

## THE SO-CALLED NOMINATIVE USES OF $\text{לְ}$ : A SEMANTIC SOLUTION<sup>1</sup>

J.H. KROEZE

### ABSTRACT

The particle  $\text{לְ}/\text{לָ}$  is most often used to mark definite direct objects. It can also be used to mark other verbal extensions, and therefore it has been called an object marker or *nota accusativi*. This, however, does not cover the surprising instances where the particle is used as a marker of the so-called nominative in Biblical Hebrew. This article investigates examples of this strange phenomenon from a semantic point of view. The semantic functions (according to S.C. Dik's Functional Grammar) of the relevant words are analyzed to demonstrate that there is a semantic pattern which could offer a new solution to this problem.

### INTRODUCTION

The particle  $\text{לְ}/\text{לָ}$  is most often used to mark definite direct objects,<sup>2</sup> but it can also be used to mark other verbal extensions, such as complements and adjuncts.<sup>3</sup> It has therefore been called an *object marker* or *nota accusativi*. However, these descriptions do not cover those surprising instances where the particle introduces the so-called *nominative* in Biblical Hebrew. In the existing grammars, this use is explained by one or more of the following arguments:<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank my colleagues, Matthew Anstey and Tamar Zewi, who thoroughly worked through the first draft of this article and made many suggestions which I could use to improve the article and to make it more reader-friendly. I also would like to thank Casper de Groot who commented on the initial idea for the paper and Yolande Steenkamp who spent many hours to update the fonts used for the Biblical Hebrew text.

<sup>2</sup> See Waltke & O'Connor (1990:179-181, §10.3.1).

<sup>3</sup> Complements are obligatory elements in the verb phrase; adjuncts are omissible adverbial modifiers which provide extra information.

<sup>4</sup> See Gesenius (1976:387-388, §117i-m, §121 a, b); Waltke & O'Connor (1990:182-183, §10.3.2); Joüon-Muraoka (2006:416-417, §125j); Muraoka (1985:147-158); Brockelman (1961:124-128, §65-66). Compare Zewi (1997:171-173) for a brief

- A way to give emphasis to a “nominative”
- The complement of elliptic verbal ideas
- The complement of an impersonal passive
- A subject marker, predicate marker or nominative absolute marker
- Attraction to another element in the “accusative”
- Ergativity
- *Anakoluthon* (change from one construction to another)
- A corrupt reading

The purpose of this article is to propose an alternative exploration to the options above from the theoretical perspective of Functional Grammar. The following sections outline briefly the need for the suggested, alternative analysis and its underlying theoretical framework, which are then followed by a detailed examination of  $\text{נָא}$  in its various functions.

## THE NEED FOR A NEW EXPLANATION

Existing explanations are often vague and unsatisfactory, since they fail to provide a simple, uniform principle which could explain the phenomenon. Examples are explained in terms of various morphological, syntactic, pragmatic or even text-critical concepts.

This article does not make use of the concept *nominative*, because it signifies a case, while the use of cases was generally eliminated in Biblical Hebrew. Instead, the article uses the labels of the syntactic functions found in Biblical Hebrew in parallelism to the nominative use in other Semitic languages, e.g. subject and copula-complement.<sup>5</sup>

---

historical overview of explanations for this phenomenon.

<sup>5</sup> The copula-complement is the complement of the (present or absent) copula. It is also called the predicate (which is actually the combination of the copula and its complement). According to Zewi (1994) nominal clauses in Biblical Hebrew basically

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The Functional Grammar of S.C. Dik was chosen as theoretical framework for this study because it clearly differentiates between the linguistic levels of morphology, syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Its system of predications and semantic functions provides an ideal paradigm which can be used in an attempt to point out a semantic principle underlying the phenomenon of the so-called “nominative” uses of  $\pi\alpha$ . Predications are semantic clause types. In Functional Grammar, the following types of predications are distinguished in terms of the semantic characteristics of controlled/uncontrolled and dynamic/non-dynamic:<sup>6</sup>

	[+controlled]	Examples	[-controlled]	Examples
[+dynamic]	<b>Action</b>	<i>The man walks.</i>	<b>Process</b>	<i>The man fell.</i>
[-dynamic]	<b>Position</b>	<i>The man sits.</i>	<b>State</b>	<i>The man is good.</i>

Both actions and positions are carried out by a controller (indicated by the subject in active clauses). Neither processes nor states are controlled, but their subjects simply undergo a process or happen to be in a state. Both actions and processes are dynamic – they are events during which something happens or changes. Both positions and states are non-dynamic – they are situations during

---

have a bipartite structure of subject and predicate; nominal clauses with (apparently) pronominal copulas should be interpreted as dislocative clauses where the pronoun functions either as the (resumptive) subject or predicate. This article uses the term copula-complement to clearly distinguish the syntactic function from other (verbal) predicates and complements.

<sup>6</sup> Dik (1997a:114).

which nothing changes; the same position is maintained or the same state continues.

It should be noted that the same verb can occur in different predication types, especially in metaphorical uses (cf. Dik, 1997a: 95, 118), e.g.:

	[+controlled]	Examples	[-controlled]	Examples
[+dynamic]	<b>Action</b>	<i>The man moves.</i>	<b>Process</b>	<i>The rock moves.</i>
[-dynamic]	<b>Position</b>	<i>The man sits.</i>	<b>State</b>	<i>The city sits.<sup>7</sup></i>

A predication consists of a predicate (such as a verb) plus arguments and satellites (cf. Dik 1997a:50) . Arguments are elements in the predication which are obligatory and selected by the predicate. Satellites are elements which give non-obligatory, extra information, e.g.:

<i>Yesterday</i>	<i>the teacher</i>	<i>gave</i>	<i>the book</i>	<i>to the girl</i>	<i>at school.</i>
<b>Satellite</b>	<b>Argument</b>	<b>Predicate</b>	<b>Argument</b>	<b>Argument</b>	<b>Satellite</b>

The verb *give* selects the syntactic functions of subject, direct object and indirect object – semantically, these are the arguments. The adverbials of time and location provide extra, non-obligatory information. Syntactically, they are adjuncts; semantically, they are called satellites. Arguments and satellites express semantic functions which indicate their logical relations to the predicate

<sup>7</sup> See Jer 17:25.

and to each other.<sup>8</sup>

<i>Yesterday</i>	<i>the teacher</i>	<i>gave</i>	<i>the book</i>	<i>to the girl</i>	<i>at school.</i>
Satellite	Argument	Predicate	Argument	Argument	Satellite
<b>Time</b>	<b>Agent</b>	-	<b>Patient</b>	<b>Receiver</b>	<b>Location</b>

- The subject of an action has the semantic function of **agent**. The agent is the controller of the action, e.g. *The man eats an apple*.
- The subject of a position has the semantic function of **positioner**. The positioner is the controller of the position, e.g. *The man keeps his money in the drawer*. Only the agent and positioner have the semantic characteristic of [+controller].
- The subject of a process has the semantic function of **processed**. The processed is the entity that (passively) undergoes a process, e.g. *The man fell from the horse*.
- The subject of a process can also have the semantic function of **force**. The force is the non-controlling entity instigating a process, e.g. *The wind blew the leaves into the gutters*. (*The wind* cannot decide to blow and thus does not control the process; it is, however, a natural force instigating the process – therefore, this example cannot be regarded as a mere metaphor.)
- The subject of a state has the semantic function of **zero**. The zero is the entity primarily involved in a state, e.g. *The woman is beautiful*. (*The woman* does not control the state – she just happens to be in it.)
- The direct object usually has the semantic function of **patient**.<sup>9</sup> The patient is the entity affected or effected (produced) by the operation of some controller or force, e.g.:

<sup>8</sup> See Dik (1997a:26, 59, 117, 118, 121, 214, 229-231, 243-245).

<sup>9</sup> Dik (1997a:121) uses the term *goal* which could be confused with the concept of

- *The man eats **the apple*** (affected patient).
- *The man keeps **the money** (affected patient) in the drawer.*
- *The wind blew **the leaves** (affected patient) into the gutters.*
- *The scribe wrote **a book*** (effected patient).

The patient shares the characteristic of [-controller] with the processed, force and zero.

