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the pronoun him in the first clause can only be that of left-dislocation, the pronoun he in the second clause is indeed required (this is indicated by placing the asterisk outside the parentheses).

These and additional arguments for broad subjects have been given by Doron (1995; 1996), Doron and Heycock (1999), Heycock and Doron (2003), and Alexopoulou, Doron and Heycock (2004). They have been contested by Landau (2009), a response to which has been provided by Doron and Heycock (2010).
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Subordination: Biblical Hebrew

The concept of ‘subordination’ has a long history in general linguistics as well as in works of descriptive grammar, and there is still no consensus about its exact definition. The main controversy concerns whether a subordinate clause should be regarded as ‘embedded in’—i.e., as being a component part within or as occupying a ‘slot’ in—the main clause, or, alternatively, be regarded as only ‘linked’ to it in a special relation. The ‘embedding’ metaphor fits fairly well in cases where a (‘complement’) clause takes up the subject or object ‘slot’ within another (main) clause. For other instances of subordinate clauses the term ‘embedding’ can be grammatically misleading, for example, when the same non-main clause qualifies several main clauses (Matthiessen and Thompson 1988:277, 281; note that in the examples that follow non-main clauses are placed within parentheses):

(i) Pattern: NEG-VprefS+NEG-VprefS+(ki+ Vsuff):

The concept of ‘subordination’ is illustrated by the biblical Hebrew example (1), which represented a digression from the main line marked by the conjunction ו kî and by a ‘switch’ to another verbal grammatical morpheme (Vsuff = qatal). In the example, it is not productive to analyze the subordinate clause as a constituent in one of the preceding clauses. It is more to the point to regard the kî-clause as circumstantially qualifying the two preceding main line clauses. Since the subordinate clause in (1) is syntactically marked for subordination, it can safely be classified as having ‘unequal status’ in relation to the two main clauses (Halliday 2004:374).

Due to the lack of agreement about the definition of ‘subordination’ many linguists prefer to avoid the term in favor of a more distinct terminology. This is the decision of Matthiessen and Thompson (1988) as well as Dixon (2009), and their approach will be followed in the rest of this entry. The term chosen for this entry will be Dixon’s ‘non-main clause linking’ involving at least one ‘main clause’ and at least one ‘non-main clause’. It is understood that ‘non-main’ clauses are syntactically marked in some way, as was the case with the non-main clause in (1), which represented a digression from the main line marked by the conjunction ו kî and by a ‘switch’ of verbal grammatical morpheme (Isaksson 2009c:121–122; 2011a:183–185; compare Fleischman 1984:869). It is fruitful to expand the scope of the definition by introducing a textual perspective: Givón’s ‘main line’, which is a semantic, text-linguistic concept (Givón 2001:1 299). In order to identify
the main line in a text in contrast to non-main clauses one must refer to the semantics and pragmatics of the discourse in which the linking appears (Matthiessen and Thompson 1988:275). The main line in a text is encoded in one or several main clauses. Non-main clauses code ‘digressions’ from the ‘main line’ (for the terms, see Givón 2001:2 299) (→ Grounding). Considering that grammatical morphology is the major signal of grammatical and discourse structure, it is also a major signal of clause relations, more important than word order (Bybee and Dahl 1989:51). This is especially so in a syntax formed in an oral society like that of the speakers of ancient Hebrew (Polak 1998:102; Sanders 2009:146–147; Isaksson 2011a:174) (→ Orality: Biblical Hebrew). The (verbal or non-verbal) predicate is the constitutive syntactic property of a clause and determines its status in relation to adjacent clauses in a text. Clauses are characterized by their predicates. Switches between distinct clause types determine a status shift from or to a main line in Biblical Hebrew. A ‘clause’ is defined according to modern linguistics as a syntagm containing one predication. This means that a clause may lack a subject and can have only one predicate. If there are two predicates, there are also two clauses. The traditional definition of a clause based on finiteness and explicit subject has no universal significance (Lehmann 1988:182; Haspelmath 1995:11; Isaksson 2009b:5). A ‘non-finite clause’ exhibits various degrees of nominalization compared to a full-fledged finite verb clause (‘desententialization’, Lehmann 1988:193). Degrees of nominalization represent a scale of loss of information. What is not expressed explicitly must be inferred “from the semantics and pragmatics of the discourse in which the linking appears” (Dixon 2009:14; Isaksson 2009b:7–23). A switch to a non-finite non-main clause is a powerful mark of digression in a text.

