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This study investigates the relationship between word order and information structure in finite verb clauses in four ancient Hebrew texts from among the Dead Sea Scrolls—the Community Rule, the War Rule, and the Habakkuk Pesher. An excursus provides a separate treatment of Daniel 8–12. The theoretical linguistic foundations of the study are rooted in generative linguistics, especially the work of J. Uriagereka and N. Erteschik-Shir. The Early Immediate Constituent Theory of J. Hawkins also plays an important role. The emphasis is on syntactic structures where word order is flexible in order to investigate the effect of variation on information structure. The basic word order of subject and verb is indeterminate, and therefore it is not possible to know whether SV or VS order is marked (although the tendencies of each order are nonetheless clear). However, it is simple to determine that the basic word order of verb and object is VO. Deviations from the basic VO order can be explained using three structures: left-dislocation of a shift topic; fronting of a Topic (whether a shift topic, contrastive constituent, or restrictive constituent); and fronting of a non-Topic (whether a cleft constituent or a constituent that opens the clause-final attentive focus position for a different constituent). The largest clause-level constituent is normally placed in clause-final position in order to satisfy the EICT.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QM</td>
<td>The War Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QpHab</td>
<td>The Habakkuk Pesher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QS</td>
<td>The Community Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>definite article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BDT</td>
<td>Branching Direction Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH</td>
<td>Biblical Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHRG</td>
<td>Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPS</td>
<td>Bare Phrase Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>The Damascus Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAF</td>
<td>clause-final attentive focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>complementizer phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRD</td>
<td>constituent recognition domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSTR</td>
<td>construct form (bound form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM</td>
<td>definite object marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>determiner phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EICT</td>
<td>Early Immediate Constituent Theorem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXIST</td>
<td>particle of existence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FD</td>
<td>feminine dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>feminine plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS (main text)</td>
<td>finite state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS (linguistic glosses)</td>
<td>feminine singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>Government and Binding Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG</td>
<td>Generative Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GKC</td>
<td>Gesenius-Kautsch-Cowley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPH</td>
<td>Hellenistic Period Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTLD</td>
<td>hanging topic left-dislocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBHS</td>
<td>Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IC</td>
<td>immediate constituent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>imperfective yiqtol verb conjugation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>information structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM</td>
<td>Joüon-Muraoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCA</td>
<td>Linear Correspondence Axiom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>left-dislocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDC</td>
<td>left-dislocated constituent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>Logical Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>masculine dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNCC</td>
<td>mother node constructing category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP (main text)</td>
<td>Minimalist Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP (linguistic glosses)</td>
<td>masculine plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>masculine singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Masoretic Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSO</td>
<td>Multiple Spell-out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negation particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-EXIST</td>
<td>particle of non-existence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>noun phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF (main text)</td>
<td>Phonetic Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF (linguistic glosses)</td>
<td>perfective qatal verb conjugation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>prepositional phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;P</td>
<td>Principles and Parameters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRON</td>
<td>pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTCP</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>right-dislocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPT</td>
<td>resumptive pronoun topicalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QH</td>
<td>Qumran Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SV</td>
<td>Subject-Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVO/VSO</td>
<td>Subject-Verb-Object/Verb-Subject-Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>triggered inversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG</td>
<td>Universal Grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vP</td>
<td>light verb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>verb phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS</td>
<td>Verb-Subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

1.1. Preliminaries

In this study I will investigate the word order of ancient Hebrew finite verb clauses in four texts. Three of these texts—the Community Rule, the War Rule, and the Habakkuk Pesher—are counted among the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the other, Daniel 8–12, is a Hebrew selection from a biblical text. I will focus on syntactic structures where word order is flexible in order to identify areas where pragmatic factors—especially those relating to information structure (i.e. topic and focus)—might help explain why one order of words appears rather than another. I conclude that the f-structure framework of Erteschik-Shir (2007) and the Early Immediate Constituent Theory of Hawkins (1994; 2004) together provide the necessary theoretical support to provide an account of clause-level word order in the three texts chosen from the Dead Sea Scrolls. Deviations from the base word order can be explained using three structures: left-dislocation of a shift topic; fronting of a Topic (whether a shift topic, contrastive constituent, or restrictive constituent); and fronting of a non-Topic (whether a cleft constituent or a constituent that opens the clause-final attentive focus position for a different constituent).

A careful exploration of this topic has several important ramifications. The topic is of obvious interest to those who study ancient Hebrew texts: Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and Jewish literature of the Hellenistic Period. It is also of interest to those who pursue scholarship in all periods of ancient Hebrew language because of its diachronic implications. This study raises many questions and provides avenues for future scholarship on
the basis of what it reveals about the nature of word order in Hellenistic Period Hebrew. However, the most important implication of this study may be its methodological approach to the study of word order and information structure, which considers structures which lack the sought after features of information structure to be equally important as those which possess them.

The methodological innovation of this study is in the use of the **allosentence** to confirm and validate hypotheses about the significance of word order for information structure. In the initial stages of his 1994 study, Lambrecht rightly emphasizes the importance of the allosentence in information structure research. The term "allo-sentences" was coined by Daneš (1964: 233) to describe sentences with identical grammatical structures and relations in every respect except for the use of different word orders.¹ Lambrecht writes that "Differences in the information structure of sentences are always understood in terms of contrasts between allosentences, i.e. against the background of available but unused grammatical alternatives for expressing a given proposition" (Lambrecht 1994: 6).² In other words, if sentence pattern A expresses an information structure A', this can only be understood in terms of a comparison with an alternative sentence pattern B that expresses an information structure B', and perhaps additional sentence patterns C, D, and so

1. Daneš used the phrase "organization of utterance" (1964: 225) rather than "word order," but the meaning is the same.
2. Unfortunately, although Lambrecht's impulse was correct, Lambrecht did not choose his allosentences from a corpus, but rather invented their structure without the empirical support that one might hope for. As J. Mukherjee points out: "Methodologically, however, there is a fundamental conflict between Lambrecht's information-structure theory and the corpus linguistic approach of the present study. The former discusses allosentence variants on the basis of hypothetical propositions and invented (and to a large extent context-independent) examples of different surface representations. On the other hand, it is a must to analyse authentic language data in context from the corpus linguistic point of view" (Mukherjee 2001: 90).
on, also expressing corresponding information structures. One of the sentence patterns will be the basic structure of the sentence, and the other sentence patterns will be pragmatically marked structures.

By comparing a set of test sentences which demonstrate a certain information structure pattern (e.g. "topicalization") with a set of allosentences which are identical except for the absence of that pattern, a statistical calculation can be done to determine whether there is a significant distinction between the two sets of clauses. If the feature in question (e.g. topicality, or "aboutness") is present in the test set to a significantly greater degree than it is present in the set of allosentences, then the hypothesis is confirmed that the word order of the test set encodes the information structure being considered.³

A detailed, firmly grounded analysis of word order in ancient Hebrew is an important step toward a better grasp of the historical and sociological contexts of the texts under consideration. J. Naudé (2003: 196–97; 2004: 97) and R. Holmstedt (2006: 18) have argued that a crucial task in scholarship of ancient Hebrew is to study the grammars of individual texts, or "bibliolects."⁴ The analysis of word order is one very important component of such a project, one

³. See §3.1.2 for a full discussion of allosentences and their role in this study.
⁴. The term "bibliolect" (cf. Holmstedt 2006: 18) plays on the linguistic term "idiolect," which refers to the mental grammar of an individual speaker. Although texts bear the effect of scribal redaction, building linguistic profiles of individual texts is still very useful for chronological and geographical placement of texts. The nature of language change and diffusion is such that the comparative distribution of features in texts provides important clues to the provenance of a text. See Naudé 2004 for an overview of this approach.
that has the potential to be very fruitful as it has historically been largely ignored in comparative analyses of Hebrew texts.

This thesis will also be significant for all linguistic research of ancient languages with relatively free word order. Classical Greek, Aramaic, and Arabic are just a few examples of ancient languages with somewhat free word order that often attract scholarly interest. The methodological aspect of this study breaks new ground, and a similar study may be effective in these other languages as well.

1.2. Previous Studies of Word Order in Hellenistic Period Hebrew

As mentioned, the relationship between word order and information structure in Biblical Hebrew has been a subject of great interest in recent years. Although much work has been done on the syntax of the Hebrew of the Hellenistic Period, and especially that of the Dead Sea Scrolls, this interest has not yet led to many studies of the specific issue of word order and information structure in specifically Hellenistic Period Hebrew (HPH) texts.

The first study of word order in the Dead Sea Scrolls was that of E. J. Revell (1962, 1964), who published a detailed statistical tabulation of the orders of elements in texts from Qumran Cave 1. Revell's work provides a thorough catalogue, but his study is limited to word

---

5. The five edited collections of symposium papers on the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira provide a wealth of resources (Muraoka and Elwolde 1997; 1999; and 2000; Joosten and Rey 2008; Fassberg et al. 2013), with the proceedings of the sixth (2011: Leuven) and seventh (2014: Strasbourg) symposia forthcoming. Works germane to the issue of clause-level word order in the verbal clause include Abegg (2010; 2011); Fassberg (2011; 2013b); Joosten (2010; 2013); Muraoka (1995; 1996; 1997; 1998; 2009; 2011); Qimron (1986; 1997b; 2000; 2009); Rendsburg (2010); Van Hecke (2013).
order and does not address information structure or the significance of the various word orders in their discourse contexts.

E. Qimron's English reference work, The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls, makes several important observations about word order. For example, Qimron (1986: §400.05) cites J. Carmignac (1966), who concludes that an object precedes its governing infinitive more often in Qumran texts than in biblical Hebrew texts, although Qimron notes that based on the sparseness of Carmignac's data this can only be a tentative conclusion. Qimron also observes that in Hebrew texts from Qumran, numerals may follow the nouns they modify (including units of measure), while in earlier (Classical) Hebrew, numerals must precede the noun (§400.20).

S. Fassberg (1999) has written a detailed essay on aspects of the word order in Ben Sira, a poetic text. Fassberg concludes that imperatives and negative command verbs are first in the clause about 80% of the time. In the other 20% of clauses, chiasmus6 is involved, and the verb is clause-final unless there is a direct object, in which case the direct object is clause-final and the verb appears immediately before it. Imperfect and perfect verbs are more frequently non-initial, and most initial imperfects are modal. Fassberg suggests that chiasmus seems to function like English punctuation, marking the boundaries of a unit. Vocatives in Ben Sira normally precede the main clause. Fassberg draws useful comparisons with Proverbs, which mirrors the patterns in

6. Chiasmus is an envelope structure, where within two parallel lines, the second is inverted (A1B1—B2A2). An example would be two successive copular clauses, the first with Subject–Predicate order and the second with Predicate–Subject order. Many different functions for this structure have been proposed, which can be grouped into structural functions (marking an important boundary or junction in a poem) and expressive functions (emphasis, contrast, etc.). See Fassberg (1999: 118) and Watson (1984: 146–149).
Ben Sira with respect to imperatives and negative commands but shows the opposite tendencies with respect to vocatives (Fassberg 1999: 130-31). Fassberg (2013) also has an important study of word order where he argues that Second Temple Period Hebrew postposes constituents in order to place them in focus, which is a shift from Classical Biblical Hebrew, where constituents are preposed in order to mark them for focus.\(^7\)

Three scholars have produced work specifically concerning word order in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Van Hecke has studied word order in existential clauses (2008) and הָיות-הָיוֹת-הָיוֹת-clauses (2013).\(^8\) Mor (2009) has studied word order in legal documents and letters, texts which use the spoken register rather than the literary register. Screnock (2010; 2011) has studied the order of subject and verb in 1QM and concluded that the basic, unmarked order is Subject–Verb, but that Verb–Subject is the unmarked order in cases where there is a "fronted" constituent (i.e. one that is neither the subject nor the verb) that introduces the clause and in cases where the verb is intransitive. Screnock (2010; 2011) is the only author to devote significant attention to information structure.\(^9\)

\(^7\) In what follows I argue that this is only partly correct. In HPH, postposing to the clause-final position is used to mark attentive focus, while contrast and restrictiveness—two features often associated with focus, although I follow Erteschik-Shir 2007 in associating them with the Topic—are marked by preposing the constituent.

\(^8\) The verb הָיוֹת (hyh), "to be, exist" is sometimes used as a copula and sometimes as a finite verb in HPH. I have chosen to omit all clauses where הָיוֹת is the main verb from the present study in order to provide a set of data composed as much as possible of unambiguous finite verb clauses. Likewise, existential clauses are not considered in the present study, given that they are not finite verb clauses.

\(^9\) Cf. §5.3.3.6 for a detailed treatment of Screnock 2011.
In this context of scarcity of direct conversation partners, this study will be in conversation primarily with two fields of scholarship: (1) general linguistic studies that address the relationship between word order and information structure and (2) previous studies of word order and information structure in ancient Semitic languages, especially Biblical Hebrew.

1.3. **Generative Linguistic Framework**

Every syntactic study has a foundation in an underlying linguistic framework. In all linguistic studies, but especially when analyzing a no-longer-spoken language, it is necessary to use a linguistic framework that has been tested against spoken language data and shown to be accurate. This study has chosen generative linguistic theory as its theoretical foundation, and is thus greatly indebted to others who have promoted such an approach by applying a generative linguistic perspective to the study of ancient Hebrew. The first to take such an approach was J. A. Naudé (Naudé 1990), who can be considered the pioneer of this perspective. Soon afterward, Vincent DeCaen's (1994) dissertation at the University of Toronto explored the interpretation of the verb from a generative linguistic perspective, and I am pleased to follow in his footsteps with this dissertation at the same university. Finally, the work of Robert Holmstedt has moved scholarship toward a comprehensive generative analysis of ancient Hebrew syntax, and it is my hope that the present study will contribute to this ongoing project.
1.4. **Corpus of Study**

1.4.1. **Texts**

The analysis of the three Qumran texts is based on the manuscripts 1QS (the Community Rule), 1QM (the War Rule), and 1QpHab (the Habakkuk Pesher). The critical edition of the texts upon which this study depends is *The Dead Sea Scrolls: The Hebrew writings, Vol. 1* by Elisha Qimron, published in 2010 by Yad Ben-Zvi. The analysis of Daniel 8–12 is based on the Masoretic text. The Qumran manuscripts supply the primary corpus of this study, while the selection from Daniel is included for comparative purposes. The primary corpus was chosen based on (1) the relative scarcity of work on the syntax, and especially the word order, of the texts from the Judean Desert; (2) the desire to study texts of known chronological provenance; and (3) the need to use well-preserved texts rather than fragments.

The availability of original manuscripts of texts written in Hebrew during the Hellenistic Period places the study of the syntax of the texts on firmer ground than similar studies of the syntax of Biblical Hebrew. This is not to say that the Dead Sea Scrolls are not without their own difficulties from a linguist's perspective: a full chronological and dialectological picture of Hebrew in the Hellenistic period is not possible, and the texts likely originate from diverse communities, possibly including multiple dialects. Furthermore, the extant texts are products of an extensive redaction history and are far removed from the ideal of an autograph.10

10. For a detailed overview of theories concerning the redaction history of 1QS, see Metso
Nevertheless, in comparison with the Hebrew Bible, the chronological and geographic proximity of the Qumran Hebrew scrolls to their sites and times of origin offers a helpful linguistic touchpoint, and in principle they provide better data than the Hebrew Bible for reconstructing the diachronic history of Hebrew.

In practice, however, the available amount of provenanced material that is useful for this study is not as large as one would like. To conduct an effective study of information structure, it is necessary to have access to continuous texts with few lacunae. This is not only because a complete clause must be available before syntax can be analyzed fully. It is also necessary to have access to the discourse context in order to determine if a given constituent has been mentioned previously in the discourse to determine whether it is thematic material and therefore eligible to be marked as a Topic or a Focus constituent.\footnote{The capitalized terms "Topic" and "Focus" refer to information structure primitives within Erteschik-Shir's (2007) f(ocus)-structure framework. For a detailed treatment of the f-structure framework, see section §2.4.2 below.} The 1QS manuscript is very well preserved and the window of its chronological provenance is relatively narrow, so it has been chosen for inclusion within the primary corpus for this study. 1QM is less well-preserved, but is still useful. Although the top of the manuscript is missing across all of its columns, making it

\begin{quote}
(2007: 15–20). Especially relevant for this study is the "latest stage of redaction . . . by the scribal corrector in 1QS VII–VIII" (2007: 18). The work of this redactor is clearly evident simply from an examination of the manuscript, which bears copious evidence of erasures and insertions in these columns. This study does not attempt to analyze reconstructed clauses prior to the work of even this relatively transparent level of redaction, and the possibility that the syntax has been altered through the redaction process is real. Nevertheless, an examination of the work of this redactor shows that his alterations rarely, if ever, affect the clause-level syntax that is the subject of this study. Furthermore, as the size of the data set increases, any individual deviations from the expected syntactic and pragmatic structures will have less impact.
\end{quote}
impossible to access the complete context in many cases, enough large portions of the text are preserved in sequence to provide an awareness of the discourse context in most cases. The genre and structure of 1QpHab are such that clauses with finite verbs are rare, and most of them are contained within subordinate וַיְכָא-clauses, but the document is still useful for the purposes of this study. The state of preservation of the document is slightly worse than that of 1QM. However, the "quotation: interpretation" structure of the document often provides an advantage because each "quotation: interpretation" pair is typically the entirety of the relevant discourse context. Therefore, less of the text needs to be preserved in sequence in order to have access to the relevant context. However, because the quotations from the book of Habakkuk are not included in the analysis and the document is relatively less well-preserved, the amount of useful data that can be mined from 1QpHab is significantly less than what is available from 1QS and 1QM.

The other well-preserved manuscripts of roughly contemporary texts all create problems that are too great to overcome. The Great Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa') is preserved well, but because the date of the text is much earlier than the date of the manuscript it would be methodologically problematic to study its word order synchronically with that of 1QS. The same applies to the Temple Scroll (11QT), which depends very heavily on Deuteronomy and Leviticus. The Damascus Document is primarily preserved in the CD-A and CD-B Cairo manuscripts, which were copied much later than the principal period of composition and redaction of its text.

The composition of Daniel 8–12 is dated between 167 and 164 BCE (Collins 1993: 38), for which reason Daniel 8–12 is a useful point of comparison for 1QS, 1QM, and 1QpHab. However, I do not include Daniel 8–12 within the primary corpus for this study. The first reason
for this is that the earliest manuscripts of Daniel are quite late relative to the date of its composition. The second reason is that the Hebrew of Daniel 8–12 diverges significantly from that of 1QS, 1QM, and 1QpHab. In fact, many scholars believe that the author(s) of Daniel 8–12 was (were) not (a) native Hebrew speaker(s). The treatment of Daniel 8–12 in this study is therefore only for the purpose of comparison with 1QS, 1QM, and 1QpHab. I will identify key features of the word order of Daniel that suggest that the idiolect(s) of its author(s) was (were) significantly different from those of the authors of 1QS, 1QM, and 1QpHab, perhaps due to a lesser degree of familiarity with Hebrew.

Text-critical and redaction-critical evidence will be considered when available. There is only one manuscript of the Habakkuk Pesher, so 1QpHab will stand on its own. The textual variants of Daniel have been examined, but the variants rarely provide interesting data with respect to word order. In the cases of 1QS and 1QM, there are several good additional witnesses to the text, and the quality and quantity of this evidence is sometimes valuable for a consideration of word order and information structure. The additional witnesses to 1QS and 1QM provide evidence that is useful for constructing a redaction history of the text from the manuscripts, and having an awareness of how the text was constructed is especially helpful when analyzing information structure. This is because a single author is more likely to preserve the

12. I will base my study of Daniel upon the standard Masoretic Text of the Leningrad Codex B19a (as transcribed in *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS = Elliger and Rudolph 1997)), which dates ca. 1008 CE. There is a gap of about 1150 years between the text's composition and the date of the best complete manuscript. Earlier fragments of Daniel 8–12 were discovered in the following Qumran manuscripts: 4Q113, 4Q114, 4Q115, 4Q116, and 6Q7. However, in general these fragments are not well-enough preserved to be useful for syntactic analysis of an entire clause.
significance of word order within the larger discourse, perhaps unconsciously, than an author that is editing or redacting a text or integrating source material into a new composition. The natural flow of a discourse produces word order patterns that correlate regularly with information structure in ways that do not typically arise in the conscious mind of the author, and these patterns are easily disturbed when redaction takes place. Therefore, determinations about thematic and rhematic material are more certain within passages of a document that are the work of a single author. Texts that result from redaction will be less likely to maintain an awareness of the larger discourse continuity. This will not often be a significant issue, because lengthy passages that are judged to result from a redaction often diverge significantly in their content from the surrounding material. Therefore there is not often any confusion about what material is thematic, because most of the thematic material (from the perspective of the manuscript text) does not appear in the inserted (or joined) text anyway.\textsuperscript{13} However, in cases where the multiple witnesses to the text suggest a particular redaction history, a divergence from more typical patterns of word order and information structure can sometimes be spotted.

I will use a conservative methodology and limit the linguistic analysis to the extant text in specific manuscripts: 1QS, 1QM, 1QpHab, and the MT of Daniel 8–12.\textsuperscript{14} The additional witnesses are useful in two ways: (1) additional witnesses can weed clauses out from the data by casting suspicion on their nativeness within the context; and (2) additional witnesses can provide

\textsuperscript{13} For a discussion of the concepts of theme and rheme, cf. §2.4.1.
\textsuperscript{14} For the text of 1QS, 1QM, and 1QpHab I rely upon the edition of Qimron (2010). For Daniel 8–12 I rely upon the 1997 edition of BHS.
fodder for speculation on the relationship between word order, information structure, and redaction in a particular clause. I will separate such speculation from the analysis of the extant manuscripts in the corpus.

1.4.2. Language

It must be kept in mind that although the texts from the Judean Desert originate from the same general time period (ca. 150 B.C.E. to ca. 70 C.E.), they do not represent a uniform dialect. There seems to be good evidence for diglossia in the Hebrew texts from the Judean Desert. Most of the preserved texts are written in the literary register, but there are several exceptions that appear to come from the spoken register, such as letters. Among these are included the Copper Scroll (3Q15), the Halakhic Letter (4QMMT = 4Q394–4Q399) and the Hebrew letters discovered at the Wadi Murabba'at.15 The corpus selected for this study includes only the literary register. Because the texts that appear to represent the spoken register are not well-preserved in lengthy, continuous sections, any analysis of word order and information structure in these texts is a difficult challenge. However, the spoken register closely resembles Mishnaic Hebrew, and a similar comparison might be obtained by means of a thorough study of word order and information structure in the Mishnah.

The best way to refer technically to the stage of the language being considered in this study is either "late Second Temple Period literary Hebrew" or "Hellenistic Period Hebrew." I

15. For a concise defense of this view of the Hebrew of the DSS see Blau (2000).
will use the latter, abbreviated as HPH, to refer to this strata of the Hebrew language. This language has much overlap with what is normally referred to as "Qumran Hebrew" (QH), a misleading and problematic title used to refer to the Hebrew of the non-biblical manuscripts from Qumran. The problem is that there is no reason to suppose that a peculiar dialect of Hebrew was in use specifically at Qumran. Further, although many of our best witnesses to the Hebrew of the late Second Temple Period come from Qumran, some do not (e.g. CD, the Ben Sira manuscripts from the Cairo Geniza, and Daniel 8–12.) Therefore I will avoid this term.

1.4.3. Clause Type

The corpus for this study has been limited to finite verb clauses due to the cross-linguistic tendency of copular clauses to pattern distinctly with respect to word order. In languages with a copular verb, such as Hebrew, clauses that use the copular verb may pattern with copular clauses, finite verbal clauses, or have some features in common with each. For this reason, clauses have been excluded from the corpus of study if the main clause finite verb is הָיָה, hyh, "to be, become, occur." The inclusion of this verb would have the potential to pollute the finite clause data with patterns that belong to copular clauses.16

---

16. Van Hecke (2013) analyzes clauses in the Dead Sea Scrolls where the finite verb is הָיָה used either as a copula or as a verb with existential semantics. He concludes that הָיָה-clauses are verb-initial by default when הָיָה functions as a copula, but when הָיָה is not a copula, the verb is not clause-initial.
1.4.4. Genre

Portions of the texts that are poetic in character have been excluded from the analysis. (The poetic texts of 1QM have been separately analyzed.) This is due to the fact that the poetic texts in 1QS and 1QM frequently have fronted constituents lacking the information structure features that motivate fronting in the prose portions of these texts. It seems that fronting in poetic texts is often motivated by the desire to achieve parallelism rather than to encode information structure.

As Kugel (1981) demonstrates, the line between poetry and prose in ancient Hebrew is not sharp. Poetry and prose should be conceived as two poles on the end of a continuum. Although it is not possible to cleanly delimit texts into "prose" and "poetry," poetry can be described succinctly by stating that the characteristic element of poetry is parallelism. Parallelism can take many forms, including phonological, lexical, and syntactic (Berlin 1985). The intention of the author is not necessarily relevant to identifying parallelism, and so parallelism is present in all texts, poetry and prose, to various degrees. However, in poetry the degree of intentionality in creating parallelism increases, and this becomes a special problem with respect to syntactic parallelism.\(^{17}\)

\(^{17}\) In §2.4.4.1 below, I summarize N. Erteschik-Shir's theory of information structure related movement. She proposes that IS-related movement takes place in the PF component of the grammar, which places IS-related movement in competition with movement that is motivated by poetic parallelism because it is in PF where poetic types of word order movement can take place, and word order can be altered for the purpose of creating parallelistic structures. The more often that movement motivated by poetry takes place in a text, the more often these movements will interfere with the ability of a researcher to identify the features of IS-related movement.
For this reason, as far as possible, poetic texts have been excluded from the analysis in this study. I say "as far as possible" because the lack of a sharp boundary between prose and poetry makes it impossible to classify texts as one or the other with certainty. The strategy I have used is to set aside texts that are characterized by parallelism in their syntactic patterns. In 1QS, this has led to the exclusion of columns X and XI, the final half-line of column IX, and a didactic text in 1QS II.25b–III.12. In 1QM, this has led to the exclusion of several short sections of text that consist of second person address to God in the form of praise.18 No poetic texts were identified in 1QpHab.

This does not necessarily mean that the information structure patterns of the prose texts do not apply to poetry as well as prose, but in poetry the rules governing information structure will tend to be stretched and perhaps broken at times in order to create parallelistic structures. On the other hand, this decision has not been made because movements motivated by parallelistic concerns do not occur in prose; they do, in fact. However, in prose they occur less often, and limiting the corpus to prose texts will lead to more reliable conclusions.

1.4.5. Fragmentary Clauses

I have classified clauses into four groups: non-fragmentary, fragmentary, supplemented, and reconstructed.

Non-fragmentary clauses are clauses that are either (1) fully preserved, or (2) syntactically preserved. A clause that is syntactically preserved is one where only a very small amount of

18. Cf. §5.1.3 for a complete list of the lines in 1QM that are classified as poetic.
text is missing (usually only one letter) and where the clause-level syntax would not change regardless of what consonants are used to reconstruct the missing text.19 Normally these small lacunae are found in a large clause-final constituent, at a point where the clause-level syntax is not in question. Even a very small lacuna can be problematic for this study if it occurs at the beginning of a clause or at the edge of a clause-level constituent because it may cloud the ability to determine clause or constituent boundaries or to identify a constituent. An example of a syntactically preserved clause is provided below. Fragmentary text is enclosed in brackets.

(1) 1QS II.23(a) 

\[
\text{wlw' yšpl } \text{yš mbyt [m]mdw}
\]

CONJ-NEG fall-IMPF.3MS man from-house [pos]tion-PRON.POSS.3MS

No one shall fall from the place of his rank.

In example (1), the missing letter is mostly preserved, but the left edge is missing. The partially missing letter does not affect the syntax of the clause.20

19. In some cases, larger amounts of texts may be missing if the missing text is found within a large constituent where it is clear that the clause-level syntax is not affected. See 1QM III.13-14 for an example where the two-word lacuna occurs within a large clause-final quotation that is a complement-theme.

20. It is clear that the final word is a separate word from the penultimate word, and it is clear that this is the last word in the clause. The structure of the penultimate word makes it clear that the final word must be a noun that continues the phrase, such that the lacuna occurs in the middle of a constituent. No other letter besides מ would match the partially preserved portion of the letter or make sense of the phrase, and even if the letter were replaced by some other letter, thus creating a nonsense word, the clause-final word would still need to be interpreted as a noun completing the phrase begun by the penultimate word.
Fragmentary clauses are marked with an asterisk (*) when referenced in the text (e.g. 1QS I.24-26*) and are excluded from the primary corpus. When 1QS, 1QM, and 1QpHab are analyzed, most sets of data are analyzed twice: once with fragmentary clauses excluded and once with fragmentary clauses included. A fragmentary clause is one where a substantial part of the clause is missing, such that a probable guess can be made as to the original syntax, but there is still room for doubt, however small. An example of a fragmentary clause is provided below.

(2) 1QS II.1*

ה comunità של/os [ג]מל עלינו ומלわא[ך]ו

wthmn hsdw [g]ml 'lynw m'wl'w md 'wl'w
CONJ-compassion.MP mercy.MS-Pron.3MS [sh]ow.PF.3MS to-Pron.1P from-forever.MS
CONJ-until forever.MS
But he [sh]owed to us his merciful compassions from forever until forever.

In this clause, the first consonant of the finite verb is partially preserved. The letter appears to be ג, but there is room for doubt that the letter could be ח. This would create a bivalent verb meaning "to have compassion," requiring two arguments, rather than the trivalent verb shown in the example above. The preceding context in 1QS I.26 is also partially fragmentary, leaving enough room for doubt that even this single partially fragmentary letter is enough to classify the clause as fragmentary. This is an unusual example. Most fragmentary clauses in the corpus have multiple letters in sequence that are missing or partially preserved. The tables in the appendix provide a complete list.21

21. Another set of instructive examples can be found in 1QpHab VII.11-14, 12-14, 13-14*. The same two letters are fragmentary in each of these three clauses, but only in 1QpHab VII.13-14* does the lacuna affect the clause-level syntax. In 1QpHab VII.11-14 and VII.12-14, the lacuna is
In 1QM, a few fragmentary clauses can be reconstructed on the basis of manuscripts from Qumran Cave 4. I refer to these as supplemented clauses and I mark them with a double asterisk (**) when they are referenced in the text (e.g. 1QM II.14**).

In cases where the extant text is not sufficiently preserved to infer a probable syntactic reading, I have not included the clauses in the corpus at all. I refer to these as reconstructed clauses, and they are not listed in the appendix. For example, in 1QM I.4, Qimron 2010 reconstructs the clause יִמְלֹךְ וּנְלַכֵּם [niche מִצְרָיִם], "[Then the king of] the Kittim [will fight] against Egypt." This clause reconstructs too much to permit a grounded syntactic analysis.

1.4.6. Boundaries of the Corpus

As outlined above, the corpus of this study consists of the finite verb clauses (excluding the copular verb היה) in prose portions of the 1QS, 1QM, and 1QpHab documents. In what follows, I will refer to this set of clauses simply as "the corpus." Both main and subordinate clauses are included, and within Chapters 4, 5, and 6, the data analysis is done twice, once with fragmentary clauses excluded and once with fragmentary clauses included. A full list of all clauses in the corpus is supplied in tables in the appendices.

When a clause is contained entirely within one line of the text, a reference is made simply by clause and line number, such as 1QS II.9. When there is more than one clause completely contained in the same line, the clauses are marked with a lowercase letter in parentheses in the

within a large clause-final subordinate clause.
order they appear, such as 1QS IV.24(a), 24(b), 24(c), 24(d). When a clause begins on one line and ends on another, both the beginning and ending line are referenced, such as 1QS I.2-3. If two separate clauses each begin and end on the same line, the alphabetical system is again used, as with 1QS VII.17-18(a), 17-18(b). A column and line number that uses a lowercase letter without parenthesis, such as 1QS II.25b, is not a reference to a specific clause from the corpus of study, but rather a reference to a half-line of the manuscript text, ignoring clause boundaries.

1.5. Overview

This study consists of two parts. Part One is introductory and lays the foundations for the research. Following the introductory material of Chapter 1, Chapter 2 surveys the various theories relating to word order and information structure that provide the framework for this study and explains their points of connection and divergence in the study that follows. Chapter 3 puts forward the methodology of the study, delimiting specific research questions, methods of data collection and manipulation, and the procedure for drawing conclusions. The discussion of Chapter 3 is presented within the context of previous work in Biblical Hebrew, which far outpaces the work in HPH in terms of both its volume and its engagement with theoretical linguistics.