- In a passive transformation of an action, position or process, the direct object becomes the subject, but it still retains the semantic function of patient, e.g.:
  - ***The apple** is eaten by the man.*
  - ***The money** is kept in the drawer by the man.*
  - ***The leaves** are blown into the gutters by the wind.*
  - ***The book** was written by the scribe.*
- In verbless predications the subject also has the semantic function of **zero**, e.g.:
  - ***The man** (is) the king.*
- A noun which acts as copula-complement of a nominal clause has the semantic function of **identity** or **class**. The identity is the entity with which the subject-zero is equated. The class is the group of entities of which the subject-zero is an example or instance. An adjective as a copula-complement has the semantic function of **quality**.<sup>10</sup> It describes a characteristic or attribute of the subject.
- These semantic functions also share the semantic characteristic of [-controller].
  - *The man (is) **the king*** (identity).

---

*purpose.*

<sup>10</sup> Dik (1997a:205, 231) uses the term *property assignment*. He uses the term *quality* for the role, function or authority by virtue of which a controller carries out an action or maintains a position. However, in the grammar of classical and Semitic languages, the term *quality* is normally used to indicate a characteristic trait.

- *The man (is) a king* (class).

- *The man (is) good* (quality).

This information can be summarized as follows:

Active sentence with verb			
<i>Subject</i>		<i>Object</i>	
Action – Agent	[+controller]	Patient	[-controller]
Position – Positioner	[+controller]	Patient	[-controller]
Process – Processed	[-controller]		
Process – Force	[-controller]	Patient	[-controller]
State – Zero	[-controller]		
Passive sentence with verb			
<i>Subject</i>		<i>Object</i>	
Patient	[-controller]	-	
Sentence without verb			
<i>Subject</i>		<i>Copula-complement</i>	
State – Zero	[-controller]	Noun – Identity	[-controller]
		Noun – Class	[-controller]
		Adjective – Quality	[-controller]

- Adjuncts or satellites can have many semantic functions,<sup>11</sup> such as **reference**, **manner** and **cause**. Reference is an element of a relation to which the relation is said to hold. Manner satellites indicate the way in which an action is carried out, a position is maintained, or a process takes place. Cause satellites provide a motivation which is not ascribed to any of the participants in the predication, but which is advanced by the speaker as an explanation for the occurrence of the predication.

<sup>11</sup> For a more complete discussion on the applicability of semantic functions to Biblical Hebrew, see Kroeze (1996).

- *He was ill **with reference to his feet*** (reference).
- *The man lived **securely*** (manner) *in the city*.
- *The man could not attend the meeting **because of illness*** (cause).
- Dislocations<sup>12</sup> can also have the semantic function of **reference**, e.g.:
  - ***That ball** – my mother gave it to me.*

## תַּאֲ AS MARKER OF THE PATIENT [-CONTROLLER]

Surface markers may be governed by syntactic or semantic functions: “The main function of case distinctions is to express the underlying semantic functions of terms; some cases (typically nom / acc, or abs / erg) *more primarily* serve the expression of syntactic functions”<sup>13</sup> (my italicisation).

In Semitic languages with case forms, the nominative case usually expresses the subject which may have the semantic functions of agent, positioner, processed, force and zero. The basic functions of the accusative case are to express the syntactic function of direct object and the semantic function of patient. Similarly, in Biblical Hebrew the surface marker תַּאֲ usually marks the syntactic function of direct object, which normally has the semantic function of affected or effected patient, e.g.:

וַתִּשֶׂם בָּהּ אֶת־הַיֶּלֶד	And she put <i>the child</i> in it (Exod 2:3).
בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם	God created <i>the heaven</i> (Gen 1:1).

<sup>12</sup> A dislocation is any constituent that is marked as the topic of the clause by moving it from its usual place to precede the rest of the clause. It may even be separated from the rest of the clause by the *waw* conjunction. Its empty place in the clause may be filled by a pronoun or adverb referring to the dislocated element. It is regarded as an extra-clausal constituent. (Cf. Van der Merwe et al. 1999:339, §46.1.2; Waltke & O’Connor 1990:128-129, §8.3a; Joüon-Muraoka 2006:551-554, §156; Gesenius 1976:457-458, §143; Dik 1997b:384, 389).

<sup>13</sup> Dik (1997a:369).



Thus, there is a parallelism between morphology,<sup>14</sup> syntactic function and semantic function (e.g.  $\text{תָּא}$  – direct object – patient). But this parallelism is not always valid, for example in passive sentences where the subject is the patient.<sup>15</sup>

$\text{תָּא}$  may also be used to mark indirect objects, other complements and even adjuncts which may have several semantic functions, all of which are [-controller].<sup>16</sup> Here is an example of each:<sup>17</sup>

Example	Translation	Syntactic function	Semantic function [-controller]
וְקָדַם אֱלֹהִים אֹתִי זָבַד טוֹב	God gave <i>me</i> a good gift (Gen 30:20) <sup>18</sup>	indirect object	receiver [-controller]
וּמִלְאוּ בָתֵּי מִצְרַיִם אֶת־הַקֶּשֶׁב אֶת־הַקֶּשֶׁב	And the houses of the Egyptians will be full of <i>flies</i> (state) (Exod 8:17).	complement <sup>19</sup>	reference [-controller]
מִצּוֹת יֵאָכְל אֶת־ שִׁבְעַת הַיָּמִים	Unleavened bread shall be eaten <i>for seven days</i> (Exod 13:7).	adjunct	duration [-controller]

The most general use of the particle  $\text{תָּא}$ , however, is to mark the direct object with the semantic function of patient. The question is whether this link between  $\text{תָּא}$  and the patient, the ultimate [-controller], could have been so strong that the semantic function sometimes overrides the syntactic function in selecting  $\text{תָּא}$  as marker. Therefore, the syntactic and semantic functions of the relevant  $\text{תָּא}$ -

<sup>14</sup> The discussion of parts of speech is regarded as a part of morphology (see Joüon-Muraoka 2006:100, §34d).

<sup>15</sup> Dik (1997a:377-380).

<sup>16</sup> For a more complete discussion on the functions of the particle, see Kroeze (1997).

<sup>17</sup> In order to find as many examples as possible, the Leningradensis text of the Hebrew Bible has been used throughout, although other readings may be possible in some places.

<sup>18</sup> Waltke & O'Connor (1990:174, §10.2.3b) calls this use a “datival object”.

<sup>19</sup> See Waltke & O'Connor (1990:181, §10.3.1c).

phrases should both be examined. To begin, we shall review the usage of תָּא to mark patients as objects in standard active sentences.

### The patient is the direct object of an active clause

As has been noted, תָּא normally marks direct objects with the semantic function of patient.<sup>20</sup> The patient is the ultimate [-controller] – it is the entity which is affected or effected (produced) by the operation of a controller or force, e.g.:

הוֹצֵא אֶת־הָאִישׁ	Bring out <i>the man</i> (action) (Judges 19:22).	direct object	patient (affected) [-controller]
הַשִּׁיב יוֹאָב אֶת־הַקָּטָנִים:	Joab restrained <i>the troops</i> (position) (2 Sam 18:16).	direct object	patient (affected) [-controller]
וּסְעָרָה תִפְיֵץ אֹתָם	And the whirlwind will scatter <i>them</i> (process) (Isa 41:16).	direct object	patient (affected) [-controller]
בָּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־הַשָּׁמַיִם	God created <i>the heaven</i> (action) (Gen 1:1).	direct object	patient (effected) [-controller]

We can now extend this analysis to the cases where תָּא marks the subject. In the following sections these are also seen to be [-controller] (especially the patient), which confirms our thesis that the semantic function of תָּא is to mark [-controller], and that this semantic function extends the syntactic range of תָּא to include marking [-controller] subjects.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> In traditional grammars this use is dealt with under the heading of the “accusative” function in Biblical Hebrew.

<sup>21</sup> Of course, usually [-controller] subjects are *not* marked by תָּא because this particle is more primarily the marker of the syntactic function of direct object. The reason why only some [-controller] subjects are marked by תָּא should be researched further – there are different possibilities: it could simply be a stylistic or dialectic phenomenon, or it could be due to pragmatic reasons. Compare Zewi (1999) who explains this

### The patient is the subject of an incomplete passive clause

When an active sentence is transformed into a passive sentence the direct object of the active sentence becomes the subject of the passive sentence, but it retains the semantic function of patient ([controller]). In Biblical Hebrew,  $\text{אֵת}$  can be used to mark the subject (patient) of a passive verb.<sup>22</sup> It is the most occurring “nominative” use of  $\text{אֵת}$ .<sup>23</sup> According to Zewi (1997:181), “[s]ubjects introduced by ‘*et*’ and several other prepositions should be interpreted as logical subjects in transition from objects into grammatical subjects”. If the main semantic function of  $\text{אֵת}$  is to mark the patient, this retention of the marker in the passive comes as no surprise.