A non-main clause may precede or succeed the main clause. Subordinating conjunctions represent a supplemental non-main marking system by which the semantic function of the non-main clause is (usually) explicitly stated (יָמָן pen ‘in case, lest’, †שֵׁשׁ ya’an ‘because’, †עַמָּן lama’an ‘in order to’, †רֵין דָּע ad āšer ‘until’, etc.; Juijon and Muraoka 2006:319). It is unusual that a conjunction alone marks non-main clause linking in Biblical Hebrew (without a switch of clause type). When a non-main clause lacks a subordinating conjunction, the semantic relation of the non-main clause is left unexpressed and must be understood from the immediate textual and pragmatic context (‘inference’, Isaksson 2011a:185; see also Dixon 2009:14). Other properties of a Biblical Hebrew clause, like word order and adverbs, are important for expressing topicalization and temporal reference (Van der Merwe 1999:345), but do not affect the status of the clause, that is, they do not signal a syntactic digression from the main line. Coordination in Biblical Hebrew is basically the linking of clauses of the same syntactic type (→ Coordination: Biblical Hebrew). The syntactical clause types recognized for Standard Biblical Hebrew in the present entry are: (1) noun clause (NC): the predicate of which may be a noun phrase including an adjective, a prepositional phrase, or an adverb), (2) clause with active participle (PA) predicate, (3) clause with passive participle (PP) predicate, (4) clause with verbal noun (VN) predicate (including the infinitive construct), (5) clause with short prefix verb (VprefS) predicate, (6) clause with long prefix verb (VprefL) predicate, (7) clause with suffix verb (Vsuff) predicate, and (8) clause with imperative (IMP) predicate (compare the tripartite finite verb system of SBH shown in Tropper 1998:164–185; Van de Sande 2008:238–239; Isaksson 2009c;125–139; 2011a:176–182).

The rest of this entry will treat non-main clauses other than relative clauses (→ Relative Clause: Biblical Hebrew) and complement clauses (→ Adverbial; Content Clause).

i. Non-finite Non-main Clauses

An important syntactic mark of non-main clause linking is a digression from a main line of finite clauses to a clause the predicate of which is a non-finite verbal morpheme. In Biblical Hebrew such a non-finite morpheme is usually a verbal noun (Isaksson 2007), or, less frequently, a participle, while the main line in prose is encoded mainly with clauses with a short prefix verb predicate (Isaksson 2011a:179–182).

(2) Pattern: VprefS+(NEG-VN): wa-yannah (way-yannah)
In (4) the main line is coded by two VprefS clauses linked in such a way that they have ‘equal status’ (‘parataxis’). The non-main clause is identified as such by the switch from VprefS clauses to a non-finite verb clause (PA). The main line clauses and the PA clause have ‘unequal status’ (‘hypotaxis’), Halliday (2004, 374). The feminine form of the PA indicates that it refers to the city of Laish and to the feminine suffix in הבור qirbāh ‘inside it’. The non-main clause is asyndetic: there is no conjunction to mark the juncture from the preceding main clause.

2. Noun Clauses as Non-main Clauses

‘Noun clauses’ (NCl) (→ Nominal Clause) lack a finite verbal grammatical morpheme. The term ‘nominal clause’ is avoided here, since some scholars maintain that it may contain a finite verb in accordance with traditional Arabic grammar (Nyberg 1972:259; Schneider 1982:165). A switch to a noun clause is a common way of signaling a digression from a main line in narrative Hebrew prose. Such a digression may express mere parenthetical information (Zewi 2007:67):

In (5) the main line is represented by the two VprefS clauses with equal status, while pieces of background information are expressed by two coordinated noun clauses. Although noun clauses in another context can code main-line information (for example, in direct speech), the digression from the main-line VprefS clauses to NCI clauses marks a shift of status, a non-main clause linkage. Digressions of this type may contain factual information aimed at later readers which is “external to the narrative sequence” (Zewi 2007:67) and irrelevant to the narrative world at reference time, as in the asyndetic NCI in (6):

Other instances express a close connection to the main clause(s) with an emotionally charged content, as in (7), where the sudden opportunity for Potiphar’s wife is described in a background clause:

(7) Pattern: VprefS+VN+(NCI):  הָיָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֱלֹהִים לְכָל־אֲשֶׁר פָּתְחָה (way-yābô hab-baytâ la’āsôt malakto (wa-ēn ‘îs mé-‘ansê hab-bâyît šām bab-bâyît) ‘He (Joseph) went into the house to attend to his duties (while none of the household servants was inside)’ (Gen. 39.11).

