and the “phrase coupée” in French.

Examples have been quoted to show the main forms of the cleft sentence in biblical Greek and the syntactical settings where it is found. Favorite settings of the cleft sentence are those with a personal, demonstrative or interrogative pronoun in the first place. The function of the cleft sentence is to inform on details of an event, i.e., *who*, *what*, *where* everything happened – not on the event itself in general terms.

In all the forms of the cleft sentence the stressed element, i.e., the syntactical predicate, takes the first place. First place and predicate, that is, position and function coincide in biblical Hebrew and Greek. This is a characteristic of biblical Hebrew, and possibly of the Semitic languages in general.⁸⁰

In three syntactical functions the initial non-verbal element is not stressed and is not the syntactical predicate: the circumstantial clause, the antecedent construction and the presentative sentence. In the first and in the second the sentence is dependent; in the third there is no syntactical predication. Beyond the difference in the initial non-verbal element that is, respectively, stressed and not stressed, a common characteristic of the four sentences – clefted, circumstantial, antecedent and presentative – is that the verb is demoted by the simple fact of being placed in the second position. In the cleft sentence the verb becomes the syntactical subject; in the circumstantial clause and in the antecedent construction the whole sentence is syntactically dependent on another verb-initial sentence; in the presentative sentence someone’s identity, a state of affairs, or a proposal is communicated to the listener with no syntactical predication – in other words, no distinction is made between

80. See A. Gianto, *Word Order Variation in the Akkadian of Byblos*, Roma 1990. On p. 5, note 8, Gianto lists a number of studies on word order in different Semitic languages, namely, Hebrew, Aramaic, Ugaritic, Arabic, comparative Semitic, classical Ethiopic, Akkadian, and Northwest Semitic. The Mesha inscription shows the same syntax of the verb as biblical Hebrew; see my paper, “The Stele of Mesha and the Bible.” Hebrew extrabiblical inscriptions also follow the same pattern, as I hope to show in a near future.

the syntactical predicate and subject, but grammatical subject and predicate are conveyed as one item in the news.

The clefted, the circumstantial, the antecedent and the presentative structures are basically one single type of marked sentence in biblical Hebrew. The unmarked structure shows the reverse order: the verb in the first place and different non-verbal elements afterwards. This unmarked structure is the normal, independent sentence in biblical Hebrew. What has been said of biblical Hebrew is valid for biblical Greek.

Admittedly, I have investigated a limited point of syntax, that is word order concerning the main constituents of the sentence, the syntactical predicate and subject. Further research is needed to be more confident in our conclusions.⁸¹ What I have investigated is, however, a very sensitive point, since word order brings us deep into the nature of a language.⁸² Precisely in this point biblical Greek follows biblical Hebrew very closely. We gain the impression that biblical Greek is a translation language as far as the

81. Among recent studies on word order the following is worth mentioning: G. Marquis, "Word Order as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the LXX and the Evaluation of Word-Order Variants as Exemplified in LXX-Ezekiel," *Textus* 13 (1986) 59-84. Marquis studies variants in word order in the Lxx with respect to the Hebrew. He also studies the order of verb, subject and object in the sentence. Among the examples he quotes outside Ezekiel, those from 1Samuel and 2Kings are of importance to our inquiry. Since he has done a complete comparison of these prose books (p. 64), it is highly significant that only two cases of deviations have been found (p. 76): in 2Kgs 3:24 and 15:19 a καί-x (subject)-verb construction is used to translate a wayyiqtol-x (subject) in the original. Other deviations not affecting the place of the verb in the sentence are insignificant for our study. The translation καί-imperfect-x (subject) for waw-x-qatal in 1Sam 3:19 (p. 71) is not at all disturbing to me since I think that the imperfect is a second level verb form and as such it functionally corresponds to qatal in the second place in Hebrew narrative. See on this point my paper "Dall'aoristo all'imperfetto."