### The passive verbs agrees with the subject

In the following examples the passive verb agrees in person, gender and number with the subject-patient which is still marked by  $\text{אֵת}$ :

וַיֻּלַּד לְחֵנוֹךְ אֶת־עִירָד	And to Enoch was born <i>Irada</i> (Gen 4:18). <sup>24</sup>
יָמִית נָא אֶת־קַיִשׁ הַזֶּה	This <i>man</i> ought to be put to death (Jer 38:4).
יִבְקַשׁ אֶת־עֲוֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל	<i>The sin</i> of Israel will be sought (Jer 50:20).
וְאֵת־הַבָּקָר הַשֵּׁנִי הֵעֵלָה ...	And <i>the second bull</i> was offered (Ju 6:28).
וְנָשְׂאוּ־בָם אֶת־הַשֻּׁלְחָן	And <i>the table</i> must be carried with these (Ex 25:28).
וְלֹא יֵאָכַל אֶת־בְּשָׂרוֹ	And <i>its flesh</i> may not be eaten (Ex 21:28).

phenomenon as “incomplete topicalisation”. But such a study is beyond the scope of this article.

<sup>22</sup> Waltke & O’Connor (1990:182, §10.3.2).

<sup>23</sup> Some verbs take two direct objects or complements (“accusatives”), see Gesenius (1976:388-389, §121c-d). In the passive the first direct object (usually the patient), becomes the subject, but the second object or complement remains as a direct object or complement and can thus be marked with  $\text{אֵת}$ . Adjuncts which are marked by  $\text{אֵת}$  also stay adjuncts in the passive. Such examples are not treated here, but only those where the new subject is still marked with  $\text{אֵת}$ .

<sup>24</sup> Note the impersonal translation: “and it was born ... to Enoch Irada” by Joüon-Muraoka (2006:432, §128b).

וְלֹא יִקְרָא עוֹד אֶת־שֵׁםְךָ אַבְרָם	And <i>your name</i> will no longer be called Abram (Gen 17:5)
הֵן לֹא הוּבָא אֶת־דַּמָּה אֶל־הַקֹּדֶשׁ פְּנִימָה	Behold, <i>its blood</i> was not brought into the sanctuary, (to the) inside (Lev 10:18).
... אֲשֶׁר הוּבָא אֶת־דָּמָם	... whose <i>blood</i> was brought in (Lev 16:27).
גַּם־אֵתוֹ לְאֲשׁוּר יוּבָל ...	<i>It</i> will also be brought to Assyria (Hos 10:6).
אַת־אַרְבַּעַת אֱלֹהֵי גַת וְלִדּוֹ לְרַפָּה בְּגַת	These <i>four</i> were born to Rapha in Gath (2 Sam 21:22).
וְלֹא תִתֵּן אֶת־קִיָּעִיר הַזֹּאת בְּיַד מֶלֶךְ אֲשׁוּר:	And this <i>city</i> will not be given in the hand of the king of Assyria (2 Kings 18:30).
וְאֶת־קִיָּעִיר לְפָנָיו מִבְּעֻרָתָּ:	And <i>the brazier (f.)</i> has been kindled before him (Jer 36:22).
וְנָתַתָּ לָּךְ גַּם־אֶת־זֹאת בְּעִבְדָּהּ	And <i>this one</i> too will be given <sup>25</sup> to you for the service (Gen 29:27).

The subject can also be a clause introduced by אֵת אֲשֶׁר with the verb of the main clause in the third person masculine singular.

וַיִּגַד לְדָוִד אֵת אֲשֶׁר עָשְׂתָה רִצְפָּה	And it was told to David <i>what</i> Rizpa ... had done (2 Sam 21:11).
הֲלֹא־הִגַּד לְאֲדֹנָי אֵת אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי	Has it not been told to my lord <i>what</i> I did? (1 Kings 18:13).
כִּי הִגַּד הַגִּד לְעַבְדֶּיךָ אֵת אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת־מֹשֶׁה עַבְדּוֹ לְתַת ... וְלְהַשְׁמִיד ...	Because it was indeed told to your servants <i>that</i> Yahweh your God had commanded Moses his servant to give ... and to destroy ... (Josh 9:24).
אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר תֹּאמַר יִנָּתֵן לָּהּ	<i>Everything</i> she says, will be given to her (Est 2:13).

### The passive verb does not agree with the subject

#### The passive verb is finite

In the following examples the passive verb does not agree in person, gender and number with the subject-patient which is still marked by אֵת. This construction is

<sup>25</sup> Or: “And we will give ...” (Qal cohortative 1 c. pl.).

often called the *impersonal passive*, and Joüon-Muraoka explains why: “The impersonal character of this construction is evident in the use of the 3m.sg. form of the verb irrespective of the gender and number of the logical object.”<sup>26</sup> According to Gesenius, the impersonal passive is recognisable by the *nota accusativi* or by disagreement with the passive verbal form in gender, number and person.<sup>27</sup> But quite a number of examples were found where the verb does agree with the subject. Therefore, it would be better to call this construction the *incomplete passive*. In a normal passive construction: (1) the direct object of the active clause becomes the subject of the passive clause; (2) the person, number and gender of the verb are brought into agreement with the new subject; and (3) the marker ׀ is omitted. In the incomplete passive either the third step, or both the second and third steps are not carried out, the verb being in the simplest form (3 m. s.). It should be remembered, however, that, according to normal rules of agreement, if the verb precedes the subject it may be in the simplest form (3 m. s.) regardless. No clear examples were found where the subject precedes the disagreeing verb.<sup>28</sup>

וַיִּוֹלְדוּ לְאַהֲרֹן אֶת־נָדָב וְאֶת־אֲבִיהוּא אֶת־אֶלְעָזָר וְאֶת־אִתְחָמָר :	To Aaron were born <i>Nadab and Abihu, Eleazar and Ithamar</i> (Num 26:60).
וַיִּוֹלְדוּ לְיוֹסֵף ... אֲשֶׁר יָלְדָהּ־לוֹ אֲסֵנַת ... אֶת־מְנַשֶּׁה וְאֶת־אֶפְרַיִם ...	And to Joseph were born ... <i>Manasseh and Ephraim</i> , <sup>29</sup> whom Asenath ... bore to him (Gen 46:20).
וַיּוֹשִׁיב אֶת־מֹשֶׁה וְאֶת־אַהֲרֹן אֶל־פַּרְעֹה	And <i>Moses and Aaron</i> were brought back to the Pharaoh (Exod 10:8).
וְהוֹבִיֵּא אֶת־בָּרָיו בְּטַבָּעֹת	And <i>its poles</i> will be put (brought) through the rings (Exod 27:7).

<sup>26</sup> Joüon-Muraoka (2006:432, §128b).

<sup>27</sup> Gesenius (1976:387, §121a, footnote 1).

<sup>28</sup> Except the example from Num 11:22 quoted below.

<sup>29</sup> This phrase could also be understood as an apposition to the relative pronoun which acts as the direct object of the relative clause.

אם אַת־כָּל־דָּגֵי הַיָּם יֵאָסֵף לָהֶם	Or will <i>all the fishes</i> <sup>30</sup> of the sea be collected for them? (Num 11:22).
הַיּוֹכֵם אֶת־דְּבָרֵי יְהוֹנָדָב ...	Jonadab's <i>orders</i> were carried out (Jer 35:14).
וַיִּגַד לְרֵבֶקָה אֶת־דְּבָרֵי עֵשָׂו בְּנֵה הַגָּדֹל	And <i>the words</i> of Esau, her elder son, were told to Rebekah (Gen 27:42).
כַּאֲשֶׁר יֵאָכַל אֶת־הַצִּבְיָה וְאֶת־הָאֵיל	Just as <i>deer and gazelle</i> is eaten (Deut 12:22).
וּבִקְשׁ אֶת־עֵוֹן יִשְׂרָאֵל ... וְאֶת־חַטָּאת יְהוּדָה	<i>The iniquity</i> of Israel ... and <i>the sins</i> of Judah will be sought (Jer 50:20).
וְתֵן אֶת־אֲבִישָׁג הַשֻּׁנַמִּית לְאֲדֹנִיָּהוּ אַחִיךָ לְאִשָּׁה:	Let <i>Abishag</i> the Shunnamite be given to your brother Adonijah as wife (1 Kings 2:21).
וְתֵן אֶת־הָאָרֶץ הַזֹּאת לְעַבְדֶיךָ לְאֶחָדָה	Let this <i>land</i> be given to your servants for a possession (Num 32:5).
אֶךְ־בְּגוּרָל יִחַלֵּק אֶת־הָאָרֶץ	But <i>the land</i> will be divided by lot (cf. verse 53) (Num 26:55).
וַיִּמְלֵא כְבוֹדוֹ אֶת־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ	And may <i>the whole earth</i> be filled with his glory (Ps 72:19, cf. Num 14:21). <sup>31</sup>
וְהָיָה הַנִּלְכָד בַּחֲרָם יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּאֵשׁ אֵלֹהִים וְאֶת־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ	And the one who is caught with the banned things – <i>he and everything</i> which belongs to him will be burned with fire (Josh 7:15).