In Part Two (Chapters 4–8), I present the data that has been collected and explain its significance within the context of the theoretical framework established in Chapter 2. I devote one chapter to each manuscript in the corpus: 1QS (Chapter 4), 1QM (Chapter 5), 1QpHab (Chapter 6), and MT Daniel 8–12 (Chapter 7). In Chapter 8 I summarize my conclusions based
on the findings of Chapters 4–7 and suggest implications for the linguistic framework and for future research of ancient Hebrew.
2. Theoretical Linguistic Foundations

This chapter explores the linguistic theories that form the theoretical foundation for this study. It is not possible to do work in word order without beginning with the early studies of Joseph Greenberg in word order typology, and I begin with a very brief summary of Greenberg's theory. I then move to generative treatments of word order as found in (1) the Minimalist Program (MP); (2) Kayne's (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA); and (3) Uriagereka's (1999, 2012) theory of Multiple Spell-out (MSO). Uriagereka's MSO work in particular is central to this study in that it builds on previous work and enables something of an integration of MP and the LCA. The other two major theories discussed below are the Early Immediate Constituent Theory (EICT) of Hawkins (1994, 2004) and Erteschik-Shir's (1997, 2007) f(ocus)-structure framework for information structure. MSO is necessary in order to explain how these two theories can be integrated with generative grammar. From a theoretical perspective, these two theories serve as supplements to MSO. In practice, my analysis of HPH will dialogue mostly with f-structure and the EICT because these theories are more directly concerned with the aspects of clause-level word order that I will investigate.

2.1. Word Order Typology

Most if not all work in word order typology traces its origins to the work of Joseph Greenberg, especially to his 1963 article "Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements." In this article Greenberg assumed six possible orders of
constituents in the world's languages with respect to S(ubject), V(erb), and O(bject), and observed that in almost all languages the subject precedes the object, leaving three potential "dominant" or "basic" orders: VSO, SVO, and SOV (Greenberg 1963: 76-77). It turns out to be the case that languages that group together into certain of these categories often share other kinds of word order features in common as well. For example, Matthew Dryer (2007: 89-96) identifies eight word order characteristics that correlate with the order of object and verb bidirectionally (i.e., one order coorelates with VO while the other correlates with OV) and four that correlate unidirectionally (i.e., one order correlates with either VO or OV, but the other order has no clear correlation with either). Work such as this provides important typological evidence regarding the typical implications of certain word order patterns cross-linguistically.

However, Dryer problematizes the significance of word order patterns in several respects (Dryer 2007: 73). For Dryer the identification of one "basic" word order in cases where the order of two or more constituents varies in a language is not always straightforward. Dryer argues that such identification should be made primarily on the basis of four criteria: frequency, distribution, pragmatics, and clause type (Dryer 2007: 73-77; cf. Holmstedt 2005: 143–146; 2009a: 116-20; 2011: 7–25).

22. The bidirectionally correlating features are verb & adpositional phrases; verb & non-argument noun phrases; main verb & auxiliary verb; copula verb & predicate; question particles that occur either at the end or beginning of the sentence; complementizer & clause; article & noun; and subordinate & main clause. The unidirectionally correlating features are noun & relative clause; plural word & noun; subordinator & clause; and complementizer & clause.

23. Even if there are clear correlations between word orders and information structure patterns, in some cases it may still not be the case that one of these orders is "basic." As Dryer (2007: 76) writes: "It is often, however, not obvious that one order involves adding an additional element of meaning, as opposed to the two orders simply having a difference in meaning."
2.2. Generative Linguistics and Word Order

The typological exploration of word order as seen in the work of Greenberg and Dryer examines phonological output without recourse to semantic relationships beneath the surface such as those in the levels of Deep Structure (DS) or Logical Form (LF). It has the major advantage of the availability of a large amount of cross-linguistic data, and this has led to several important cross-linguistic generalizations about word order. However, as important as it is, the typological approach alone cannot explain why word orders pattern as they do cross-linguistically. Many attempts at progress have been made toward reducing word order correlations to broader governing principles, some more successful than others.

Within generative linguistics, Kayne's (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA) has been the most influential word order paradigm. Although within typological linguistics word order variations are pragmatically motivated; some are entirely syntactic in nature. Holmstedt (2005: 147 n. 34; 2009a: 112; 2011: 6) cites Bailey (1998: 10 n. 4) as a functionalist who recognizes this as well.

24. My view of the relationship between generative linguistics and word order follows Song 2012, to which I am indebted for my integration of Kayne (LCA), Uriagereka (MSO), and Hawkins (EICT).

25. For example, verb-initial word order entails prepositions rather than postpositions; SOV and SVO are the most common word orders by a significant margin; Noun–Relative order is far more likely to occur in VO languages; and Auxilliary–Verb order correlates with VO order, and vice-versa (Greenberg 1963; Song 2012: 12–13, 20). Some of Greenberg's initial observations have stood the test of time, while others have not (cf. Dryer 1992).

26. Lehmann (1973) and Vennemann (1974) reduce SVO typology to the VO/OV distinction (Song 2012: 18–20). Hawkins (1983) rejects the verb-based typology in favour of one based on the preposition/postposition distinction and also introduces the Heaviness Serializaton Principle (HSP), which states that structurally heavier elements prefer rightward positions while structurally lighter ones prefer to be farther left (Song 2012: 21–25).
order has been a subject of major interest for some time, within generative linguistics research on word order has not heated up until relatively recently, ignited largely by Kayne's seminal volume. In the GB and P&P theories which include multiple levels of representation in deep structure (DS) and surface structure (SS), the underlying constituent structure often looks dramatically different from the phonological representation that appears in the form of spoken or written language, and therefore the linear order that occurs at the surface or phonetic level has not normally been the primary subject of interest for the generativist. Constituent structure, being conceptual rather than empirical, can involve more dimensions than word order, which must be linear due to the constraint that "a consequence of the application of the laws of nature to the human mouth [is that one] can . . . just make one sound at a time" (Higginbotham 1983: 151; cf. Uriagereka 2012: 49). 27 If a phrase marker 28 in DS is viewed as three-dimensional, like a mobile that hangs above an infant's crib, creating a fixed word order is akin to placing the mobile on the ground (Uriagereka 1999:251) in that the ground forces the structure into a two-dimensional plane from which linear order can then be read off. This is why generative linguists often refer to "linearization" or "linear order" rather than "word order." Placing the mobile on the ground again and again will create a wide variety of language-specific word orders that are not part of Universal Grammar (UG), which is bound up instead with constituent structure. To use the

27. This statement is not strictly accurate. For example, Chinese phonology depends upon the ability to express two phonological signifiers simultaneously. Nonetheless, the analogy with respect to word order is valid in that linearization of lexemes is almost always a requirement of the A-P interface.

28. A phrase marker is a schematic representation of a constituent structure, normally depicted using either a tree diagram or a series of brackets.
terminology of MP, linearization is a requirement imposed upon the computation by the articulatory-perceptual (A-P) interface. This means that the act of speaking must begin with a multi-dimensional conceptual syntactic structure and create out of it a one-dimensional string of words and syntactic constituents wherein every element is in a precedence relationship with every other element. One linguist refers to this as "the Squeezing Problem" (Uriagereka 2012: 50).

Kayne's LCA proposed a paradigm shift for the development of linear order within the computational system. To understand the significance of Kayne's LCA for word order in generative grammar it is first necessary to highlight some basic features of the Minimalist Program.

2.2.1. The Minimalist Program

The Minimalist Program (MP) is a programme rather than a theory and therefore does not necessarily supplant previous linguistic theories. According to Chomsky it is "the first genuine framework for theory in the history of [linguistics]" (Chomsky 2002: 105, emphasis added). MP is a conceptual framework, a set of assumptions about how linguistic research should be conducted and an environment in which to test and evaluate possible theories. Nevertheless, in practice minimalist studies share certain theoretical components that are taken to be derivative from the conceptual framework of MP, such as binary branching and more broadly the apparatus known as bare phrase structure.
Three of the central assumptions of MP are virtual conceptual necessity, modularity, and economy (Lasnik and Uriagereka 2005: 1–30). Virtual conceptual necessity (Lasnik and Uriagereka 2005: 7) is the idea that some observations seem to be obviously true about language, and only these concepts without which language would be unimaginable can be included in any minimalist theory. For example, a lexicon is indispensible, as is a computational system. The command Merge is also necessary to include within the computational system, because if nothing else it seems obvious that the system must somehow combine items from the lexicon. Modularity (Lasnik and Uriagereka 2005: 13) is the assumption that the system is made up of component parts which interact with one another to produce output. It is within the modular framework that the final principle of economy is assumed as a way to navigate the complexity that arises from modularity. Economy (Lasnik and Uriagereka 2005: 18) is the assumption that language is optimally designed in order to satisfy as efficiently as possible the conditions that the articulatory-perceptual interface imposes on the computational system. This is sometimes referred to as the "minimalist gamble" because it is an assumption that may be proven true or false on the basis of research within the programme.

From these principles Chomsky derives a concept of phrase structure that he terms "bare phrase structure" (Chomsky 1995a; 1995b §4.3; Hornstein et al. 2005: 196–211). Bare phrase structure (BPS) improves upon the previous generative model of phrase structure, X-bar theory,

29. Lasnik and Uriagereka (2005: 31) suggest that Minimalism is "underspecified, symmetrical, reduced, [and] economical," and also list modularity as one of the foundational Minimalist assumptions (2005: 13).
30. Chomsky (1995b: 168) calls these "the two components" of which language consists.
and is characterized by four elements: (1) binary branching; (2) the functional determination of bar levels; (3) a structure-building operation called Merge; and (4) an operation called Copy that when combined with Merge produces a two-part operation called Move. The functional determination of bar levels eliminates the vacuous bar levels that are present in X-bar theory (see below). Bar levels still exist in BPS, but only where they are parent nodes for something more than a single label node—that is, either two label nodes or some lexical content. This is because in BPS, bar levels are conceived relationally rather than featurally (Hornstein et al. 2005: 197). In other words, bar levels are not inherent features of the phrase marker in BPS, but instead they are simply relationships among tree nodes. This particular change from X-bar theory is very important when it comes to the LCA because the LCA is based upon X-bar theory and the presence of vacuous, categorical bar levels is crucial to its success in its original form.

Importantly, BPS retains the relationships of GB theory that exist among specifiers, heads, and complements. These relationships are required for every projection in X-bar theory because bar levels are a structural feature. In X-bar theory, for a given head X, the Head–Complement relation is that between the two children of the X' node. The Specifier–Head relation is that between the two children of the XP node.

(3) X-bar Structure

![Diagram of X-bar Structure](image-url)
In BPS, the relationships remain the same but the requirement that every head have a complement and a specifier is dropped. Projections in MP are "determined from the structure in which they appear" rather than through the use of "special marking" (Chomsky 1995b: 242). Labels such as XP, X', and X are simply conventions when used in MP and do not indicate the presence of any defined structures. What remain significant are the concepts of minimal, maximal, and intermediate projections. A category that does not project is a maximal projection (XP in GB theory; |X| in MP, where the notation represents the outer limit of the projection); a category that is not actually a projection is called a minimal projection (X in GB theory; #X# in MP, where the notation represents that this item was selected from the numeration); 31 and anything that is neither a minimal nor a maximal projection is an intermediate projection (X' in GB theory; X in MP, with no projection symbol).

It is also important to note the special properties of adjuncts. 32 In X-bar theory, adjuncts may be contained within any maximal projection at a level above the complement but below the specifier. They may occur to the left or right of the head, as shown in the following diagram.

31. The terminology referring to a non-projection as a projection is admittedly confusing, but it is a convention of MP. See Chomsky 1995b: 242.
32. The terms "adjunct" and "modifier" are often used interchangeably.
Unfortunately within MP the placement of adjuncts has not been so clearly established, in spite of much research. It is clear that adjuncts have a distinctly different character from specifiers and complements within the syntactic framework of generative grammar, but the details have been elusive; Uriagereka calls adjuncts "a nightmare to define" (2002: 279). Although specific languages do restrict adjuncts from appearing in certain contexts, there is as yet no theory explaining their cross-linguistic distribution. For example, as Hornstein's introduction to the Minimalist Program points out with respect to one common type of adjunct, the adverb: "Just where adverbs hang is not entirely clear. However, it is very reasonable to assume that they can hang as low as VP and perhaps as high as I' (at least some of them)" (Hornstein et al. 2005: 139). In other words, uncertainty remains with respect to the location of adverbs in the phrase marker.

In a 2001 seminar, Chomsky suggested that adjuncts belong to "a different dimension." Although he did not clarify the precise nature of this alternate dimension (Lasnik and Uriagereka 2005: 254), Uriagereka notes that this dimension is "especially simple," to the point that adjuncts do not even have labels (2002: 279). Hornstein (2005: 205) notes that adjuncts do not enter into
agreement relations; they do not have the same case requirements as complements and specifiers; semantically they are conjuncts; and they may have many different category types. Syntactically, they have structural properties that differ from those of specifiers and complements: adjuncts are contained by their ancestor nodes but not dominated by them (Hornstein et al. 2005: 206). This permits adjuncts to be invisible to the mechanism of c-command, which is crucial to many concepts in generative grammar such as anaphora, negative polarity, and the LCA. Uriagereka refers to adjuncts as "free-floating modifiers" (2012: 180) and states that they have "no complex syntactic properties to speak of" (2002: 279). The unique character of adjuncts is especially important with respect to the controversial question of whether the LCA applies to adjuncts. Uriagereka understands adjuncts to be "orthogonal to the LCA" (2012: 180), and I will follow Uriagereka in treating adjuncts as if they operate in a separate dimension.

2.2.2. The Linear Correspondence Axiom

According to one reviewer, Kayne's (1994) monograph *The Antisymmetry of Syntax* brought about the "closest approximation to a [scientific] revolution" that can occur in syntactic theory (Cinque 1996: 463). In this short but rich book Kayne presents the Linear Correspondence

33. A node x typically "dominates" another node y whenever x is an ancestor node of y. A special exception is made here for cases of adjunction.

34. Kayne's antisymmetry is not to be confused with the minimalist ideal of symmetry. Symmetry as one of the values of MP is concerned with methodological economy (Hornstein et al. 2005: 8); in other words, a symmetrical analysis is one that is without exceptions. For example, Chomsky takes advantage of the Split-Infl hypothesis to produce an analysis of case assignment (or, in MP, case checking) that only makes use of the Spec–Head relationship. This is a symmetrical analysis in opposition to the asymmetrical analysis of GB theory which uses both the Spec–Head relationship and the Head–Complement relationship to assign case.
Axiom (the LCA). The LCA is based upon c-command relationships that inhere in the X-bar theory of phrase structure. C-command is defined as follows:

(5) Definition of c-command
\[\alpha \text{ c-commands } \beta \text{ if and only if}
\]
(i) \(\alpha\) does not dominate \(\beta\);  
(ii) \(\beta\) does not dominate \(\alpha\);  
(iii) the first branching node dominating \(\alpha\) also dominates \(\beta\); and  
(iv) \(\alpha\) does not equal \(\beta\).  

(Hornstein et al. 2005: 78)

For example, in (4) the Specifier node and the topmost X' node c-command one another, and the Specifier node also c-commands all the descendants of the topmost X' node. However, the descendants of the topmost X' node do not c-command the Specifier node. The XP node does not c-command any nodes, nor does any other node c-command the XP node.

In its pure form the LCA is stated as follows (Kayne 1994: 3-6):

(6) The LCA
\[\text{[For a given phrase marker } P,] \ d(A) \text{ is a linear ordering of } T.\]

Here 'T' is the set of all terminal nodes in P; 'A' is the set of all ordered pairs of nonterminal nodes in P such that the first asymmetrically c-commands the second; and 'd' is a many-to-many mapping relationship from nonterminals to terminals based on dominance relationships. In simpler terms, the LCA claims that the asymmetric c-command relationships in a phrase marker

______________________________

Antisymmetry, on the other hand, is a specific property of linear order wherein two elements x and y that participate in a linearly ordered set cannot occur in both orders, that is, it cannot be true both that x precedes y and that x follows y (Kayne 1994: 4).
are inherently representative of a linear ordering of the terminal nodes. Kayne's argument is that "phrase structure in fact always completely determines linear order and consequently that if two phrases differ in linear order, they must also differ in hierarchical structure" (Kayne 1994: 3). Returning to the previous illustration of the infant's bedroom mobile, this means that under the LCA the mobile never has three dimensions at any point. Instead, constituent structure always and only exists in two dimensions and any two phrases that share the same constituent structure also share the same linear order. Whereas linear order had been previously understood to be germane only to the articulatory-perceptual (A-P) interface, the LCA proposes that linearization is inherent in the constituent structure at all times and has already been determined any time two nodes are connected in a well-formed tree.

One important restriction of the LCA is that it requires a universal underlying constituent order. The LCA requires that the head occur between the specifier and complement because if the specifier and complement are adjacent they cannot be linearized. Two of the six possible orders for the specifier, head, and complement have the head in the middle: Spec–Head–Compl and Compl–Head–Spec. Kayne determines on the basis of typology that the underlying universal

35. However, which end of the linear ordering is the front and which end is the back is not determined by the phrase marker but must be decided on the basis of stipulation. Kayne appeals to word order typology to argue that Specifier–Head–Complement is the universally determined linear order rather than Complement–Head–Specifier (1994: 35). Uriagereka reaches the same conclusion by means of a more complex argument (2012: 57–82).
37. The specifier and complement are both non-terminal nodes, and therefore they do not stand in an asymmetric c-command relationship if they are adjacent. Since asymmetric c-command maps directly onto linear order in the LCA, without it linear order cannot be determined and the structure fails the LCA's requirements. See Kayne 1994: 33-36.
order is Spec–Head–Compl rather than Compl–Head–Spec. This restriction provides two strong arguments in favour of the LCA.

38. For a more detailed discussion of why c-command is mapped to precedence rather than subsequence (i.e., why the LCA is considered to be accurate rather than the Mirror-Image LCA (MLCA)), see Uriagereka (2012: 57–82). Note that processing considerations have also been invoked by Kayne (2010: 14) and Lasnik and Uriagereka (2005: 45–46) to explain the preference for precedence: c-command follows the asymmetry of language production and processing (Song 314 n. 2).

39. The first argument: The LCA is motivated in part by data from word order typology, most notably the fact that the world's languages evidence a remarkable amount of syntactic asymmetry. In other words, "[the parametric approach] appears to overgenerate in predicting structures that are not found in natural languages" (Hornstein et al. 2005: 220). For example, if word order were truly variable and were established only on the basis of parameters, one might expect to find more "mirror image" phenomena, i.e., languages or structures that are precisely inverse from a structural perspective. However, no mirror image languages have been discovered. Even further, many phenomena only occur in one direction; for example, verb-second languages are relatively common, but there is no known case of a verb second-to-last language, known as an "anti-V2 structure" (Kayne 1994: 50; Hornstein et al. 2005: 220-1).

More recent research has confirmed the validity of the LCA in previously unstudied contexts. In order to evaluate the antisymmetry hypothesis, Zwart (2009) chooses to study conjunctions due to their "basic" character: conjunctions, especially of noun phrases, are unlikely to involve the kinds of movement which normally complicate investigations of other syntactic structures. Zwart concludes that conjunctions always occur together with the second element of the conjoined pair, and never as the initial constituent in a conjunction phrase and never attached to the first element. Zwart sees here an inherent antisymmetry that suggests that there is an inherent inequality between the two nodes of the tree that represent the conjoined constituents. See also Cinque's (1996) review article on Kayne 1994 regarding the implications of the LCA.

The second argument: The LCA succeeds where the parametric approach is unable to address in any way the cases where linear order has very strong and perhaps universal correlations with grammatical properties that are not related to linear order (cf. Kayne (1994:49-50); Hornstein et al. (2005: 222); and Song (2012: 127-8)). For example, it is cross-linguistically true that postpositions may include agreement features and agree with their complements but prepositions may not. Principles and Parameters theory has no explanation for this, but the LCA has a simple explanation. Assuming that case is checked universally by means of the Spec–Head relationship, prepositions cannot check the case of their complements because they are in a Head–Complement relationship. Since heads universally precede their complements, there is no movement in a prepositional phrase and no case checking. Postpositions, however, must involve movement since their complements precede them. The complement of a postposition moves to
Another important restriction is that the LCA only allows movement in the leftward direction (i.e. towards the beginning of the phrase); no rightward movement is permitted. This entails that all structures which are sometimes analyzed as cases of rightward movement must be reinterpretated in terms of leftward movement.

Although Kayne's work was done within Government and Binding Theory rather than MP, for many minimalists it eventually led to a shift in the conception of the computational system in MP syntax. This is theoretically problematic without some modifications. Furthermore, moving linearization into the phrase marker in the vein of the LCA is problematic for word order theories that depend on processing and information structure considerations, which are understood to apply at PF. In the next section I will examine Uriagereka's Multiple Spell-out theory, which removes part of the linearization process from LF into PF and makes an attempt to draw the LCA and MP together into a consistent framework.

2.2.3. Multiple Spell-out

Incorporating the original form of the LCA into MP is impossible because the LCA is entirely dependent upon X-bar theory, which is superceded in MP by the more economical BPS theory. In X-bar theory, at least one bar level between a head X and its maximal projection XP is required even if that node does not branch. This vacuous bar level disappears in BPS, where every non-terminal node is a branching node, but the LCA depends upon these vacuous bar

the specifier position for case checking purposes. So the order Complement–Head/Postposition is the result of movement from the original Head/Postposition–Complement order.
levels to create relationships of asymmetric c-command. Relationships of symmetric (mutual) c-command are those where two nodes are sisters and therefore each node c-commands the other. When both of the nodes are lexical rather than categorical, mutual c-command is disallowed by the original form of the LCA because two nodes that symmetrically c-command one another cannot be linearized. It is only asymmetric c-command relationships that can map onto precedence in a linear order. The vacuous bar levels of X-bar theory ensure that symmetric c-command will not occur between two terminal nodes (that is, nodes with lexical content) with the consequence that linearization becomes impossible. In BPS, however, symmetric c-command is possible and in fact quite common between nodes with lexical content that needs to be linearized.

Several linguists have proposed solutions for reconciling the LCA with BPS and thereby MP, and Chomsky was the first to do so. Hornstein (2009) also has an interesting proposal.

40. The publication of the LCA followed Chomsky's initial proposal of the Minimalist Program (1993) but preceded his full presentation of it (1995b), allowing him the opportunity to address the compatibility of the LCA with MP within an essay on BPS (1995a: 413–18) in MP's early stages. Given the difficulties, Chomsky (1995a: 413–14) argues that the empirical aspects of the LCA can be easily incorporated into MP but the conceptual aspects cannot (cf. Song 2012: 141–142). In this essay Chomsky proposes two tentative solutions (cf. Song 2012: 145–149). Song summarizes Chomsky's solutions as follows: "The solutions boil down to a single-terminal being (re)analysed as a complex category (whether by means of a trace or a functional head) or as a single phonological word in conjuction with the object with which it will otherwise enter into a mutual c-command relationship" (Song 2012: 148–49). Chomsky's solutions have been called "somewhat desperate" and "seemingly bizarre" (Lasnik and Uriagereka 2005: 117) and have not gained a significant following among those who work with the LCA.

41. Hornstein conceives of Merge as an inherently asymmetric operation and makes linearization depend upon asymmetric Merge rather than upon asymmetric c-command (Hornstein 2009: 31–4; Zwart 2009; 2011). This is a promising hypothesis, but Hornstein's proposal is complex because he allows that Merge may be a symmetric operation in cases where features other than Case or θ-features are checked (Hornstein 2009:32; Song 2012: 155). In these cases, Hornstein
The solution that will be adopted in this study is the Multiple Spell-out (MSO) framework proposed by Uriagereka (1999; 2012). Uriagereka's model makes modifications to both traditional MP theory and the LCA. Uriagereka proposes that a cyclical application of Spell-out, as outlined within his developed framework Multiple Spell-out (MSO), can account for the linearization of phrase markers with mutual c-command between lexical nodes. In MP Spell-out is the stage where the Logical Form (LF) and the Phonological Form (PF) of the phrase marker diverge from one another in the derivation and is the point past which the computation can no longer access the lexicon (Chomsky 1995b: 189). Covert movement (movement that is not evident in spoken language) occurs after Spell-out in the LF domain. Overt movement is typically understood to occur before Spell-out, but some theories (including Erteschik-Shir's f-structure framework; cf. §2.4.2 and §2.4.4) assign a substantial amount of overt movement to the PF domain as well. Uriagereka proposes that Spell-out can occur multiple times during the process of a derivation, creating "cycles" within the derivation. This theory has become very influential in minimalist research.

suggests that something like a P&P approach is applicable, where different languages may linearize the symmetrically merged constituents (e.g. T and vP) differently (Song 2012: 155). Incidentally, this also nullifies one of the advantages of the LCA (and one of its original objectives), which is the elimination of stipulation in the area of word order, especially the elimination of the Head Parameter (Song 2012: 155). Uriagereka's MSO theory also restores the Head Parameter (Lasnik and Uriagereka 2005: 35).

42. Uriagereka is still working within the MP framework in that he retains the applicability of its core principles, such as economy, although he diverges somewhat from the theoretical specifics of Spell-out proposed by Chomsky. The LCA is preserved in Uriagereka's treatment of the linearization of the Spec–Head relationship.

43. According to Uriagereka (1999: 276), MSO is "conceptually indistinguishable" from the phase-based approach of Chomsky (2001), which is a dynamic model for the computational
In MSO, the points at which Spell-out occur within a derivation are determined by an assumption that Uriagereka terms the "Finite State limit" (2012: 52–57, 88).

(7) The Finite State Limit on Phrase Structure
An exhaustively binary phrase-marker, none of whose branches symmetrically bifurcates, can be expressed in FS fashion. (Uriagereka 2012: 53)

The FS limit assumption is advantageous because it enables all derivations to converge within Kayne's LCA. The key to this insight is the recognition that symmetric c-command can be avoided if and only if there is no symmetric bifurcation in the (binary) phrase marker. Symmetric bifurcation is a case where both daughters of a parent node are of the same type, whether terminal or non-terminal nodes. In other words, to satisfy the FS limit, for every node with two daughter nodes in a phrase marker, one of the daughter nodes must be a terminal node and the other must be a non-terminal node.

For example, when the LCA is assumed, the following phrase marker crashes due to symmetric bifurcation.\footnote{In all tree diagrams, ellipses are used to represent a simplified, collapsed phrase structure.}
(8) Symmetric Bifurcation

Nodes 2 and 3 evidence symmetric bifurcation since both are non-terminal nodes. Likewise, nodes 4 and 5 are symmetric, as are nodes 6 and 7. If nodes 2 and 3 were both terminal nodes, for example, that would also cause a derivation crash under the LCA.

All trees that satisfy the FS limit look something like (9), where every non-terminal node (other than the node that dominates all others) is a sister of a terminal node.

(9) Asymmetric Bifurcation

This produces an FS relation, where the non-terminal nodes represent the states of the device and the terminal nodes represent signals that mark the transition from one state to another, as in (10).
Of course, not all phrase markers satisfy the FS limit. There are two specific structures that do not meet the FS limit in a binary tree: (1) sister nodes that are both terminal nodes and (2) sister nodes that are both non-terminal nodes. I will address each structure in turn. The first structure occurs at the bottom of a tree or branch. Eventually the final two nodes must both be terminal nodes in order to prevent the tree from expanding indefinitely. One way to linearize two sister terminal nodes is through Uriagereka's advocation against Kayne (1994) that a linearization mechanism (L) does still operate on phrase markers after all (Uriagereka 2012: 52). Kayne eliminated the linearization mechanism by proposing that linear order is inherent in the phrase marker, but Uriagereka restores a linearization mechanism to the model (following Chomsky 1995a), which entails that the phrase marker does not entirely determine linear order. He proposes that precedence relations are fixed only at the point when the linearization mechanism encounters "the specific component of grammar that organizes speech/sign" (Uriagereka 2012: 52). In other words, the LCA does not linearize any nodes that do not contain phonological content since its purpose is only to "squeeze" the lexical input into the one-dimensional A-I interface. This means that some portions of the phrase marker never become linearized.
This restriction on the LCA solves the problem of linearizing two terminal nodes in cases where one of the final two nodes is empty of phonological content. If this theory is accurate, then a phrase marker normally requires at least one empty node to permit linearization, and therefore it is likely that the presence of empty nodes in a tree can often (although not always) be explained by the need to satisfy the LCA. There are two primary mechanisms that can produce a node devoid of phonological content. First, an empty determiner or a null functional head such as a gender head or number head can be included in the phrase marker (Hornstein et al. 2005: 228–30). Second, an empty node can result from the leftward movement of a lexical item.45

A third way to linearize two sister terminal nodes is a phonological merger to create a single morpheme. This seems to happen occasionally in English with pronouns, as in the phonological cliticization of the pronoun to the verb in the phrase "like it" (like't) in a sentence such as "I like it" (Hornstein et al. 2005: 232). In Hebrew this kind of cliticization is far more common, and it appears to be a strategy that Hebrew uses frequently to permit linearization. Enclitic pronouns are extremely common in Hebrew. Proclitic determiners may also be utilized as a strategy to permit the convergence of the LCA.46

45. The Move operation that is utilized in GB theory is not incorporated into MP because it does not align with the principle of virtual conceptual necessity. Movement in MP is conceived in terms of two operations, Copy and Merge, which unlike Move are considered theoretical primitives. As to why both instantiations of a copied lexeme are not phonetically realized in the Copy and Merge model, one theory states that the LCA cannot converge if both copies are pronounced because an item cannot linearize with respect to itself. Thus the LCA is used again to explain the mechanisms of phrase structure (Hornstein et al. 2005: 241).

46. Another possibility is that "the 'last' element in a right branch is always the predicate of a small clause" (Uriagereka 1996; 1999: n. 14).
The second structure that does not meet the FS limit, two sister non-terminal nodes, can be linearized when Uriagereka's MSO has been brought into the model. First, MSO breaks down phrase markers that include symmetric bifurcation and do not satisfy the FS limit (as in Figure 2.3) into sets of phrase markers that do satisfy the FS limit. Each phrase marker that satisfies the FS limit is called a "current," and any current that gets spelled out is called a "vortex" (Uriagereka 2012: 86–89). The current that includes the top node of the original phrase marker and does not depend on any other current is the "main" current; any other phrase markers are "tributary" currents (Uriagereka 2012: 86–87). Second, the LCA applies "within each of these phrase markers" (Uriagereka 2012: 73). Finally, the top nodes of the tributary phrase markers are "made to correspond" with the appropriate nodes in the main phrase marker (Uriagereka 2012: 73). For example, the tree in (11) can be separated into trees (12a) and (12b), where (12b) is the main phrase marker.

(11) Two Sister Non-terminal Nodes

(Uriagereka 2012: 72, fig. 29)

47. The "current" term replaces Uriagereka's earlier (1999) "command unit" (CU).
Each of (12a) and (12b) satisfy the FS limit, so Spell-out and the LCA will apply to each phrase marker separately. Within the main phrase marker—(12b) in this example—the node that corresponds with the top node of the tributary phrase marker—node 2 in this example—is impenetrable to the vision of the LCA \textit{as it applies to the main phrase marker}. When the two nodes are again made to correspond, the spelled-out tributary phrase marker falls into place at the location of the corresponding node in the order in which it was already spelled out.

This analysis raises an important question: how does the Spell-out operation select the point of division in cases where there are two ways to divide the phrase marker such that both resulting phrase markers satisfy the FS limit? For example, how does Spell-out know to divide (11) as in (12) rather than as in (13)?
Uriagereka resolves this dilemma by means of the presupposition that "tree-divisions [do not] tamper with any lexical projection" (2012: 74). He also puts it another way: "that the computational system does not like to tamper with labeling mechanisms" (2012: 74 n.40). Given a tree like that in (11), one of the available options will always divide a projection, while the other will not. Consider (14) and (15), which are examples of (12) and (13), respectively, schematized using MP notation.48

48. In phrase marker diagrams, N represents a Noun; V, a verb; A, an adjective; P, a preposition; D, a determiner; T, a tense marker; I, an inflection marker; Cop, a copula; Neg, a negation particle; and C, a complementizer.
(14) Correct Division of Two Non-terminal Nodes
(a) ![Diagram](14a.png)
(b) ![Diagram](14b.png)

(Uriagereka 2012: 75, fig. 35)

(15) Incorrect Division of Two Non-terminal Nodes
(a) ![Diagram](15a.png)
(b) ![Diagram](15b.png)

(Uriagereka 2012: 75, fig. 36)

By dividing the original tree at the point of the intermediate projection T, (15) tampers with a lexical projection, namely |T|. On the other hand, by dividing the original tree at the point of the maximal projection |D|, (14) does not tamper with any lexical projections.