3. Finite Clauses as Non-main Clauses

We have seen how non-finite clauses and noun clauses may be used to form a digression (a switch) from the main-clause structure used for the main line of a story. The sudden use of a noun clause or a non-finite verbal morpheme is, then, the formal mark of the non-main clause. However, the digression can also be brought about with finite non-main clauses. Below is an example of a non-main clause with conjunction (CONJ) and suffix verb (Vsuff; Isaksson 2011a:176–179):

(8) Pattern: VprefS+(CONJ)+Vsuff: יָשַׁב בָּבֶית אָבָר מְלַאכְתּוֹ שֶׁבֶּם (way-tabillennâ šebâ šem hâ-râḏâb lâbîo (ka-‘âsêr ‘āmar yōsêph) ‘The seven years of famine began to come, (just as Joseph had said)’ (Gen. 41.54).

A subordinating conjunction marks a digression from the main line. The advantage of such a conjunction is its explicitness: it specifies the semantic relation of the non-main clause to the main clause (final, concessive, causal, temporal, comparative, etc. → Adverbal). In (8) the relation is comparative. The non-main clause linking is doubly marked: by the conjunction and by the switch from a VprefS to a Vsuff clause. Such a double marking of the digression is common in Hebrew syntax, but there are cases when a switch of clause structure is not feasible and the conjunction is the only syntactic mark of the non-main clause linking. In (9) both main and non-main clauses have long prefix verb predicates (VprefL; Isaksson 2011a:182):

(9) Pattern: VprefL+(CONJ)+VprefL: יָשַׁב בָּבֶית אָבָר מְלַאכְתּוֹ (way-yābô hab-baytâ la’āsôt (wa-ēn ‘îs mé-‘ansê hab-bâyît šām bab-bâyît) ‘He (Joseph) went into the house to attend to his duties (while none of the household servants was inside)’ (Gen. 39.11).

Subordinating conjunctions play a role in Hebrew syntax, but it is limited (Nyberg 1972:60). From a cross-linguistic perspective hypotaxis is not necessarily encoded by means of connective particles. A switch to another verbal grammatical morpheme is in itself a powerful mark of digression for a listener in a text-reading performance (Sanders 2009:147). This kind of non-main clause marking has the advantage of being efficient and simple: there is no need to specify the exact semantic relation of the linkage, which is usually easy to understand anyhow.

In (10) below the non-main clause is positioned before the main line. Non-main clause linking is marked by a switch of verbal grammatical morphemes (Vsuff / VprefS). There is no syntactic indication of the intended semantic meaning of the non-main clause, but the receiver easily perceives that it is one of causality (‘since’), or, possibly, temporality (‘when’):

(10) Pattern: (Vsuff)+VprefS: יָשַׁב בָּבֶית אָבָר מְלַאכְתּוֹ (way-yābô hab-baytâ la’āsôt (wa-ēn ‘îs mé-‘ansê hab-bâyît šām bab-bâyît) ‘Since [or once/after] the famine had spread over all the land' Joseph opened all the storehouses’ (Gen. 41.56).

In (10) the suffix verb (bâyâ) has, as is frequently the case, the anterior force (‘pluperfect’), which is probably not the case in (11), where a perfective meaning of the Vsuff is more to the point (Waltke and O’Connor 1990:484; Isaksson 2011a:176–179):

and Muraoka 2006:361; Isaksson 2011b). In (11) the non-main clause linking is marked by a switch from VprefS (coding the main line) to a Vsuff clause (coding background). Switches of the type VprefS / Vsuff are frequent in narrative prose. Since a non-verbal constituent is often topicalized in background clauses, a non-main Vsuff clause usually exhibits a subject (as in (11)), an object, or a prepositional phrase in clause-initial position (before the verb, the so-called ‘x-qatal’ structure, Niccacci 1990:70). A chiastic word-order is extremely common in non-main clauses expressing a ‘same-event addition’ which, as Dixon points out, semantically speaking are supporting clauses (Dixon 2009:27). Examples abound in both prose and poetry. (12) is taken from plain narrative prose:

(12) VprefS+(object noun-Vsuff)  uyay-kakbh l-pi-hreb (uo-et-ha-ir sibh h-b-ees)  ‘They put it to the sword (and left the city to the fire)’ (Judg. 1.8).