### The passive verb is an infinitive

Of course, agreement is not possible in these cases, since the infinitive construct does not have person, gender or number.

בְּהוֹלֵד לוֹ אֶת־יִצְחָק בְּנוֹ:	When <i>Isaac</i> his son was born to him (Gen 21:5).
יוֹם הַלֵּדָת אֶת־פַּרְעֹה	The day on which <i>the Pharaoh</i> was born (Gen 40:20).
בְּיוֹם הוֹלֵדָת אֶתְךָ	On the day that <i>you</i> were born (Ezek 16:4, 5).
בְּיוֹם הַנְּמֹל אֶת־יִצְחָק	On the day that <i>Isaac</i> was weaned (Gen 21:8).
אַחֲרֵי הַפִּחַ אֶת־הַבַּיִת	After <i>the house</i> was plastered (Lev 14:48).

<sup>30</sup> The predicate usually agrees in gender and number with the postconstruct (“genitive”) after כל – see Gesenius (1976:467, §146c).

<sup>31</sup> See Num 11:22 above.

אַחֲרֵי הַכִּבֵּס אֶת־הַנֶּגַע	After <i>the disease</i> has been washed (Lev 13:55).
אַחֲרֵי הַכִּבֵּס אִתּוֹ	After <i>it</i> has been washed (Lev 13:56).
בַּיּוֹם הַמְּשֻׁחַ אִתּוֹ	On the day when <i>it</i> was anointed (Num 7:10, 8:4, Lev 6:13).
אַחֲרֵי הַמְּשֻׁחַ אִתּוֹ	After <i>it</i> was anointed (Num 7:88).

## אֶת AS MARKER OF OTHER [-CONTROLLER] SEMANTIC FUNCTIONS

### אֶת as marker of the processed

Several examples are found where אֶת marks the subject of a process ([-control] [+dynamic]). Such a subject has the semantic function of processed ([-controller]). The processed is the entity that undergoes a process.

וַאֲתֵרֶכֶזֶל נָפַל אֶל־הַמַּיִם	And <i>the iron</i> fell into the water (2 Ki 6:5).
וְאֵת כָּל־מִבְּרָקָיוּ בְּכָל־אֲנָפָיוּ בַחֲרֵב יִפְּלוּ	And <i>all his fugitives</i> among all his troops will fall by the sword (Ezek 17:21).
וּמָתוּ אֶת־הַנְּעֻרָה ... וְאֶת־הָאִישׁ ...	And <i>the young woman</i> ... and <i>the man</i> will die (Deut 22:24).
וַתִּחַנַּף אֶת־דָּאָרְצָן	And <i>the land</i> became defiled (Jer 3:9).
וְאֶת־קַעֲדֵר הַזֹּאת תִּשְׂרַף בְּאֵשׁ	And <i>this city</i> will burn with fire (Jer. 38:23).
וּבְרוּמָם יָרוּמוּ אֲוֹתָם	When they (the cherubim) rose up, <i>they</i> (the wheels) rose up (Ezek 10:17). <sup>32</sup>
וְיָשָׁב לְבֵיתוֹ וְלֹא יִמַּס אֶת־לֵבִב אֲחָיוּ כִּלְבָּבוֹ	And let him go back to his house so that <i>the heart</i> of his brothers does not melt like his own (Deut 20:8).
וַיִּפְּלוּ מִבְּנֵימִן שְׁמֹנְהָעָשָׂר אֶלֶף אִישׁ אֶת־כָּל־אֵלֶּה אַנְשֵׁי־חֵיל	And from Benjamin eighteen thousand men fell, <i>all of these</i> <sup>33</sup> courageous men (Judg 20:44).

<sup>32</sup> Note that the NRSV takes אֲוֹתָם as the preposition אֶת with suffix: they rose up *with them*.

<sup>33</sup> In apposition to the subject as processed. See Waltke & O'Connor (1990:182,

### אָת as marker of the force

Several examples were found where אָת also marks the subject of a process ([-control] [+dynamic]) but it has the semantic function of force ([-controller]). The force is the non-controlling entity instigating a process.

אֶת־עַמּוּד הָעָנָן לֹא־סָר מֵעֲלֵיהֶם ... וְאֶת־עַמּוּד הָאֵשׁ	<i>The pillar</i> of cloud did not turn away from them ... nor <i>the pillar</i> of fire (Neh 9:19).
אֵת כָּל־דִּרְעָה הַזֹּאת בָּאָה עָלֵינוּ	<i>All this disaster</i> came upon us (Dan 9:13). <sup>34</sup>
אֶת־נְהַרְתֶּיהָ הַלְךְ סְבִיבוֹת מִטְעָה	<i>Its rivers</i> (pl.) were flowing (s.) <sup>35</sup> around its bed(s) (Ezek 31:4).

### אָת as marker of the zero

Quite a number of examples occur where אָת is the marker of the subject of a state ([-control] [-dynamic]). It has the semantic function of zero ([-controller]). The zero is the entity primarily involved in a state.

#### With stative verb

In the following examples the predications each contains an intransitive verb expressing a state. The third person masculine singular form of the verb is used regardless of the subject. In these examples the subject-zero is marked by אָת:

אֶל־יָרַע בְּעֵינֶיךָ אֶת־דְּלֶקֶת הַזֶּה	May this <i>matter</i> not be bad in your eyes (2 Sam 11:25). <sup>36</sup>
---	--

§10.3.2, footnote 36). See the similar construction in Judges 20:46. See below: “With noun in verbless predicate”.

<sup>34</sup> אָת could perhaps be used to introduce or mark the subject clause of a passive verb, i.e. כָּרוּב (pass. part.): “Just as *all this calamity* (which) came upon us is written in the Law of Moses”. See above: “The passive verb does not agree with the subject”.

<sup>35</sup> The singular of the participle form could be used here distributively.

<sup>36</sup> See Joüon-Muraoka (2006:417, §125j (6)): impersonal verb plus accusative of limitation: “May *it* not be bad in your eyes with regard to this matter”. See



כִּי־יִטֵב <sup>37</sup> אֶל־אָבִי אֶת־הָרָעָה עָלַיִךְ	If <i>the evil</i> (f. s.) against you will be good (3 m. s.) <sup>38</sup> to my father (1 Sam 20:13). <sup>39</sup>
אֶל־יִמְעַט לְפָנֶיךָ אֶת כָּל־הַמְלָאָה	May <i>all the toil</i> (f. s.) not be trivial (m. s.) before you (Neh 9:32). <sup>40</sup>
וְאֵת כָּל־דָּגַת יַאֲרִיךְ בְּקַשְׁשֹׁתַיִךְ תִּדְבֹק:	And <i>all the fish</i> of your channels will stick to your scales (Ezek 29:4).
וְאִישׁ אֶת־קִדְשׁוֹ <sup>41</sup> לוֹ יִהְיֶה	And everyone - <i>his sacred donations</i> will be his own (Num 5:10).
אֶת־שְׁנֵי הַגּוֹיִם וְאֶת־שְׁתֵּי הָאָרְצוֹת לִי תִהְיֶינָה	<i>The two nations and the two countries</i> will be mine (Ezek 35:10). <sup>42</sup>
וַיְהִי לְמַנַּשֶּׁה בְּיִשְׁשָׁכָר וּבְאַשֵּׁר בֵּית־שֵׁאֵן וּבְנוֹתֶיהָ וּבִלְעָם וּבְנוֹתֶיהָ וְאֶת־יֹשְׁבֵי דוֹר וּבְנוֹתֶיהָ וְיֹשְׁבֵי עֵין־דוֹר וּבְנוֹתֶיהָ וְיֹשְׁבֵי תַעֲנָךְ וּבְנוֹתֶיהָ וְיֹשְׁבֵי מִגְדוֹ וּבְנוֹתֶיהָ שְׁלֹשֶׁת הַנְּפֹת	And it (3ms) was to Manasseh in Issachar and in Asher: Beth-shean and its villages, and Ibleam and its villages, and the inhabitants <sup>43</sup> of Dor and its villages, and the inhabitants of En-dor and its villages, and the inhabitants of Taanach and its villages, and the inhabitants of Megiddo and its villages, and the inhabitants of Megiddo and its villages, the three hill(s) (Josh 17:11).