Uriagereka lays this out under the heading "The Address Issue":

---

URIAGEREKA 2012: 75, FIG. 35

URIAGEREKA 2012: 75, FIG. 36
(16) The Address Issue
Whenever a phrase-marker $K$ is divided into complex sub-components $L$ and $M$, for $K$ to meet LCA conditions of multiple Spell-out, the daughter phrase-marker $M$ that spells-out separately must correspond to an identical term $M$ within $K$. (Uriagereka 2012: 75)

Another way of stating the MSO procedure is to say that noncomplements (that is, specifiers and adjuncts) that are more complex than a single node are spelled out separately (Uriagereka 1999: 267; Lasnik and Uriagereka 2005: 94).49

Uriagereka (1999: 256–259, 265–268) suggests a "conservative" (syntactic) and a "radical" (performance) option for the reintegration of the phrase marker after multiple Spell-out.50 The thorniest issue to resolve is antecedence, which can involve multiple currents. An antecedent that c-commands a co-referential anaphor in a spelled-out current needs to "see into" the current to relate with its anaphor, but if the current has already been spelled out it should be inaccessible to the syntax. The conservative solution to this problem is that the syntax can "identify even if not operate with" the terms inside the spelled-out phrase marker. In the

49. Within the radical framework for MSO, specifiers and adjuncts are spelled out in top-down order beginning at the root of the phrase marker. This is done so that an antecedent will be sent to PF prior to its anaphor and will be "live" in a derivational cascade for the purposes of agreement with its anaphor (Uriagereka 1999: 267–268).

50. Uriagereka does not prefer one solution over the other. Both solutions are appropriate within the MSO framework. Uriagereka hypothesizes that the two solutions might be parametric alternatives, and that individual languages may select one system over the other depending on the richness of their case and/or agreement morphology. Languages with rich case/agreement morphology may tend to select the radical solution, because they can use their agreement or case features to linearize the phrase marker at PF. Languages with poor case/agreement morphology may tend to select the conservative solution because the agreement features are insufficient to linearize the phrase marker. Hebrew is somewhere in the middle of the rich/poor continuum with respect to agreement morphology, so it may be that Hebrew uses both systems, where some parts spell-out radically and some parts spell-out conservatively. See Uriagereka (2012: 171–172).
conservative solution, the spelled out phrase marker is treated essentially as a single word by the syntax, uninterpretable in terms of its parts. However, Uriagereka makes a distinction between interpretability and accessibility (1999: 266). Although the phrase marker is uninterpretable, its units are accessible. Within this solution, each cycle is reintegrated into the syntax immediately after it has been spelled out and linearized, and the PF domain is not responsible for reconnecting the phrase marker after it has been split into currents.

The radical solution is to send each current to PF independently and reassemble the phrase marker in PF. Uriagereka hypothesizes that the reassembly process is conducted by means of agreement, and even that PF reassembly is in fact the motivation for grammatical agreement. Unlike the conservative option, the currents are not compressed into a single word-like conglomeration of non-syntactic material. Each structure retains its visibility, and the uninterpretability of the currents in the syntax post-Spell-out is simply a result of the currents having been shipped off to PF.

In this study the radical option will be assumed because it dovetails more cleanly with Erteschik-Shir's conception of information structure related movement, which takes place primarily in the PF domain (cf. §2.4.4.1 and §2.4.4.2). Preserving structure rather than collapsing it into "frozen compound[s]" (Uriagereka 1999: 257) permits the type of PF operations on phrase markers that Erteschik-Shir's f-structure framework requires.

With respect to adjuncts, Uriagereka follows Chomsky (cf. Lasnik and Uriagereka 2005: 254) in concluding that adjuncts "live in their own dimension" (2012: 187). This background is important context for the perhaps surprising claim from Lasnik and Uriagereka that the best
representation for adjuncts that modify the same constituent is a flat structure (2005: 256).\textsuperscript{51} In other words, Lasnik and Uriagereka abandon binary branching when it comes to adjuncts within the same projection. They claim that "All that matters for a pure adjunct is that it be activated in some derivational domain, where it modifies" (257). Adjuncts essentially do not participate in the fundamental operations of narrow syntax. Adjuncts do, however, participate in relationships of antecedence, which is a problem for the notion that adjuncts are invisible to mechanisms that rely upon c-command (Hornstein et al. 2005: 206) because antecedence requires the antecedent to c-command its anaphor. This suggests that antecedence is a PF relationship and that adjuncts are visible for c-command in the PF component but not in narrow syntax.

Uriagereka understands Kayne's chief insight to be the mapping of asymmetric c-command to precedence.\textsuperscript{52} When it comes to word order typology, however, Uriagereka dispenses with the majority of Kayne's hypothesis of universal Specifier–Head–Complement order by means of including two major exceptions to the LCA. First, in Uriagereka's model Head–Complement relations are linearized on the basis of the Head Parameter and not on the basis of the LCA (Uriagereka 2012: 46). Second, Uriagereka treats adjuncts as if they are "more loosely related to what they modify than is customarily assumed" (2012: 176). Summarizing his

\textsuperscript{51} Kayne (1994) equates adjuncts and specifiers, but Uriagereka restores the distinction. He writes that Kayne's equation of the two is a desperate solution to the problem of licensing only leftward projections necessitated by the assumption of a single Spell-out (Uriagereka 1999: 259).

\textsuperscript{52} Uriagereka presents a complex argument that mapping asymmetric c-command to precedence is "more natural" (2012: 57) than mapping it to subsequence (i.e. the "mirror-image LCA", the MLCA) with appeal to context-sensitive dependencies, context-sensitive asymmetries, information flow, and the linearization of complex structures (2012: 57–82).
own (2002) work, Uriagereka claims that "true modifiers [adjuncts] are pronounced in the same order as they are generated and deactivated as identified by the system (setting aside whatever internal complexity they may each have): first come, first served" (2012: 179; cf. also Lasnik and Uriagereka 2005: 35–37). In other words, the linearization of adjuncts is essentially arbitrary from a syntactic perspective and tied instead to the PF component. In his discussion of small clause modifiers, Uriagereka puts it this way: "the order of deactivation in the small-clause workspace directly maps to the PF sequence of modifiers" [emphasis original] (2012: 179). Given that adjuncts have a flat structure, their relative order is syntactically unbound as long as they modify the same constituent. Obviously this means that adjuncts are not governed by the LCA in Uriagereka's model.\(^{53}\) In fact, once the exceptions are removed, only the Spec–Head relation is governed by the LCA in Uriagereka's model.\(^{54}\)

At this point I have laid the groundwork for a minimalist understanding of the relationship between phrase structure and word order that incorporates Kayne's (1994) LCA indirectly by means of Uriagereka's (1999; 2012) theory of Multiple Spell-out. In the following section I will explain how this theory can be used to describe the Hebrew language of the Hellenistic Period.

---

53. Whether the LCA is relevant to the linearization of adjuncts is a subject about which there is no consensus due largely to the lack of consensus about the status of adjuncts in general (Hornstein et al. 2005: 232–233). Most scholars address the problem by equating adjuncts and specifiers (Uriagereka 2002: 279). For example, Cinque (1999: 140–141) argues that adverbs are ordered by the LCA, but he classifies adverbs as specifiers rather than adjuncts.

2.2.4. Hellenistic Period Hebrew

As mentioned above, in the MSO model Spec–Head order is universal, Head–Complement order is set by means of the Head Parameter, and Adjunct–Head order is variable within a given language. In ancient Hebrew generally, specifiers precede their heads, heads precede their complements, and adjuncts vary with type and context. All of this is according to expectation, with the Head Parameter set for Head–Comp order.

Three Head–Comp relationships make it especially clear that complements generally follow their heads: Determiner–Noun Phrase; Preposition–Noun Phrase; and Verb–Object. These relationships are consistent through both Biblical and Hellenistic Hebrew.

First, in the Det–NP construction, the NP complement always follows its determiner head, as in (17). 56

(17) Det–NP construction

הכהנים

hkwhnym

DET-priest.MP

"the priests"

1QS I.18

55. For definitions of the terms specifier, head, and complement, see §2.2.1.
56. For Biblical Hebrew, see Kautzsch 1910 (GKC): §35a; Waltke and O'Conor 1990 (IBHS): §13.3b; van der Merwe et al. 1999 (BHRG): §24.4.2; Joüon and Muraoka 2006 (JM): §35b. In some theories the determiner is conceived as a modifier of the noun, but in generative grammar the determiner is the head of the phrase, which is classified as a determiner phrase (DP) rather than a noun phrase (NP) (cf. Szabolcsi 1983; Abney 1987).
The use of the definite article as a determiner is often more complex than (17). For example, the article cliticizes to nouns in the unbound form, but does not cliticize to nouns in the bound form in nominal phrases, as in (18).\textsuperscript{57}

\textbf{(18) Bound Phrase with Definite Article}

\begin{verbatim}
שומרי ברית
šmry hbryt
preserve.PTCP,MP,CSTR DET-covenant.FS
"the preservers of the covenant"
1QS V.2
\end{verbatim}

In cases where a noun is modified by another noun, the modifying noun uses the free, unbound form and follows the modified noun, which often uses a morphologically distinct bound form. If a definite article is used in the phrase, only one is used, and that article cliticizes to the second noun, the unbound noun. The bound form is restricted from bearing the article. Note in (18) that the article cliticizes to ברית, "covenant" rather than שומרי, "preservers" in the bound phrase שומרי ברית, "the preservers of the covenant." If the article that appears in the Hebrew bound phrase is taken to modify an otherwise indefinite NP, then the bound phrase could be interpreted to provide evidence as to the order of head and complement. However, from a Minimalist perspective, the determiner (article) in the bound phrase is best interpreted as the head only of the unbound noun, while the absence of a determiner with the bound noun results from a Hebrew-specific restriction. The diagram in (19) illustrates the structure of example (18). Note

\begin{verbatim}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{57.} GKC §127; IBHS §13.4c; BHRG §25.3.1.ii; JM §139.
the phonological merger of the proclitic determiner to its complement to permit linearization of the two terminal nodes.

(19) Phrase Marker of Bound Phrase with Determiner

This structure illustrates that Head–Complement order is maintained in the bound phrase; in (19), the only Head–Complement relationship involving lexical content is between \( h \)- and \( bryt \), and the head precedes the complement.\(^{58}\)

Example (20) also involves a bound phrase, where the bound noun is \( dbry \), "words," and the noun phrase in the unbound form is \( hbr\ yt \ hzw t \), "this covenant."

(20) Bound Phrase with Demonstrative and Two Definite Articles

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{דבר
} \text{ברית
} \text{דברי
} \text{בתרות
} \\
\text{dbry
} \text{hbr\ yt
} \text{hzwt
}
\end{array}
\]

"the words of this covenant"

1QS II.13

\(^{58}\) For a Minimalist analysis of Definiteness Spreading in the (modern) Hebrew bound phrase, which explains precisely how the definiteness feature of the unbound noun is shared by the bound noun, see Danon 2008.
Within this noun phrase, a noun is modified by a demonstrative that is functioning similarly to an adjective. Typically, Hebrew grammars describe this construction as a case of agreement, where the demonstrative or adjective must agree with the definiteness status of the head noun. Biblical Hebrew grammars state that an adjective carries the article if and only if the noun it modifies carries the article. However, it is not especially rare for adjectives not to agree with the nouns they modify with respect to definiteness. Furthermore, it is also well known that the proclitic particle ה can also function as a relative marker, often governing a participle and, in rarer cases, a finite verb. In light of these facts it is more economical to interpret the proclitic as a relative marker when it governs any adjective or demonstrative, not only when it governs a participle (or

59. GKC §126u–v; IBHS §14.3.1a; BHRG §24.4.3.iv; JM §138a.

60. "When a substantive is defined by the article . . . the attribute belonging to it (whether adjective, participle, ordinal, or demonstrative pronoun) necessarily takes the article" (GKC §126u). "[An attributive adjective] is recognized (1) by its inflection (agreement with its head with respect to gender, number, and determination) and (2) by its position" (IBHS §14.3.1a). The article on an adjective "marks [it] . . . as grammatically congruent with a noun" (BHRG §24.4.3.iv). "An attribute in apposition (adjective, participle) agrees with its noun in respect of determination" (JM §138.a).

61. For cases where a modifier bears the article but its noun does not, see GKC §126w–x; IBHS §14.3.1d; JM §138b–d; for cases where a noun bears the article but its modifier does not, see GKC §126y; JM §138e–i.

62. GKC §138g–k; BHRG §24.4.3.ii; JM §145d–f. IBHS §19.7b presents the opaque argument that the morphological article is not also a relative marker because a participle can also initiate a relative clause without the use of an article. Clearly a participle without a relative ה is best analyzed as an asyndetic relative clause; the presence of asyndetic relative participle clauses does not negate the relative function of ה any more than asyndetic relative clauses in general negate the relative function of the typical relative pronoun אשר.
finite verb). The phrase marker for example (20) under this view is in (21) below. Note that the null copula in the relative clause permits linearization of the final two terminal nodes.

(21) Phrase Marker of Bound Phrase with Demonstrative and Two Definite Articles

In sum, the majority of the evidence points in the direction of Head–Comp order for a determiner and the NP it modifies.

Second, in the Prep–NP relationship, the preposition nearly always precedes its NP complement, as in (22).

64. It may be that a full clause is not required in cases where the modifier is not complex. For a full treatment of the issue, see Holmstedt (forthcoming).
65. Possessive pronominal suffixes on nouns, which are enclitic in Hebrew, are the main exception, since they are the determiner head of the DP but follow their complement nouns.
66. IBHS §11; JM §132–133. There is one postposition in Hebrew, which is known as the
Third, in the Verb–Complement relationship, the verb (the head) typically precedes its complements (including objects). The exceptional cases where the verbal complement precedes the verb are typically a result of fronting motivated by information structure, as will be demonstrated in later chapters of this study. Example (23) is an example of a clause with Verb–Object order. In this example, the bottom of the tree is linearized by means of the cliticization of the proclitic conjunction, which merges the two terminal nodes phonologically to permit linearization.

(23) Sample VO Clause

\[
\text{וָהָוָאָוֶה רַבִּרְבּוֹתָו} אָוֶה חַוְָוָאָוֶה.
\]

\[
\text{whw'h br' rwhwt 'wr whwšk}
\]

CONJ-SUBPRON.3MS create.3MS spirit.FP light.MS CONJ-darkness.MS

"And he created spirits of light and darkness."

1QS III.25(a)

---

locative-directional \( \overset{\text{ד}}{\sim} \) (ד), an adverbial suffix ending on nouns that functions similarly to the English suffix '–ward'; cf. IBHS §10.5; JM §93c–f.

67. JM §155o.
Since Det–NP, Prep–NP, and Verb–Object relations all demonstrate Head–Complement order, and this is the word order of UG under the LCA, there is little difficulty explaining Head–Comp order in ancient Hebrew.

When it comes to Head–Specifier relations, the clearest example of Spec–Head order is found in moved *wh*-phrases, which land in the specifier of a complementizer (C) projection.\(^{68}\)

---

68. IBHS §18.2–3; BHRG §46.1.2(ii)a (p. 340). The appearance of *wh*-phrases in sentence-initial position is "overwhelming" in its dominance cross-linguistically, as is Spec–Head order in general (Kayne 1994: 35-36). Exceptions do occur in Hebrew with the interrogative *wh*-word in non-initial position: cf. JM §161k(3). However, even the *wh*-words in non-initial position in JM §161k(3) do not occur *in situ*. It appears they have been fronted to the head of the clause as usual, but another constituent has also been fronted ahead of them in each case, whether due to left-dislocation (Isa 49.21 (2x); Gen 23.15; Num 16.11), the fronting of a topic subject, which may involve hanging topic LD as described in §4.3.1.1.3 (Ex 16:7; 2Sam 13.13), or the fronting of a scene-setting topic (Ps 6.6).
As for subjects, they may appear either before or after the verb in ancient Hebrew. The complicated factors that govern Subject–Verb order are one of the primary subjects of investigation in this study and will be addressed in detail in later chapters.\(^{69}\) As a theoretical

---

69. For analysis of Verb–Subject order in the standard reference grammars, which all treat Biblical Hebrew as a Verb–Subject language, see IBHS §8.3b; BHRG §46–47; JM §154f–j, §155k–t. There is general agreement that Late Biblical Hebrew and HPH have shifted towards SV order relative to the more common VS order of BH. The criteria used to sort out the
starting point, this study will assume the Predicate-Internal Subject Hypothesis (PISH), which states that a subject is initially merged into the specifier position of the head with which it has a \( \theta \)-relation (Hornstein et al. 2005: 81). The distinction between Verb–Subject clauses and Subject–Verb clauses is based on movements that occur from this base position.

For the sake of simplicity, it would be useful if there were a "VS parameter" that triggered a certain movement or sequence of movements in VS languages, thus differentiating them from the more commonly attested SV languages. However, there is no evidence that such a parameter exists. As J. McCloskey argues, "... there will be many, many different ways of arriving at a surface order of Verb–Subject–Complements" (McCloskey 1996: 273–4). An examination of the Hebrew data in later chapters will elaborate upon the possibilities here.

Whereas specifiers are daughters of maximal projections and complements are sisters of minimal projections, adjuncts (on a surface level analysis) are daughters and sisters of intermediate projections. However, as noted above, adjuncts are more difficult to classify than that. Here I repeat what I mentioned earlier, that adjuncts are contained by their ancestor nodes.

---

70 In a verbal clause, this head will be the main verb. In generative grammar, the specifier of the finite verb phrase is generally assumed to be the initial point of merge for the subject. The placement of the copula is a highly debated issue in linguistics. The older, more traditional view is that the copula is a regular verb with \( \theta \)-relations (cf. Adger and Ramchand 2003). Many now consider the copula to be an auxiliary verb introduced in Infl, where the copula clause is a small clause relation, at least in cases where the copula is equative rather than predicational (cf. Heycock and Kroch 1997, 2012). I have assumed that the copula takes the place of a finite verb within the phrase marker, but I do not defend this assumption here because this study is limited to clauses with a finite verb.
but not dominated by them (Hornstein et al. 2005: 206). Although ". . . there is no consensus in
the literature on whether or not adjuncts should also be ordered by the LCA . . . " (Hornstein et
al. 2005: 232–233 and 233 n. 12), I will follow Uriagereka in treating adjuncts as "orthogonal to
the LCA" and thereby free from its stipulation (Uriagereka 2012: 180). The relationship of
adjuncts to the other nodes of a phrase marker is very different from the relationships involved in
the rest of the phrase marker.

Adjuncts in ancient Hebrew typically follow their heads, with a few exceptions.71 The
major exception in Biblical Hebrew is that it is typical for most numerals to precede the nouns
they modify.72 The data is very regular when it comes to adjunct modification of nouns.
Adverbial phrases normally follow the verbs they modify, but it is not uncommon for an
adverbial phrase to precede the verb, and variation is permissible. Few lexical adverbs exist in
ancient Hebrew, but those that do typically allow variation in Head–Adjunct order. I assume that
all of these restrictions are non-syntactic and belong within the PF domain. Further details
involving some of these structures will be explored in later chapters.

2.3. Early Immediate Constituent Theory

Above I used the LCA and MSO to establish a basic framework for understanding phrase
structure, word order, and linearization. However, from a theoretical perspective this is

71. For Biblical Hebrew, cf. BHRG §46.1.2–3; JM §141b. HPH is identical with Biblical
Hebrew in this respect.
72. For details, see JM §142.
insufficient because there is much about the clause-level word order of HPH that these theories do not explain, such as the linearization of (flat branching) adjuncts at PF.

The issue of adjunct linearization is a difficult one, but some insights that are important for comprehending this aspect of word order, as well as others that do not fall under the purview of the LCA, can be found by looking outside what has historically been considered the realm of generative grammar to performance-based (or processing-based) linguistic theory. The need for theoretical frameworks such as MSO that bring performance considerations to bear on narrow syntax demonstrates that performance-based theory has significant contributions to make to generative grammar.73

The performance-based work of Jack Hawkins—specifically the Early Immediate Constituent Theory (EICT) (1994) and its later revision (2004)—can serve as a useful supplement to the LCA and MSO Theory. I am unaware of any attempts to reconcile Hawkins' Early Immediate Constituent Theory with the Minimalist Program, although translating Hawkins' program into minimalist terms is straightforward, if cumbersome. Yet the value of Hawkins' work is clear and must be included in a rigorous theoretical analysis of word order in ancient Hebrew.

Hawkins' work concerns the tendency of word order to correlate with ease of processing. This means that language orders its constituents in such a way that a listener can identify the scope of each constituent as quickly as possible. The theory is based on the assumption that there

73. Richards (2010) is one example of the possible implications of performance considerations for generative grammar within the context of the LCA; cf. Song 157–159 for an overview.
are mental costs involved in processing a sentence and that the primary concern of the linguistic processing system is to minimize these costs and maximize efficiency and processing speed when building a phrase marker (Song 2012: 237). Such concerns belong within the PF component of the grammar, post-Spell-out, and this is where I will apply the EICT. To quantify this theory Hawkins (1994: 58–60) defines several key concepts that I must present in some detail here.

The first category is the immediate constituent (IC), which is a node that is an immediate descendant of a mother node M. In the diagram in (25) of the sentence, "I gave to Mary the valuable book that was extremely difficult to find" (Hawkins 1994: 60), VP₁ is the mother node and V, PP, and NP₃ are the IC's.

(25) Immediate Constituents

```
S₁
  └── NP₁
      ├── V
      │   └── VP₁
      |      └── PP
      |          └── NP₂
      |              └── Det
      |                  └── AdjP
      |                                  └── N
      |                                               └── S
      |                                                     └── that was extremely difficult to find
      └── NP₃
          └── N
              └── the
                  └── NP₁
                      └── Pro
                          └── I
gave
      └── to
          └── NP₂
              └── Det
                  └── N
                      └── Mary
```
One point of divergence from generative grammar is immediately apparent in this diagram: Hawkins does not assume binary branching even for constituents that generative grammar would identify as heads, complements and specifiers. In order to apply Hawkins' EICT within a generative framework, it will be necessary to reframe it for binary branching structures. However, before doing so I will explain Hawkins' theory on its own terms.

The most important conceptual tool of Hawkins' theory is the Constituent Recognition Domain.

(26) Constituent Recognition Domain (CRD)
The CRD for a phrasal mother node M consists of the set of terminal and non-terminal nodes that must be parsed in order to recognize M and all ICs of M, proceeding from the terminal node in the parse string that constructs the first IC on the left, to the terminal node that constructs the last IC on the right, and including all intervening terminal nodes and the non-terminal nodes that they construct. (Hawkins 1994: 58–59)

To paraphrase (26), a CRD is whatever portion of the phrase marker must be parsed before the parser is able to recognize all of the IC's of M. To understand what it means to "recognize" an IC, we must also be aware of Hawkins' assumption of mother-node constructing categories (MNCC's).

(27) Axiom of MNCC Existence
For each phrasal mother node M there will be at least one daughter category C that can construct M on each occasion of use. (Hawkins 1994: 63)

In (25), for example, the MNCC for NP₃ is the NP-initial determiner. (Generative grammar would label NP₃ as a DP, but I am following Hawkins' terminology for the moment.)
Once the parser reaches this determiner, it can construct the category NP (or DP) and await further data that will complete the structure of this category.

The CRD of VP₁ in (25), then, is whatever must be parsed in order to recognize all of the IC's of VP₁: V, PP, and NP₃. Each IC of VP₁ can be identified as soon as its MNCC is identified; however, the CRD is not complete until the MNCC of the final IC is identified. This is possible once the Det node is reached in NP₃. Therefore the constituent recognition domain of VP₁ is everything between V and Det, inclusive. (The boundaries are marked by the dotted lines in the diagram.) Once the parser reaches the determiner, it can identify all three IC's of VP₁: V, PP, and NP₃.

The great insight of Hawkins is that there is a strong cross-linguistic tendency to order constituents in such a way as to maximize the ratio of IC's to non-IC's within any given CRD. This is the Principle of Early Immediate Constituents (Hawkins 1994: 77; Song 2012: 241).

(28) Principle of Early Immediate Constituents (PEIC)
The human parser prefers linear orders that maximize the IC-to-non-IC ratios of Constituent Recognition Domains (CRD's).

One helpful way to frame this concept is to say that the IC's of a given mother node M are ordered in such a way as to minimize the number of non-IC's within the CRD of M. In (25), for example, there are three IC's within the CRD of VP₁: V, PP, and NP₃. Ignoring the CRD for a moment, we can see that the V node governs one non-IC of VP₁ ("gave"), while the PP node governs five (P, "to," NP₂, N, and "Mary.") The NP₃ node is not fully diagrammed in (25), but when it is (cf. Hawkins 1994: 59), it governs twenty-one non-IC's. There are six possible orders
for these three IC's, but the factor that determines the IC-to-non-IC ratio is which of the IC's is placed last in the sequence, because the last IC does not have all of its non-IC's included in the ratio calculation. The CRD ends when the MNCC of the final IC is reached, excluding most of the non-IC's governed by the final IC from the CRD. The number of non-IC's that occur before and including the MNCC of V is reached is one ("gave"); before and including the MNCC of PP, two non-IC's are found ("P" and "to"); and two non-IC's occur up to the MNCC of NP, ("Det" and "the"). In (25), NP occurs last, and the ratio of IC's to non-IC's in the CRD is 3:8 \((8 = 1 + 5 + 2)\). If the PP were placed last, the ratio would be 3:24 \((24 = 1 + 21 + 2)\); if the V were placed last, the ratio would be 3:27 \((27 = 5 + 21 + 1)\). Since 3:8 is the largest of these three ratios, the parser prefers to place NP last in the sequence.

Although Hawkins' assumptions and terminology do not necessarily align with those of the Minimalist Program, Hawkins leaves room within his study to reframe his analysis in minor ways that render it compatible with MP. Some of Hawkins' terminology translates fairly directly into MP. For example, the relationship between a mother node constructing category (MNCC) and its mother node is the same as that between the MP minimal projection and maximal projection. In (25), for example, NP is a maximal projection of the minimal projection "the," a determiner; NP would be labeled as a DP (determiner phrase) in GB or P&P theory, and as \(|D|\) in MP. However, some of Hawkins' assumptions are incompatible with MP. The most notable divergence is Hawkins' assumption of non-binary branching.

Although Hawkins uses non-binary branching in his analysis, he emphasizes that his theory is not tied to any particular model of phrase structure and that his choice of non-binary
branching is not essential, noting that "The performance theory of this book does not, in general, depend upon the syntactic assumptions of any one current model, and I would like my results to be as compatible as possible with different models." (Hawkins 1994: 450, n. 2). Of Hawkins' (1994) theory, Song (2012: 238–239) writes, "... even if such 'extra' structures as those employed routinely in GB or P&P were incorporated into his analysis, Hawkins' theory would be unlikely to return different results, as long as they were applied consistently." In this study I will do what Song suggests, applying Hawkins' EICT theory to the binary phrase markers used within the Minimalist Program. As an example, I will reanalyze the sentence in (25) in minimalist terms, demonstrating how the EICT will reach the same conclusions with a binary branching structure.75

74. Hawkins (1994: 450, n. 2) also ignores empty (null) categories in his analysis.
75. For the sake of convenience, the branches in (29) and (30) have been diagrammed in their positions at the point of the EICT calculation. This means that the movement of 'v + t_v' to T has not been shown as it would appear at LF.
(29) Phrase Marker Before EICT
As in (25), the dotted lines demarcate the relevant CRD. In each case the mother node M of the CRD is the maximal projection of the light verb phrase vP. Diagram (29) shows the phrase marker as it would look in the absence of the operation of the EICT. The ratio of IC's to non-IC's in the CRD is $2/25 = 0.08$. This ratio is greatly reduced when the PP goal precedes the NP theme as it does in (25).

In diagram (30), the result of the operation of the EICT on (29) can be observed. The PP complement of V has been raised to an adjunct position in the light verb phrase. This
dramatically raises the ratio of IC's to non-IC's from $2/25 = 0.08$ to $2/10 = 0.2$. At this point it is simply conjecture to identify the landing site for the PP because the mechanism the PF component might use to rearrange the ICs is unclear. It is even unclear whether the EICT would apply on the VP level or on the vP level. The most natural position for the EICT to place any moved constituents would be in an adjunct position at the topmost location in the verb phrase. Perhaps once a constituent (such as the PP in (30)) has been moved to this adjunct position, the EICT will operate upon the verb phrase again to determine if any further movement will increase the IC-to-non-IC ratio. If so, another adjunct position can be added to the verb phrase. If not, then the derivation may continue.

Limiting the application of the EICT to the VP or vP projection does not align with Hawkins' presentation of his theory in that Hawkins intends for the EICT to apply broadly to every phrase in a phrase marker. In his more recent (2004) revision of the EICT Hawkins adds additional (performance-based) principles to his theory of word-order, and he also extends the application of the EICT to areas of grammar beyond word order, such as relativization and wh-question movement (Song 2012: 273). Nevertheless, as Song (2012: 273) indicates, "Hawkins (2004) does not depart from the conceptual position of his 1994 work: basic word order is the conventionalization or grammaticalization of the ordering that maximizes efficiency and speed in processing." Although in this study I will not evaluate Hawkins' (2004) extension of his theory to other realms of grammar, I would argue that Hawkins applies his theory too broadly without accounting for the variety of complex factors that influence word order cross-linguistically.\footnote{76. For example, Hawkins' theory "has no place for language contact as one of the potential}
However, the overall predictive power of Hawkins' model indicates that his maxims "Express the most with the least" and "Express it earliest" (2004: 25) do apply at some level. In the ancient Hebrew corpus under consideration in this study, it seems clear that they have an especially strong influence at the vP-level, and therefore it is at the vP-level that the EICT will be utilized.

2.4. Information Structure

Although there is broad agreement among linguists that information structure considerations have a powerful impact upon word order, research has not led to a consensus in the understanding of the relationship between word order and information structure; indeed, even definitions of some of the basic concepts of information structure are controversial. For this reason, a careful assessment of the information structure patterns in the Hebrew data will require attention to a variety of theoretical models.

2.4.1. Defining Topic and Focus

A good place to begin is with the concepts of theme and rheme. A theme is some concept or entity that has already been introduced in a discourse, while a rheme is something that is new to the discourse. Information is also considered thematic if it can be derived from other thematic information based on assumptions shared between the author and reader (Daneš 1974: 119–120; Erteschik-Shir 2007: 2–3). For example, if "Mark's family" has been mentioned in the discourse and has thereby become thematic, then if "Mark's mother" or "Mark's sister" are mentioned later, factors" (Song 2012: 255).
they are considered thematic from their first appearance, and not rhematic, because they derive from the earlier "hypertheme" of "Mark's family" (Daneš 1974: 120).

The "theme–rheme" framework for information structure was developed by the Prague School's Functional Sentence Perspective (FSP) theory (Firbas 1962; 1964). FSP rates each sentence element in terms of its Communicative Dynamism (CD) (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 2). CD is the degree to which an element "pushes the communication forward" by "convey[ing] new, unknown information." An element with low CD is "contextually known." The Prague School divided sentences into two mutually exclusive parts: the theme was the element with the least CD and the rheme was whatever remained. (2007: 2)

Within this framework, Daneš (1974: 118–120) outlines "three types of thematic progression: (1) Keeping the theme constant [Erteschik-Shir's 'topic chaining'], (2) deriving the theme from the previous rheme [Erteschik-Shir's 'focus chaining'], and (3) deriving the theme from a 'hypertheme' [Erteschik-Shir's 'restrictive topic']" (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 2).

Theme and rheme are key ideas in information structure theory; however, the two basic aspects of information structure most commonly cited as impacting word order are topic and focus. Unlike theme and rheme, topic and focus have proven difficult to define with precision.

The concept of topic is based on a fundamental distinction between topic and comment, where the topic of a sentence is the thing "about" which something is said, and the comment is the thing that is said. As defined by Vallduví and Engdahl, one good way to describe the "characteristic 'aboutness' feeling" of a topic is with the frame "He said about x that P," where x
is the topic (e.g. "the answer") and P is the comment (the remainder of the clause). This is somewhat satisfying, although in a research program such a definition leaves much room for error, as it is often possible for a clause to subjectively satisfy this criteria in multiple ways.