In (12) “(t)wo clauses describe different aspects of a single event” (Dixon 2009:27). The fronted constituent (here the object reythny et-ha-ir) in the non-main clause refers back in the text and is a signal that the clause is linked to a preceding clause, not to a following clause. A well-known same-event addition is the naming act following the creation of the light:

(13) VprefS+(object noun-Vsuff)  qmr l-oyom l-la-bseg qrr l-layyl ‘God called the light Day, (and the darkness he called Night)’ (Gen. 1.5).

Chiastic word-order is common in non-main clauses, but there are examples of non-main Vsuff clauses without topicalized element, even in narrative:

(14) Pattern: VprefS+VprefS+VprefS+(Vsuff):  wa-yiqqr l-l-o mr ‘(for he was not able to pronounce it ‘asyndesis’), the receiver infers the semantic function of the non-main clause correctly’ (Judg. 12.6).

As in (14), there is no explicit indication of the semantic function of the non-main clause in (15). The nuance of causality (‘for...’) is understood from the context. The use of the imperfective VprefL morpheme in this context indicates habitual action.

4. Non-main Clauses in Poetry

In poetry there is no convention as to how to encode the main line, but, as in prose, non-main clause linking is marked by digressions from the main line (Isaksson 2012).

(15) Pattern: VprefS+VprefS+(VprefL):  wa-yomr l- ‘emr-n sibbolet way-yomr sibbolet (uo-l o krr l-layyl) ‘They said to him, “Please say ‘shibbolet’,” and he said “shibbolet” (for he was not able to pronounce it correctly)” (Judg. 12.6).

(16) Pattern: NCl+(VprefL)+NCl+(VprefL):  sbb-br ‘consequence/result’ of a preceding clause is expressed by a wa-Vsuff clause to express a ‘follow-up’ or ‘consequence/result’ of a preceding clause is a characteristic Hebrew syntactic innovation, though there are parallel cases of clause linking in other Semitic languages (Joosten 2012:16). The meaning of the Vsuff gram in (14) is perfective (‘the tent fell’). In all such cases when the connective is the neutral -l w-, or when there is no connective (‘asyndesis’), the receiver infers the semantic relation from the context. In (14) a nuance of natural result is a suitable meaning: ‘and so...’ (for ‘inference’ see Isaksson 2009b:17, 19–21, 123; for ‘asyndesis’ see Isaksson 2009c:117).

When the expression of the imperfective aspect is required in the non-main clause, a VprefL morpheme can be utilized to encode a digression from the usual narrative main line:

(16) Pattern: NCl+(VprefL)+NCl+(VprefL):  l l ‘God is not man (to be capricious), or mortal (to change his mind)’ (Num. 23.19a).

The main line in (16) is coded by noun clauses, and the two digressions are VprefL clauses, which can be interpreted with a consequence-result meaning (‘so that’). In the next hemistich of Num. 23.19 the main line changes to Vsuff clauses in rhetorical questions with digressions in the form of VprefL clauses:

An elaborative short prefix verb clause may also refer to a generally valid activity when qualifying a participle clause. Even in such cases the Masoretic vocalization reflects the interpretation of the clause as having a narrative flavor, although not encoding a narrative storyline, and they render the conjunction with the allomorph 1 wa-:

5. Short Prefix Verb Clauses Expressing Elaboration

A clause expressing elaboration of the main line is a type of non-main clause linking with high saliency. Such a clause is semantically a ‘focal clause’ and adds “additional information about the event” (Dixon 2009:27). Short prefix verb clauses frequently encode non-main elaborative digressions (enclosed within curly brackets, {elaboration}).

God speaks to the Adversary about Job, and the VprefS clause elaborates on the PA clause with high saliency. The aspect is perfective in the digression and refers to a single event in the past.

In poetic language participles also may serve in main clauses. In (18) VprefL clauses code digressions from such a main line (Brockelman 1913:II 505; Nyberg 1972:268–269):

In (23) the VprefS clause is still non-main and elaborates the longing for death. A similar clause is a digression from Vsuff clauses with a prototypical stative/resultative meaning (Tupper 1995:513; 1998:182; Isaksson 2011a:176–177):

A clause expressing elaboration of the main line is a type of non-main clause linking with high saliency. Such a clause is semantically a ‘focal clause’ and adds “additional information about the event” (Dixon 2009:2, 6, 27). Short prefix verb clauses frequently encode non-main elaborative digressions (enclosed within curly brackets, {elaboration}).