82. C. Rabin, "The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint," *Textus* 6 (1968) 1-26 gives instructive insights into the problem of "translation language" and "acceptability" from a socio and psycho-linguistic perspective. Rabin stresses the novelty of the Greek translation of the Pentateuch, that became afterwards a model language for the translation of other OT books and also for the NT Greek. I am not sure that his "dragoman theory" – i.e. that the Pentateuch translators followed the model of contemporary interpreters – really explains the technique of translating the original almost word for word. However, also taking into consideration the awe inspired by a sacred text, like the Pentateuch, it helps unravel the situation. More recent studies on sociolinguistics and multilingualism in 1 century Palestine are surveyed in G.H.R. Horsley, "The Fiction of 'Jewish Greek'," in Idem, ed., *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vol. 5, Murrickville 1989, 5-40, esp. 5-26.

syntax of the verb is concerned.⁸³ Morphology and vocabulary may be shown to be Koine Greek.⁸⁴ Syntax is, however, basically Hebrew. As Wevers writes,

It is precisely at the syntactic level that Hebrew syntax has exerted a major influence on the syntax of Exod[us] as the Notes abundantly show. Its syntax is far more Hebraic than ordinary Greek composition would be, and the stringing along of clauses in paratactic fashion also characterizes many structures in Exod[us].⁸⁵

Our conclusion needs to be checked against the syntax of classical Greek investigated within a textlinguistic approach. A thorough investigation of this kind is still missing and the indications of different grammars are insufficient, although some attempts in the right direction have been made. The essential problem is, of course, to what extent is what we have observed a translation phenomenon or, on the contrary, represents a

83. On the translation technique of the Lxx the following studies can be consulted: E. Tov, "The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the LXX in the Past and Present," in C.E. Cox, ed., *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986*, Atlanta, Georgia 1987, 337-359 (with a bibliographical list arranged according to different topics); I. Soisalon-Soininen, "Methodologische Fragen der Erforschung der Septuaginta-Syntax," *ibid.*, 425-444. See also Marquis, "Word Order," quoted above.

84. See, e.g., B.G. Mandilaras, *The Verb in the Greek Non-Literary Papyri*, Athens 1973. A debate is still going on on whether or not the language of the Lxx is a special dialect of Koine called "Jewish Greek". Consult a full discussion of this issue by Horsley, "The Fiction of 'Jewish Greek'," and a synthesis of the debate in S.E. Porter, "Introduction: The Greek of the New Testament as a Disputed Area of Research," in Idem, ed., *The Language of the New Testament. Classic Essays*, Sheffield 1991, 11-38.

85. J.W. Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*, Atlanta, Georgia 1990, pp. xiii-xiv. The connection of the Septuagint Greek to the Koine has been played down and, at the same time, its closeness to the Hebrew has been stressed by Lust in his introduction to *A Greek - English Lexicon of the Septuagint*, Part I, A - I, ed. J. Lust - E. Eynikel - K. Hauspie, Stuttgart 1992. He writes: "Although it may be based on it, Septuagint Greek cannot simply be characterized as Koine Greek. It is first of all translation Greek. This is most obvious on the level of syntax and style. The order of the words in the translation most often closely sticks to that of the Hebrew original. In fact, in many passages, the Hebrew and the Greek can be put in parallel columns, word by word. The result is that the syntax of the Septuagint is Hebrew rather than Greek. No classical author and hardly any author using Koine Greek would have written sentences the way they are composed in the first Bible translation. They did not try to create an artistic Greek literary composition, but chose to stay as closely as possible with the Semitic original. This led to what is usually called 'Hebraisms' or 'semitisms' and which should probably better be called 'translationisms'" (pp. VIII-IX).

capability of the Greek language, taken into consideration its different phases of development.

Opinions on this point diverge sharply. They range from affirming a strong Semitic influence on the Greek of the LXX and of the NT, to negating such an influence at all and trying to explain out the so-called Semitisms – either lexical, phraseological, grammatical or syntactical – as normal phenomena of Koine Greek. While until recently word order in the LXX and the NT was commonly thought to be Semitic because of its favorite sequence verb–subject, some recent studies tend to demonstrate that everything can be explained in the line of development of the Greek language from the classical to hellenistic age.⁸⁶

A rather impressive attempt in this direction is found in a study on the syntax and style of the Gospel of Mark by Reiser.⁸⁷ The author is rather cautious in his use of statistics, aware as he is of their limitations. In fact, he adopts differentiated parameters according to various syntactical settings, a choice that makes his findings more reliable. His main conclusion is that word order in the Gospel of Mark, as far as subject and predicate are concerned, accords with the hellenistic usage and is in no way influenced by Semitic syntax. Reiser notes as follows:

Die volkstümliche und nicht klassizistische Erzählliteratur der Koine zeigt in den Regeln für die Wortstellung von Subjekt und Prädikat keine wesentlichen Unterschiede und Wandlungen gegenüber der klassischen Literatur. Einzig die Häufigkeit der Sätze mit Anfangsstellung des Verbs hat deutlich zugenommen, was sich aber leicht als Fortführung bereits angelegter Tendenzen und durch den allgemein einfacheren Stil und Satzbau erklären läßt. (...)

In diese Verhältnisse fügt sich das Markusevangelium vollkommen ein und es bestätigt sich bezüglich der Hauptsätze, was Frisk bereits für die Nebensätze festgestellt hat: Sie bieten hinsichtlich der Wortstellung nichts Auffälliges, was

86. See the very instructive introduction by G. Friedrich to the index volume of the *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, X/1, Stuttgart etc. 1978, esp. §§ 4 and 7 (I thank Prof. Marco Adinolfi for calling my attention to it). Friedrich refers to L. Rydbeck, *Fachprosa, vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament*, Uppsala 1967, who strongly opposes the view that the language of the NT is popular and of a poor quality. In his view it can be compared to the language of the scientific texts of the time, which did not aim at any special literary artistry in contrast with historical and philosophical texts. This point is worth of further study.

87. M. Reiser, *Syntax und Stil des Markusevangeliums im Licht der hellenistischen Volksliteratur*, Tübingen 1984.

durch einen irgendwie gearteten Einfluß einer semitischen Sprache auf Syntax und Stil des Evangelisten erklärt werden müßte.⁸⁸

Without going into the question of word order in Greek, I present some comments on Reiser's methodology. He first studies classical, then hellenistic Greek and Mark on a statistical basis after having excluded from the analysis several types of sentences.⁸⁹ A rather critical shortcoming is, in my opinion, the fact that he does not even attempt to identify the basic syntactic patterns of the sentence. He does try to relate word order to syntax – a thing not commonly done by authors – but he fails to distinguish normal, unmarked patterns from special, marked ones. Statistics do not help in this decision because the criterion is not frequency but function, and function is only understandable on a text-linguistic analysis of texts.

A more specific point is to be made in this respect. Reiser is totally correct in his contention that the main point of interest is the word order of subject and predicate. He also conveniently invokes the concepts of theme and rheme in the analysis. The problem is, however, the precise relationship between grammatical subject and predicate, on the one hand, and theme and rheme, on the other. Reiser rightly states that in independent sentences normally theme coincides with the subject and rheme with the predicate. But he also affirms that the theme normally comes at the beginning of the sentence, and that the verb itself can be used 'thematically' in the first position (p. 62). On the other hand, in an emotional discourse (the so-called "Affekt- oder Ausdrucksstellung", e.g., p. 69), the rheme takes the first position of the sentence.

88. Reiser, *Syntax*, 96. A similar conclusion is reached in the domain of verbal aspect by S.E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood*, New York etc. 1989. After a discussion of different opinions, Porter writes: "The findings of this chapter reveal as well that the verbal network is unaffected in its structure by Semitic influence" (p. 145). See more recently S.E. Porter - D.A. Carson, ed., *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics. Open Questions in Current Research*, Sheffield 1993, with a discussion on verbal aspect, especially between Porter himself and B.M. Fanning.

89. These exclusions might endanger the comprehensiveness of his statistics, however. Among others, he excludes sentences with a personal, demonstrative or indefinite pronoun for the reason that in them the subject almost always comes in the first place (Reiser, *Syntax*, 49). This exclusion, however, precludes him from studying the cleft sentence, a structure that can provide a clue to understanding marked and unmarked structures in Greek.