Like topic, focus is difficult to define precisely. The concept is generally used in connection with the relationship between what is "given" and what is "new" in a discourse (making it very similar to the concept of rheme), where focus is understood to be something that is new (Crystal 1997: 154; Bosch & van der Sandt 1999: xii). Chomsky (1971: 199ff.) understood the "new," focused information to be that which is not "presupposed" by the context; Rochemont (1986: 9), following Jackendoff (1972: 230), argues against focus as non-presupposition and in favour of focus as "the information . . . that is assumed by the speaker not to be shared by him and the hearer." Vallduví (1996: 460-68) proposed a three-part model, where a sentence can be divided into a focus and a ground, and the ground can be further divided into a Link and a Tail. For Vallduví, the focus is the "informative, newsy, dominant, or contrary-to-expectation part" of a sentence, while the ground is the "noninformative, known, or expected part." Gundel (1999) argues that the word focus has three distinct, logically independent senses: psychological focus (focus of attention); semantic focus (focus on new information—the answer to the relevant wh-question in a given context); and constrastive/emphatic focus.

78. Moshavi (2010: 35-36) makes use of Gundel's work in this area in her study of Biblical Hebrew word order.
Rather than attempt to balance and integrate several theories of topic and focus I will adopt the view of topic and focus held by Nomi Erteschik-Shir (1997, 2007). Erteschik-Shir's cross-linguistic research on information structure accounts for a wide range of observations in a broad range of languages. Erteschik-Shir's work is particularly useful for this study because of her efforts to integrate her theory of information structure into a generative framework.

Erteschik-Shir's (1997) model is called f(ocus)-structure. The f-structure model depends on two information structure "primitives": Topic and Focus (2007: 42–43). F-structure departs from typical analyses of IS that depend upon binary divisions of the sentence, such as the topic–comment or theme–rheme models, in that the f-structure Topic and Focus are not necessarily all-encompassing. For example, there may be parts of the sentence that are neither Topic nor Focus, or a sentence may have multiple Topics and Foci, occurring in pairs (i.e., a Topic element will always have a opposing Focus element, and vice-versa). Crucially, every sentence has at least one main Topic and one main Focus, and this is the heart of f-structure. Although the model does include a variety of types of topic and focus, these "two fundamental notions" of Topic and Focus are all that are needed to explain information structure according to Erteschik-Shir (2007: 42-43).

Erteschik-Shir (2007: 13) adopts Strawson's (1964: 97–98) definition of a topic for her definition of the capital-T Topic:

(31) Definition of Topic
   (a) The topic is what a statement is about.
   (b) The topic is used to invoke 'knowledge in the possession of an audience.'
   (c) 'The statement is assessed as putative information about its topic.'
Erteschik-Shir uses the term "given" to specify what is entailed by property (31b) for topics (2007: 18). "Old" information, information that has appeared previously in the discourse, is topical since it is clearly "in the possession of the audience." For this reason, all anaphoric pronouns are topics (2007: 19–22, 45).79 Givenness goes beyond old information, however, to also include derived information, permanently available information, and temporarily available information. As Erteschik-Shir puts it, "We can conclude that previous mention identifies topics, but that not all topics require previous mention." (2007: 20). The concept of a derived topic is the same as that of a derived theme described above. A permanently available topic, such as "the moon," is something known to the audience on the basis of shared assumptions about the world that are not specific to the discourse. Deictic topics, such as "that man" or "those women" are examples of temporarily available topics.

Erteschik-Shir rephrases property (31c) to help describe the Topic, stating that the Topic is the "pivot for truth value assessment (2007: 15)." By this she means that without a Topic, it is impossible for a sentence to make a statement or claim about the world because it has no point of reference (14–16). Naturally, the subject is often the Topic; in fact, Erteschik-Shir considers the subject of a sentence to be the "unmarked" Topic, but other constituents may be topics as well, depending upon the discourse context (2007: 20). Reinhart (1981: 78) develops Strawson's idea further, making use of the notion of a "context set," where every new proposition in a discourse

79. Even non-anaphoric pronouns are topics within Erteschik-Shir's framework, although they are naturally subordinate rather than main topics: "Non-anaphoric, weak pronouns, according to Erteschik-Shir 1997, are always topics since they, like topics, must be given. Moreover, if pronouns are considered to be topics, then the fact that they must have a contextual coreferent antecedent can be derived" (2007: 21).
adds something new to the set of presuppositions shared between the speaker and the audience, and these propositions are classified according to their topics. Erteschik-Shir follows the Strawson-Reinhart approach when she establishes her method of testing for topichood (2007: 19).

Following Daneš (1974), Erteschik-Shir delineates three types of topic progressions (2007: 2–4). The first is "topic chaining," where the topic of one sentence is the same as the topic in the preceding one. The second is "focus chaining," where a topic is derived from a focus in the preceding sentence. The third is a "restrictive topic" (2007: 49–50) (referred to as a "hyperthème" in Daneš's terminology), where a topic is "derived from a discoursally restricted set of elements" (2007: 3).

One particularly important type of topic is the "stage topic." The need for stage topics is clear from the evidence of thetic, or "all-focus" sentences, sentences without a clear Topic, such as Erteschik Shir's (15) (2007: 16):

(32) Covert Stage Topic
Q: What happened?
A: John washed the dishes!

The property that topics are the pivot for truth value assessment creates the requirement that all sentences have a Topic. Yet, as the response to the initial question, the entire sentence "John washed the dishes!" is a Focus in that all of it is new information in the context. The solution to this dilemma is to posit a covert topic, a "stage topic." The idea that a thetic sentence has a covert topic comes from Gundel (1974) who claims that the covert topic in an all-focus sentence is "the
particular situation (time and place) about which [the sentence] is asserted" (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 16).

By extension, stage topics are not necessarily covert, in some cases, they can be overt as well, and when they are overt they are either locative or temporal. In the following example (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 17), the initial locative PP is the stage topic:

(33) Overt Stage Topic
Outside the door, there's a cat.

The cross-linguistic tendency of languages to place temporal phrases in clause-initial position may be connected to the fronting of stage topics.80

Erteschik-Shir recounts various definitions of focus proposed from many linguistic perspectives: semantic, phonological, syntactic, and pragmatic. Languages use a variety of means to mark foci; chief among these are intonation, word order (fronting), and morphological marking. In Erteschik-Shir's view it is crucial in spite of this variety to arrive at a universal definition of focus (2007: 40). After reviewing previous work from these perspectives (2007: 27–42),81 she settles on a primarily pragmatic definition of focus (2007: 38), following the work

80. In the World Atlas of Language Structures, Dryer comments on temporal expressions when discussing the order of Object, Oblique, and Verb as follows: "... in many languages [temporal expressions] exhibit positional properties different from other obliques, often occurring at the beginning of the clause" (Haspelmath et al., 2005: 342).

81. Among those who define focus semantically, "as the non-presupposed information in the sentence" (2007: 27), Erteschik-Shir includes Chomsky (1971), Jackendoff (1972), Rooth (1985; 1992), and Lambrecht (1994). Selkirk (1995) and Heusinger (1999) represent the phonological perspective that focus is derived from intonation and stress. Cinque (1993) agrees that focus is derived from stress but then also argues that stress is derived from syntax.

The focal information in a linguistic expression is that information which is relatively the most important or salient in the given communicative setting, and considered by [the] S[peaker] to be most essential for [the] A[ddressee] to integrate into his pragmatic information.

And from Erteschik-Shir (2007: 38): "The FOCUS of a sentence S = the (intension of a) constituent c of S which the speaker intends to direct the attention of his/her hearer(s) to, by uttering S."

Erteschik-Shir lists several properties of foci as she proceeds through her detailed evaluation presentation of her model of information structure. The following list is compiled from Erteschik-Shir 2007: 38–39.

(34) Definition of Focus
(a) The focus of a sentence is a constituent to which the speaker intends to direct the attention of his/her hearer(s) by uttering S.
(b) "A sentence, in discourse, has only one main focus which is assigned to a syntactic constituent. This constituent may be an NP, a VP, or even the whole S."
(c) "the focus constituent is selected freely among the non-topic constituents of the sentence."

As can be seen, in Erteschik-Shir's framework the choice of a Focus for any given sentence is at the discretion of the speaker within that discourse context. The only restriction on the speaker's

82. It is possible for a sentence to have multiple foci, but only one main focus is allowed. Each focus must have a corresponding topic. See §2.4.2 below.
83. This characteristic of the Focus makes it impossible to locate in a written text without help from some kind of syntactic marking. Even when the Focus is marked, it is impossible to compare a test set with a set of allosentences because it is impossible to know if the
choice of Focus is that the Topic is excluded from consideration "because it is by definition already in the hearer's attention" (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 39). Of course, certain contexts encourage or even require the choice of certain Foci, such as wh-questions where the attention of the hearer will be naturally drawn to the portion of the answer that responds to the wh-question (2007: 39). Nevertheless, a speaker has considerable freedom in his or her use of Focus, and there is no grammatical restriction other than the non-topic requirement.

2.4.2. F(ocus)-structure

Erteschik-Shir frames the relationship between Topic and Focus in a model she has termed f(ocus)-structure. She explains f-structure by analogy with a system of file cards (2007: 43–47), where "topic and focus are . . . defined as triggering instructions to manipulate a stack of filing cards, each of which represents a referent available in the discourse" (2007: 44). The rules of f-structure are as follows (2007: 44–45):

allo-sentences "lack" Focus, given that Focus is at the complete discretion of the speaker or author and is not a property of the sentence itself. Nevertheless, the intentional assignment of Focus can be identified in HPH in cases where the EICT has been violated (cf. §4.4; §5.4; §6.4; and §8.1.6).

84. Elsewhere Erteschik-Shir provides examples of a Focus that includes a Topic; cf. (37) below. It seems that the practical restriction is that the Focus must include at least some portion of the clause that is not the Topic.

(35) F-structure Rules
   (a) TOPIC instructs the hearer to locate on the top of his file an existing card
       with the appropriate reference.
   (b) FOCUS instructs the hearer to either
       (i) open a new card and put it on the top of the file.86 Assign it a new label
           (for an indefinite) or
       (ii) locate an existing card and put it on the top of the file (for a definite).
   (c) UPDATE instructs the hearer to enter the focus on the topic card and then to
       copy all entries to all cards activated by the focus rule.

While this system is useful for explaining the processing of information structure patterns, I will
not spend time elaborating on the file card analogy here because a detailed grasp of it is not
necessary. The reader is encouraged to consult Erteschik-Shir's work on the subject (2007: 43–
47). More important at this point are the restrictions with respect to how Topic and Focus
interact with syntactic and phonological structures.

(36) F-structure Restrictions
   (a) Each topic must have exactly one focus associated with it. Each of these
top(ic)-foc(us) pairs is called an "f-structure."87
   (b) It is possible for a sentence to have multiple f-structures, but each sentence
       has exactly one main topic and one main focus.88

Erteschik-Shir provides six English examples to illustrate some of the most common types of f-
structures (2007: 47–48). These are provided below in (37) (Erteschik-Shir's (2.64 and 2.65)).

86. In the f-structure model, the "top" of the file can have multiple cards in it at once; Erteschik-
Shir suggests that some may prefer the analogy of a file drawer with a "front section" rather than
(37) F-structure Examples

(a) Q: What did John do?
   A: he\textsubscript{top} [washed the dishes]\textsubscript{loc}

(b) Q: What did John wash?
   A: he\textsubscript{top} washed [the dishes]\textsubscript{loc}

(c) Q: Who washed the dishes?
   A: John\textsubscript{loc} washed them\textsubscript{top}

(d) Q: What happened to the dishes?
   A\textsubscript{1}: [John washed them\textsubscript{top}]\textsubscript{loc}
   A\textsubscript{2}: [John washed]\textsubscript{loc} them\textsubscript{top}

(e) Q: What did John do with the dishes?
   A: [he\textsubscript{top} [washed them\textsubscript{top}]]\textsubscript{loc} \textsubscript{foc}

(f) Q: What happened?
   A: ,top, [John washed the dishes]\textsubscript{loc} \textsubscript{foc}

(37a), (37b), and (37c) are straightforward cases of a single, main Topic and a single, main Focus, where the Topics are pronouns that reference the given information from the questions and the Foci are the constituents that answer the questions. In (37d), the two answers provided are notational variants, which differ only with respect to the issue of whether the Topic is included within the Focus. The advantage of A\textsubscript{1} is that the Focus remains a syntactic constituent, although the true Focus from a semantic perspective is represented in A\textsubscript{2}. In (37e), the main Topic and Focus are indicated in bold, while the subordinate f-structure is marked in regular

89. In \textsubscript{top}, the subscripts are a notation for the spatial and temporal parameters of the covert stage topic.

90. The inclusion of the Topic within the Focus makes "no interpretive difference" because it still behaves as a topic (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 48).
2.4.3. Contrastive and Restrictive Elements

One of Erteschik-Shir's most important innovations is the claim that both Topic and Focus can be contrastive or restrictive (2007: 48–51). This claim enables her to say that the f-structure model of information structure is all-encompassing "without recourse to more than these two primitives [Topic and Focus]" (2007: 43). According to Erteschik-Shir, contrast takes place when a contrast set is present in the preceding discourse context and one member of that set is selected and stressed (2007: 48–49). Erteschik-Shir's examples (2.66) and (2.67) are included here as examples of a contrastive Focus\(^\text{92}\) (38) and a contrastive Topic (39).

(38) Contrastive Focus Example
Q: Which laundry did John wash, the white, or the colored?
A: He washed the WHITE laundry.

(39) Contrastive Topic Example
B: Tell me about your brothers John and Bill.
A: JOHN is the smart one.

91. The structure in example (e) is similar to the structure that would occur with a double wh-question and its answer, in that it would require a main topic and main focus in addition to a subordinate topic and a subordinate focus. For example: Q: Who did what with the dishes? A: John\(_{\text{foc}}\) [washed\(_{\text{foc}}\) them\(_{\text{top}}\)]\(_{\text{top}}\) (if the "what" question is taken as the main question), or John\(_{\text{foc}}\) [washed\(_{\text{foc}}\) them\(_{\text{top}}\)]\(_{\text{top}}\) (if the "who" question is taken as the main question).

92. Contrastive foci are often referred to by other names in the literature: "Contrastive foci are often referred to as 'narrow,' 'exhaustive,' or 'exclusive' foci. Non-contrastive foci are referred to as informational foci or presentational foci (when they occur in existentials)" (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 29).
It is also possible for a contrastive element to function as both a Topic and a Focus simultaneously.⁹３ In fact, this is the case in (39) above, the full f-structure of which is reproduced in (40) (Erteschik-Shir's (2.69)):

(40) F-structure for Contrastive Topic Example

\[ \{\text{John}_{\text{foc}}, \text{Bill}\}_{\text{top}} \text{ top } [\text{is the smart one}]_{\text{foc}} \]

Here \{\text{John}_{\text{foc}}, \text{Bill}\}_{\text{top}} represents the selection from the contrast set available from the preceding discourse, which contains in itself a subordinate f-structure, implying (if not stating outright) the contrast "John [not Bill]"; the speaker focuses the attention on John within the contrast set, which is the topic.

In the corpus, it is rare for a contrast set to be explicity provided in the preceding discourse. More commonly, a contrastive element appears in the following discourse. Often, contrastive pairs are presented as fronted elements in successive clauses, creating a two-member set. For the second element, the other member of the contrast set occurs in the preceding discourse, but for the first element, the other member occurs in the discourse that follows it. In such a situation, I label both elements contrastive.

Restrictive elements differ from contrastive elements in two ways. Firstly, "whereas the elements of restrictive sets need not be specified overtly and can be derived from world knowledge, contrasted elements must be clearly defined" (2007: 50). Rather than undergoing

---

⁹３ Erteschik-Shir (2007: 49) explains why this does not violate the rule that the Focus must be selected from the non-topic material.
selection from an overtly provided contrast set, a restrictive element is derived from a "hypertheme," the members of which do not need to appear overtly in the preceding context. Secondly, restrictive elements do not exclude the other members of their set. It is possible that the statement that is true of the restrictive element may also be true of other members of the set from which it was chosen. This is not true of contrastive elements, which exclude the other members of their contrast set from making the contrastive statement true. Contrastive and restrictive elements have in common the fact that either a restrictive or a contrastive element may be a Topic, a Focus, or both. Example (41) below (Erteschik-Shir's (2.71)) is an example of a restrictive Focus.

(41) Restrictive Focus Example
Q: Which one of his friends wants to meet John?  
A: JANET wants to meet John.

Erteschik-Shir explains the difference between contrastive and restrictive elements as follows, using the examples cited above:

"... contrast divides the topic set into two subsets; one such subset is selected, the other is eliminated. To see this compare [(34)] and [(36)]. The interpretation of [(34)] involves not only John being smart, but also the assertion that Bill is not smart. Bill is thus eliminated as a possible topic of the predicate. In [(36)], however, the selection of Janet as the one who wants to meet John doesn't necessarily mean that none of the other friends wants to meet him. The difference does not show up in the f-structure of the sentence; it is derived from the manner in which the topic set is discursively defined." (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 50)
2.4.4. The Architecture of Information Structure

2.4.4.1. Integrating F-structure with MP: The PF Domain

Like all theories of information structure, Erteschik-Shir's framework encounters a speedbump when one attempts to integrate it into the MP architecture due to the optionality of IS-related word order patterns and the phonological strategies used to mark focus in many languages.

There is abundant evidence that marking of information structure notions (i.e. Topic and Focus) in the world's languages involves a variety of combinations of phonological, morphological, and word order (syntactic?) strategies. Topics are commonly fronted (i.e. topicalized) in order to mark their status as Topics. Hungarian is a relatively rare example of a language that clearly marks both Topic and Focus with fronting. Foci are sometimes marked morphologically, as in Wambon and Aghem; the latter also uses syntactic means to mark the Foci (Dik 1997: 335–336; cf. Erteschik-Shir 2007: 40–41). Marking Foci with stress is not universal cross-linguistically, but it is very common.94 Erteschik-Shir and Lappin (1983) provide a simple rule to explain Focus marking in English:

(42) Rule for Focus Marking in English
Assign stress to the focus constituents.

94. Stress involves combinations of duration, amplitude, and pitch (Erteschik-Shir 2007:30 n. 26).
Information structure also interacts with scopal properties. In some cases, scopal ambiguity can be resolved with the knowledge of which sentence constituent is the Topic because the Topic has wide scope over the clause. Erteschik-Shir (2007: 25–26) provides the following example:

(43) Scopal Ambiguity Example
Two girls arrested three boys.

If the subject "two girls" is the Topic, then the sentence can be interpreted in one of two ways. First, each of the two girls may have arrested three boys, for a total of six boys arrested. Second, the two girls may have arrested a total of three boys. If the object is the Topic (the most difficult reading to access in English), each boy would be arrested by two girls, so that six girls did the arresting. If neither subject nor object is the Topic and the entire clause is predicated of a stage topic, the event took place at some given time and place, and only two girls and three boys were involved.

The inclusion of phonological strategies as well as morphological and (apparently) syntactic strategies in the handling of information structure as well as the ability of information structure to resolve scopal ambiguity is problematic for the sharp distinction between competence (which includes syntax) and performance (which includes phonology, intonation and stress) that has historically characterized generative linguistics. Hesitancy surrounding this issue leads Erteschik-Shir to state in her final analysis that it remains an open question whether information structure is part of the grammar of a language or not because neither a strictly syntactic model nor a strictly interface model of IS can account for all of the available data.
I outlined above the need to appeal to performance-based theories such as that of Hawkins to explain word order phenomena based on relative weight or syntactic complexity. In the realm of information structure performance factors are again seen to bear their weight heavily, and information structure likewise demonstrates at least some degree of influence upon syntax (this is especially clear in the resolution of scopal ambiguity). If Erteschik-Shir is correct that information structure belongs primarily in the domain of language processing, a choice must be made: "...we either have to give up the competence-performance distinction, or else the domain of grammar will be much less encompassing than previously thought" (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 193). Erteschik-Shir chooses the former option. She considers this road advantageous for generative theory more broadly: "If many problematic issues receive an account in terms of processing, what is left for the grammar can potentially receive a more minimalistic account" (2007: 193).

Not only is the juxtaposition of phonological and syntactic strategies problematic for a minimalist analysis, but incorporating an information structure model into an MP architecture is also challenging because of the optionality of information structure related movement in many of the world's languages. The degree of optionality varies from language to language. For example, according to Erteschik-Shir (2007: 87), in Hungarian topicalization is "strongly preferred"; in Danish it is "common, but not obligatory"; and in English it is "rarely employed." Nonetheless, a comprehensive theory of IS movement must account for it.
Erteschik-Shir's original (1997) theory involved assigning f-structure onto the output of syntax, but this has the problem of violating the Inclusiveness Condition. Chomsky states the Inclusiveness Condition as follows (1995b: 228):

(44) The Inclusiveness Condition
"... any structure formed by the computation ... is constituted of elements already present in the lexical items selected for [the numeration]; no new objects are added in the course of computation apart from rearrangements of lexical properties."

The solution to these problems in Erteschik-Shir's f-structure model has three parts: (a) assigning information structure features to lexical items optionally when they are selected; and (b) confining information structure related movement to the PF domain. Topic and Focus appear in the derivation as "features optionally assigned to lexical items" rather than as heads of projections. On analogy with φ-features, these top/foc features may percolate to the maximal projection of their lexical item (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 63). Erteschik-Shir assumes that the [foc] feature can percolate from N to its extended projection DP and from I to CP, which allows a complete DP or a complete sentence to receive focus (2007: 63 n. 58). These features are then fed into the PF domain, where they motivate movement within the phonological linearization process.95

95. Since topicalization is optional, Erteschik-Shir assigns it to the PF domain, along with other optional dislocation processes. For evidence that the optionality of topicalization indicates that it functions at the PF level, Erteschik-Shir (2007: 66) refers the reader to Erteschik Shir 2005b; 2005a; 2006a. She asserts that it is probably necessary to analyze all optional dislocation processes as linearization and hints at the possibility that all dislocation, whether optional or not, is phonological (rather than syntactic) in spite of the drastic alteration of the syntax module that such an analysis would require.
Assigning f-structure mechanizations to the PF domain also accounts for what Erteschik-Shir terms the "mapping of f-structure onto intonational phrases" (2007: 54). Such analysis is required not only because focus is marked frequently by intonation, but also because in some sentences, especially those where a Topic is contained within the Focus of its f-structure pair, the focused portion of the sentence is not a syntactic constituent. "The focus rule applies vacuously to the topics contained in it" (2007:65), meaning that a Topic contained within its paired Focus does not receive Focus stress. In such cases, the portion of the sentence that receives the stress is computed based on the relationships among those sentence constituents that receive Topic and Focus marking, producing an intonational focus phrase that is not a syntactic constituent.

Erteschik-Shir (2007: 64) provides the following example (Erteschik-Shir's (98)):

(45) Intonational Focus as Non-constituent Example
(a) What happened to the dishes?
   John washed them.
(b) select "them" » assign [top]
    select "washed" » assign [foc]
    select "john" » no assignment
(c)

The [foc] feature of the verb "washed" percolates up to its maximal projection 'vp', placing the entire VP in focus. The focus rule only applies vacuously to the topic "them" contained within it, so that the non-constituent "John washed" is the stressed (focused) portion of the sentence.
In practice the featural approach and the syntactic structure approach where projections for Topic phrases and Focus phrases (i.e. TopP and FocP) are included in the phrase marker "derive exactly the same f-structure" and are "notational variants of one another" (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 66). The difficulty with the architectural approach is that it violates the Inclusiveness Condition in that the decision to topicalize, for example, is based on optional criteria external to what is selected from the lexicon. Whether the structural approach is possible can only be determined on the basis of more research of the Inclusiveness Condition (2007: 66).

2.4.4.2. Integrating F-structure with the LCA and MSO

The placement of information structure computations in the PF domain not only solves the problems of optionality and intonational focus, but it also avoids a conflict between word order theories that appeal to information structure and those that do not. Isolating IS-related movement from the numeration and the LF domain permits axioms such as the LCA and MSO to hold sway in a separate realm. This is appropriate given that the LCA and MSO do not take intentional steps to address IS-related movement or Topic and Focus marking, while the f-structure

96. Although information structure related movement is not treated comprehensively within the LCA or MSO by Kayne or Uriagereka, incidental appeal to information structure is made, most notably in the appeal to focus as an explanation for end-of-tree linearization of two terminal nodes (Lasnik and Uriagereka 2005: 118). The suggestion is that if one of the two final nodes is a non-phonological, non-categorical "focus element" F which places its corresponding NP in focus, the linearization dilemma is resolved, producing an output such as I love HER, with the complement NP in focus, rather than the phonologically merged I love'er. However, such a proposal is ad hoc in that it does not originate from a general theory of information structure, and so it will be set aside here. In any case, it is unclear how a non-category could facilitate linearization based on c-command. Interestingly, the idea that focus is non-categorical is closer to Erteschik-Shir's featural analysis of focus than a structural analysis of focus. In such cases it
framework is concerned with modifications of the basic word order. In essence, in the f-structure model the syntactic and interpretive components of the grammar take place before or apart from those that concern "dislocations" and morphological and phonological computations. The following diagram illustrates the structure of this grammar (modified from Erteschik-Shir 2007: 66 (100)).

(46) Integrating f-structure with MSO

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Initial merge (incl. top/foc)} & \quad \text{Numeration} \\
\rightarrow & \quad \theta\text{-assignments} \\
\quad & \quad (\text{Multiple}) \text{ Spell-out} \quad \rightarrow \quad \text{Interpret} \\
\quad & \quad \downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow \quad \text{PF computation} \\
\rightarrow & \quad \text{dislocation (and reordering)} \\
\rightarrow & \quad \text{morphology} \\
\rightarrow & \quad \text{phonology (including EICT)}
\end{align*}
\]

The term "dislocation" is unfortunately not consistently applied across the literature, and therefore its use can be a source of confusion. Within her definition of f-structure Erteschik-Shir uses the term "dislocation" to refer to any kind of word order rearrangement, such as fronting or scrambling, as well as left-dislocation and right-dislocation, which involve more than rearrangement because an additional item, a resumptive pronoun, must be introduced as well. When referring to left- and right-dislocation Erteschik-Shir always uses the full terms (or the ____________

may unfortunately be necessary to appeal to the Head Parameter to explain the linearization of the final two terminal nodes.
abbreviations LD and RD). To hopefully alleviate this confusion, I will use the term "reordering" to refer to scrambling and IS-motivated fronting, while reserving the term "dislocation" for LD and RD.

For Erteschik-Shir, all reorderings and dislocations (not only those motivated by information structure) are part of the PF computation and take place after Spell-out.97 (Hence placing the rearrangements produced by the EICT within the PF component is unproblematic for the f-structure framework.) Assigning IS reorderings to the PF domain is a relatively simple matter, but placing LD and RD in the PF domain is more complex because of the need to introduce a resumptive pronoun. Whereas a fronted Topic can be relocated to the left periphery in the PF computation with no difficulty, a left-dislocated Topic cannot because a pronoun would need to be selected from the numeration to take its place in the original sentence. Erteschik-Shir's model includes the ability for the PF domain to access semantics and insert pronouns where necessary in the case of resumptive pronouns only. Her 1992 essay outlines the reasoning behind this model for certain types of resumptive pronouns, based on evidence from English of the dependence of resumptive pronoun grammaticality upon language processing factors (such as distance) that go beyond syntax.

97. From Erteschik-Shir (2005a: 85): "The idea that displacements can be ‘stylistic’ or phonological originates with Ross, 1967, who initiated the discussion of scrambling within generative grammar and viewed it as a stylistic rule of permutation. . . . Prime candidates for displacement in the phonology are heavy NP shift and other stylistic rules which are sensitive to phonological properties, e.g., constituent heaviness, adjacency, and movement to an ‘edge’ on the one hand, and movement motivated by focus or topic properties of the moved constituent on the other."
Imposing information structure movements only after all operations of Spell-out are complete helps to integrate information structure theory with the rest of the grammar because it allows for the construction of a basic and unmarked word order upon which information structure operations are performed. Van Gelderen (2003) argues for such a division in Russian, explaining the variation between word order in subordinate and main clauses on this basis: the word order of subordinate clauses is formed in the syntax, pre-Spell-out, while the word order of main clauses may be subject to IS-motivated movements in linearization at PF (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 129).

Such a model of information structure is a welcome departure from alternative theories of information structure that attempt to explain universal word order in terms of given and new elements in the phrase. As Song (2012: 7) points out, information structure is irrelevant for most aspects of word order, such as Preposition–Noun / Noun–Postposition order and correlations between orders such as the Object–Verb & Verb–Auxiliary / Verb–Object & Auxiliary–Verb correlation. Hawkins has particular disdain for IS-based word order theories, claiming that in such research "there is no systematic investigation of what the grammatical structure actually is of the sentences and phrases of languages whose ordering is claimed to be driven by discourse [i.e. information packaging] alone" (1994: 112; also Song 2007: 7). Limiting IS movement to the PF domain allows for such grammaticalized orders to be governed by pre-Spell-out rules with which IS does not interfere.
2.4.4.3. Configurational and Non-configurational Languages

The relationship between word order and information structure varies from one language to another, but languages can be characterized into four types (Van Valin 1999: 3–4; cf. Erteschik-Shir 2007: 80–85). The boundaries between these types are not rigid, and it is better to think of languages distributed across a cline rather than sorted into four separate bins. Languages can be described based on their degree of two types of "configurationality." Configurational languages are those where word order is rigid and is used to identify syntactic constituents, i.e., word order maps strictly to a hierarchical syntactic structure. This configurationality usually involves the relationship between the subject and VP, as in English, a highly configurational language where the subject is required to precede the VP. Non-configurational languages are those where word order is highly flexible and there is no correlation between word order and syntactic role. Word order in non-configurational languages is generally taken to be governed by pragmatic factors, i.e. information structure.

Hungarian demonstrates configurationality of a different sort. Word order in Hungarian is rigidly structured, but instead of correlating with a syntactic hierarchy, Hungarian word order correlates with the pragmatic notions of topic and focus. Hungarian is therefore non-configurational with respect to syntax but configurational with respect to pragmatics. Such a language has been termed "discourse-configurational" by K. É. Kiss (1995). Hungarian is an unusual language in that it requires the marking of both topic and focus by means of word order; most discourse-configurational languages require only the topic to be marked (e.g. Catalan).
Danish is a language that prefers topic marking but does not require it as rigidly as Hungarian, so it can be said that Danish is moderately discourse-configurational. Topic-configurational languages typically mark foci by means of intonation. Whether any languages mark focus with word order while marking topic by other means is a subject of debate, but Celtic languages are candidates for this designation. It is typical for topic marking to be optional when it is undertaken by movement of the topic to the left periphery. On the other hand, when focus is marked by intonation, it is typical for such marking to be required. As we will see, the Hebrew of the HPH corpus is mainly non-configurational with respect to syntax while allowing for optional Topic-marking by means of movement to the left periphery.98

2.4.4.4. Types and Functions of IS-related Movement

As mentioned above, Topic and Focus can be marked phonologically (including intonation marking), morphologically, or positionally (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 159). When working with a written corpus such as the Dead Sea Scrolls, intonational marking is inaccessible. Since there is no morphological marking of Topic or Focus in Hebrew, positional marking is the only available access point into IS marking.

98. There are cases in HPH where syntactic variation is restricted by semantic considerations. For example, the wayyiqtol and weqatal verb forms must be clause-initial with the exception of any left-dislocated constituents. However, alternative verb forms are available in HPH to express the semantic ranges signified by these forms, so there is no clause-level restriction attached to any particular semantic. An alternative verb form is always available that will enable any desired word order. See §5.3.3.5 and §8.2.1.3 for an examination of this feature of HPH with respect to the weqatal form.
As Erteschik-Shir notes, "an explanatory cross-linguistic account of information structure-triggered word order is still missing" (2007: 124). Such an account would be the ideal theoretical starting point for a corpus-based research project such as this one, but in its absence a review of the literature is the best substitute. Erteschik-Shir provides this in her 2007 volume, which I will use as my primary source for cataloguing potential types of IS-triggered movement. Erteschik-Shir surveys nine potential forms of positional marking: left-dislocation (LD), fronting, existentials, clefting, prosodic inversion, syntactic inversion, scrambling, object shift, and right-dislocation (RD). These forms have a range of IS and non-IS functions attested in various languages. Here I will list the major possibilities for each type as reviewed by Erteschik-Shir (2007: 101–153), and this will form the basis for my study in Chapters 4–6.

IS-related movement may be directly or indirectly motivated by Topic and Focus features. Topic and Focus assignment are the only two potential direct IS motivations for movement to the left periphery (i.e. fronting) within the f-structure framework (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 101). Direct motivation requires that the moved constituent has either a [+top] feature or a [+foc] feature. (Topic fronting is much more common than Focus fronting cross-linguistically.) As mentioned above in §2.4.3, the simplicity of this analysis is permitted by Erteschik-Shir's analysis of contrast, which proposes that both Topics and Foci can be contrastive (and restrictive) cross-linguistically, while any further restrictions are language-specific. For example,

99. Right-dislocation is a special case. Although RD is related to information structure, RD does not mark Topic or Focus as they are defined within Erteschik-Shir's system. In Catalan, right-dislocation is used to mark given information that is not the main clause Topic (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 12–13; citing Vallduví), while in Italian, "right-dislocation applies to given, yet 'heavy' material" (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 123).
some languages treat all contrastive elements as Topics and may front contrastive elements as Topics. Other languages may treat all contrastive elements as Foci, and if such a language also has a restriction against Focus fronting, there would also be a restriction against fronting contrastive elements (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 101).