In poetic language participles also may serve in main clauses. In (18) VprefL clauses code digressions from such a main line (Brockelman 1913:II 505; Nyberg 1972:268–269):

Like in prosa same-event addition is common in poetry, where ‘parallelism’ is often coded by a main clause followed by a supporting clause expressing a different aspect of the same event (Dixon 2009:27). In Biblical Hebrew a same-event-addition clause is practically always coded by a switch of grammatical morpheme in the predicate, as in (19):

In (20) the people ‘bitter of soul’ are described related to the previous clause, {elaboration}:

In (21) the people ‘bitter of soul’ are described as longing for death (PA). This longing is elaborated by a wa-VprefS clause (wayyiqtol). The short prefix verb is not narrative, since the text type is poetical description. The VprefS encodes an activity, but it is an activity that elaborates the longing for death. A similar elaboration is found in (22), where the VprefS clause is a digression from VprefS clauses with a prototypical stative/resultative meaning (Tupper 1995:513; 1998:182; Isaksson 2011a:176–177):

In (22) the VprefS clause is still non-main and elaborates the longing for death. A similar clause is a digression from Vsuff clauses with a prototypical stative/resultative meaning (Tupper 1995:513; 1998:182; Isaksson 2011a:176–177):

In this case the VprefS clause is specifically related to the previous clause, {elaboration}:

In (23) the VprefS clause is still non-main and elaborative, but if a chain of VprefS clauses had followed after a chain of VprefS clauses it would have become a main line (the core of a story):
bo-lüz bo-‘eres kana’an [wa-ybārek ‘ôtì] ‘God Almighty appeared to me at Luz in the land of Canaan [and blessed me]’ (Gen. 48.3).

(23) is a case of clause linking in direct speech (of Jacob). Since it is a direct quotation, the wa-Vpref clause cannot be taken as encoding a narrative storyline. The wa-Vpref clause qualifies the preceding Vsuff clause by elaborating (giving additional information) about the event.

6. Non-main Clauses in Instructional Discourse

Cross-linguistically, procedural or instructional discourse tend to adapt to a genre-specific literary style, characterized by highly formalized language (Longacre 1995:23; Isaksson 2011b). In Biblical Hebrew the established convention was to encode the main line of this discourse type by wa-Vsuff syntagms (weqatal). As we have seen in (14) such wa-Vsuff syntagms may encode a non-main clause with a ‘follow-up’ or consequence-result relation to a preceding main clause. In instructional or procedural discourse on the other hand the convention requires a main line uniformly coded by wa-Vsuff clauses. Even in such texts there is nearly always a beginning clause of another type that defines the function of the text (instruction, prophecy, etc.), but in such a text an introductory imperative or prohibition is perceived as a pre-ambulatory, not as a main line clause:

(24) Pattern: (NEG-VprefL)+wa-Vsuff+wa-x-Vsuff+wa-Vsuff: שֶׁאָלָּא לְאָמַר אֶת הַקַּפֹּרֶת יְהוָה אָנֹכָּה יִמָּצֵאשׁ בְּשֵׂרְעָה יִמָּצֵאתוּ אֶת-שְׁמָ֖הּ בַּכַּפֹּֽרֶת שָׂרָ֑י (‘As regards your wife Sarai, you must not call her Sarai, but Sarah. I will bless her, and moreover I will give you a son by her. I will bless her, and she shall give rise to nations’ (Gen. 17.15–16).

The first person Vsuff verbs in (24) could be taken as close to performative in meaning in non-main clause position (‘in that I bless her and give you a son…’) were it not for the instructional discourse setting where the wa-Vsuff clauses instead encode the main message and the main line: ‘I will bless her and give you a son by her…’ The convention is not absolute: the clause with wa-’Nātattī…deviates from the wa-Vsuff pattern, but has the same meaning as the other Vsuff clauses.

As in other text types, a non-main clause in instructional discourse is marked by digression from the main line of wa-Vsuff clauses:

(25) Pattern: wa-Vsuff+(VprefL): וָאָֽשָׁהְתִּֽי שָׂרָ֖י (‘And I will bless her (and give you a son by her). I will bless her, and moreover I will give rise to nations’ (Gen. 17.15–16).)

The first person Vsuff verbs in (24) could be taken as close to performative in meaning in non-main clause position (‘in that I bless her and give you a son…’) were it not for the instructional discourse setting where the wa-Vsuff clauses instead encode the main message and the main line: ‘I will bless her and give you a son by her…’. The convention is not absolute: the clause with wa-Vsuff
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