Brockelmann (1961:125, §65).

<sup>37</sup> See Gesenius (1976:365, § 1171, footnote 2).

<sup>38</sup> If the verb precedes the subject it may be in the 3 m. s., even if the subject is feminine or plural, see Gesenius (1976:465, §145o).

<sup>39</sup> Or: "If it is good to my father *with regard to the evil* against you."

<sup>40</sup> Or: "May it not be trivial before you *with regard to all this toil*."

<sup>41</sup> Muraoka (1985: 154-155): pregnant expression for אִישׁ אֶשְׂרֵי־יָתֵן קִדְשׁוֹ.

<sup>42</sup> Muraoka (1985:155): attraction to the object suffix in וַיִּרְשְׁנוּהָ in verse 10b.

<sup>43</sup> אֵת can also be interpreted as the preposition *together with* which introduces the last four towns in addition to the first two. Other explanations are: Joüon-Muraoka (2006:417, §125j (2)): אֵת appears "at the beginning of the group of four יֹשְׁבֵי in an enumeration in the nominative". See Gesenius (1976:365, §1171): the accusative depends on the verbal idea *they gave him* virtually contained in וַיִּתֵּן לָהֶם; Muraoka (1985:155): *casus pendens* plus *waw apodosis* in verse 12.

### With noun in verbless predicate

In the following examples the predication does not have a verbal predicate. The predicate consists only of a noun which acts as copula-complement. Verbless clauses are also states with the subject having the zero semantic function. In the examples below the subject-zero is also marked by אֵת:

נָאֵת הַעָרִים אֲשֶׁר תִּתְּנוּ לְלוּוִיִּם אֵת שְׁש־עָרֵי הַמִּקְלָט אֲשֶׁר תִּתְּנוּ ...	And <i>the cities</i> <sup>44</sup> which you give to the Levites, will be the six cities of refuge which you will give (Num 35:6).
כָּל־הָעָרִים אֲשֶׁר תִּתְּנוּ לְלוּוִיִּם אַרְבָּעִים וְשִׁמְנָה עִיר אֶתְהֶן וְאֶת־מִגְרָשֵׁיהֶן	All the cities which you will give to the Levites, will be 48 cities, <i>them and their pastures</i> <sup>45</sup> (Num 35:7).
(וַיִּפְּלוּ מִבְּנֵימִן שְׁמֹנֶה־עָשָׂר אֶלֶף אִישׁ) אֵת־כָּל־אֵלֶּה אַנְשֵׁי־הַיָּל	(And from Benjamin eighteen thousand men fell.) <i>All these</i> were courageous men (Judg 20:44). <sup>46</sup>
הַמַּעַט־לָנוּ אֶת־עוֹן פְּעוֹר	Is <i>the sin</i> <sup>47</sup> of Peor a little to us? (Josh 22:17).

### With predicative adjective in verbless predicate

In the following examples, the predicate consists only of an adjective which acts as copula-complement. The subject of such verbless clauses also has the zero semantic function. In the examples below the subject-zero is also marked by אֵת:

<sup>44</sup> The marker אֵת could be used due to the fact that הַעָרִים is the patient of *give* in the mind of the speaker, although, syntactically, it is the subject. Or: attraction of the subject to the relative pronoun which is the direct object of the relative clause. According to Hoftijzer (1965:50), this is a *casus pendens* plus apposition to it. Also compare “אֵת as marker of the identity” below.

<sup>45</sup> In apposition to the subject-zero. In the mind of the speaker this phrase could be the patient of *give*. Or: attraction of the words in apposition to the relative pronoun as direct object of the relative clause. See below: “אֵת as marker of class”.

<sup>46</sup> See the identical construction in Judges 20:46. See above: “אֵת as marker of the possessed”.

<sup>47</sup> See Brockelmann (1961:349, §229): this is an impersonal construction with the “accusative” of regard (“ist es uns nicht genug an der Sünde P.’s”).

הִישׁ אֶת־לִבְכֶּךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל	Is <i>your heart</i> right? (2 Kings 10:15).
מֵרַם מִמּוֹת אֶת־הָאִשָּׁה ...	Bitter, more than death, is <i>the woman</i> <sup>48</sup> ... (Eccles 7:26).
וְטוֹב מִשְׁנֵיהֶם אֵת אֲשֶׁר עָדֵן לֹא הָיָה	And better than both of them is <i>the one who</i> <sup>49</sup> has not yet been (Eccles 4:3).

### With preposition phrase in verbless predicate

In the following examples the predicate of the verbless clause consists of a preposition phrase which acts as copula-complement. The subject has the semantic function of zero. The subject-zero is marked by אֵת:

וְאֵין אִתְּכֶם אֵלִי	And <i>you</i> were not to me (Hag 2:17). <sup>50</sup>
וְאֵת הַרְגִּישׁ הַכֹּהֲנִים לְבֵית אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם	And <i>the registration</i> of the priests was according to the house of their fathers (2 Chron 31:17).

### With adverbial interrogative in verbless predicate

In the following example, the predicate of the verbless clause consists of an interrogative adverb which acts as copula-complement. The subject has the semantic function of zero. The subject-zero is also marked by אֵת:

רְאֵה אֵי־חֲנִית הַמֶּלֶךְ וְאֵת־צִפְתָּת הַמַּיִם	See, where are the king's spear and <i>the water jar</i> ? <sup>52</sup> (1 Sam 26:16).
--	---

<sup>48</sup> מוֹצֵא אֲנִי אֵת־הָאִשָּׁה can also be interpreted as the direct object of אֲנִי.

<sup>49</sup> Gesenius (1976:365, §1171): "... a verb like *I esteem* is mentally supplied before שָׁבַח אֲנִי – see verse 2: שָׁבַח אֲנִי אֵת אֲשֶׁר – see verse 2: שָׁבַח אֲנִי אֵת אֲשֶׁר can simply be a second object of אֲנִי. See Hoftijzer (1965:78).

<sup>50</sup> Gesenius (1976:365-366, §117m, footnote 3: corrupt); Muraoka (1985:157): "hopelessly corrupt".

<sup>51</sup> Muraoka (1985:157) reads וְאֵת.

<sup>52</sup> Gesenius (1976:365, §1171): the "accusative" depends on the verbal idea "search now for" virtually contained in what has gone before, "see where". See Gesenius (1976:365-366, §117m, footnote 3): corrupt.

### With independent relative clause in verbless predicate

In the following examples, the predicate of the verbless clause consists of an independent relative clause<sup>53</sup> which acts as copula-complement. The subject of the main clause still has the semantic function of zero. In the examples below the subject-zero is also marked by אֵלֶּה:

כִּי אֵלֶּה כָּל־אֵלֶּה אֲשֶׁר שָׂנֵאתִי	Because <i>all these things</i> <sup>54</sup> are which I hate (Zech 8:17).
וְזֶה אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תֹאכְלוּ מִמֶּם ... וְאֵת־קִיָּה ...	And this is of which you should not eat: ... and <i>the kite</i> <sup>55</sup> ... (cf. Deut 14:12-17).

We have seen that those subjects which are marked by אֵלֶּה are all [-controller]. Before considering possible examples where the subject is semantically [+controller], it is worth examining the use of אֵלֶּה to mark other “nominative” syntactic functions. In these we also see אֵלֶּה indicating a semantic role of [-controller]. In other words, the semantic range of אֵלֶּה is [-controller], and since [-controller] sentence elements occur in various syntactic functions, the syntactic range of אֵלֶּה includes these various constructions.

### אֵלֶּה as marker of the identity

In the following examples of verbless clauses (states), a definite noun functions as the copula-complement. If both the subject and copula-complement are definite nouns, the semantic function of the copula-complement is identity. The identity is the entity with which the subject-zero is equated. The identity is [-

<sup>53</sup> An independent relative clause has no antecedent in the main clause. Therefore, it fulfills the syntactic function which the antecedent would have fulfilled.

<sup>54</sup> See Gesenius (1976:365, §1171): attraction to following relative pronoun in the “accusative”; Muraoka (1985:155): *anakoluthon* (change from one construction to another).