Indirectly motivated movement has a broader array of potential motivations than directly motivated movement. A good case study of indirectly motivated IS movement can be found in the work of Ellen Prince (1997, 1998) on English left-dislocation. Prince has demonstrated that the traditional association of LD with topic marking is inaccurate. She finds three distinct functions of LD in English, all of which are only indirectly related to topic and focus. These functions are "simplifying discourse processing, triggering a (po)set inference, and amnestying an island violation" (1998: 283). She explains the simplifying function as follows:

100. It is not possible to determine if ancient Hebrew restricts constrast to Topic or Focus constituents because it is not possible to identify Focus constituents consistently within the written discourse. Access to the spoken language would be required.

101. Prince (1998: 291–295) also argues that topicalization (in English) is not a topic marking device per se, but serves one of two functions: (1) it triggers a poset inference, or (2) it "structures the proposition into a focus and presupposition or 'focus-frame' (Partee 1991), i.e. an open proposition and the instantiation of the variable in it, marking the open proposition as being salient 'shared knowledge' at that point in the discourse and marking the instantiation as new in the discourse."
(47) Discourse Processing Function of Left-Dislocation: "Simplifying" LDs
A 'Simplifying' Left-Dislocation serves to simplify the discourse processing of Discourse-new entities by removing the NPs evoking them from a syntactic position disfavored for NPs evoking Discourse-new entities and creating a separate processing unit for them. Once that unit is processed and they have become Discourse-old, they (or, rather, the pronouns which represent them) may comfortably occur in their canonical positions within the clause.
(Prince 1998: 286)

In other words, a simplifying LD is a mechanism to avoid a disfavoured information structure pattern rather than mark a particular constituent as a topic or focus. The effect is to "simplify discourse processing" (Prince 1998: 283). A simplifying LD dislocates a discourse-new constituent from a position that generally favours topics, or at least discourse-old entities, replacing it with a pronoun that is thematic because of the occurrence of its antecedent on the left periphery. Prince (1998: 285) finds that subjects and possessives are unfavorable positions for discourse-new information, while object position is the preferred location for discourse-new information. It is not accurate to say that a simplifying LD marks a discourse-new constituent, because it is not the purpose of the LD to mark the dislocated constituent. However, it does dislocate a discourse-new constituent in order to permit its original position to contain a discourse-old constituent. By creating a "new processing unit" for the displaced NP wherein it can be naturally interpreted as discourse-new, a canonical f-structure is produced within the clause proper (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 112–113) with a discourse-old constituent in the expected position. This discourse-old constituent is then, by definition, "topical" material, and may well serve as the main Topic of the clause. However, the notion of the main Topic is not relevant to the simplifying LD structure as such.
The second function of LD in English is the poset-inference triggering function:

(48) Set-inference Triggering Function of Left-Dislocation: 'Poset' LDs
A 'Poset' Left-Dislocation serves to trigger an inference on the part of the hearer that the entity represented by the initial NP stands in a salient partially-ordered set relation to some entity or entities already evoked in the discourse-model.
(Prince 1998: 288)

Partially-ordered set relations include partitive relationships (e.g. the relationship between a chapter and a book), subtype relationships (e.g. the relationship between paperbacks and books), identity relationships, and typical subset relationships (i.e. the NP may be an element or subset of elements from within a preceding list). They do not include possessive relationships (e.g. the relationship between a book and its cover).

The third type of LD in English is that which Prince terms "resumptive pronoun topicalization" (RPT) (Prince 1998: 291). In RPT, a preposed topicalization is desired rather than LD, but topicalization is difficult or impossible to perform due to the position of the NP within the clause. For example, if the topical NP is the clause-initial subject of the matrix clause, the "topicalized" clause will be indistinguishable from the original clause because the clause-initial position is the natural position for matrix subjects in English. Another common example is the topicalization of an NP from within a subordinate clause, where the subordinate clause can no longer be interpreted if the NP is fronted to the left periphery of the matrix clause due to an

102. For more on poset relationships, see Prince 1998: 288–289; Ward and Prince 1991; and Hirschberg 1985.
island violation. Again, LD is the only way to topicalize the NP. NPs that are embedded within other phrases may also be difficult to topicalize.

The second form of positional marking outlined by Erteschik-Shir is fronting. Fronting has a wide variety of functions. As discussed in §2.4.4.3, some languages front topics as a rule, and some do so more selectively. Germanic languages as a whole front only "switch topics" (or "shifted topics"), which "redirect the emphasis of the discourse," but not "continued topics" (Svenonius 2004: 217; Erteschik-Shir 2007: 103), perhaps due to a preference for switch topics to precede continued topics (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 105).

Erteschik-Shir is generally skeptical of the possibility of Focus fronting (Focus preposing).\textsuperscript{103} She allows for its theoretical possibility but finds no convincing evidence that it takes place in any language. Typically she reconstrues the evidence offered in support of Focus preposing as evidence of topicalization where contrastive and/or restrictive elements are interpreted as Topics.\textsuperscript{104} In Hungarian and Italian, the pre-verbal focus position is limited to restrictive elements and does not permit informational foci, that is, foci that are marked because they provide new information (2007: 124); in Hungarian, this amounts to a proposal of two pre-verbal Topics.

Although Focus fronting is not part of Erteschik-Shir's framework, she does devote a special category to the fronting of a non-topic (2007: 113–119). According to Erteschik-Shir there exist languages (such as German and Danish) in which a fronted non-topic marks the

\textsuperscript{103} Throughout this study the terms "fronting" and "preposing" are used interchangeably.

\textsuperscript{104} For examples, see Erteschik-Shir 2007: 110–112.
sentence for a stage topic (2007: 116, 119).\footnote{105} The fronted constituent may be the overt stage topic, but if not, the clause is marked for a null stage topic. This happens because in some languages it may be necessary to remove the subject from its canonical topic position in order to produce the stage topic, out-of-the-blue interpretation (2007: 119).\footnote{106}

It has been argued that existentials are also among the clause-types that mark the subject as a non-topic, creating a stage topic and permitting the subject to function as part of the focus by means of the whole clause becoming the focus (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 117–120).

Cleft sentences\footnote{107} are used in English and Norwegian to mark a subject or another constituent as the primary informational focus (Gundel 2006: 517–520). In these languages a cleft sentence like (49b) (Gundel's (2)) consists of four elements in sequence: a third person singular pronoun subject (It); a main verb copula (was); the clefted constituent (Nielsen); and a relative clause termed the "cleft clause" (who won).\footnote{108}

(49) Cleft Sentence Example (English)
   (a) Nielsen won.
   (b) It was Nielsen who won.

\footnote{105}{Additional research claiming that fronting can have a discourse function unrelated to the information structure features of the fronted element can be found in Holmberg 2000 and É. Kiss 1998.}

\footnote{106}{When the Topic is a stage topic, the entire main clause is the primary Focus.}

\footnote{107}{I use "cleft" to refer only to it-clefs and not to pseudo-clefs and other types of clefs. The clefting terminology used in this study is (following Gundel 2006) based on Hedberg 2000.}

\footnote{108}{The relative marker may be omitted from the relative clause if the clefted consituent is not the subject of the base sentence (see (42a)).}
In the prototypical cleft, the cleft constituent is the subject of the base sentence and is marked as a focus (and thereby a non-topic) by means of its placement in the copular predicate. The cleft clause is prototypically topical (e.g., the presupposition that someone won), but it may also contain relatively new and thereby focal information (Gundel 2006: 520). Erteschik-Shir's use of the term Focus to refer specifically to the focus of attention (which is selected from the informational focus; cf. §2.5.1) leads her to use a different phraseology, stating that Gundel's theory amounts to the cleft constituent being marked as a non-topic, because within Erteschik-Shir's f-structure framework, the "non-topic" portion of a clause is equivalent to the informational focus (cf. Erteschik-Shir 2007: 121).

The existential and cleft structures are insufficient resources for the marking of a subject as a non-topic; additional structures are needed because these two are too restricted to cover every scenario. Lambrecht (2000: 625) proposes two options: prosodic inversion, where the subject receives prosodic prominence; English uses this strategy) and syntactic inversion (where the subject is postposed; Italian uses this strategy). Prosodic inversion involves placing intonational stress on the subject, thereby marking it as a focus (and therefore also as a non-topic). Stress is inaccessible in the written corpora of ancient Hebrew, so it is not possible to know directly through data collection if prosodic inversion is in play in ancient Hebrew. However, syntactic inversion—the postposing of a focused subject, motivated by the same considerations as in prosodic inversion—would be observable. Syntactic inversion would

involve the postposing of a (focused) subject to mark it as a non-topic. I am unaware of any studies of the postposing of subjects in BH, and whether such a strategy is used in BH is a question that I do not think has yet been asked. This structure would be especially relevant to studies of the tripartite verbless clause.

Scrambling is a phenomenon where non-basic (or non-canonical) word orders occur in free word order (non-configurational) languages. Unlike other movement operations, scrambling can take place on any level, including within subordinate clauses. Most other aspects of the definition of scrambling are disputed, most notably the issue of whether scrambling is motivated by information structure considerations or if scrambled clauses are pragmatically indistinct from unscrambled ones. Erteschik-Shir surveys research on scrambling in Russian (a highly non-configurational language), Japanese, Dutch, and Persian (2007: 124–147). Few conclusions are drawn because much of her analysis is speculative, but she finds that van Gelderen's (2003) study provides enough evidence to warrant the acceptance of its model. Van Gelderen concludes that scrambled clauses in Russian (those that use word orders other than the unmarked SVO and SOV) "all exhibit initial topic and final focus" (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 127). It is unlikely that scrambling operates in ancient Hebrew because it typically depends upon a rich case morphology in order not to disrupt the syntax, and Hebrew, which is not a non-configurational, free word order language, generally has a poor case morphology. Further, research of scrambling in BH

in arguing that the apparent rightward movement of a postposed subject is in fact the leftward movement of TP, which is left-joined to a functional projection that contains the subject.
would run into a roadblock at the initial step of defining the nature of scrambling in BH, given that the nature of scrambling in linguistics more generally speaking is not well understood.

Object shift occurs in Scandinavian languages (most clearly in Icelandic) when an object moves to the left of an adverbial such as a negation particle but remains to the right of the verb. Object shift is only possible in languages with overt morphological case marking and takes place in order to identify the object as a topic (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 151). The rarity of adverbials in ancient Hebrew, the fact that negation particles always occur to the left of the verb, and the absence of required case-marking make HPH an unlikely candidate for object shift.

Right-dislocation involves the movement of a constituent to the right edge of the clause, leaving behind a cataphoric pronoun in its original position. For Erteschik-Shir, right-dislocation can take place with given material that is not a main clause Topic (2007: 12–13) or is 'heavy' (2007: 123). RD does occur in ancient Hebrew, although it has been studied far less frequently than LD.

To summarize, there are certain patterns of information structure triggered movement that can be recognized through cross-linguistic study. The corpus is written and not spoken, and so intonational stress, which is a critical aspect of information structure marking cross-linguistically, is inaccessible. For this reason, it is especially important to rely upon information structure processes that are already attested in spoken languages when arguing that information structure functions in a certain way in a written corpus. Three of the nine mechanisms discussed by Erteschik-Shir (2007) are not applicable to ancient Hebrew: prosodic inversion, scrambling,
and object shift. With this in mind, in Chapters 4–6 the corpus will be analyzed with respect to the following six possible mechanisms of IS triggered movement.

(50) Information Structure Constructs to be Tested for Validity

(1) Left-Dislocation
   (a) simplifying
   (b) poset-inference triggering
   (c) resumptive pronoun topicalization (RPT)
(2) Fronting (Preposing)\footnote{111}
   (a) all Topics (including stage topics)
   (b) only shift Topics
   (c) contrastive NPs
   (d) restrictive NPs
   (e) a non-topic (marking a null stage topic)
(3) Existentials (stage topic)
(4) Clefts (marking a non-topic)
(5) Syntactic Inversion (marking the subject as a non-topic)
(6) Right-Dislocation
   (a) given material that is not a Topic
   (b) given, ‘heavy’ material

\footnote{111. Although informational focus fronting is a popular framework in scholarship on ancient Hebrew, I will not test for it, for two reasons. First, informational focus fronting is difficult, if not impossible, to demonstrate statistically. The evidence for Topic fronting is much stronger. By positing informational focus fronting as well as Topic fronting, every fronted constituent has a ready motivation at hand because Topics and informational foci are mutually exclusive categories that encompass all constituents. Second, given that Erteschik-Shir does not find evidence of informational focus fronting in her cross-linguistic analysis, the theoretical foundation of this study does not provide the expectation of informational focus fronting that is necessary to perform a statistically valid analysis. Note, however, that frontings that bear characteristics of what is typically thought of as "informational focus fronting" do occur within Erteschik-Shir's model and are analyzed in this study. For example, contrastive and restrictive elements can be classified as Topics in the f-structure framework, and the fronting of a contrastive element is placed within the realm of topic fronting rather than that of informational focus fronting.}
2.5. Comparing F(ocus)-structure with IS Theories for Biblical Hebrew

Analyses of information structure in BH vary widely with respect to the definitions adopted for basic terms such as topic, focus, and contrast. This variance is not necessarily a shortcoming of BH studies, but often simply reflects the variance within the linguistic literature—although in some cases, BH scholars do stretch the signification of these terms beyond what is typically seen in linguistics. Of necessity, due to the unique boundaries drawn by Erteschik-Shir, I have selected definitions of "Topic" and "Focus" that are slightly different from what has previously been seen in scholarship of ancient Hebrew. Before I embark on an exploration of information structure in HPH, I will therefore pause to review some select studies of information structure in BH and compare them with the model chosen for this study, f(ocus)-structure (Erteschik-Shir 2007). It is my hope that this overview will help the reader to understand similarities and differences among various models and how to relate alternative frameworks to the f-structure framework.

2.5.1. Definition of Topic

As noted earlier, Erteschik-Shir (2007: 13) adopts Strawson's (1964: 97–98) definition of a Topic:

112. In what follows I rely largely upon Moshavi's (2010: 31–46) survey of studies of information structure in Biblical Hebrew for an overview of various interpretations of "topic" and "focus" in BH scholarship.
(51) Definition of Topic
(a) The topic is what a statement is about.
(b) The topic is used to invoke 'knowledge in the possession of an audience.'
(c) "The statement is assessed as putative information about its topic.'

Of course, many other linguists adopt a variety of diverse definitions of the term "topic". Gómez-González (2001) helpfully classifies linguistic definitions of topic into three categories. (1) The term "topic" may be used to identify "aboutness," that is, what a sentence is about; (2) it may have an "informational" use, in that it represents the part of a sentence that is given (not new) information; and (3) it may have a "syntactic" use, where it simply refers to a constituent at the beginning of a sentence.\(^{113}\) Note that the first definition of topic, "aboutness," is a subset of the informational definition because a sentence must be about some "given" thing in order to be interpretable.

Defining topic in terms of aboutness, as does Erteschik-Shir, is the most common approach in linguistics, and the same approach likewise predominates in studies of information structure in BH. Bandstra (1982: 74) defines topic in terms of aboutness, as does Lambrecht (1994: 118). For Lambrecht, a topic is not required in every sentence (i.e. in sentence-focus structure; 1994: 235) and a sentence may have multiple topics (Lambrecht 1994: 147–150).\(^{114}\) Holmstedt's (2009a: 127) definition of topic as a "thematic entit[y]. . . to which information is being added" also belongs within the "aboutness" framework. Holmstedt's topic "isolate[s] one among multiple themes" (2009a: 128), indicating that Holmstedt's "aboutness" topic is a subset

\(^{113}\) Cf. Moshavi (2010: 32). There is also a fourth use of the term "topic" where the "topic-comment" relationship is equivalent to the "subject-predicate" relationship. Cf. IBHS §4.3c.

of the "informational" use of the term topic. In Holmstedt's model each topic is conceived in terms of an entry in a data structure, and each sentence assigns new information to its topic like a field in a database record or a document in a file folder, where the record/folder is what the sentence/assignment is "about." This is similar to the Link and Tail analysis of Vallduví and Engdahl (1998) and McNally (1998).  

Some scholars, such as Buth and Moshavi, do not find the term "topic" very useful. Buth uses the term "topic" but prefers his own term "Contextualizing Constituent." For Buth, a topic is a constituent that is "specially signalled" and pragmatically "relat[es] the clause to the larger context" (1999: 81). Being "specially signalled" essentially equates to being preposed. A Buth Topic is not a topic unless it is preposed, but not all preposed or clause-initial constituents are necessarily a Buth Topic. Topicalization in Buth's system is therefore not "topic marking," since a constituent cannot be a topic unless it is already preposed. It could be more accurately described as "context-relator marking." However, this is misleading, because the important result of topicalization for Buth is not the marking of a constituent but the connection of one clause with another. This approach bears similarities to a "syntactic" definition of topic, but it cannot be easily classified into one of the three categories from Gómez-Gónzalez (2001).

Moshavi's treatment of topic is very similar to Buth's. Moshavi does not define the term "topic" within her system, but "topicalization" is central to her work (2010: 101). Her exploration of topicalization (see below) is functionally very similar to Buth's model in that the fronted (topicalized) constituent is simply a preposed constituent that is connected to the preceding

context in some way. Just as Buth prefers to use the term "Contextualizing Constituent," Moshavi uses the phrase "preposed constituent" and avoids the term "topic" in her framework for BH.

Within the "aboutness" school of thought there is some disagreement about whether the term "topic" refers to the topic of the sentence or the topic of the discourse (cf. Moshavi 2010: 32–33, 33 n. 41, 38; Floor 2004). F-structure restricts the Topic\(^\text{116}\) to the level of the sentence and does not reference topicality on the discourse level, and neither do most Biblical Hebrew scholars. Although there is no discourse-level topic for Erteschik-Shir, "topic progressions" between sentences are an important component of her theory.\(^\text{117}\) Whether the topic remains constant or changes from one sentence to another is an important factor in BH scholarship as well.

\subsection*{2.5.2. Definition of Focus}

Moshavi (2010: 35–36) lists three distinct meanings of the term "focus" as it is applied to Biblical Hebrew by various linguists: informational focus, contrastive focus, and attentive focus.\(^\text{118}\)

\begin{itemize}
\item[116.] Since I am using Erteschik-Shir's f-structure model as a basis for my analysis in this study, I will capitalize Topic and Focus when I use the terms to refer to the specific primitives of Erteschik-Shir's model. Otherwise the terms topic and focus will refer to concepts used more generally in linguistics or within linguistic models other than that of Erteschik-Shir.
\item[117.] The three types of topic progression are topic chaining, focus chaining, and restrictive topics (see above for definitions).
\item[118.] Moshavi (2010: 35–36) takes the first two uses from Gundel's (1999) interpretation and includes the third, attentive focus, based on her own observations. Moshavi also lists a fourth
\end{itemize}
"Informational focus" marks the new and "non-given" content of a clause—it is the part of the clause intended to inform the audience. Lambrecht (1994), one study of information structure that has been particularly influential for many Biblical Hebrew scholars, adopts an informational definition of focus.119

"Contrastive focus," as Moshavi points out, is difficult to define. Recall that Erteschik-Shir's model allows that a contrastive element may be either a Topic or a Focus, and whether contrastive elements are handled as Topics or Foci is a language-specific restriction (2007: 101). Thus the f-structure model divorces the concepts of "focus" and "contrast," while studies that adopt a contrastive definition of focus merge the two ideas. Thus, the f-structure framework clashes most strongly in terms of its definitions with those studies that adopt a contrastive definition of focus.

Within the f-structure framework, "contrast" has three requirements (cf. §2.4.3). First, a contrastive element must be selected from a "contrast set." Second, the contrast set must be explicitly included in the discourse. It cannot be assumed based on the implicit knowledge of the universe shared between the speaker/author and audience. Third, the contrastive element must be type of focus, also taken from Gundel, "psychological focus," a concept she describes as "somewhat confusing, because this concept is in a sense the opposite of information focus and is much closer to the notion of topic" (2010: 36). The phrase "psychological focus" does appear in BH scholarship in connection with the use of the independent personal pronouns (cf. IBHS §16.3.2e).

119. Those adopting Lambrecht's (1994) model include Heimerdinger (1999), van der Merwe (1999), van der Merwe and Talstra (2002), and Shimasaki (2002), although Shimasaki most closely approximates the attentive focus model rather than the informational focus model of Lambrecht (Moshavi 2010: 41–46).
selected exclusively from the contrast set, meaning that each of the non-selected members of the contrast set would make the clause false if they were to replace the contrastive element. Within the f-structure framework, if an element is contrastive, that is enough to qualify it for marking as a Topic or Focus.120

Other categories are sometimes lumped into the contrastive label as well, such as "contrary to expectation" informational foci (Moshavi 2010: 36) and elements that are "contrary to belief" from the perspective of the audience.121 Erteschik-Shir does not consider these elements contrastive or restrictive, and the features of being "contrary to expectation" or "contrary to belief" would not in itself be enough to qualify a constituent as a Topic or Focus within the f-structure framework. Nonetheless, there is a great deal of overlap in these definitions, because many "contrary to expectation/belief" constituents will also happen to be contrastive or restrictive.

Holmstedt (2009a: 128) adopts a contrastive definition of focus, defining focus as a projection that may be occupied by a contrastive constituent. Gross (1996: 66–72) is another scholar who understands a "focus" as something selected from a set of explicit discourse referents, a description that is normally labelled "contrastive".122

Moshavi defines attentive focus as "the entity to which the speaker wishes to direct the attention of the addressee" (2010: 36). This category, as Moshavi admits, has the disadvantage of

120. Restrictive elements can also be Foci or Topics. They are similar to contrastive elements in that they require a selection set, but they differ in the other two features. Restrictive elements are non-exclusive and the "restrictiveness set" from which they are selected does not need to be explicitly included in the discourse.
being "non-specific" in nature; that is, it is difficult to pin down. Moshavi rightly links her attentive focus with the concept of "emphasis" that has received much use in BH scholarship: a concept that can have the tendency to function as a catch-all to explain unusual word order and eludes specific definition. Buth's (1999: 81) conception of focus as "a specially signaled constituent for highlighting salient information of a clause" is similar to attentive focus. Buth notes that the focus may or may not be contrastive, contrary to expectation, new (non-given), or given, meaning that focus may sometimes overlap with informational or contrastive constituents but is in no way defined by those categories. The key for Buth is that the constituent must be specially marked. It is only a focus because of the marking, and not because of any inherent characteristic of the focused element itself. Buth's focus is defined both morpho-syntactically and pragmatically: focus is only present when the two aspects of focus (morpho-syntactic marking and pragmatics of salience/highlighting) co-occur.

This list of three types of focus is essentially complete and serves as a good starting point for understanding the various interpretations of the term "focus" in work on Biblical Hebrew.

Erteschik-Shir's conception of Focus is a mixture of informational and attentive focus. Firstly, Erteschik-Shir's Focus is an attentive focus, "a consituent to which the speaker intends to direct the attention of his/her hearer(s)" (34a). However, Erteschik-Shir places a restriction on this attentive focus: since the "informational focus" and the "non-topic constituents of the sentence" are equivalent, her claim that "the focus constituent is selected freely among the non-topic constituents of the sentence" (34c) indicates that her Focus is selected from the "informational
focus” (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 38). In sum, in f-structure, the Focus is an attentive focus that must consist of all or part of the non-topical/informational-focus material.\footnote{Another restriction is that a sentence may only have one main Focus. Also, as we have seen, the Focus may include the Topic in some cases.}
3. Research Methodology

3.1. Identifying Basic and Marked Word Order

3.1.1. Developing a Hypothesis about Basic and Marked Word Order

The process of identifying a correlation between word order and information structure has two steps. First, a hypothesis must be developed with respect to a correlation between a particular word order and a particular information structure. Second, this hypothesis must be tested against the data using statistical methods. The development of the hypothesis must be done independently of the data itself, because the statistical test is not valid unless the original hypothesis can be generated independently from the statistical calculations. This section explains how a hypothesis is developed. The following section (§3.1.2) will explain how the hypothesis is tested by comparing the data with a set of allosentences. After this test the hypothesis is either confirmed by statistically significant evidence or left unsupported by the lack of such evidence.

Cross-linguistically, basic word order is determined using the criteria of clause type, frequency, distribution, and pragmatics. Within ancient Hebrew specifically, it is important to keep in mind the possibility that triggered inversion is taking place, especially in clauses with modal verbs.
3.1.1.1. Criteria: Clause Type, Frequency, Distribution, and Pragmatics

Before one can analyze movement related to information structure, it is of course necessary to identify which structures involve movement and which do not; that is, which word orders are marked and which word orders are basic. This is not a simple task. Holmstedt (2009a: 116–120), following Dryer (2007), outlines four criteria for determining basic word order: clause type, frequency, distribution, and pragmatics.

Frequency is the most problematic of these four criteria (Holmstedt 2009a: 120), although historically it has been the most favoured criterion in BH studies in terms of determining the basic word order of subject and verb. When it comes to determining which of two word orders is basic, a wide distribution in a variety of contexts is more important than a statistical majority of occurrences within a corpus, because a corpus can be biased in the direction of a certain word order on the basis of genre. Holmstedt (2009a; 2011), Cook (2012), and others124 argue that the frequency of verb-initial wayyiqtol in biblical narrative has often clouded the issue of determining basic word order in Biblical Hebrew. The wayyiqtol form is required to occur in the first position of the clause and does not exhibit variation.125 For this reason, Holmstedt and Cook ar—

125. A scholar's view of IS in BH is bound closely to his or her understanding of BH as a configurational or non-configurational language (cf. §2.4.4.3). Most scholars treat BH as a middling language with respect to the configurationality of its syntax. It is not a "free word order language," where any order of constituents seems acceptable, but neither is it a rigidly configurational language like English, in that every clause-level constituent appears before the verb on a fairly regular basis (for whatever reason) and the order of post-verbal constituents is generally not constrained by syntax. Verbs do tend to appear towards the front of the clause, and
gue that *wayyiqtol* clauses should be excluded from any frequency-based analysis of basic word order. On the other hand, Moshavi has argued that *wayyiqtol* is a positional variant (2010: 12–13), following Revell (1989: 32). She claims that the *wayyiqtol* form has no semantic or pragmatic significance in itself but is simply a variant on the *qatal* form that appears in contexts where a *qatal* verb would immediately follow a conjunction as an amalgamation of the conjunction and the verb. Cook (2012:288–312) explains why the semantic distribution of *qatal* and *wayyiqtol* does not support the claim that the *wayyiqtol* is a positional variant. Cook's analysis of the verbal system determines that the *qatal* marks perfective aspect while the *wayyiqtol* is a narrative tense (a common phenomenon cross-linguistically speaking) that marks a foregrounded narrative statement.

The clause type criterion is based on the monograph of Siewierska (1988: 8) in which she finds that basic word order is found in "stylistically neutral, independent, indicative clauses with

---

there are certain complexes that include verbs, such as the *wayyiqtol*, that are always clause-initial. This kind of environment offers some flexibility for IS-related marked word orders, but not complete flexibility. The suspect argument that the *wayyiqtol* is a positional variant and not truly a unique verb form is a movement in the direction of understanding BH as a free word order, non-configurational language (see §3.1.1.1 for a criticism of this view).

With respect to pragmatics, BH is almost universally understood as a non-discourse-configurational language. Shimasaki (2002) is an exception. Shimasaki takes Hebrew to be discourse-configurational with respect to focus, arguing that the focus of a clause must be clause-initial. This perspective is not only unique within BH scholarship, but also rare within linguistics in general, where the existence of focus-configurational languages is a topic of debate (cf. §2.4.4.3).

The list of Erteschik-Shir's observed constructs of IS-movement is provided in (50) above (see p. 103). This list covers nearly all of the syntactic constructs proposed for BH, although theories about the pragmatic significance of these constructs sometimes diverge from Erteschik-Shir's observations about cross-linguistic tendencies. The majority of the BH scholarship of IS focuses on fronting.
full noun phrase (NP) participants, where the subject is definite, agentive and human, the object is a definite semantic patient, and the verb represents an action, not a state or an event” (cited in Holmstedt 2009a: 116). Unfortunately clauses like this do not occur very often in BH, and even when they do, it is usually difficult to be certain that topicalization, focus fronting, or a movement with some other motivation has not taken place. So this perspective, while very valuable for a theoretical awareness of how language works, does not often turn out to be of much practical use for identifying basic word order in BH.

The criteria of distribution and pragmatics are of the most practical use for determining basic word order. Researching distribution is relatively straightforward because most salient features of distribution are on the surface and objectively identifiable when collecting data. However, the study of the pragmatic criterion is very complex. It involves all of the difficulties with defining terminology and adopting a theoretical perspective that have been the subject of discussion thus far in this study, and it requires a close attention to the intricacies of each sentence as it contributes to the discourse. Many sentences have multiple potential pragmatic interpretations. It is also likely if not certain that whatever type of pragmatic movements do take place in ancient Hebrew are optional, which again makes certainty elusive. Furthermore, answering the question of pragmatics and answering the question of basic word order are one and the same problem. We are using pragmatics as one of two primary criteria for identifying basic word order, yet knowing basic word order is a prerequisite for identifying pragmatically marked word order. While previous studies of the pragmatics of IS structure in BH have added much important data to the de-
bate, there is room to improve upon previous work, especially with respect to the thoroughness of the data analysis.

3.1.1.2. Triggered Inversion Typology

In Modern Hebrew, fronting a constituent changes the word order from Subject–Verb to Verb–Subject in a process called triggered inversion (TI).\textsuperscript{126} Holmstedt (2009) suggests that triggered inversion also takes place in Biblical Hebrew. This means that although the underlying, basic word order of Biblical Hebrew is SV, when a clause has a fronted constituent the order will invert to VS. Holmstedt proposes a list of constituent types that may trigger inversion in BH: relative words, interrogatives, causal words, negative operators, and modal operators (Holmstedt 2009: 124). Normally in Hebrew the modal operator will be covert, meaning that although there is no explicitly pronounced fronted constituent, the word order is still inverted VS for all modal verbs. The hypothesis of a covert modal operator is reasonable within a TI framework given that modal verbs in BH strongly prefer VS order.

When analyzing word order in HPH, it will be important to keep the possibility of triggered inversion in mind. As I will demonstrate in Chapters 4–6, the possibility that triggered inversion is taking place is an important reason why it is difficult or perhaps impossible to identify SV or VS as the basic word order in the finite verb clause in HPH. I do not draw any conclusions in this study regarding the presence or absence of triggered inversion in HPH.

\textsuperscript{126} The term "triggered inversion" was proposed by Shlonsky and Doron (1992).
3.1.1.3. Modal Verbs

The issue of triggered inversion in HPH is especially significant in the case of modal verbs. In BH, modal verbs are generally clause-initial unless they are overridden by the fronting of another clause constituent. As John Cook concludes, "at this point the case for an SV-real: VS-irrealis opposition makes the best sense of the word order data generally and . . . the [Biblical Hebrew verbal system] specifically" (Cook 2012: 237). This opposition may result from triggered inversion. Modal verbs in BH include those with directive-volitive forms (the imperative, jussive, and cohortative) as well as certain perfect (qatal) and imperfect (yiqtol) verbs.

Unfortunately, identifying directive-volitive forms morphologically in the Dead Sea Scrolls is not possible because the Classical Biblical Hebrew system of morphologically distinct forms had collapsed by the time of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Fassberg 2013a). For example, the characteristic -n ending of the cohortative form is nearly always used to mark the indicative in the non-biblical DSS (Qimron 1986: §310.122). Also, jussive forms and shortened forms within the wayyiqtol are sometimes replaced by the regular imperfect (Fassberg 2013a). This means that identifying a verb with irrealis mood in the DSS must normally take place on the basis of the discourse context alone.


128. There is only one exception, in 11QT 59.7, for which Qimron argues a dependence on biblical phraseology (cf. Deut 31.18; Ezek 39.23-24, 29). Qimron (1997a) argues further that the longer cohortative form is clause-initial and is in complementary distribution with the imperfect (yiqtol) (cf. Fassberg 2013a).
I argue below (cf. §4.3.1.1.4; §5.3.3.5; and §8.2.1.3) that a shift has occurred from BH to HPH with respect to the modal *qatal*. In BH, the *qatal* is clearly used as a modal verb, but in HPH, it seems that the *weqatal* is used as a distinct gram, and it is unclear if the *qatal* retains its irrealis significance without the preceding *waw*. The *yiqtol* is still used to express the irrealis mood in HPH, as in BH.