Three questions can be raised on this respect. Does the initial position belong to the theme or to the rheme, after all? What are the criteria to determine theme and rheme, or: is intuition⁹⁰ a sufficient criterion to determine theme and rheme? Does the non-coincidence of rheme and predicate affect the structure of the sentence in any way? For my part, I cannot give a definite answer to the first question, but I do have an answer for the other two. Intuition – intended as analysis of the context situation – can be too subjective without a basic knowledge of the unmarked and marked structures in Greek. Moreover, the non-coincidence of rheme and grammatical predicate does change the structure of the sentence in the sense that rheme, being the new element, is the syntactical predicate; as a consequence the grammatical predicate becomes the syntactical subject.

These considerations put a question mark on the results of Reiser's research. Note, moreover, that Reiser analyses NT Greek, not the Lxx. Indeed, in the present paper I do not distinguish one from the other because no difference appears in the word order of the marked structures I have studied. However, the possibility remains open that some differences might emerge on other issues.⁹¹

The fact that I studied Lxx Greek in comparison with biblical Hebrew puts my research, as I think, on firm ground. Thus, the result that Lxx Greek follows the rigid word order of biblical Hebrew closely cannot but clash with the common doctrine that a free word order prevails in both classical and hellenistic Greek. The Lxx Greek is definitely a translation language in this respect, and the NT follows its lead.

Finally, let me stress that I have only envisaged two slots in the sentence, that of the syntactical predicate and that of the syntactical subject. Indeed, the word order of these *syntactical* components alone is significant from the point of view of syntax, that is, it determines the structure of the sentence. The word order of the different *grammatical* components

90. Reiser, *Syntax*, 62.

91. Authors normally distinguish NT Greek from Lxx Greek. A likely case of difference is a larger use of the circumstantial, or conjunctive, participle before the main verb in narrative – a construction not found in biblical Hebrew. A further case of difference can be the possibility in Greek, but most probably not in Hebrew, of putting a stressed element in the last place of the sentence. In fact, in § 4 only examples from the NT, not from the Lxx, have been quoted.

(subject, object, complement, adverb) is important from a pragmatic point of view, i.e., it affects the quality of the information, but it does not alter the basic structure of the sentence. Compare, e.g., (103) to (106) above, where we find, in the slot of the syntactical subject, a copula–grammatical subject vs. grammatical subject–copula word order. Thus, the sentence is no “threeness” but a “twoness”, also in biblical Hebrew and Greek.

Instead of the old ‘threeness’ it is now more customary to postulate a ‘twoness’: every sentence is said to be composed of two parts, Subject and Predicate. In «the sun shines» *the sun* is subject and *shines* predicate. Each of these two parts may be composite: in «The youngest brother of the boy whom we have just seen once told me a funny story about his sister in Ireland» all the words up to *seen* constitute the subject, and the rest the predicate.⁹²

Jespersen goes on to show that a one-member sentence must also be recognized. Although he is firmly opposed to it, I think that ellipsis is a reasonable explanation for the one-member sentence, most clearly in cases where an inflected verb form indicates the subject by itself and where the subject is easily supplied by the context. Many cases of this kind have shown up in the present paper.

It seems, therefore, that some remarks by Porter on the clause structure miss the mark.⁹³ It is quite possible, as he maintains, that the majority of the Greek clauses do not express all the elements verb-object-subject. It is however more than doubtful that this is, in his words, a “major problem” of the syntactical analysis. Moreover, if, as Porter suggests, “the most frequent patterns (in no designated order) are simply predicate and predicate–complement structures,” this comes to no surprise since we all agree with him that “Greek verbs are monolectic; that is, the one form contains information regarding the verbal action (aspect, mood, voice), as well as information about the subject (even though it does not explicitly specify or express that subject)” (p. 293). In other words, since the predicate is the main constituent of the sentence, the subject can easily be implied, especially when it is the given information in the immediate context.

92. Jespersen, *The Philosophy of Grammar*, 306.

93. Porter, *Idioms* § 2.2.

This point is matter of course if one accepts the distinction posited in the present paper between syntactical ad grammatical predicate and subject. According to this distinction, the verb is not necessarily the syntactical predicate and the noun is not necessarily the syntactical subject, but every grammatical element can function as the syntactical predicate and the syntactical subject according to the types of sentence involved.

September 26, 1993

Alviero Niccacci, ofm
Studium Biblicum Franciscanum, Jerusalem