<sup>55</sup> In apposition to הַיָּד, the subject-zero. Or: in the mind of the speaker *the kite* could be the patient of *eat*, see Muraoka (1985:154).

controller]:

והנותר אֶת־הַקְּמוֹן הַזֶּה:	And the remnant is this <i>multitude</i> (2 Chron 31:10).
וּמִשְׁמֶרֶת בְּנֵי־גֶרְשׁוֹן בְּאֶהֱל מוֹעֵד הַמִּשְׁכָּן ... וְאֶת־מִסְךְ ... וְאֶת מִיתְקָיו לְכֹל עַבְדָּתוֹ:	The task of the sons of Gershon in the tent of meeting was the tabernacle ... and <i>the curtain</i> ... and <i>its cords</i> ...; with regard to everyone - its service (Num 3:25-26). <sup>56</sup>
וְאֵת הָעָרִים אֲשֶׁר תִּתֶּנּוּ לְלוֹוִים אֶת־שֵׁשׁ־עָרֵי הַמִּקְלָט אֲשֶׁר תִּתֶּנּוּ ...	And the cities which you give to the Levites, will be <i>the six cities</i> of refuge which you will give (Num 35:6). <sup>57</sup>
וּבְנֵי הַצִּרּוֹן אֲשֶׁר נִוְלְדוּ־לוֹ אֶת־יֶרְמְיָאֵל וְאֶת־רָם וְאֶת־כְּלֻבַי:	And the sons of Hezron who were born to him, were <i>Jerahmeel, Ram, and Chelubai</i> (1 Chron 2:9).
וְאֶת־כָּל־הָאָרֶץ הִיא	That is <i>the whole land</i> (Jer 45:4).
וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלַי בֶּן־אָדָם אֶת־מְקוֹם כִּסְאִי וְאֶת־מְקוֹם כַּפּוֹת רַגְלֵי	And he said to me: “Son of man, (this is) <i>the place</i> of my throne and <i>the place</i> of the soles of my feet” (Ezek 43:7). <sup>58</sup>

<sup>56</sup> Joüon-Muraoka (2006:417, §125j (2)): אֶת is used “before the last two longer terms of an enumeration in the nominative.” Gesenius (1976:365, §1171): the “accusative” depends on a verbal idea virtually contained in מִשְׁמֶרֶת - “they had to take charge of”. אֶת could also simply be read as the preposition *together with*. Even the translation *with regard to* is possible: “with regard to the curtain ... and with regard to its cords, with regard (preposition – לְ!) to everyone - its service”.

<sup>57</sup> Waltke & O’Connor (1990:183, §10.3.2): אֶת is the marker of the predicate in a verbless clause. In the mind of the speaker the אֶת-phrase could be the patient of *give*, although it is syntactically the copula-complement. Or: attraction of the copula-complement to the relative pronoun as direct object of the relative clause. See above: “With noun in verbless predicate”.

<sup>58</sup> Elliptic nominal clause: subject missing. See Joüon-Muraoka (2006:417, §125j (5)): אֶת has “a strong meaning equivalent to a pronoun”. See Muraoka (1985:155): *anakoluthon*. See Hoftijzer (1965: 71): *casus pendens*.

אֵת־הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר־כָּרַתִּי אִתְּכֶם בְּצֵאתְכֶם מִמִּצְרַיִם	(This is) <i>the word</i> which I made with you when you came out of Egypt (Hag 2:5). <sup>59</sup>
הֲלוֹא אֵת־הַדְּבָרִים אֲשֶׁר קָרָא יְהוָה	(Were these) not <i>the words</i> which Yahweh spoke? (Zech 7:7). <sup>60</sup>
... וְאֵת פְּאֵת צָפוֹן ... ... וְאֵת פְּאֵת קְדִימָה ... ... וְאֵת פְּאֵת־תֵּימָנָה ... ... וְאֵת פְּאֵת־יָם ...	... (This will be) <i>the north side</i> ... ... (This will be) <i>the east side</i> ... ... (This will be) <i>the south side</i> ... ... (This will be) <i>the west side</i> ... (Ezek 47:17-20). <sup>61</sup>
וְדַמוֹת פְּנֵיהֶם הָמָּה הָפְּנִים אֲשֶׁר רָאִיתִי עַל־נְהַר־כְּבָר מִרְאֵיהֶם וְאִנְשֵׁיהֶם	With regard to the shape of their faces - they were the faces which I saw near the river Chebar, their appearances and <i>they</i> <i>themselves</i> (Ezek 10:22). <sup>62</sup>

### אֵת as marker of the class

In the following example of a verbless clause (state), an indefinite noun functions as the copula-complement. If the subject is a definite noun, but the copula-complement is an indefinite noun, the semantic function of the copula-complement is class. The class is the group of entities of which the subject-zero

<sup>59</sup> אֵת could also indicate reference/regard. Gesenius (1976:365, §1171): due to attraction to a following relative pronoun. Muraoka (1985:155, footnote 135): אֵת־הַדְּבָרִים is the object of עָשָׂה in verse 4 after a parenthesis.

<sup>60</sup> See Joüon-Muraoka (2006:417, §125j (5)); Gesenius (1976:365, §1171): *aposiopesis* (the concealment or suppression of entire sentences or clauses which must be supplied from the context). Or: attraction to relative pronoun. See Hoftijzer (1965: 76).

<sup>61</sup> Muraoka (1985:157) reads וְאֵת – cf. verse 20. See Hoftijzer (1965: 71): *casus pendens*.

<sup>62</sup> In apposition to copula-complement. See Waltke & O'Connor (1990:183): אֵת is the marker of a word in apposition to the predicate in the verbless clause. However, it should be remembered that אֲשֶׁר is an indeclinable conjunction and that אֲשֶׁר and the suffixes in מִרְאֵיהֶם and אִנְשֵׁיהֶם could be read together as *of which*: "... they were the faces of which I saw the appearances and themselves". In this interpretation אֵת is simply the object marker. See above: "The patient is the direct object of an active clause".

is an example or instance. The class is [-controller]:

כָּל־הָעָרִים אֲשֶׁר תִּתֶּנּוּ לְלוֹוִים אַרְבָּעִים וּשְׁמֹנֶה עִיר אֶתְדָן וְאֶת־מִדְּשָׁתָן	All the cities which you will give to the Levites, will be 48 cities, <i>them and their pastures</i> <sup>63</sup> (Num 35:7). <sup>64</sup>
--	--

### אָת as marker of the quality

In the following example of a verbless clause (state), a participle phrase functions as the copula-complement. A participle is a verbal adjective. An adjective which functions as copula-complement has the semantic function of quality. It describes a characteristic or attribute of the subject. The quality is [-controller].<sup>65</sup>

כִּי־זָכַר אָנֹכִי וְאָתָּה אֶת־לִבֵּי צְמֹדִים אַחֲרַי אַחֲזָב אָבִיו	Because remember, you and I were <i>riding</i> as a team behind his father Ahab (2 Kings 9:25).
---	---

### אָת as marker of the reference

This section deals with examples which are often treated as “nominatives”, but which may be excluded from this category, even if one works within a case paradigm. For the sake of completeness, however, these examples are discussed below, as well as some examples which are treated by some scholars as dislocatives, but which could also be analyzed as simple adjuncts (see below: “other exclusions”). This would imply that these examples do not have the

<sup>63</sup> In apposition to the copula-complement.

<sup>64</sup> In the mind of the speaker the אָת-phrase could be the patient of *give*. Or: attraction of the words in apposition to the relative pronoun as direct object of the relative clause. See above: “With noun in verbless predicate”.

<sup>65</sup> However, a participle also has verbal characteristics. Therefore, it is an imbedded construction which acts on its own as the predicate of an action, position, etc., and may include the agent, positioner, etc. In the main clause it acts as copula-complement with the semantic function of quality.

“nominative” function and are actually irrelevant for our survey.

The occurrences of **dislocatives** (the so-called *nominativus absolutus* or *casus pendens*)<sup>66</sup> could have been in the nominative, if Biblical Hebrew had case endings. A dislocative is dislocated from the rest of the clause, and it may be replaced by an adverb or personal pronoun in the clause. The dislocative can even be separated from the main clause by the conjunction -וְ.<sup>67</sup> Syntactically, a dislocative is an extra-clausal constituent (see footnote 12); semantically, it is the reference. Dislocation, which is also called extraposition, facilitates topicalisation or focalisation (cf. Zewi, 1994:150). According to Zewi (1997:181) the marker כִּי, which she regards as a normal preposition, may have been retained due to an incomplete process of extraposition of a direct object.

But a dislocative could also have been in the so-called “accusative case” for another reason. The “object marker” or “nota accusativi” כִּי is sometimes also used as an adverbial marker, and as such it can mark the reference (regard, *scopus* or *respectus*).<sup>68</sup> Thus, this use of כִּי could better be dealt with under the heading of accusative if one works within a case paradigm.