Cook categorizes irrealis mood into six categories: directive, volitive, epistemic, dynamic, contingent, and habitual (2012: 255). Using 1QS as a case study, most irrealis verbs in 1QS are directives found in instructional discourse, such as the verb ישלחו, "they shall send (him)" in example (52).

(52) 1QS VII.17(b)

> והאיש אשר ילנו על יסוד יהוד ישלחו
> CONJ-ART-man.MS REL grumble.IMPF.3MS against foundation ART-Yahad banish.IMPF.3MP-PRON.3MS
> And the man who grumbles against the foundation of the Yahad, they shall banish him.

Volitives are also common; the verb יחנתה, "may he (God) have mercy on you," provides an example.
Other types of modality are rare in 1QS.

As we will see, the data within the corpus does not provide enough evidence to determine if modal verbs trigger VS-inversion in HPH, or if they precede their subjects because the basic word order of the clause is already VS.

3.1.2. Allosentences: Testing the Hypothesis against the Evidence

In the introduction (cf. §1.1) I emphasized the importance of allosentences in a study of word order and information structure. I will repeat Lambrecht's explanation here: "Differences in the information structure of sentences are always understood in terms of contrasts between allosentences, i.e. against the background of available but unused grammatical alternatives for expressing a given proposition" (Lambrecht 1994: 6). In other words, a given structure is only significant by comparison with an alternative structure that lacks its significance. This study is concerned with cases where information structure manifests itself in a marked word order that bears some IS significance by comparison with a basic word order. I will refer to the sentences with the marked word order as the test set and the sentences with basic word order as the set of allosentences.¹²⁹

¹²⁹ This choice is made merely for the sake of convenience. In reality, both sets are
In a corpus-based linguistic study of word order, the researcher is faced with the task of presenting evidence of a meaningful distinction between the information structure of test sentences and that of the relevant allosentences. The task is to find evidence that some feature or group of features is present in the test set to a greater degree than it is present in the set of allosentences. Once the comparison is made, a calculation should be performed to determine whether a statistically significant distinction is present between the degree to which each set of sentences correlates with a specific information structure pattern.

For example, in order to argue that clause-initial, pre-verbal objects (OV objects) are marked as Topics, it is necessary to compare the objects in OV clauses to objects in VO clauses to see if topic features correlate with OV clauses to a significantly higher degree than VO clauses. The following is an invented data table of such a comparison to determine if informational topics are fronted in a hypothetical language called Jibberish. (Recall that informational topics are "given" and not new in the discourse.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OV Clauses</th>
<th>VO Clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of clauses in the corpus</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses with informationally &quot;given&quot; objects</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses with informationally &quot;new&quot; objects</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"allosentences" in relation to one another.
The hypothetical data in Table 1 indicate a statistically significant correlation between object fronting and the givenness (or "informational topicality") of the object.\(^{130}\) Such data could be presented as evidence in favour of an analysis of informational topic fronting in Jibberish. Note that 21 of 50 clauses contain given objects that are \textit{not} fronted, indicating that if informational topic fronting does take place in Jibberish, it is optional. However, this data does not support the hypothesis that topic fronting is the \textit{only} reason for object fronting in Jibberish, since there are 12 clauses in the corpus with preposed, informationally "new" objects. Some other hypothesis, such as focus fronting, would need to be considered to explain the totality of clauses with pre-verbal objects in Jibberish.

Unfortunately, studies of word order and information structure in BH have not devoted significant space to the study of the information structure features of "unmarked" or "basic order" sets of allosentences. In the Jibberish example in Table 1, this means that the data from OV clauses would typically be the only data presented, while the data from VO clauses is not typically studied. In the case of Jibberish this would not create a problem because the VO data confirms the hypothesis. However, imagine a second language called Blabber, with invented data shown in Table 2.

\[^{130}\] The p-value of this imaginary data set is \(p = 0.00055\), meaning that there is a less than 0.1\% probability of these imaginary data occurring if preposing is not affected by the givenness of the preposed constituent. Statistically, this data would be highly significant.
Table 2: Are Objects that are Informational Topics Preposed in Blabber?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OV Clauses</th>
<th>VO Clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of clauses in the corpus</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses with informationally &quot;given&quot; objects</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clauses with informationally &quot;new&quot; objects</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The OV clause data in Blabber is the same as that in Jibberish, but the VO data is different. The OV data from Blabber considered in isolation might seem to suggest a correlation between preposed objects and topicality like that observed in Jibberish. However, once the VO data is considered it becomes clear that no such correlation exists, and the correlation is instead between objects and topicality in the Blabber corpus more generally. However, there is no significant difference between pre-verbal and post-verbal objects with respect to topicality.\textsuperscript{131}

It might be argued that within the framework of a particular linguistic theory, it is not necessary to demonstrate a statistical distinction between sets of allosentences because the theory requires certain relationships of the language. There is some truth to this objection, which is captured in the ubiquitous statistics maxim "correlation does not imply causation." Without an independent reason to suspect that a certain word order correlates with a certain information structure, it is useless to search out correlations at random and argue that a certain structure is marked. In the field of corpus-based linguistics, an independent reason to suspect a correlation can only

\textsuperscript{131} The p-value of this imaginary data set is $p = 0.373$, meaning that there is a greater than 37% probability of these imaginary data occurring if preposing is not affected by the givenness of the preposed constituent. This data would not be statistically significant.
come from some type of linguistic theory, whether typological, generative, functional, historical, or otherwise.

However, the necessity of a theoretical framework does not obviate empirical support. It is possible to make an entirely theory-based argument, but such arguments will generally be held in suspicion by all but the most ardent supporters of that particular theory. It is a reasonable standard for descriptive claims about a language to have an argument that is supported by both theory and data. Just as it holds true that without a foundation in a theoretical framework, it may be that one is explaining the data in a way that bears little resemblance to the way the language functions, so also without empirical verification from the data, it may be that a theory is being imposed on the data.  

132. It can be argued that a statistical distinction might not be visible because of the complexity of word order dynamics and because of the optionality of information structure movement. If IS-related movement is entirely optional, the argument goes, then it is possible that the IS characteristics of preposed clauses might not differ from those of clauses without preposing. This is true, but there are two points to make in response. First, if the absence of a statistical difference between the two sets of allo-sentences is not evidence against IS-related movement, then neither is it evidence for it. The burden of proof rests with the case that some kind of IS-related movement is taking place. Second, if IS-related movement is only and entirely optional, then it serves no meaningful purpose in a language. The commonly observed relationship of a privative opposition is necessary in language in order to make variance meaningful. If a privative opposition is present in IS-related preposing, for example, then the pragmatically "marked" clauses should show an especially high correlation with the pragmatically "marked" characteristic (such as contrast), because clauses without contrast will not be allowed into the pragmatically marked structure. At this stage it could be argued that some other type of phenomenon is interfering, such as "comparing" (van der Merwe 1999: 184) or anteriority (Moshavi 2010: 112). If this is the case, the presence of these phenomena must also be argued on the basis of comparative evidence to demonstrate the interference. A theory that leaves a large number of clauses with a "marked" structure unexplained also leaves many questions about the empirical support for the proposed markedness phenomenon. This is my primary criticism of Moshavi 2010, where the presence of a large percentage of preposed clauses that cannot be explained by topic and focus fronting, which Moshavi classifies as "residue,"
For example, van der Merwe (1999: 183–184) studies fronting in Deut 31 and 32. He finds that 24% (13/54) of clauses in the prose portions of Deut 31 and 32 with verbal forms that clearly permit fronting\textsuperscript{133} actually utilize fronting. He analyzes these clauses in terms of Lambrecht's (1994) IS scheme, labeling nine as argument-focus clauses and one as a sentence-focus clause. However, he makes no mention of the information structure characteristics of the other 41 clauses, which should follow Lambrecht's pragmatic predictions for a predicate-focus structure. A full defense of the application of this theory to BH would require a comparison of the information structure characteristics in context of the set of 41 allosentences with predicate-focus structure with the set of 13 allosentences with fronting. Similarly, Moshavi's (2010) study on preposing in Genesis does not study clauses without preposing for comparative purposes, but limits its scope to clauses with preposing. For example, Moshavi's Table 6 (2010: 105), which lists "the pragmatic functions of preposed clauses in Genesis," would be helpfully supported by evidence that the characteristics that are present in each pragmatic type are not present, or are present to a lesser degree, in comparable clauses without preposing.

Unlike van der Merwe and Moshavi, Holmstedt (2009a) views SV as the basic, unmarked order with respect to information structure. Within Holmstedt's framework, there is no allosentence for a clause with a fronted subject (whether it is fronted for topic, focus, or some other motivation) because a clause with a preposed contrastive subject would have the same SV order

\textsuperscript{133} Van der Merwe excludes clauses with wayyiqtol, weqatal, and imperative forms from his analysis of the 119 clauses with finite verbs in Deut 31 and 32, leaving 54 clauses.
as a clause without a preposed subject. This perspective shifts the locus of the comparative data to fronted (possibly contrastive) verbs. Holmstedt's example of a contrastive verb in Ruth 1:15 is helpful in this respect (2009a: 133), but to thoroughly argue the case, the next step would be to compare the contrastive features of verbs in all verb-initial VS clauses in the corpus to the contrastive features of verbs in SV allosentence clauses. It is unlikely that verbs in SV clauses will display significant contrastive features, but such an analysis would nonetheless be necessary to complete the argument.

The absence of comparisons like these from studies of IS in BH is not surprising due to the intensive labor required to locate and analyze all such sentences in context within a corpus, not least because the "unmarked" sentences generally outnumber the "marked" sentences by a large margin. In this study I intend to take the typical research method a step further and make a more complete argument for information structure patterns in the Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls through comparative analyses of all relevant data sets.

3.2. Research Questions

In order to evaluate the information structure features of specific syntactic constructions it is necessary to formulate research questions that are specific, relevant, and answerable.
3.2.1. Research Questions Concerning Pragmatics

The research questions involving the pragmatics of clauses are based on the information structure constructs to be tested for validity that are listed under (43) in §2.4.4.4. Five of these constructions either do not occur in the corpus or cannot be verified on the basis of empirical research: the use of existential clauses to mark a stage topic; prosodic inversion; scrambling; object shift; and right-dislocation.\textsuperscript{134} Research questions are given in italics, while questions in standard typeface are subdivided into the italicized research questions.

(54) Research Questions Concerning Pragmatics

(1) A left-dislocated constituent (LDC)
   (a) simplifying: Is the LDC discourse-new/rhematic?
   (b) poset-inference triggering:
      (i) Is a poset relationship available to the LDC?
      (ii) Is the relationship contrastive?
   (c) resumptive pronoun topicalization (RPT):
      (i) Would preposing be difficult or impossible?
      (ii) Is the LDC a possible topic?
         (a) Is the LDC given? AND Does it satisfy the aboutness criterion?
         (b) Is the LDC selecting (exclusively or non-exclusively) from a set?\textsuperscript{135}
         (iii) Is the LDC a shift topic or a continued topic?\textsuperscript{136}

\textsuperscript{134} For existential clauses, no research question is available. The other four constructions do not occur in the corpus.

\textsuperscript{135} Selecting exclusively entails contrast. Selecting non-exclusively entails restrictiveness. Cf. §2.4.3.

\textsuperscript{136} This question is only relevant if it is determined that topicalization is taking place, in order to qualify the nature of the topicalization.
(2) A fronted constituent (FC)\textsuperscript{137}
   (a) all topics: Is the FC a possible topic?
      (i) Is the FC given? AND Does the FC satisfy the aboutness criterion?\textsuperscript{138}
   (b) only shift topics: Is the FC a shift or continued topic?\textsuperscript{138}
   (c) contrastive NPs: Is the FC selecting exclusively from a set?
   (d) restrictive NPs: Is the FC selecting non-exclusively from a set?
   (e) informational foci: Is the FC discourse-new/rhetic?
   (f) a non-topic (marking a stage topic): Is the FC a non-topic?
      (i) Is the FC discourse-new/rhetic? OR
      (ii) Does the FC fail to satisfy the aboutness criterion?
(3) A cleft constituent (marking a non-topic):
   (a) Is the cleft constituent a non-topic?
      (i) Is the cleft constituent discourse-new/rhetic? OR
      (ii) Does the cleft constituent fail to satisfy the aboutness criterion?
   (b) Is the cleft clause discourse-new/rhetic?\textsuperscript{139}
(4) Syntactic Inversion (marking the subject as a non-topic):\textsuperscript{140}
   Is the postposed subject a non-topic?
   (a) Is the postposed subject discourse-new/rhetic? OR
   (b) Does the postposed subject fail to satisfy the aboutness criterion?

In order to satisfy the requirements of the research method, each of these research questions has a counterpart question that compares it to a relevant set of allosentences. The counterpart questions take the form, "If so, do comparable clauses without this structure contain this feature sig-

\textsuperscript{137} In the case of subjects, it cannot be known in advance if a clause-initial subject has been fronted or if it is present in its basic position because it is unclear whether SV or VS order is basic. In order to explore all possible relevant data, tests will be done on pre-verbal subjects for features that may motivate fronting, even though they may not be fronted.

\textsuperscript{138} This question is only relevant if it is determined that topicalization is taking place, in order to qualify the nature of the topicalization.

\textsuperscript{139} This question is only relevant if it is determined that clefts are used to mark a non-topic, in order to qualify the information status of the cleft clause.

\textsuperscript{140} In the case of subjects that follow the verb in a simple VS clause with no modifiers, it cannot be known in advance if a clause-initial subject has been postposed or if it is present in its basic position.
nificantly less often?" For example, the counterpart to the first question, "Is the left-dislocated constituent discourse-new/rhematic?" is "If so, are comparable constituents that are not left-dislocated discourse-new/rhematic significantly less often?"
4. 1QS (The Community Rule, Cave 1 Manuscript)

4.1. Preliminary Issues

Before analyzing the information structure characteristics of the text of 1QS, it is necessary to deal with several preliminary issues that complicate the study of this particular text.

4.1.1. Establishing the Corpus

Certain portions of the 1QS manuscript are excluded from the analysis of information structure in 1QS. These are (i) Columns X and XI, as well as 1QS XI.26b; (ii) 1QS II.25b–III.12; and (iii) biblical quotations.

4.1.1.1. Removing Biblical Quotations and Allusions

To identify biblical quotations and allusions in the corpus I rely upon the work of Lange and Weigold (2011). Biblical quotations must be excluded from the analysis because they do not necessarily reflect the language of the author(s) of the 1QS document(s). Lange and Weigold subcategorize biblical quotations into explicit and implicit quotations (2011: 26–27). Explicit quotations are introduced outright with a quotation formula or speech formula, while implicit quotations are seamlessly inserted into the text without any notice given. Both kinds of quotation are problematic for linguistic analysis, so both types will be excluded here.
Biblical allusions present a more complex problem because when a text is merely alluded to rather than quoted it is much less clear to what degree the biblical text has impacted the word order of the corpus text. It is even a complex matter to distinguish allusions from implicit quotations in some cases. Lange and Weigold make the distinction on the basis of the number of identical words used in sequence: an implicit quotation requires four consecutive identical words, while an allusion requires two or three parallel (but not necessarily identical) words (2011: 25–26). Whether a biblical allusion is included in the corpus is determined on a case-by-case basis throughout the analysis based on the degree of linear dependence upon the biblical text; those texts that follow the word order of the biblical text at key points will be excluded. Table 12 (p. 170) lists clauses with fronted elements that were removed from the corpus due to their reliance on biblical texts. Table 3 lists all clauses that were removed from the corpus due to their dependence upon biblical texts.\textsuperscript{141}

\begin{itemize}
  \item All biblical quotations and allusions in 1QS are identified based on the tables in Lange and Weigold (2011: 267–269). Clauses that allude to biblical texts but do not depend upon their clause-level syntax are included from 1QS I.24-26* (1Kgs 8:47; 2Chr 6:37); II.1* (Isa 63:7); II.14-15 (Deut 29:18-19); II.15 (Deut 29:19); II.15-16 (Deut 29:19); II.16-17 (Ezek 14:7, 8); II.21-23 (Ex 18:21, 25; Deut 1:15); III.21 (Prov 2:13); V.3-5 (Mic 6:8); V.12-13 (Ezek 24:8; Ezra 9:14); VI.6-7 (Josh 1:8; Ps 1:2); VIII.7-8 (Isa 28:16); VIII.8 (Isa 28:16); VIII.12-14 (Isa 40:3).
\end{itemize}
Table 3: Finite Verb, Non-Copular Clauses in 1QS I.1–IX.26a that Depend Upon Biblical Texts and are Excluded from the Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Location</th>
<th>Biblical Parallel</th>
<th>Hebrew Clause</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.2-3</td>
<td>Num 6:24</td>
<td>יברק_movement</td>
<td>ybrkʾ bhʾl ʾtwʾb</td>
<td>May he bless you with all goodness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3(a)</td>
<td>Num 6:24; Ps 121:7</td>
<td>ישמורך_movement</td>
<td>wyšmrkʾ mnkʾl ʾrʾ</td>
<td>And may he keep you from all wickedness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3(b)</td>
<td>Num 6:25</td>
<td>יאור_sequence</td>
<td>wyʾr ʾbkʾl ḥʾyym</td>
<td>And may he illuminate your heart with understanding of life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3(c)</td>
<td>Num 6:25</td>
<td>ויוהנהו תלשך</td>
<td>wyhwnkʾ bdʾʾwlmym</td>
<td>And may he show you favour with knowledge of ages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4</td>
<td>Num 6:26</td>
<td>יושר עלפי תفة</td>
<td>wyʾšʾ pny ḥṣdw ṭk ʾšlwʾ ʾwlmym</td>
<td>And may he lift the face of his mercy to you for everlasting peace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.12</td>
<td>Ezek 14:4, 7</td>
<td>ומקשת ענינו</td>
<td>wmʾkʾšʾ ṭwnʾm yʾṣʾ ṭpbyʾ ṭhsʾw ṭwʾ</td>
<td>and the stumbling block of his sin he sets before himself to turn back because of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.13</td>
<td>Deut 29:18</td>
<td>יתברך לעבב</td>
<td>ybrʾ bḥʾbw</td>
<td>he shall bless himself in his heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.14</td>
<td>Deut 29:18</td>
<td>יכי בשרר COMPUTER</td>
<td>kyʾ ṭḥʾrʾr ṭbʾy ṭlʾk</td>
<td>Indeed, I walk in the stubborn-ness of my heart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.16</td>
<td>Deut 29:20</td>
<td>יברידלוו אל הער</td>
<td>wyʾbdylhw ʾl brʾh</td>
<td>And God shall separate him out for wickedness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.11(b)</td>
<td>Zeph 1:6</td>
<td>כלא לא בקש</td>
<td>kyʾ lwʾ bqʾšʾ</td>
<td>For they did not seek.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.11(c)</td>
<td>Zeph 1:6</td>
<td>ולא לדרשו בקוקו</td>
<td>wʾlwʾ ḏʾrʾwʾ ḥʾwʾqyhwʾy</td>
<td>And they did not study him in his statutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.14-15(b)</td>
<td>Lev 22:16</td>
<td>פנ ישניא נון אשמה</td>
<td>pn yʾšʾʾnwʾ ṭwnʾ ʾšmʾh</td>
<td>Lest he cause him to carry guilt of sin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.15(b)</td>
<td>Ex 23:7</td>
<td>מקל דבר שקר תרחק</td>
<td>mkʾlw ṭbʾr ṣʾqr trʾḥq</td>
<td>Keep far from every false thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.17</td>
<td>Isa 2.22</td>
<td>הלוולruits מloh אדס</td>
<td>hdlʾw ṭkm mn ḥʾdmʾʾšʾ nʾšmʾ bʾʾpʾw kyʾʾ ṭmʾ nʾḥʾb hwʾh</td>
<td>Do not concern yourselves about humankind, which has breath in its nose, for of what account is he?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.14</td>
<td>Isa 40:3</td>
<td>במדבר פּ֑נֵי [דַ֑עְך]</td>
<td>bmdʾbr pnʾʾ dwʾrʾ ///</td>
<td>In the desert prepare the way of the Lord.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.1.2. Removing 1QS IX.26b–XI.22
Columns X and XI of 1QS, along with the last half-line of column IX, have not been included in this analysis due to their poetic character.\textsuperscript{142} Cf. §1.4.4 for the rationale behind excluding poetic texts from the corpus.\textsuperscript{143}

4.1.1.3. Removing 1QS II.25b–III.12
1QS II.25b–III.12 is an instructional religious text with a poetic tendency that diverges in subject matter and perspective from the rest of the covenant ceremony that precedes it (Metso 1997: 141–42). This section contains "the curse upon those who are unwilling to commit themselves to the covenant or do so insincerely" (Metso 2007: 8). Metso (1997) finds it unlikely (although possible) that this text would have been included in the performance of the covenant ceremony. More probably, as J. Murphy-O'Connor (1969) suggests, this text was used for didactic purposes, and the didactic interest has pushed this text in the direction of poetry and away from prose.\textsuperscript{144}

The poetic nature of this text is the best way to account for the sequence of clauses with pre-verbal constituents in III.1-4, presented in Table 4 below.\textsuperscript{145}

\textsuperscript{142} Revell also omitted columns X and XI in his studies of the word order of 1QS. Unlike Revell, however, this study includes 1QS I.24–II.1; II.2-4; and II.5-9 in the analysis, but excludes 1QS II.25b–III.12.
\textsuperscript{143} Circumstantial evidence of the distinct linguistic character of this portion of 1QS can be found in the reconstruction of the textual history based on the Cave 4 fragments, which demonstrate that 1QS XI.26b–XI.22 "had an independent existence before its insertion in the composition" (Metso 2007: 14).
\textsuperscript{144} Murphy-O'Connor (1969) refers to this text as a "catéchisme."
\textsuperscript{145} The table uses the following abbreviations: S(ubject), C(omplement), A(djunct).
Table 4: Pre-verbal Constituents in 1QS II.25b–III.12 (complementizers and negation particles excluded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XV Clauses</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>IS Motivation for Fronting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.25-26*</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>לברר את לולא</td>
<td>bbr yšrm</td>
<td>anyone who refuses to enter the covenant of God in order to walk in the stubbornness of his heart</td>
<td>Topic Shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1(b)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>עם ישרים</td>
<td>wm yšrm</td>
<td>with the upright</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>דעתו והונו והחיה</td>
<td>dʿtw wkwhw whwnw</td>
<td>his knowledge and his strength and his wealth</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.3(b)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>חוסך</td>
<td>ḥwšk</td>
<td>darkness</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.3-4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>עיני הפמיס</td>
<td>bʿyn tmymym</td>
<td>with an honest eye</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.6-7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>ברוחו העתמה אל</td>
<td>brwh ʿst mtʾl</td>
<td>in the spirit of God's true congregation</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.7-8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>הזרה קודה של 혼</td>
<td>brwh qdwhš lyḥd bʾmtw</td>
<td>with a holy spirit for to unite with his truth</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>הזרה ישרש ו_syntax_</td>
<td>brwh ywsr wʾnwḥ</td>
<td>with an upright and humble spirit</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.8-9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>בני נפשו стал</td>
<td>bʿnwʿt npšw lkwl hwqʿ ʾl</td>
<td>by the humility of his spirit to all the statutes of God</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of these constituents have no motivation for their pre-verbal position that relates to information structure.\(^{146}\) The word order may be controlled by a desire for a parallel cadence, perhaps

\(^{146}\) It may appear at first that many of these fronted constituents are contrastive; for example, in 1QS III.1(b), "[Not with the wicked, but] with the upright he shall not be reckoned." Erteschik-Shir's definition of contrast is more limited than this. Contrast has two requirements within the f-structure framework. First, it is exclusive, meaning that non-selected members of the set would make the statement false if they replaced the selected member. Second, the contrast set must be explicit in the discourse. It cannot be implicit, nor can it be part of the shared knowledge between speaker and audience (cf. §2.4.3). On the other hand, the restrictiveness feature is less stringent in that it does not require its set of alternative constituents to be explicit in the discourse. However, the limit on restrictiveness is that it is not an exclusive relationship, which means that some (at least one) of the non-selected members of the set will make the statement true. The result is that there is no motivation within the theory for a fronted constituent with an exclusive contrast with non-explicit contrast set. 1QS II.25b–III.12 is the only section of the
as an aid in memorization. The last four constituents in Table 4 can be interpreted as cleft constituents, but given the idiosyncratic nature of the word order of III.1-4, it is more likely that the word order in III.6-11 is a reflection of a poetic interest rather than information structure features.

4.1.2. Redaction Criticism

As S. Metso has clearly demonstrated (Metso 1997; 2007: 15–20), 1QS has undergone several redactions where texts have been joined and edited together. This type of activity is an issue that

________________________________________________________________________
corpus (aside from the poetry) with a concentration of fronted clauses that lack motivation within Ereteschik-Shir's framework.

Here I include the rationale behind each assignment of "None" as the IS motivation in Table 4. 1QS III.1(b): Contrast is ruled out because other members of the set not mentioned before or after; restrictiveness is ruled out because the relationship with its implied opposite "the wicked" would be exclusive. 1QS III.3(b): This clause is difficult to interpret. Translation: "And darkness may gaze upon paths of light." Contrast and restrictiveness are ruled out. The word נמות, "light," follows in the same clause, so there appears at first to be an exclusive contrast set. But exclusive contrast is not simply that one thing is not another (i.e. darkness cannot be light). Exclusive contrast means that the proposition of the clause is true only for the contrastive element and not for the remainder of the contrast set. The hypothetical alternative, contrasted clause, "Light may gaze upon paths of light," is not an exclusive contrast. The alternative clause has no clear meaning at all, and for this reason, a restrictive reading is also impossible. 1QS III.3-4: Contrast is ruled out because there is no explicit contrast set. Restrictiveness is ruled out because all possibilities other than "an honest eye" are excluded; with any other kind of eye (one with some level of dishonesty), he could be reckoned faultless. 1QS III.6-7, 7-8, 8, 8-9: Contrast is ruled out because there is no exclusive contrast set. Restrictiveness is ruled out because the clause-initial constituents of the four clauses in 1QS III.6-9 are synonyms rather than a set of four distinct elements to be selected from. They are not exclusive, which does qualify them for restrictiveness, but they are also not a "set," which disqualifies them for restrictiveness. A cleft clause is ruled out unless everything following the fronted constituent is topical. Since the four clauses are parallel to one another and nearly synonymous in meaning, it cannot be the case that the pre-verbal constituents are all non-topical while the post-verbal constituents are all topical.
must be considered carefully in a study of information structure, because information structure is concerned with the continuity of the Topic through a strand of discourse and the introduction of rhematic information within a certain discourse with specific beginning and ending points. If texts have been spliced together, the flow of the information structure can be disturbed. It is unlikely that scribes joining multiple texts together on a single scroll would have edited the word order of the spliced sections of text in order to maintain a consistent information structure. The evidence of scribal practice from the texts in the Judean Desert suggests rather that scribes would preserve texts in their original form when they were inserted or added to another text. For this reason, it is probable that an insertion will maintain an information structure separate from that of its context. It may relate to an earlier context from which that particular text was lifted before being inserted in its present location. If the insertion was originally an independent text, it may take part in an independent information structure. If new text was appended to the beginning of an earlier text, then some of what would appear to be thematic information from the perspective of the redacted text would actually have been rhematic information at the time the earlier text was composed.

These complications require that 1QS not be treated as one continuous block of text as far as information structure is concerned. The possibility must be kept in mind that redaction does not typically lead to a unified, flowing information structure. For this reason, sections of 1QS that seem to be independent from one another and can be best explained using a redaction-critical theory of the textual history will be treated independently from one another where information structure is concerned.
### 4.1.3. Fragmentary Clauses

Fragmentary clauses are relatively rare in 1QS vis-à-vis 1QM and 1QpHab due to the high level of preservation of the 1QS manuscript. Fragmentary clauses with finite verbs do occur in 1QS at the bottom of each column.\(^{147}\) All fragmentary clauses in 1QS have been marked with an asterisk (*) and removed from the primary data, although some well-preserved fragmentary clauses have been discussed in detail in order to develop a full picture of the evidence.

### 4.2. Constituents with Fixed Position

Complementizers, negation particles, and infinitive phrases that modify finite verbs have a fixed position at the clause level as far as it can be determined on the basis of the available data.

#### 4.2.1. Complementizers

Complementizers in the 1QS corpus are always clause-initial. Two complementizers introduce main clauses: מָשָׁא, ʾaz, "then";\(^{148}\) and גֵמ, gm, "also."\(^{149}\) Five complementizers introduce subordinate

---

147. Fragmentary finite verb clauses in the 1QS corpus occur in 1QS I.24-26*; II.1*; III.26–IV.1*; IV.25-26*, 26*; V.25-26*, 26(a)*; VI.25-27*, 26, 27(a)*, 27(b)*; VI.27–VII.1*; VII.11-12*, 24-25*; VIII.15*; IX.25(a)*, 25(b)*, 25(c)*.

148. Cf. 1QS IV.19, 20. Cf. also 1QS III.11 in the removed text of 1QS II.25(b)–III.12.

149. Cf. 1QS VI.1, 10-11, 17(b). The word גֵמ is also used adverbially in 1QS VI.18-20.
4.2.2. Negation Particles

If a finite verb clause is negated, the negation particle always immediately precedes the finite verb and follows any complementizer. However, the negation particle is not necessarily clause-initial (after the complementizer). Other clause constituents, such as the subject, will also precede the negation particle if they have been fronted.

---

Clauses: מ, "if", מ, relative marker, מ, "as", כ, "because," "indeed", and כ, מ, "unless."

4.2.2. Negation Particles

If a finite verb clause is negated, the negation particle always immediately precedes the finite verb and follows any complementizer. However, the negation particle is not necessarily clause-initial (after the complementizer). Other clause constituents, such as the subject, will also precede the negation particle if they have been fronted.

---

150. Cf. 1QS VI.13(a), 14, 18-19, 21-22(a), 24-25(a); VII.2(b), 3(a), 5-6(a), 6, 8(a), 17-18(a), 18-19(a), 21(a); VIII.24(a), 25(b), 26-27.

151. Cf. 1QS V.1, 4-5, 10, 11-12, 14-15(a), 15-16, 16, 18, 19(a), 22; VI.17(a), 24, 24-25(c), 25-26, 27(c)*; VII.3(c), 4(b), 5(a), 8(c), 9, 10, 12(a), 13(b), 13(c), 14(b), 15(b), 17(c), 18-19(c), 24-25*; VIII.15*, 17, 18(b), 20, 22, 25(a); IX.8-9(b), 10-11(b). Clauses governed by a null relative particle or by a non-adjacent מ due to conjunction of clauses are found in 1QS VI.26*; VII.5(c), 14(a), 16, 23, 23-24; VIII.7-8, 8, 11-12(b).

152. Cf. 1QS I.2-3; VI.16(a); VIII.16. Cf. also 1QS III.10 in the removed text of 1QS II.25(b)–III.12.

153. Cf. 1QS IV.16-17, 18(a), 19-20, 22, 25; V.11(a), 13-14, 15(a), 20, 26(b); VI.4-5; IX.1(a). Cf. also 1QS II.26–III.1; III.6-7 in the removed text of 1QS II.25(b)–III.12.

154. Cf. 1QS V.14.

155. In 1QS IV.18(a), the post-verbal negation particle modifies the adverb מ, yhd, "together," rather than the verb.

156. In clauses with finite non-copular verbs, clause-initial negation particles are found in the following locations. With י (l): 1QS V.13, 25-26*, 26(a)*; VI.6-7, 10, 20-21; VIII.18(a). With ב (bl): 1QS VIII.7-8, 8. With ה (h): 1QS II.8(a), 8(b), 23(a), 23(b); III.13-14, 14-15(a), 15-16, 16, 16-17, 18, 18-19, 19(a); V.26–VI.1; VII.2(a), 8(a), 17(a); VIII.23, 23-24, 25(a), 26-27; IX.8-9(b). (Cf. also 1QS II.25-26*; III.1(a), 3(a), 4(a), 4(b), 4-5, 5; IV.4-5, 11(a) in the removed text of 1QS II.25(b)–III.12.) Non-clause-initial negation particles in clauses with finite non-copular verbs are found in the following locations. With י (l): 1QS VI.1.1, 3-4, 10-11, 11-12, 17(b); VIII.11-12(a), 16-17; IX.8-9(a). With ה (h): 1QS VI.16-17, 20(b); VII.19-20, 20(a)*, 20(a)*;
4.2.3. Infinitive Phrases that Modify a Finite Verb

Any post-verbal infinitive phrase that modifies a finite verb is the final clause-level constituent within its clause.\textsuperscript{157} If there is more than one infinitive phrase that modifies a finite verb, the two infinitive phrases are clause-final and the largest one (in terms of the number of nodes in the phrase marker) is placed last.\textsuperscript{158} It is difficult to know if this distribution is based on grammatical restriction, the expectations of the EICT and the tendency of infinitive phrases to be large, stylistic preference, or coincidence.

