

**Biblical Hebrew who will understand?**  
**Methodological reflections on identifying topic and focus in a dead language**

Tamás Biró (*tamas.biro@btk.elte.hu*)

Eötvös Loránd University

The notions of topic and focus are well known to a theoretical linguist by the end of the second decade of the twenty-first century. Much less were they so just a few decades ago, and much less are they still so outside the general linguistics community. The topic of this talk is the word order in Biblical Hebrew, and we focus on why these two concepts have posed a challenge to biblical scholars.

Topic relates to information structure, and topicalization does not affect the truth condition of a sentence. Focussing does. However, it is not easy to distinguish between truth conditions without full access to context. E.g., if Donald Trump twitters “I won”, it sounds like a focus with the intended meaning ‘it is me who won, and not you’. But when he twitted “I won big and he didn’t” about Mitt Romney (on January 2, 2019), he topicalized the subjects: ‘in 2012, you did not win for the Republicans, whereas I did in 2016’.

On a linguistic level, several devices can be deployed to mark topicalization and focussing: at least prosody, lexical items (cf. Japanese *wa*), word order (cf. Hungarian) and syntactic constructions (cf. cleft sentences in English). Biblical Hebrew does not have dedicated lexical items or obvious syntactic constructions, even though a specific syntactic structure will be shortly argued to be a focus marker. As far as prosody is concerned, it has not been preserved.<sup>1</sup> The only candidate still in the game is word order.

Biblical Hebrew is standardly postulated to be a VSO language. (For alternatives, cf. Holmstedt 2011 and other works of his.) Any deviation therefrom is an aspirant for topicalization or focussing.

Bandstra 1986 argues for VOS emerging when the object is known (topic-like), whereas the subject is new. Revisiting his examples, I shall argue that scrambling in the middle field is better understood as being related to weight, i.e. pronouns preceding nouns, and shorter NPs preceding longer ones. True, the two explanations converge, since pronouns refer to entities already known in the discourse. Further factors may also contribute to scrambling.

Subsequently, I shall turn to the Vorfeld, and argue for a *topic – focus – V S O* order. Consider the following examples with both the topic and focus positions filled (note the Wh-word in the focus position):

- (1) a. *wəhanniš’ārîm herāh nāsū* (Gen 14:10b)  
and.the.rest to.hill fled  
[...the kings of Sodom and Gomorrah fled, some fell into them,]  
‘and the rest fled to the hill country.’ (NRSV)
- b. *’ēšet hayil mî yimšā* (Prov 31:10a)  
woman valour who find.IMPF.3.SING.MASC  
‘A capable wife who can find?’ (...) (NRSV)

Yet, how shall we interpret sentence (2) with a single NP before the verb?

- (2) a. *bəqōr bāneqā titten lî* (Exod 22:28b)  
firstborn sons.your give.IMPF.2.SING.MASC to.me  
‘The firstborn of your sons you shall give to me.’ (NRSV)

Is here *firstborn* a topic or a focus? Can we distinguish between the two, without reference to prosody or a native speaker’s intuition? To answer this question with some certainty, we must make use of disciplines that linguistics long ago parted ways with, such as literature, religious history and philology.

In an Iron Age context, Exod 22:28 would be read with a topicalized object. Even if the dative object was not explicitly focussed, the sentence might have contained an implicit contrast between “giving” (whatever that meant) the firstborn to the Lord and sacrificing him to Moloch. The direct object needed not be focussed. Yet a few centuries later, for the Priestly author (P, standardly dated to the 5th century BCE), the same direct object was contrasted to other sons of yours: the former is to be redeemed, and not the latter (compare Exod

---

<sup>1</sup> The standard text of the Hebrew Bible, the *Textus Masoreticus* contains cantillation marks. Yet, these marks, originating at the late 1st millennium CE (!), were added to the text for liturgical reasons, and in a period when Hebrew had not been in spontaneous oral usage for centuries anymore. While future research might search for a possible correlation between cantillation marks and topic or focus positions, currently they are of no help to us.

22:28 to Exod 34:20, the parallel verse in P; Farber 2018:443). Hence, P might have reanalysed this left-dislocated NP as a focus. We cannot tell if intonation changed with this reanalysis.

Finally, I'll argue for the structure *Full NP – pronoun – V* to be a special construction for focus. Take the following examples:

- (3) a.        *'iššāh*            *yir'at*            *YHWH hî*            *tiḥallāl*            (Prov 31:30b)  
 woman            fearing.FEM    LORD she            is.praised.IMPF.3.SING.FEM  
 [Charm is deceitful, and beauty is vain,]  
 'but a woman who fears the Lord is to be praised'            (NRSV)
- b.        *hā'iššāh*            *'āšer nātattāh*            *'immādī*  
 the.woman        who            give.PERF.2.SING.MASC            with.SING.1  
*hî nātənāh*            *lî min hā'êš wā'ōkēl* (Gen 3:12b)  
 she            give.PERF.3.SING.FEM            to.me            from            the.tree and.eat.IMPF.1.SING  
 'The woman whom you gave to be with me, she gave me fruit from the tree, and I ate.' (NRSV)
- c.        *'ēt kol haddābār*            *'āšer 'ānōkī māsawweh*            *'etkem*  
 ACC all            the.thing            which I            commend            you.PLUR.MASC.ACC  
*'ōtō*            *tišmərū*            *la'āsōt*            (Deut 13:1a)  
 he/it.ACC            keep.IMPF.2.PLUR.MASC            do.INFINITIVE  
 'You must diligently observe everything that I command you'  
 [do not add to it or take anything from it.]            (NRSV)

In these examples, the contexts make it clear that the left-dislocated constituents function as focus. (3a) appears in the context of the description of the “capable wife”, contrasting in this verse the fear of God to charm and beauty. In (3b), the speaker answers an unposed question, and shifts responsibility to his wife, implicitly contrasting himself to her. In (3c), the second part of the biblical verse makes the contrast explicit between the focussed object<sup>2</sup> and all other alternative possibilities (either more, or less than it).

In the last two examples, heavy NPs are raised to a topic-like position, leaving behind a trace in the focus position realized as a pronoun. The NP in (3a) is probably not very heavy, and yet, it is raised further so that a visible trace in the focus position would appear. Observe that without a visible trace a sentence with a focus would be surface-identical to a sentence with a topic. So – we hypothesize – the role of the resumptive pronoun is to disambiguate between these two structures, topicalization and focussing.

To summarize, the interpretation of a left-dislocated constituent as topic or focus is often a matter of exegesis in the absence of a native speaker or clear linguistic devices. Nevertheless, it might still be possible to discover such devices even in extinct languages.

## References

- Bandstra, B. L. (1992). Word order and emphasis in Biblical Hebrew narrative: syntactic observations on Genesis 22 from a discourse perspective. Bodine (ed.), *Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew* (Eisenbrauns, 109-123).
- Farber, Z. I. (2018). Religion in eighth-century Judah: an overview. Zev I. Farber and Jacob L. Wright (eds.), *Archaeology and History of Eighth-Century Judah* (SBL Press), 431-453.
- Holmstedt, R. D. (2011). The typological classification of the Hebrew of Genesis: subject-verb or verb-subject? *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures*, 11.

<sup>2</sup> While the consonantal text could be ambiguous, the cantillation marks in the Masoretic text make it clear that *'ōtō* belongs to the matrix clause, and not to the subordinate clause. Accusative resumptive pronouns in subordinate clauses are generally dropped anyway.