The use of כִּי to mark the semantic function of reference makes it the ideal dislocative marker, because the dislocative construction highlights the theme or topic<sup>69</sup> of the clause. In the following examples, the כִּי-phrases are dislocatives with the semantic function of reference:

וְאֵת־חֻקֵּי לֹא־הָלְכוּ בָהֶם	And concerning my statutes - they did not walk in them (Ezek 20:16).
--------------------------------	--

<sup>66</sup> See Waltke & O’Connor (1990:183, §10.3.2d).

<sup>67</sup> See Gesenius (1976:458, §143d).

<sup>68</sup> See Gesenius (1976: 365-366, 458, §117m, ll, §143c); Muraoka (1985:155); Joüon-Muraoka (2006:417, §125j (4)).

<sup>69</sup> Topic is a pragmatic function, see Dik (1997a:313-326).



וְגַם אֶת־מַעֲכָה אִמּוֹ נִסְרָהּ מִזְבִּיחַהּ	And also <i>concerning Maacah</i> his mother - (and) he removed her away from being queen mother (1 Kings 15:13).
וְאֵת פְּדוּתִי ... וְלָקַחְתָּ	And <i>with regard to the ransom</i> ... (and) you shall accept ... (Num 3:46-47).

In Jer. 27:8, the phrase וְאֵת אֶת־צַוְאָרוֹ “And not put its neck ...” can be considered as a second dislocative phrase, which is marked by אֵת to make clear that this is not a second dependent relative clause after מִלְּךָ, but an independent relative clause. In 1 Kings 8:31, the אֵת-phrase is also a dislocative, indicating reference, with the main clause in verse 32. Similarly, וְאֵת־הָרָעָה in 1 Kings 11:25 could be a dislocative with the semantic function of reference: “*with reference to the evil* which Hadad (did) (and) he despised Israel ...”<sup>70</sup> Other texts where the dislocatives are marked by אֵת are Gen 20:16, Num 32:31, 2 Sam 5:8, 2 Chron 25:24, 2 Kings 16:14, Isa 51:22, 57:12, 8:13 and Ezek 34:23.

### Other exclusions

The phrase אֵת כֹּל־אֲשֶׁר הֵבֵאתִי עָלֶיךָ “all that I have brought upon it” in Ezek 14:22 could be an adjunct with the semantic function of reference, if the phrase is in apposition to הָרָעָה (על-). This phrase can also simply be in apposition to the preceding relative pronoun אֲשֶׁר, which is the direct object of הֵבֵאתִי.<sup>71</sup> In Deut 11:2, 7-9, the אֵת-phrase marks an adjunct with the semantic function of reference.<sup>72</sup>

וַיִּדְעֻם הַיּוֹם כִּי לֹא אֶת־בְּנֵיכֶם ...	And you must know today that (it is) not <i>with regard to your children</i> ...
---	--

<sup>70</sup> See Gesenius (1976:365-366, §117m, footnote 3); Muraoka (1985:157): “hopelessly corrupt”.

<sup>71</sup> See Joüon-Muraoka (2006:417, §125j (1)); Gesenius (1976:365, §117l).

<sup>72</sup> See Gesenius (1976:365, 505; §117l, §167a): *aposiopesis*; Muraoka (1985:155): *anakoluthon*; Hoftijzer (1965: 48, footnote 1): subject.

... כִּי עֵינֵיכֶם הָרְאִיתָ אֶת־כָּל־מַעֲשֵׂה יְהוָה ...	that your own eyes were the seers of every
וּשְׁמַרְתֶּם אֶת־כָּל־הַמִּצְוָה ...	deed of Yahweh ...
... לְמַעַן תִּחְזְקוּ וּבֹאתֶם וּרְשַׁתֶּם אֶת־הָאָרֶץ ...	and you must keep every law ...
וּלְמַעַן תִּצְרִיכוּ יָמִים ...	so that you can be strong and come and
	inherit the land ...
	and so that you can lengthen days ...

It is possible to interpret אֵת כָּל־עֲבֹדָתָם in Exod 1:14 as an adjunct with the semantic function of manner. In Gen 49:25, וְאֵת שְׂדֵי can be interpreted as an adjunct of cause after וַיָּפֹּו in verse 24. In a case system these adjuncts of reference, manner and cause would be “adverbial accusatives”.<sup>73</sup>

In Jer 23:33 (וְאָמַרְתָּ אֲלֵיהֶם אֶת־מַה־מִּשָּׂא<sup>74</sup>), the particle מַה is used as an adjectival interrogative pronoun (And you will say to them: “Which pronouncement/burden?”) The phrase אֶת־מַה־מִּשָּׂא is the object clause of וְאָמַרְתָּ. אֵת marks the clause as direct object. Object-clauses can also be introduced by אֶת־אֲשֶׁר.<sup>75</sup> Consequently, this is also not a “nominative” use of אֵת. It is not clear why Waltke & O’Connor<sup>76</sup> treat a noun in apposition to a prepositional object as a “nominative” (Exod 1:14) – if one works in the classical paradigm with cases, nouns following prepositions are in the “genitive”. Similar texts where the אֵת-phrases are not “nominatives” are Ezek 37:19<sup>77</sup> (where the second אֵת-phrase is in apposition to the complement of עַל), and Ezek 43:17<sup>78</sup> (where אֵת־הָהֵּה is the complement of כְּבִיב, which is used like a preposition).

<sup>73</sup> Gesenius (1976: 372-376, §118).

<sup>74</sup> See Hoftijzer (1965: 68): *casus pendens*.

<sup>75</sup> Gesenius (1976:491-492, §157c).

<sup>76</sup> Waltke & O’Connor (1990:183, §10.3.2d).

<sup>77</sup> See Gesenius (1976:365-366, §117m, footnote 3); Hoftijzer (1965: 69-70).

<sup>78</sup> See Gesenius (1976:365, §117k).

## DIFFICULT CASES: ׀ AS POSSIBLE MARKER OF [+CONTROLLER] SEMANTIC FUNCTIONS

There are seven cases where ׀ could mark subjects which are semantically [+controller], but in almost each case an alternative understanding is possible where it in fact marks them as [-controller].

### ׀ as possible marker of the agent

The subject of an action ([+controlled] [+dynamic]) has the semantic function of agent. The agent is the entity that controls an action and is therefore [+controller]. There are six examples where ׀ apparently marks the subject with the semantic function of agent. However, for all of these examples other solutions are also possible.

וּבָא הַאֲרִי וְהַיָּלֵד וְהַדָּבָר	And the lion and <i>the bear</i> came (1 Sam 17:34).
-------------------------------------	--

If the bear didn't come on purpose, but by accident, it can have the semantic function of processed [-controller].<sup>79</sup> However, this seems to be unlikely in the given context.

וְאֵתָם אִישׁ אֶל-עֵבֶר פָּנָיו יֵלְכוּ:	And <i>they</i> , each one, moved straight ahead (Ezek 10:22).
--	--

Perhaps *they* refers to the wheels in verse 19 – this will make *they* a processed which is [-controller] (cf. verse 17).<sup>80</sup>

<sup>79</sup> In the following sense: the two beasts *came upon* the shepherd; See Muraoka (1985:157): *waw* concomitance + preposition ׀.

<sup>80</sup> See above: “׀ as marker of the identity”.

וְאֶת־מְלָכֵינוּ שָׂרֵינוּ כֹּהֲנֵינוּ וְאֲבוֹתֵינוּ לֹא עָשׂוּ חֻקְךָ	<i>Our kings, our officials, our priests and our ancestors did not keep your law (Neh 9:34).</i>
---	--

The אַתָּה could here be taken as the preposition אַתָּה meaning *together with*. This interpretation would make this example irrelevant for our study.<sup>81</sup>

אֵת אֲשֶׁר יַחַמֵּא אִישׁ לְרֵעֵהוּ ... וְאַתָּה תִשְׁמַע הַשָּׁמַיִם	<i>He who sins against his neighbour ... and You must hear in heaven (1 Kings 8:31-32).</i>
--	---

This is an adverbial (temporal) use of אַתָּה, which precedes several temporal phrases and clauses in verses 33, 35, 37, 44 and 46, formed with אַתָּה and infinitive construct or by כִּי. This implies that אֵת אֲשֶׁר is to be interpreted as a conjunction which introduces a temporal clause and can be translated as: “*When/if* a man sins ...” instead of “*He who* sins .” It could also be a dislocative of reference: “*With regard to him who* sins ...” Both possibilities are irrelevant for our study because they are “accusative” uses of אַתָּה.