It is also possible for an infinitive phrase to be fronted, in which case it is normally the clause-initial constituent.\textsuperscript{159}

\textsuperscript{157} Cf. 1QS I.11-13, 16-18, 24-26*; II.8(a), 8(b), 16-17, 21-23; III.17-18, 18; IV.20-21, 21-22; V.3-5, 4-5, 12-13, 13, 22, 23; VI.4-5, 4-6, 7-8, 9-10, 14-15, 20-21, 21-22(a), 21-22(b), 26*; VII.6, 8(a), 14(b), 18-19(c), 23, 23-24; VIII.12-14, 15*, 18(b), 26-27; IX.5-6, 8-9(b), 9-10. (Cf. also 1QS III.1(a), 3(a), 6-7, 8-9, 9-11 in the removed text of 1QS II.25(b)–III.12.)

\textsuperscript{158} Cf. 1QS IV.26*; IX.10-11(b).

\textsuperscript{159} Cf. 1QS III.15, 16; VI.15-16, 16-17, 18, 21; VIII.10-11, 12-14. In 1QS VI.15-16, the infinitive phrase is an appositive to the clause-initial temporal adverb אחר, "afterwards."
4.2.4. *Subordinate Clauses with a Finite Verb*

In 1QS, most main-clause level subordinate clauses occur in clause-initial position.\(^{160}\) Two such clauses occur in clause-final position, and these use complementizers that do not appear elsewhere in 1QS.\(^{161}\) The only subordinate clause that is neither clause-initial nor clause-final is preceded only by a left-dislocated constituent (cf. 1QS VII.18-19(b)).\(^{162}\) There is also one relative clause below main-clause level that is extraposed to the end of a clause (cf. 1QS VI.1).

4.3. *The Left Periphery*

Two information structure patterns can be clearly identified in 1QS: left-dislocation and fronting.

---

\(^{160}\) Subordinate clauses with a finite verb are found in clause-initial position in the following locations. "if"-clauses: 1QS V.13-14; VI.18-20, 21-22(b), 24-25(b); VII.2-3, 3(b), 5-6(b), 6-7, 8(b), 11-12*, 21(b); VIII.24(b); "according as"-clauses: 1QS VI.16(b); "lest"-clauses: 1QS V.20-22; VI.4-6.

\(^{161}\) A "lest"-clause ("lest") occurs in clause-final position in 1QS V.14-15(a). A "before"-clause ("before") occurs in clause-final position in 1QS VI.10.

\(^{162}\) I consider phrases that begin with one clause type and are conjoined to a finite verb clause to maintain the character of the initial clause type. For example, in 1QS IV.21-22, the penultimate clause constituent is a verbal adjunct PP that begins with a null copula clause and is continued by a finite clause: "like waters of separation from (null copula with null relative) all false abominations and wallowing (finite verb) in a spirit of impurity." I do not assign this finite verb subordinate clause status at the main clause level.
4.3.1. Left-dislocations in 1QS

In what follows, I conclude that in 1QS, left-dislocation applies to subjects and complements of the main finite verb. However, when subjects are left-dislocated, there is no pronominal resumption in the main clause. Left-dislocated complements are always followed by pronominal resumption.

This conclusion requires a departure from the standard definition of left-dislocation (LD). The standard definition requires the use of a resumptive pronoun to mark the position from which the left-dislocated constituent was "dislocated." Alternative definitions of left-dislocation, especially hanging-topic left-dislocation (HTLD), are a better fit for the HPH data.163

163. The question of the distinctive marker of LD is complex, and there is a debate in the literature over the question of whether LD is a transformational structure generated by means of movement of the LDC from a base-generated position within the main clause, or whether the LDC is generated in situ. Some differentiate between various types of LD, arguing that Hanging Topic LD (HTLD) involves in situ generation of the LDC and does not require the use of a resumptive pronoun, while other types, such as Clitic LD (CLLD) and Contrastive LD (CLD) involve movement of the LDC out of the main clause. For an in depth discussion of these issues see the collection of essays in Anagnostopoulou et al. 1997. Within this volume, Cinque (1997: 95) argues that "In HTLD the lefthand phrase is used to bring up or shift attention to a new or unexpected topic." He states that in HTLD, "the 'resumptive element' can be a 'pronominal' name (or epithet, like that poor guy) or an ordinary pronoun, either tonic or clitic" (1997: 96). Further, he notes that only if the LDC is an object NP within the main clause is an explicit resumption required; in all other cases, the LDC may be resumed by means of a 'gap,' a null pronoun (1997: 114 n.6). This fits the HPH data well, where verbal complement LDCs utilize a resumptive pronoun while subject LDCs do not. Rodman (1997: 40) also outlines a structure in which resumption in LD is not required. He argues that LD is "a thematicizing process," by which he means the LDC is presented early as the aboutness element in a clause (the Topic in Erteschik-Shir's terminology), and that "it is likely to be pronominalized as befits a thematic element, but nothing compels that the left dislocated, thematicized element be repeated." The LD clauses in 1QS exhibit the characteristics of HTLD rather than those of other types of LD.
4.3.1.1. Varieties of LD Structures and Similar Structures in 1QS

4.3.1.1.1. Canonical LD with pronominal resumption

A left-dislocation is a clause structure wherein a well-formed main clause is preceded by an additional clause-initial, left-dislocated constituent (LDC) that is referenced within the clause. The hallmark of an LD clause vis-à-vis a clause with fronting is that the omission of the LDC leaves a fully formed clause behind (Lambrecht 2001: 1052–1053).\(^{164}\) In the canonical LD structure, the LDC is normally referenced within the main clause by a pronoun, commonly referred to as a "resumptive pronoun."\(^{165}\) Consider the following example of a canonical LD from 1QS, which repeats example (52) above.

(55) 1QS VII.17(b)

�חאש אשיש לול על יסוד יהדה ישלחו

\(wh\)'yš ʿš ṭlwn ḫ yswd hyḥd yšḥhw

CONJ-ART-man.MS REL grumble.IMPF.3MS against foundation ART-Yahad banish.IMPF.3MP-PRON.3MS

And the man who grumbles against the foundation of the Yahad, they shall banish him.

---

164. Note that this definition does not require the use of a resumptive pronoun in a pro-drop language such as Hebrew in cases where the LDC is the subject; cf. also note 163 above.

165. In the next several LD examples, the LDC is underlined and the resumptive constituent is underlined twice.
The LDC is "the man who grumbles against the foundation of the Yahad." The LDC is resumed within the main clause, "they shall banish him," by the resumptive enclitic pronoun הוא.\textsuperscript{166}

4.3.1.1.2. Non-canonical LD with full NP resumption

There are two major types of "non-canonical" LD structures in 1QS.\textsuperscript{167} In the first type, in lieu of a resumptive pronoun, an LD clause may utilize any constituent that is co-referential with the LDC.\textsuperscript{168} Consider the following example from 1QS where the resumptive element is an NP, המיש, הַיָּשׁ, "the man."\textsuperscript{169}

\textsuperscript{166} Canonical LD's occur in 1QS IV.1(b); VI.13–14; VII.15–16, 17(b); VIII.11–12(a); and VIII.21-22. The fragmentarily preserved clause in 1QS VI.27–VII.I* appears to involve canonical LD as well. The clause in 1QS IV.18(b) is either canonical LD or a cleft.

\textsuperscript{167} See Lambrecht 2001 for a cross-linguistic overview of left- and right-dislocation structures.

\textsuperscript{168} A co-referential NP following a LDC occurs in 1QS VI.12–13 and IX.8-9(a). On the use of a non-pronominal NP within the main clause in LD in English, see Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1412. With respect to Biblical Hebrew, see JM 2006: §156f. Driver (§197.6) lists several BH examples of lamed PP LDCs that are resumed by a lamed with an enclitic pronoun that is co-referential to the complement of the lamed in the LDC.

\textsuperscript{169} In 1QS VI.12–13, the first character, ו, waw, may also be read as י, yod, which changes the first lexeme into a verb meaning "he will be able" rather than a conjunction–noun combination. The yod muddles the structure of the clause much more than the waw, which is therefore the preferred reading.
And every man who has a word to speak to the many who is not at the station of the man who is questioning the congregation of the Yahad, the man shall stand up on his feet.

From the point of view of constituent movement at the LF and PF levels of the grammar, LD that includes full NP resumption is not true LD. Within Erteschik-Shir's model, LD involves movement of the LDC at the PF level of the grammar, with the possibility of the insertion of a pronoun at PF in order to preserve interpretability. However, a full NP cannot be inserted at PF, so the entire LD structure must be created at LF rather than PF.

4.3.1.1.3. Non-canonical LD with null subject resumption

The second type of non-canonical LD in 1QS involves null subject resumption. In 1QS VII.18-19, no explicit co-referential element is present in the main clause, but it is nevertheless true that the clause has an LD structure. If there were no resumptive constituent, the clause

170. This model of LD fits well with the HTLD structure mentioned in note 163 above. See also §2.4.4.2 in this study for more on Erteschik-Shir's understanding of dislocation.

171. LD with full NP resumption has the Topic-shift-marking lamed (cf. §4.3.1.1.6) as its closest relative because in neither case is the clause-initial constituent "dislocated" in the sense of being moved to the front of the clause.
would in theory have a structure identical to a clause with preposing rather than LD. However, the presence of a DP in front of a clause constituent that is restricted to clause-initial position serves as an indicator of LD. For example, a complementizer is required to stand in the clause-initial position. Therefore, the clause in 1QS VII.18-19(b), which utilizes an אם-clause (an "if"-clause) where the LDC precedes the complementizer אם, is best analyzed as an LD construction.172

(57) 1QS VII.18-19(b)

And the man whose spirit trembles before the foundation of the Yahad so to deal treacherously with the truth and to walk in the stubbornness of his heart, if he returns, then he shall be punished for two years.

The confusing aspect of the LD analysis in (57) is the absence of an explicit constituent that is co-referential with the LDC. According to Lambrecht's cross-linguistic overview of dislocation structures, in such clauses the LDC is resumed within the clause by an inflectional affix on the

172. On boundary constituents in BH that separate an LDC from the lower levels of the clause, see Holmstedt 2014: 13-14. Holmstedt does not consider this to be an example of LD due to the absence of a resumptive constituent. (See note 163 above on page 140 for my alternative view.)
main verb (Lambrecht 2001: 1051, 1055–1056). From a generative perspective, the resumptive element is a null subject,¹⁷³ and for this reason I will refer to clauses such as (57) as "LD clauses with null subject resumption."¹⁷⁴ In (57), the LDC is co-referential with the null subject of both the subordinate clause (the prodosis) and the main clause (the apodosis).

4.3.1.1.4. Non-canonical LD with the weqatal and null subject resumption:

In nine clauses in 1QS VII, what appears to be a left-dislocated constituent (LDC) is the subject of the clause and immediately precedes the main verb וָנֵעֵנָשׁ, "and he shall be punished" (cf. (56) and (57) above). In these clauses, the LDC-subject is not referenced within the clause by a resumptive anaphoric pronoun.¹⁷⁵ An example is provided below.

---

¹⁷³ Hebrew is a pro-drop language, and therefore a pronominal subject is often "dropped" from the clause. The rich inflectional morphology on the verb makes this possible. On Qumran Hebrew as a pro-drop language, see Naudé 1991 and Holmstedt 2013c; 2014.

¹⁷⁴ From a theoretical perspective that considers all examples of LD in HPH to be left-dislocation of the HTLD (see note 163 above), there is structurally no difference between this structure that lacks a resumptive constituent and one that uses a resumptive constituent. Both are examples of HTLD.

¹⁷⁵ Such clauses occur in 1QS VII.3-4, 4(a), 5(b), 8(d), 12(b), 13(a), 13-14, 14-15, and 15(a). There are no left-dislocated subjects with resumptive pronouns in the HPH corpus, although there are several left-dislocated complements with resumptive pronouns (cf. §4.3.1.1.1). The absence of left-dislocated subjects can be explained if left-dislocated subjects use either full NP resumption (cf. §4.3.1.1.2) or null subject resumption (cf. §4.3.1.1.3) and are marked by a clause-initial boundary such as a complementizer or weqatal.
And a man who spits into the midst of a session of the many (and) (he) shall be punished for thirty days.

It is uncertain whether these clauses involve LD or fronting. Unlike the clause in example (57) above in §4.3.1.1.3, in these clauses there is no clear boundary marker (such as the conditional complementizer אם) between the LDC and the main clause proper. In the absence of a resumptive pronoun, it is impossible to distinguish such clauses from clauses with pre-verbal (possibly fronted) subjects.

The presence of a waw conjunction in itself does not indicate a boundary at the left edge of the main clause proper, between the LDC and the main verb. A conjunction may be used following any fronted constituent, especially when the fronted constituent is large. However, it

176. Holmstedt (2014: 34-35) refutes the status of the waw conjunction as a boundary marker (against BHRG §46.1.2.i.c.4) between the left edge of a clause and a LDC. Indeed, a conjunction in itself is not sufficient to identify LD in BH. However, in HPH the complementary distribution of subjects and complements with respect to resumption and the use of the conjunction whenever another boundary marker is not present (such as the conditional complementizer אם, "if") suggests that the waw conjunction has been interpreted and used as such a boundary marker in HPH. Joüon and Muraoka classify this conjunction in BH as an extension of the waw of apodosis (JM §156l, §176a), the use of which "is not subject to any strict rules" (JM §176 c). They state that in clauses with casus pendens [= LD], a lengthy protasis [= LDC] can motivate the use of the intervening conjunction. Some uses of the BH conjunction after an LDC, a protasis, and a temporal phrase are catalogued in GKC §143d.

177. An example can be found in 1QM VII.9-11. In this clause it is unknown if the main verb is a modal (we)qatal or a modal yiqtol. If it is taken as a (we)qatal, then 1QM VII.9-11 provides an example of a fronted (not left-dislocated) constituent preceding a (we)qatal, which would run counter to the proposal presented in this section that the weqatal may function as a boundary
is uncertain whether these verbs represent a distinct weqatal gram encoding irrealis mood, which is required to occupy clause-initial position (LDCs excepted), or a waw conjunction followed by an irrealis qatal verb, which is fronted to the head of the clause, as all modal verbs are within a triggered inversion analysis (cf. §3.1.1.2). If this is simply a conjunction followed by an irrealis qatal, it may still permit another constituent, such as a shift Topic, to be fronted over it, and these nine clauses are more likely to involve subject fronting than LD. However, if these verbs are weqatal verbs, they may serve as a boundary marker comparable to the conditional complementizer דּוּנָּ, since the weqatal verb is required to occupy the clause-initial position (on analogy with the past narrative wayyiqtol gram).

There are two primary pieces of evidence for the weqatal as a distinct gram in HPH. First, there is no clear modal use of the qatal verb without the preceding conjunction in the corpus of study. Second, in 1QM, shift-topic subjects are always fronted when the main verb is a modal yiqtol verb, but they are never fronted when the main verb is a modal (we)qatal verb, suggesting that the weqatal is a distinct gram that must occur in clause-initial position (cf. §5.3.3.5). Given the evidence for the weqatal from elsewhere in the corpus, the possibility remains open that the author has chosen the weqatal verb as a clause-boundary marker in these nine cases to mark the LD of a subject with null subject resumption.

marker for LD in 1QS VII.

178. Cf. §8.2.1.3 for an overview of the argument regarding the weqatal.

179. Two possible exceptions occur in quoted speech in 1QM III.9(b), 10(b), but these too are uncertain; cf. §5.3.3.3 below.

180. This is a type of hanging-topic LD (HTLD); cf. note 163 above on page 140.
The alternative possibility is that these are simply nine fronted subjects. This reading would not significantly affect the interpretation of the clauses. As we will see below when the pragmatics of these clauses are analyzed (see §4.3.1.3), LD is best understood as a shift-topic-marking device in the corpus, and fronting may also be used to mark a shift topic. The distinction is that while fronting may have other functions as well (such as marking a contrastive Topic, a restrictive Topic, or a non-Topic), LD only marks shift-topics within the corpus.

4.3.1.1.5. Nested LD

One unusual clause includes an apparent LDC with a resumptive element inside of another LDC. The outer LDC and its resumptive pronoun are marked with overlines, while the inner LDC is marked with an underline and double underline.

(59) 1QS VIII.21-22

kwl hbʾ bʾst hqwdš hhwlkym btym drk kʾšr šwh kwl ʾyš mhnm ʾšr yʾbr dbr mtwrt
mwšḥ bdʾ rmḥʾ w brmh ʾyšlw ṭʾsh ᵢḥd

Anyone who enters into the congregation of holiness, the ones who walk in blamelessness of way just as he commanded—any man from among them who transgresses a word from the law of Moses with a high hand or by negligence, they shall banish him from the congregation of the Yahad.
The inner LD is canonical, but the outer LD is unusual. This construction does not occur elsewhere in the corpus of this study, and it is rare in Biblical Hebrew as well, if not absent altogether. As I conclude below, left-dislocation in HPH is best understood as a topic-shift-marking device. A clause can only have one main Topic, and so two topic shifts within one clause is unexpected. It may be that the outer LDC is a secondary Topic and the inner LDC is the primary Topic, but it is unclear why the author felt the need to utilize left-dislocation on a secondary topic in this particular case.

4.3.1.1.6. A Topic-shift-marking *lamed*

One clause in 1QS begins with a ל (lamed) preposition (often translated as "to" or "for") with an NP complement that is co-referential with the null subject of the clause.

(60) 1QS IX.1(b)

```
wlʾwšḥ bḥd rmḥ lwʾ yšwb ᵵd
CONJ-as_for-do.PTCP.MS with-hand.FS be_high.PTCP.FS NEG return.IMPF.MS again
```

As for the one who acted with a high hand (intentionally), he shall not return again.

This type of structure is very different from a temporal or locative PP that has been fronted as a "scene-setting" Topic in that the pre-verbal PP is not a verbal modifier. Instead, the object of the preposition is the subject of the clause. Without the resumption of the preposition's object in subject position, the pre-verbal PP has no place within the clause.
This structure bears many similarities to a left-dislocation, but the addition of the *lamed* is structurally significant. Given that LD takes place at the PF level in the f-structure framework, an LDC that includes an introductory preposition is problematic because there is no path for the preposition to enter the derivation. It cannot enter at the PF level because lexemes can only enter at the narrow syntax level, but it cannot enter at narrow syntax because at this level the NP complement of the *lamed* is part of the main clause where the *lamed* is not syntactically appropriate.

This construction is rare in ancient Hebrew,\(^{181}\) so there is little data to use in the analysis. However, a helpful comparison can be made with the English "as-for" construction, which indicates a topic shift,\(^{182}\) because the form and function of (60) are similar to the English "as-for" construction. The English "as-for" construction differs from an English left-dislocation both structurally and pragmatically. The LD construction does not necessarily mark a topic cross-linguistically, as Prince (1998) outlines with respect to English.\(^ {183}\) Also, unlike an LDC, the NP in an "as-for" construction is not necessarily followed by a resumptive constituent in the main clause, whether null or otherwise. An "as-for" construction may even mark a discourse-level topic that is not present in the main clause at all (Lambrecht 2001: 1057–1058). Consider the following example, from Lambrecht 2001: 1058.

---

181. Kautzsch (1910: §143e) identifies its use in Num 18.8 and Qoh 9.4. Other citations he lists do not have the same properties as 1QS IX.1; most lack a resumptive pronoun.
182. "*As for* indicates that its complement . . . expresses the topic of the clause; more specifically, it indicates a change of topic, typically to something that has been mentioned earlier" (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1371).
183. "*As for* assigns topic status to its complement, but in left dislocation the prenuclear element is not marked as topic . . ." (Huddleston and Pullam 2002: 1409).
(61) As for education, John prefers Bertrand Russell's ideas.

Clauses without resumption suggest that "as-for" constructions do not result from movement, whether in narrow syntax or at the PF level. Instead, the as-for phrase is located at the left periphery in a specialized projection. Perhaps the Hebrew *lamed* can also mark a Topic-shift as the head of a constituent on the left periphery.

The formation of a clause with a topic-shift-marking *lamed* is similar to the formation of a "left-dislocation" clause with full NP resumption, which does not truly involve dislocation (cf. §4.3.1.1.2 and §8.1.3).

4.3.1.2. Unambiguous Cases of LD

The next step is to isolate the IS functions of LD in 1QS. Prince (1998) proposes three IS functions for English left-dislocation (cf. §2.4.4.4):

(62) Discourse Functions of Left-Dislocation (Prince 1998)

*Simplifying*: removes discourse-new NP from subject position
*Poset*: triggers an inference that the NP stands in a partially-ordered set relation
*Resumptive Pronoun Topicalization (RPT)*: the NP's position prevents fronting

Research in Biblical Hebrew indicates a topic marking function (Holmstedt 2009a)\(^{184}\) as well as a contrast marking function (Khan 1998; Holmstedt 2009a; Moshavi 2010) for LD. Prince's RPT is simply a more restrictive version of topic marking LD in that she restricts it to situations where it would be difficult to prepose the constituent due to the grammatical structure

\(^{184}\) This topic should be understood in terms of givenness and aboutness.
of the clause. On the other hand, contrast marking is a more restrictive version of Prince's poset LD, which might trigger an inference of any partially-ordered set relation, of which contrast with a set of alternatives is only one type. Note that within Erteschik-Shir's model, contrastive elements are Topics, so RPT may also overlap in its application with LD clauses that have been labeled as contrast marking. Combining all of these possibilities, we have the following questions to ask regarding LD. The bold questions below are also stand-alone research questions: question (b (i)) tests for topic marking, and question (c (ii)) tests for contrast marking.

(63) Research Questions Regarding Left-Dislocated Constituents (LDCs)
(a) simplifying LD:
   (i) *Is the LDC discourse-new/rhematic?*
   (ii) Is the resumption in a position disfavoured for discourse-new entities?
      (a) *Is the resumption a subject?*
      (b) *Is the resumption a possessive?*
(b) resumptive pronoun topicalization (RPT):
   (i) *Is the LDC the main clause topic?*
      i.e. Is the LDC given? AND Does it satisfy the aboutness criterion?
   (ii) *Would preposing be difficult or impossible?*
   (iii) Is the LDC selecting exclusively or non-exclusively from a set?
      (a) *Is the LDC selecting exclusively from an available set?*
      (b) *Is the LDC selecting non-exclusively from an available set?*
   (iv) Is the LDC a shift topic or a continued topic?
      (a) *Is the LDC a shift topic?*
      (b) *Is the LDC a continued topic?*
(c) poset-inference triggering LD:
   (i) *Is a poset relationship available to the LDC?*
   (ii) *If there is a poset, is the relationship contrastive?*

185. This question is also used to assess the presence of topic marking.
186. Selecting exclusively entails contrast. Selecting non-exclusively entails restrictiveness. Cf. §2.4.3.
187. This question is only relevant if it is determined that topicalization is taking place, in order to qualify the nature of the topicalization.
188. This question is also used to assess the presence of contrast marking.
Nine clauses in 1QS unambiguously involve LD. Table 5 notes the information structure characteristics of these nine clauses. Clauses in italics involve the left-dislocation of a subject.

Table 5: Unambiguous Cases of LD in 1QS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simplifying</th>
<th>Resumptive Pronoun Topicalization</th>
<th>Poset Inference Triggering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a(i)</td>
<td>a(ii.α)</td>
<td>a(ii.β)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QS IV.1(b)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QS VI.12-13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QS VI.13-14</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QS VII.15-16</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QS VII.17(b)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QS VII.18-19(b)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QS VIII.11-12(a)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QS VIII.21-22</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QS IX.8-9(a)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

189. Separated by clause structure: (a) canonical LD (6): 1QS IV.1(b); VI.13-14; VII.15-16, 17; VIII.11-12(a); VIII.21-22; (b) with non-pronominal resumption (2): 1QS VI.12-13; IX.8-9(a); (c) with null subject resumption (1): 1QS VII.18-19(b). Separated by the category of the left-dislocated constituent: (a) with a complement-theme LDC (5): 1QS VI.13-14; VII.15-16, 17(b); VIII.11-12(a), 21-22; (b) with a complement-theme modifier as LDC (1): 1QS IV.1(b); (c) with a subject LDC (3): 1QS VI.12-13; VII.18-19(b); IX.8-9(a). None of these clauses demonstrate evidence of syntactic influence from biblical quotations or allusions. Lange and Weigold (2011: 269) list Isa 29:15 as a text that has influenced 1QS IX.9. However, such influence is minimal with respect to word order and syntax. Not only that, the relevant structures for an analysis of left dislocation all occur in line 8 of column 9, so that whatever allusion is taking place is limited to the relative clause in line 9, which does not impact the clause-level syntax.
The highlighted boxes indicate that the features of one of Prince's (1998) three forms of topicalization are present. Thus, clauses in 1QS VI.12-13; VII.18-19(b); and IX.8-9(a) have both of the necessary characteristics for structure (a), simplifying LD. The clause in 1QS IV.1(b) has the two characteristics necessary for structure (b), resumptive pronoun topicalization, as well as the two characteristics necessary for structure (c), poset-inference triggering LD.

The columns in bold—b(i) and c(ii)—indicate features that motivate movement independently within frameworks that interpret LD as a topic marking structure (b(i)) and/or as a contrast marking structure (c(ii)).

In all nine clauses the LDC is the main topic of the clause (b(i)), so it may be the case that all nine of these LD structures are topic marking structures. The topic is a shift topic as well in all nine clauses. At this point, then, it is possible to be more specific and propose that LD in 1QS is a topic-shift-marking device. Note that this is not one of the three discourse functions of LD identified by Prince (1998), and to my knowledge there is no cross-linguistic evidence for the use of LD to mark a topic shift. Nevertheless, this theory easily provides the best fit for the evidence in 1QS.

In addition to satisfying the criteria for topic-shift-marking, the clauses in 1QS VI.12-13; VII.18-19(b); and IX.8-9(a) also satisfy the criteria for Prince's (1998) simplifying LD. Note that a clause can simultaneously satisfy the criteria for simplifying LD and topic marking (or topic-shift-marking) LD. Simplifying LD applies to discourse-new elements in positions that favour discourse-old constituents. The complexity arises when a discourse-new element is the topic of a clause. The Danish language, which is a moderately discourse-configurational language,
demonstrates this. In Danish it is grammatical to mark as a topic any of the following classes of DPs: pronouns, definites, specific indefinites, generics, and contrastives (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 8). The underlined words in the following English translations reflect the topical elements in their Danish counterparts (see Erteschik-Shir 2007: 8 for the full examples):

(64) Topicalized elements in Danish clauses (English translations):

- **pronoun:** I met her yesterday.
- **definite:** I met the girl yesterday.
- **generic:** One sees flowers in the spring.
- **specific indefinite:** I gave a good book to a girl that I met yesterday.
- **contrastive:** I met the girl yesterday, I met the boy only today.

What cannot be topicalized in Danish are *non-specific, non-contrastive indefinites*. Thus, in the clause "I met a girl yesterday," "a girl" cannot function as the topic.

In 1QS, the LDC in an LD clause is often a discourse-new, *non-specific, definite* DP, a situation that is not often discussed in the IS literature. For example, in 1QS VII.18-19(b) (cf. (57) above) the LDC is translated "the man whose spirit trembles before the foundation of the Yahad so to deal treacherously with the truth and to walk in the stubbornness of his heart."

Although this DP bears the definite article ה, it does not refer to a specific individual, but simply to any man who satisfies the criteria. This DP is a discourse-new subject topic. It can theoretically be topic-marked, topic-shift-marked, or treated as discourse-new, as would be the case in a simplifying LD clause. In such a simplifying LD, the LDC is rhematic, and co-referential with the topic, but the topical element is the resumptive pronoun or null subject of the main clause. Since there is no topic marking in a simplifying LD, it is not necessary to have an
explicit resumptive pronoun in the main clause to mark it as the topic. Thus the special case of
the non-specific, definite DP permits the same clause to satisfy the requirements of both
simplifying LD and topic-(shift-)marking LD. The three clauses in Table 5 that satisfy the
requirements of simplifying LD are the same three clauses that involve the LD of a subject.

Four more of these clauses also qualify for a simplifying LD analysis if the category is
stretched slightly beyond Prince's description. Prince identifies subjects and possessives as
constituents that disfavour rhematic information, but it may be possible to add to this list
complement-themes\(^{190}\) of an impersonal passive verb, such as the LDC in 1QS VII.17(b) (cf. (55)
above). These LDCs are often rendered as subjects when translated into English, as in the
translation of 1QS VII.17(b) in García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997: 87), "And whoever
complains against the foundation of the Community shall be expelled and will not return." All
four of these clauses use resumptive pronouns that cliticize to the main verb (1QS VII.15-16,
17(b); VIII.11-12(a), 21-22).

The topic-shift-marking LD that takes place in 1QS cannot, for the most part, be
classified under the rubric of Prince's (1998) concept of resumptive pronoun topicalization
because 8 of these 9 structures do not have features that would interfere with preposing. Only in
the clause in 1QS IV.1(b) would it be awkward to prepose the LDC without a resumptive
element because the topic is a possessive modifier of the verbal complement-theme. Therefore,
in addition to its topic-shift function, this clause can also be classified as an RPT clause.

\(^{190}\) I use the term "complement-theme" to refer to what is often called the direct object.
This clause in 1QS IV.1(b) is in fact very versatile because it also meets the criteria for contrast marking and thereby also the criteria for poset-inference triggering.

Although three (or perhaps even seven) of these clauses satisfy the criteria for simplifying LD and one clause satisfies the criteria for contrast marking and poset-inference triggering, it is not necessary to posit these structures as part of the grammar of HPH because it is possible to explain all LD structures that we have seen so far as topic marking structures, and more specifically, as topic-shift-marking structures. Here we see clearly why the analysis of IS structures is so difficult: it is a common state of affairs in ancient Hebrew clauses that more than one IS interpretation is possible.

4.3.1.3. Clause-initial Subjects Followed by a Conjunction

Now that we have an analysis of unambiguous cases of LD in 1QS, it will be instructive to compare the analysis to some ambiguous cases. The nine clauses without explicit resumption and with an intervening conjunction provide a large set of material (cf. (58) above for an example of one of these clauses, from 1QS VII.13(a)).
Here again, all nine clauses satisfy the requirements for topic marking and topic-shift-marking.\textsuperscript{191} In this case, however, all nine clauses also satisfy the criteria for simplifying LD because the null resumptive elements are all subjects.\textsuperscript{192} These clauses have much in common with the unambiguous LD clauses in Table 5, and there is every reason to think that they are simply additional examples of the left dislocation of a subject.\textsuperscript{193}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|ccc|ccc|cccc|}
\hline
 & a(i) & a(ii.α) & a(ii.β) & b(i) & b(ii) & b(iii.α) & b(iv.α) & c(i) & c(ii) \\
\hline
1QS VII.3-4 & ✓ & ✓ & & ✓ & ? & & & ✓ & \\
1QS VII.4(a) & ✓ & ✓ & & ✓ & ? & & & ✓ & \\
1QS VII.5(b) & ✓ & ✓ & & ✓ & ? & & & ✓ & \\
1QS VII.8(d) & ✓ & ✓ & & ✓ & ? & & & ✓ & \\
1QS VII.12(b) & ✓ & ✓ & & ✓ & ? & & & ✓ & \\
1QS VII.13(a) & ✓ & ✓ & & ✓ & ? & & & ✓ & \\
1QS VII.13-14 & ✓ & ✓ & & ✓ & ? & & & ✓ & \\
1QS VII.14-15 & ✓ & ✓ & & ✓ & ? & & & ✓ & \\
1QS VII.15(a) & ✓ & ✓ & & ✓ & ? & & & ✓ & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Fronting or Dislocation? Clause-initial subjects followed by a conjunction.}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{191} Column (b (ii)) regarding whether preposing is difficult or impossible is not answerable because it is not known if SV or VS is the basic word order. If it is SV, then preposing would not have a visible impact and would not be useful.

\textsuperscript{192} The criteria for RPT (category (b)) are not relevant because these clauses do not have resumptive pronouns.