כִּי־יִחְיֶה אֵת אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה־לָּנוּ אֶת־הַנְּפֶשׁ הַזֹּאת אִם אֶמְיָתֶךָ	<i>As the Lord lives, He who gave us this life, I will not kill you (Jer 38:16).</i>
---	--

Instead of taking אֵת אֲשֶׁר as a relative (*He who*), this can be interpreted as a conjunction of an adverbial clause with the semantic function of cause (*because* He gave us life). Again, this last possibility is irrelevant for our study.

אֵלֶּה הִחֵל לְבִנּוֹת מִזְבֵּחַ לַיהוָה:	<i>He began to build an altar for the Lord (1 Sam 14:35).</i>
---	---

<sup>81</sup> See Muraoka (1985:154).

*Begin* is an auxiliary verb which is semantically on the same level as an adverb. Therefore, this could perhaps be explained as an adverbial use of  $\text{הָאֵל}$ . However, this explanation is not very satisfactory – this could be an exception to the rule that  $\text{הָאֵל}$  marks [-controller] entities.

### $\text{הָאֵל}$ as possible marker of the positioner

The subject of a position ([+contolled] [-dynamic]) has the semantic function of positioner. The positioner is the entity that controls a position and is therefore [+controller]. One example was found where  $\text{הָאֵל}$  apparently marks the subject with the semantic function of positioner [+ controller]:

אֵלֶּיךָ הַקִּיּוֹן הַזֶּה יֵשֵׁב לֶאֱכֹל לֶחֶם לִפְנֵי יְהוָה	<i>The prince</i> <sup>82</sup> - he is a prince - may sit in it to eat food before the Lord (Ezek 44:3).
---	--

But this phrase can also function as an adjunct of reference: *With reference to the prince...* Due to the fact that there are so few and dubious examples of  $\text{הָאֵל}$  with the agent and positioner, it can be concluded that the particle is never, or only by way of exception, used to mark [+controller] semantic functions.

## SEMANTICS VERSUS SYNTAX

In the examples discussed above it was found that  $\text{הָאֵל}$  functions as a marker of the following syntactic and semantic functions:

Subject - patient [-controller]	41
Subject - zero [-controller]	19
Subject - processed [-controller]	9

<sup>82</sup> Instead of “*The prince*, because he is a prince ...” See Hoftijzer (1965: 71): *casus pendens*.

Subject - force [-controller]	3
Copula-complement - identity [-controller]	10
Copula-complement - class [-controller]	1
Copula-complement - quality [-controller]	1
Subject - agent [+controller]	6?
Subject - positioner [+controller]	1?

There is a semantic similarity between the patient, zero, processed, force, identity, class and quality. All of them are [-controller]. The normal use of the particle 𐤀𐤃 is to mark direct objects which usually have the semantic function of patient, which is also [-controller]. In other words, the connection of the object particle 𐤀𐤃 with the semantic characteristic [-controller] (especially the patient) is so strong that the semantic deep structure sometimes overrides the syntactic surface structure, consequently using the particle as a marker of the semantic function of patient in passive sentences where the subject is the patient of the action, position or process. This is an example of semantic interference in the syntactic structure. Taking into account that 𐤀𐤃 is a marker of not only the syntactic function of direct object, but also of the semantic function of patient, this is understandable. Similarly, the particle is also used to mark other [-controller] semantic functions, like the zero, processed, force, identity, class and quality.

The few examples where 𐤀𐤃 apparently marks [+controller] agents and positioners can all be interpreted differently (or be regarded as exceptions), and, considering our findings above, this should probably be done. This conclusion confirms Hoftijzer's<sup>83</sup> findings:

- 𐤀𐤃 marks the complement of “an action to which someone or something outside the subject is subjected or to which they are submitted” (direct object) (i.e. the patient).

---

<sup>83</sup> See Hoftijzer (1965: 23-29, 44, 81).

- All verbal sentences with the so-called ‘*t nominativi*’ belong to a second type of sentence, i.e. “a situation in which the subject finds itself” or where “the subject undergoes a certain action or is submitted to it” (i.e. 𐤀𐤃 indicates the zero or processed, as well as the patient in a passive sentence).
- Rarely, 𐤀𐤃 marks the “subject” or “predicate” in nominal sentences (i.e. the zero, identity, class and quality).<sup>84</sup>

## CONCLUSION

Functional grammar identifies a common thread running through seemingly disparate uses of 𐤀𐤃 - it marks the semantic function of [-controller], especially the patient. The most common sentence component to have this characteristic is of course the direct object and this accounts for the majority of the uses of 𐤀𐤃. This also explains the use of 𐤀𐤃 to mark the subject-patient in passive clauses. However, it has been demonstrated that, like the patient, other syntactic functions can also be semantically [-controller] and so it is not without reason that 𐤀𐤃 is also found to indicate these syntactic functions. In other words, with reference to the so-called “nominative” uses of 𐤀𐤃, the syntactic range of 𐤀𐤃 is explained by its semantic range. Since traditional grammars pay inadequate

---

<sup>84</sup> Fillmore (1968:25) also captured the semantic similarity of some of these semantic roles (e.g. patient, zero and processed) in his case grammar with the category “objective”. The idea that 𐤀𐤃 is a marker of non-controlling entities is also supported by the following statement of Waltke & O’Connor (1990: 182, §10.3.2b), although they did not express the idea in semantic terms: “The use” (of 𐤀𐤃 as subject marker) “with transitives is extremely rare; the other two usages” (with intransitive active verbs and passive verbs) “are more common.” The semantic similarity of the direct object and the subject of intransitive verbs is also captured by ergative languages in which the subject of an intransitive verb, the object of a transitive verb, and the citation form have the same ending called the *absolutive*. In this kind of languages the subject of a transitive verb is the *ergative* (see Dik 1997a:369).

attention to semantics, our findings further indicate the importance of applying modern linguistic theory to the study of Biblical Hebrew.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bach, E & Harms, R T (eds.) 1968. *Universals in linguistic theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Brockelmann, C 1961. *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen: in zwei Bänden*. II. Bd: Syntax. Hildesheim: Olms.
- De Boer, P A H (ed.) 1965. *kh: 1940-1965*. Oudtestamentische studiën 14. Leiden: Brill.
- Dik, S C 1997a. *The theory of functional grammar. Part 1: The structure of the clause*. 2nd revised edition, edited by Kees Hengeveld. Functional Grammar Series 20. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1997b. *The theory of functional grammar. Part 2: Complex and derived constructions*, edited by Kees Hengeveld. Functional Grammar Series 21. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fillmore, C J 1968. The case for case, in Bach & Harms 1968:1-88.
- Gesenius, F H W 1976. *Gesenius' Hebrew grammar: as edited and enlarged by the late E. Kautzsch*. Second English edition, revised in accordance with the twenty-eighth German edition (1909) by A. E. Cowley, with a facsimile of the Siloam Inscription by J. Euting, and a table of alphabets by M. Lidzbarski. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Goldenberg, G & Raz S (eds.) 1994. *Semitic and Cushitic studies*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hoftijzer, J 1965. Remarks concerning the use of the particle 't in classical Hebrew, in De Boer 1965:1-99.
- Joüon, P-Muraoka, T 2006. *A grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico. (Subsidia biblica 27.)
- Kroeze, J H 1996. The applicability of semantic functions to Biblical Hebrew. *South African Journal of Linguistics*, Supplement 33:47-60, Dec.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1997. Alternatives for the accusative in Biblical Hebrew, in Wagner 1997:11-25.
- Muraoka, T 1985. *Emphatic words and structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Van der Merwe, C H J, Naudé, J A & Kroeze, J H 1999. *A Biblical Hebrew reference grammar*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Wagner, A (ed.) 1997. *Studien zur hebräischen Grammatik*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 156. Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag.
- Waltke, B C & O'Connor, M 1990. *An introduction to Biblical Hebrew syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Zewi, T 1994. The nominal sentence in Biblical Hebrew, in Goldenberg & Raz



1994:145-167.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1997. Subjects preceded by the preposition 'et in Biblical Hebrew, in Wagner 1997:171-183.

\_\_\_\_\_ 1999. Incomplete topicalization in Biblical and Modern Hebrew and several Arabic Bible translations. *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, 19/2:241-253.

Wagner, A (ed) 1997. *Studien zur hebräische Grammatik*. Freiburg, Schweiz: Universitätsverlag/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, Bd. 156.)

Prof J.H. Kroeze  
Department of Informatics  
University of Pretoria  
Lynnwood Avenue  
Pretoria  
0002  
South Africa  
E-mail: jan.kroeze@up.ac.za