\textsuperscript{193} It must be noted that the use of the conjunction itself does not indicate a disjunction in the clause. In BH as well as HPH, it is not uncommon for a conjunction to appear after a clause-initial constituent that is not an LDC. For example, another use of an intervening conjunction within a clause occurs in 1QS VI.15-16, where a conjunction occurs following an introductory PP with an appositive, perhaps to aid in the processing of the complexity of the apposition. Holmstedt (2014: 35) concludes that in BH it is simply a side effect of its grammatical function the conjunction can serve as “the left-edge marker of any phrase.” In HPH, nevertheless, the distribution of the data indicates that the use of a clause-initial conjunction (or a complementizer, as with the use of בֵּן in example (57)) coincides with the LD of a subject. Such a boundary-
4.3.1.4. Resumption in Subject LD Clauses

In 1QS there is an absolute correspondence between non-canonical LD structures and subject LD clauses. In other words, in canonical LD structures, the LDC is never co-referential with the subject of the main clause. On the other hand, in non-canonical LD structures, the LDC is always co-referential with the subject of the main clause. This data is presented below in tabular form.

Table 7: Pronominal resumption vs. dislocation of subject in LD in 1QS\textsuperscript{194}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LDC co-referential with...</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Non-subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complement-theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canonical LD with pronominal resumption</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD with non-pronominal resumption</td>
<td>explicit DP resumption</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>null resumption</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

marking element seems to be a necessary condition of LD of a subject in HPH, but a conjunction that follows the first clause-level constituent does not mark a boundary in every case.

\textsuperscript{194}. Canonical LD of a complement-theme (5): 1QS VI.13-14; VII.15-16, 17(b); VIII.11-12(a); VIII.21-22. Canonical LD of a modifier of the complement-theme (1): 1QS IV.1(b). LD of a subject with explicit DP resumption (2): 1QS VI.12-13; IX.8-9(a). LD of a subject with null resumption (10): 1QS VII.3-4, 4(a), 5(b), 8(d), 12(b), 13(a), 13-14, 14-15, 15(a), 18-19(b). In VII.18-19(b) the complementizer נָּה appears between the LDC and the main clause; in the other nine LD clauses with null resumption, the conjunction י appears between the LDC and the main clause.
It is unclear if there is a restriction in HPH on pronominal resumption in subject LD clauses, or if some other factor is at work. A study of this correlation in BH could help to shed more light on this issue.

4.3.1.5. Allosentences for LD Clauses

To be completely confident in the status of LD as a topic-shift-marking device in 1QS, it is necessary to compare the LD clauses to their allosentences in 1QS. The form of the allosentence of an LD clause varies with the structure of the LD clause. Also, each LD clause has two allosentences: a clause with basic word order and a clause where the LDC is fronted rather than left-dislocated. I will only treat the basic word order allosentences.

4.3.1.5.1. Allosentences for LD of a complement-theme

Clauses where the complement-theme becomes the LDC utilize an enclitic pronoun for resumption. Assuming that post-verbal word order does not normally have implications for IS, any clause with a post-verbal complement-theme qualifies as a basic word order allosentence.

The verbal complement must be a DP and may be an enclitic pronoun of the verb. PPs and infinitive phrases are excluded because there are no LD clauses with a PP or infinitive phrase as the LDC. Subordinate clauses are also excluded because none of the complement LDs have a complementizer. The clause in 1QS IV.1(b), where a modifier of the complement-theme is an LD resumptive pronoun, is also excluded.
The 5 clauses in 1QS with a complement-theme LDC have 38 basic word order allosentences. In other words, there are 38 main clauses in 1QS with a post-verbal complement-theme. The characteristics of these clauses are listed in Table 8 below.

Table 8: Topicality of the complement-theme in basic word order allosentences for clauses with a complement-theme LDC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the complement-theme the main clause topic?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Indeterminate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LD Clauses with a complement-theme LDC</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All basic word order allosentences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) where the complement-theme is an enclitic pronoun of the main verb</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) where the complement-theme is the first non-clitic constituent after the verb</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) where the complement-theme is the second non-clitic constituent after the verb</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

195. These clauses occur in 1QS VI.13-14; VII.15-16, 17(b); VIII.11-12(a); VIII.21-22.

196. These allosentences occur with the complement-theme as the main topic (9): 1QS II.5-6, 8(a); VI.14-15, 20(a), 20(b), 21, 21-22(b), 24-25(b); VIII.18-19; and with a complement-theme that is not the main topic (3): 1QS III.17; IV.18-19; VII.6-7. In one case it is indeterminate whether the complement-theme is the main topic: 1QS V.23. The allosentences in 1QS II.2-3, 3(a), 3(c) have been removed from consideration due to their dependence on the priestly blessing of Num 6.23-26, and the allosentence in 1QS II.16 has been removed due to its word order parallelism with Ezek 14.8 (cf. Lange and Weigold 2011: 268). All four of these allosentences that depend upon biblical texts utilize the complement-theme as the main topic.

197. These 16 allosentences are found in 1QS I.11-13; II.9; III.15, 16, 17-18, 25(a), 25(b); IV.17, 18(b), 24-25; V.20-22; VI.4-6, 18-20, 25; VII.20(a); VIII.24-25. The allosentences in 1QS II.3(b), 4 have been removed from consideration due to their dependence on the priestly blessing of Num 6.23-26 (Lange and Weigold 2011: 268). An allosentence occurs in the removed text in 1QS III.9-11. There is also a fragmentary allosentence in 1QS IV.25-26*.

198. These 9 allosentences are found in 1QS III.18; IV.20-21, 21-22; V.8-10, 16-17; V.26–VI.1; VI.1, 7-8, 11-12.
It can be seen in Table 8 that most complement-themes in basic word order position are not main clause topics (28 out of 37 = 75.7%). An example is shown below.

(66) 1QS II.9

\[\text{理财产品ynthia פניו לנקמתההו} \]
\[\text{lift.impf.3ms face.cstr anger.ms-pron.3ms for-vengeance.fs.cstr-pron.2ms} \]

May he lift up the face of his anger for your vengeance.

In 1QS II.9, the topic is the person who is the object of series of the curses, referenced in this clause by the second person masculine singular enclitic possessive pronoun -ה, -kh. The complement-theme of the verb, פניו pw, "the face of his (God's) anger," is not the main topic.

Conversely, relatively few complement-themes in basic word order position are main clause topics (9 out of 37 = 24.3%). One of these is shown in (67) below.

(67) 1QS II.8(a)

\[\text{לאו יוהנה אלה בקורהבה} \]
\[\text{neg favour.impf.3ms-pron.2ms God in-cry_out.inf-pron.poss.2ms} \]

May God not show you favour as you cry out.

The clause in (67) precedes the clause in (66) in the list of curses, and here the enclitic pronoun on the verb, which is the complement-theme, is the main clause topic as well.

199. Clauses where the IS features are unclear have been omitted from all calculations.
On the other hand, all complement-themes that are LDCs are main clause topics (5 out of 5 = 100%) (cf. 1QS VII.17(b), shown above in (55)).

Thus, the evidence indicates that left-dislocation functions effectively as a topic marking device for complement-themes in 1QS. It is also worth pointing out that in 1QS every complement-theme that is the main clause topic is an enclitic pronoun on the main verb.

To determine if left-dislocation functions effectively as a topic-shift-marking device for complement-themes, it is necessary to look at how many of the basic word order allosentences where the complement-theme is the main clause topic involve continued topics and how many involve shift topics.

Table 9: Topic shift in the complement-theme in basic word order allosentences for clauses with a complement-theme LDC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the main topic complement-theme a shift topic or a continuous topic?</th>
<th>Continued topic</th>
<th>Shift topic</th>
<th>Indeterminate</th>
<th>Total (Determinate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD Clauses with a complement-theme LDC(^{200})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic word order allosentences where the complement-theme is the main clause topic(^{201})</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9 (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we see that left-dislocation in 1QS also functions effectively as a topic-shift-marking device for complement-themes. Complement-themes that do not use left-dislocation are rarely shift

---

200. These clauses occur in 1QS VI.13-14; VII.15-16, 17(b); VIII.11-12;(a) VIII.21-22.
201. With a continued topic (6): 1QS II.5-6, 8(a); VI.14-15; VI.20(b), 21-22(b); VIII.18-19. With a shift topic (1): VI.24-25(b) (introduced by conditional). Indeterminate if shift or continued (2): VI.20(a), 21. 1QS II.2-3, 3(a), 3(c) have been removed from consideration due to their dependency on the priestly blessing of Num 6.23-26 (Lange and Weigold 2011: 268).
topics (1 out of 7 = 14.3%), but all complement-themes with left-dislocation are shift topics (5 out of 5 = 100%).

The one complement-theme that is not left-dislocated but is still a shift topic occurs in 1QS VI.24-25(b), shown below.

(68) 1QS VI.24-25(b)

אָם וַיֵּצֵא בִּם אִישׁ עָשָׂר יִשְׁרָאֵל יִשְׁרָאֵל וַתּוֹדֵל יחֻד וַיַּקְרָא שֶׁאָשר אִשֶּׁה בָּמֶּם כַּחַר עַד מַעֲבָרָה בְּכִפָּר שָׁנָה אֲחָת

If a man is found among them who lies about wealth and he knows [i.e. he lies knowingly], then they shall separate him from the midst of the pure food of the many for one year.

In this case, the exception proves the rule. In the one clause where the post-verbal complement-theme topic is not left-dislocated, its antecedent appears before the main clause proper within a pre-verbal subordinate conditional clause. So in every case where the enclitic pronoun complement-theme is a shift topic, the antecedent of the pronoun occurs earlier in the clause ahead of the main clause proper, whether within a LDC (5x) or within a subordinate clause (1x). Thus we can see that the following rules govern the topicality of complement-themes in 1QS:

(69) Rules for the topicality of complement-themes in 1QS

(a) A complement-theme can only be the main clause topic if it is an enclitic pronoun on the main verb.

(b) If the complement-theme is a shift topic, then the antecedent of the enclitic pronoun must appear before the main verb, either within a subordinate clause or as an LDC.
In other words, there appears to be a restriction in 1QS against a topical, non-pronominal complement-theme.

4.3.1.5.2. Allosentences for LD of a subject

Assuming that post-verbal word order does not normally have implications for IS, any clause with a post-verbal subject qualifies as a basic word order allosentence for a clause with a subject LDC as long as the subject is not a resumptive constituent in a left-dislocation. Subordinate clauses are excluded.202 All post-verbal subjects that are main topics are also shift topics.

202. Note that there are no post-verbal pronominal subjects in 1QS.
Table 10: Topicality of post-verbal subjects in allosentences for clauses with a subject LDC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the subject the main clause topic?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Indeterminate</th>
<th>Total (Indeterminate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD Clauses with a subject LDC(^{203})</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-verbal subject allosentences(^{204})</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) where the subject is the first non-clitic constituent after the verb</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) where the subject is the second non-clitic constituent after the verb</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two biblical allusions in the subject LD allosentences with post-verbal subjects, but they do not interfere with the syntactic analysis, and so they remain in the data set described in Table 10. 1QS V.3-5 alludes to Mic 6.8, but the allusion is within an infinitive purpose clause and does not affect the clause-level syntax. 1QS VI.6-7 alludes to Josh 1.8 and Ps 1.2, but the al-

---

203. These 12 clauses occur in 1QS VI.12-13; VII.3-4, 4(a), 5(b), 8(d), 12(b), 13(a), 13-14, 14-15, 15(a), 18-19(b); IX.8-9(a).

204. Topical post-verbal subjects (3): V.18-19 (ʾyš ḥqwdš); VI.2(a) (ḥqtn) (possibly a continued stage topic ḥqwdš), VI.10 (ʾyš). Non-topical post-verbal subjects (9): 1QS II.8(a) (ʾl), 15-16 (kwł ḥwṭ ḥbryt ḥzwṭ); V.3-5 (tkwn ḥgwrl); VI.3-4 (ʾyš kwln), 6-7 (ʾyš dwrš btwrh), 11-12 (ʾyš); VI.18 (hrbym), VII.20-21 (hrbym); IX.7(b) (whgwrl). (In some of these clauses, the subject is the second post-verbal constituent rather than the first (excluding enclitic pronouns on the verb): 1QS II.15-16; VI.3-4, 6-7.) Clauses where the topicality of the post-verbal subject is indeterminate (8) occur in 1QS II.14-15 (rhw ḥsm’h), 23(a) (ʾyš); IV.15(a) (kwł ṣḥʾwtn), 20 (ʾl), 23 (rhw yʾmt ḥwīl); VI.15-16 (hkwl); VIII.23-24 (ʾyš mʾnšy ḥqwdš); IX.5-6 (ʾnšy ḥyḥd). In 1QS II.14-15 (rhw ḥsm’h), the topic is the possessive pronoun modifying the subject.
lusion is within a null relative clause modifying the subject and does not impact the clause-level syntax.

Many of the post-verbal subjects offer indeterminate data with respect to whether they are the main topic of the clause. In such cases there are multiple ways to interpret a clause, each with its own potential main topic. For example, in 1QS IV.15(a), it is possible to interpret each of three separate elements as the main topic: the entire subject of the main verb (\(kwl\) \(šb\) \(wtm\), "all their (humanity's) hosts"); the possessive pronominal modifier of the subject (-\(m\), "humanity"); and the possessive pronominal modifier of the clause-initial PP (-\(hn\), "the spirits").

(70) 1QS IV.15(a)

\(wbm\)\(mplg\)\(yn\)\(hl\)\(w\) \(kwl\) \(šb\) \(wtm\) \(ldwr\)\(wtm\)

\(CONJ\)-in-division.\(MP\)-\(PRON.3\)\(FP\) inherit.\(IMPF.3\)\(MP\) all \(host.\)\(PRON.3\)\(MP\)

through-generation.\(MP\)-\(PRON.3\)\(MP\)

And all their (humanity's) hosts will inherit their (the spirits') divisions through their (humanity's) generations.

When the indeterminate cases are set aside, a contrast is visible similar to that seen in Table 8 with respect to complement-theme LD. While all of the subject LDCs are main topics (12 out of 12 = 100%), most post-verbal subjects are not main topics (9 out of 12 = 75%).\(^{205}\) The overall significance of this comparison of subject LD clauses with their allosentences with post-

---

\(^{205}\) It is not possible to calculate a p-value when one of the categories has a count of zero. Therefore this column value was changed to 1 in order to permit the calculation, as this would skew the results in the direction of an insignificant difference. This is a highly statistically significant difference, with \(p < 0.001\).
verbal subjects will not become clear until the nature of fronting has been established. The complete set of allosentences for subject LD clauses will include (some) pre-verbal subjects if the basic word order in main clauses is SV, but not if the basic word order in main clauses is VS. Only an analysis of clauses with fronting in 1QS can hope to establish either SV or VS as the basic word order.

All 12 clauses with LD of a subject also satisfy the requirements for simplifying LD because the subjects are discourse-new. Any rhematic subject is eligible for simplifying LD. A comparison with the allosentences in 1QS that have post-verbal subjects shows that LD of a subject tends to involve rhematic subjects significantly more frequently than clauses with post-verbal subjects.  

This is shown below in Table 11.

Table 11: Rhematicity (discourse-new status) of post-verbal subjects in allosentences for clauses with a subject LDC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the subject discourse-new?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Indeterminate</th>
<th>Total (Determinate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD Clauses with a subject LDC</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-verbal subject allosentences</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20 (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

206. When the '0' entry is changed to '1', p < 0.05, indicating that there is a statistically significant difference between these two data sets.

207. These 12 clauses occur in 1QS VI.12-13; VII.3-4, 4(a), 5(b), 8(d), 12(b), 13(a), 13-14, 14-15, 15(a), 18-19(b); IX.8-9(a).

208. Discourse-old (8): 1QS II.8(a) (ʾl); IV.20 (ʾl); V.18-19 (ʾyš hqwdš); VI.15-16 (hkwl), 18 (hrbym); VII.20-21 (hrbym); VIII.23-24 (ʾyš mʾnšy hqwdš); IX.5-6 (ʾnšy hyḥd). Discourse-new and specific (6): 1QS II.14-15 (rwhw ḥšmʾh), 15-16 (kwł ḥlwt hbrtyt ḥzwt); IV.15(a) (kwł ṣbʾwtm); V.3-5 (tkwn hgwrl); VI.3-4 (ʾyš kwln), 6-7 (ʾyš dwrš ḥtwrh). Discourse-new and generic (5): 1QS II.23(a) (ʾyš); VI.2(a) (hqtn), 10 (ʾyš), 11-12 (ʾyš); IX.7(b) (whgwrł).
Subject LDCs are always rhematic (12 out of 12 = 100%), while post-verbal subjects are rhematic just about as often as not (11 out of 19 = 58%). The correlation is significant, but not quite as strong as the correlation with the features of shift topics.

4.3.1.5.3. Allosentences for LD of the modifier of a complement-theme

Only one clause in 1QS involves LD of the modifier of a complement theme (cf. (65), 1QS IV.1(b)). Unfortunately the data set is too small to make any useful comparison with a set of allosentences.

4.3.1.6. Summary of LD in 1QS

Left-dislocation in 1QS is best understood as a topic-shift-marking device. In 1QS IV.1(b), a clause occurs which utilizes resumptive pronoun topicalization in addition to its topic-shift-marking function. Resumption of the left-dislocated constituent normally uses a pronoun, but in two cases a full NP is utilized. Resumption with a null subject can also occur. There is also one structure in 1QS IX.1(b) that is similar to left-dislocation, but technically distinct, where a lamed preposition is used to mark topic shift.

__________________________

Indeterminate (1): 1QS IV.23 (rwhy ʾmt wʿwl). In 1QS IV.23 it is unclear if the subject refers back to the two spirits of 1QS III.18-19 or if it refers to non-specific, generic spirits.
4.3.2. Fronting (Preposing)

Fronting of verbal complements and adjuncts clearly occurs in 1QS.

4.3.2.1. Fronting in Texts with Biblical Parallels

The following clauses with fronted elements are dependent upon biblical quotations and allusions and have been excluded from the analysis.

Table 12: Clauses with Pre-verbal Elements that are based on Quotations and Allusions of Sacred Texts in 1QS I.1–IX.26a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Location</th>
<th>Biblical Parallel</th>
<th>Hebrew Clause</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.14</td>
<td>Deut 29:18</td>
<td>יִכְּבִּישֲרִיֲהָתָלְּבִי־אַל־[ב]</td>
<td>ky’Brien bšryrw lby ‘lk</td>
<td>Indeed, I walk in the stubbornness of my heart.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.15(b)</td>
<td>Ex 23:7</td>
<td>מַכֵּל דֵבָר שֶׁקֶר תַּחְפֹּס</td>
<td>mkwl dbr šqr trhq</td>
<td>Keep far from every false thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.14</td>
<td>Isa 40:3</td>
<td>בָּמַדְבָּר פּ[נ]ג יָדְר</td>
<td>bmdbr pnw drk ///</td>
<td>In the desert prepare the way of the Lord.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2.2. Double Fronting?

There are no unambiguous cases of two pre-verbal, fronted constituents in 1QS. Three clauses in the corpus have two pre-verbal constituents (not including complementizers and negation particles, which are invariably pre-verbal; cf. §4.2.1 and §4.2.2). These clauses occur in 1QS IV.18(b); VII.18-19(b); and VIII.21-22. Two of these clauses clearly involve left-dislocation. In VII.18-19(b), shown in example (57), the LDC precedes a subordinate conditional clause. In

---

209. Another clause with two pre-verbal constituents is found in the didactic text, in 1QS III.6–7. It consists of an adjunct locative PP followed by the subject.
VIII.21-22, shown in example (59), both of the pre-verbal constituents are LDCs in an apparent double left-dislocation structure. The other clause is in IV.18(b), shown below.

(71) 1QS IV.18(b)

וַיֵּלַע בָּרִי שְׁכֹלָה וּפַתְבוֹמָתָה בֵּבֹדוּתָּן קָשׁ קַז לְחֵיָּתָן

$w' lyt$ wb$kmt kbwdw ntn qṣ lhwt ʿwlh$

CONJ-God in-mystery.MP.CSTR understanding.MS-PRON.3MS CONJ-in-wisdom.FS.CSTR

glory.MS-PRON.3MS set.PF.3MS end.MS for-be.INF evil

And God in his mysterious understanding and in his glorious wisdom has set an end for the existence of evil.

This clause has the formal features of left-dislocation of the subject. The subject אלה, "God," is clause initial and is resumed by two pronouns within the adjunct PP that follows it, בָּרִי שְׁכֹלָה וּפַתְבוֹמָתָה בֵּבֹדוּתָּן "in the mystery of his understanding and in the wisdom of his glory." The subject of (71) has some of the functional features of LD in 1QS. Like subject LDCs, it is a shift topic; it passes the tests for aboutness and is absent from the preceding clause. However, unlike all other LDC subjects in 1QS, the subject in (71) is not rhematic, having served as the subject four clauses earlier in 1QS IV.16-17. This subject is also different from subject LDCs in 1QS in that they are more complex than the subject in (71); all include a relative clause and are at least 9 syllables in length. Left-dislocation in (71) cannot be ruled out completely, but neither is the evidence in favour of it particularly strong.

If the subject is not an LDC, it must be either a fronted constituent or a cleft constituent. The cleft reading is a very poor fit because the subject appears most likely to be the main topic of

210. Cf. Table 5 and Table 42 above.
this clause, and cleft constituents must be non-topics. Further, there is nothing topical about the remainder of the clause once the subject is removed.

If the subject has been fronted, then there are two fronted constituents in this clause, because the PP following the subject finds its normal position after the verb. Assuming that the subject is the main topic, the fronted PP needs to be a contrastive constituent, a restrictive constituent, or an informational focus. The contrastive reading is awkward because there is no contrast set for "[God's] mysterious understanding and his glorious wisdom." It would not be useful to emphasize that God used his own wisdom and not someone else's, or that he performed this action in his wisdom rather than in his foolishness. Likewise, there is no salient set from which to select the PP as a restrictive constituent, because there is no alternative to God's understanding and wisdom that can be used in this clause. Reading this PP as an informational focus is also awkward because the informative aspect of this clause is that an end has been set for the existence of evil. It is unlikely that the audience had the prior knowledge that God had set an end for the existence of evil, but did not know that he had done it with his understanding and wisdom.

The only possibility that remains is that the pre-verbal PP in example (71) modifies the subject rather than the verb, so that the full subject should be translated "God [who is] in his mysterious understanding and his glorious wisdom." From a syntactic perspective, this reading is less likely, but not impossible, while from an IS perspective, this reading is the best fit. If this is the correct reading, example (71) is either a case of simple fronting of the subject as a shift topic (assuming basic VS order) or a basic word order clause (assuming basic SV order).
None of the possible interpretations of 1QS IV.18(b) are convincing enough to label this clause with confidence as an example of double fronting. In sum, there is little evidence for multiple fronting in 1QS, because in both clauses that clearly contain two pre-verbal constituents (1QS VII.18-19(b); VIII.21-22), the first constituent is an LDC.

4.3.2.3. Complement Fronting

4.3.2.3.1. VO vs. OV order

As mentioned in §2.2.4, the expected position for a complement of the verb in HPH is post-verbal. This is confirmed by the frequency and distribution data in the 1QS corpus. There are 115 verbal complements in finite verb clauses in 1QS, of which 14 are pre-verbal, for a pre-verbal rate of 14 out of 115 (12.2%) for verbal complements.211

The distribution of verbal complements with respect to subordinate clauses and specific complementizers points in the same direction. Post-verbal complements occur in a wider variety of contexts, so the basic position for a complement is more likely to be post-verbal.

211. One clause with a fronted complement is a biblical quotation, so I have removed it from the corpus. The fronted complement in the subordinate clause in 1QS II.12 quotes Ezek 14.4,7 (Lange and Weigold 2011: 268). 1QS II.1* alludes to Isa 63.7 (Lange and Weigold 2011: 268), but it changes the syntax substantially, so I have retained it in the corpus. The clause in 1QS III.21 alludes to Prov 2.13 (Lange and Weigold 2011: 268), but the syntax has been changed, so I have retained it in the corpus. 1QS V.12-13 alludes to Ezek 24.8 and Ezra 9.14 (Lange and Weigold 2011: 268), but the allusions are within a subordinate infinitive clause and are thereby removed from the clause-level syntax, so I have retained it in the corpus.
Table 13: Verbal Complements in Finite Verb Clauses of the 1QS Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Clauses</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Clauses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pre-verbal complements in main clauses (11) occur in 1QS II.1*; III.20, 21; III.26–IV.1*; IV.1(a), 1(c), 15(a), 15(b); V.12-13, 19(b); VI.1-2; IX.24(a), 24(b), 25(a)*, 25(c)*. Pre-verbal complements in subordinate clauses (3) occur in 1QS IV.22; VII.5-6(a), 6. Fragmentary main clauses with pre-verbal complements (4) occur in 1QS II.1*; III.26–IV.1*; IX.25(a), 25(c). Post-verbal complements in main clauses (74) occur in 1QS I.11-13 (2x), 16-18; II.5-6, 6-7, 8(a), 9, 15-16, 16-17, 17, 19-20, 21-23; III.15, 16, 17, 17-18, 18, 25(a), 25(b); IV.1(a), 1(c), 17, 18-19, 20, 20-21, 21-22, 24(a), 24(c), 24(d), 24-25; V.7-8, 8-10, 13, 16-17, 18-19, 20-22, 23; VI.26– VII.1; VI.1; VI.2(a), 3-4, 4(b), 4-6, 6-7, 7-8, 11-12, 13-14, 14-15, 15, 15-16, 16-17, 17(b), 18, 18-20, 20(a), 20-21, 21, 21-22(b), 24-25(b), 25; VII.6-7, 15-16, 17(b), 19-20, 20(a), 22-24; VIII.11-12(a), 16-17, 18(a), 18-19, 21-22, 23-24, 24-25; IX.7(a), 8-9(a). Post-verbal complements in subordinate clauses (27) occur in 1QS IV.16-17, 18(a), 25; V.4-5, 10, 11(a), 14, 15(a), 16, 19(b), 20, 22, 26(b); VI.1, 4-5, 14, 17(a), 25-26; VII.4(b), 5(a), 9, 13(c), 17(c); VIII.20, 22; IX.8-9(b), 10-11(b). Post-verbal complements in fragmentary main clauses (5) occur in 1QS II.1*; IV.25-26*; IV.26*; VI.27–VII.1*; IX.25(b)*. Post-verbal complements in fragmentary subordinate clauses (3) occur in 1QS VI.27(b)*; VII.24-25*; VIII.15*. These subordinate clauses (23) occur in 1QS V.4-5, 10, 11(a), 14, 15(a), 16, 19(b), 20, 22; VI.1, 4-5, 14, 17(a), 25-26; VII.4(b), 5(a), 9, 13(c), 17(c); VIII.20, 22; IX.8-9(b), 10-11(b). None of these clauses demonstrate evidence of syntactic influence from biblical quotations or allusions. Three fragmentary subordinate clause alloSentences occur in 1QS VI.27(b)*; VII.24-25*; VIII.15*. Four of these clauses are subordinate clauses: 1QS IV.16-17, 18(a), 25; V.26(b).
Table 14: Distribution of Verbal Complements with Complementizers in the 1QS corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אם</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אשר</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[null relative]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אז</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>גם</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כיא</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

214. Post-verbal: 1QS V.10, 14-15(a), 16, 19(a), 22; VI.17(a), 25-26; VII.4(b), 9, 13(c); VIII.20, 22; IX.8-9(b), 10-11(b). There are also fragmentary אשר-clauses with post-verbal complements in 1QS VI.27(c)*; VII.24-25*; VIII.15*.
217. Post-verbal: 1QS VI.1 (2x), 17(b).
218. Pre-verbal: 1QS IV.22. Post-verbal: 1QS IV.16-17, 25; V.11(a), 15(a), 20, 26(b).
Table 15: Distribution of Complement-themes with Complementizers in the 1QS corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אתה</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אשר</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[null relative]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כיא</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Total</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Word order typology also suggests that VO is the unmarked order, because in HPH heads generally precede their complements (cf. §2.2.4).

4.3.2.3.2. IS features of fronted complements in 1QS

Comparing the pragmatics of objects and complements in VO clauses with the pragmatics of objects and complements in OV clauses confirms that VO is the unmarked order in the 1QS corpus.

220. Post-verbal: 1QS V.10, 16, 19(a), 22; VI.17(a); VII.4(b), 9, 13(c); VIII.22; IX.8-9(b), 10-11(b). There are also fragmentary רבי-ן-clauses with post-verbal complement-themes in 1QS VI.27(c)*; VII.24-25*; VIII.15*.
221. Pre-verbal: 1QS II.12 (removed from the corpus due to dependence upon Ezek 14:4, 7). Post-verbal: 1QS VII.5.
223. Post-verbal: 1QS VI.1, 17(b).
224. Pre-verbal: 1QS IV.22. Post-verbal: 1QS IV.16-17, 25; V.26(b).
In clauses with Complement-Verb order, the pre-verbal complements demonstrate features associated with fronting that are generally not present when complements follow the verb.

The evidence suggests that fronted complements in 1QS are fronted for one of five motivations: (1) marking a shift topic; (2) contrast marking; (3) restrictiveness marking; (4) creating a cleft sentence; and (5) permitting the focus constituent to occur in clause-final position. The features of clauses with fronted complements are listed below in Table 16.
Table 16: Pre-verbal Complements in the 1QS Prose Corpus

*italic text* = subordinate clause

**bold text** = most likely interpretation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Contrast</th>
<th>Restrictiveness</th>
<th>Non-Topic</th>
<th>Poetic Parallelism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.1*</td>
<td>no</td>
<td><strong>yes</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.20</td>
<td>no</td>
<td><strong>yes</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.21</td>
<td>no</td>
<td><strong>yes</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.26–IV.1*</td>
<td>no</td>
<td><strong>yes</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.1(a)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td><strong>yes (final focus)</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.1(c)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td><strong>yes (final focus)</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.15(a)</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td><strong>yes (cleft)</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.15(b)</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td><strong>yes (cleft)</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.22</td>
<td><strong>no</strong></td>
<td><strong>yes</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.12-13</td>
<td>no</td>
<td><strong>yes</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.19(b)</td>
<td><strong>shift topic</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.1-2</td>
<td><strong>shift topic</strong></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.5-6(a)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.6</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.24(a)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td><strong>yes (final focus)</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.24(b)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td><strong>yes (cleft)</strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.25(a)*</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>improbable</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>*<em>yes (cleft)</em></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.25(c)*</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>improbable</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>*<em>yes (final focus)</em></td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4 (+ 2 frag.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 (+ 2 frag.)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shift Topics

Two of the clauses demonstrate no features related to fronting other than the topicality of the fronted complement, and it is reasonable to conclude that these complements have been marked as topics. Both of them are shift topics. One of them is provided below as an example.

(72) 1QS V.19(b)

And all who discard his word he will destroy from the world.

This topic is new to the discourse, but because it is identifiable, it is eligible to be a shift topic.

Contrast Marking

Three main clauses and one subordinate clause have fronted contrastive complements that are not topics. 1QS V.12-13 provides an example.

225. These clauses are in 1QS V.19(b); VI.1-2.
226. These clauses occur in 1QS III.20, 21; IV.22; V.12-13. The clause in 1QS IV.22 is a subordinate clause. Two fragmentary main clauses with fronted contrastive non-topic complements occur in 1QS II.1*; III.26–IV.1*.
And the revealed things they do with uplifted hand, resulting in the arising of anger, in judgment, and in the taking of vengeance: in the curses of the covenant; resulting in bringing against them great judgments for complete destruction to the (point of the) non-existence of a remnant.

In this clause, the fronted complement הָנְגָלְתָּה, "the revealed things," contrasts with הָנְסָרְתָה, "the hidden things," in 1QS V.11.

A contrastive element will contrast with an item that is explicitly mentioned in the preceding discourse, as in example (73). The fronted complements in 1QS III.20, 21 ("paths of light," "paths of darkness") are fronted in order to contrast them with one another. Thus, the first fronted complement is forward-looking, while the second is backward-looking, in order to contrast with the other member of the contrast set.227

227. This also occurs in 1QS III.26–IV.1*. The fronted complement תַּחַת constrasts with the fronted modifier תַּחַת in 1QS IV.1(b). See §2.4.3 for an explanation of contrast within the f-structure theoretical framework.
(74) 1QS III.20

যিলছে ওয়ার যথহলম

bdʁkʏ ’wr yṯlkw
in-path.MP.CSTR light walk.IMPF.3MP
They walk in paths of light.

(75) 1QS III.21

ষয়োছে ওয়ার যথহলম

wbdrkʏ ḥwʃk yṯlkw
CONJ-in-path.MP.CSTR darkness walk.IMPF.3MP
And they walk in paths of darkness.

Contrastive elements are exclusive, meaning that the statement is not true for other elements from the contrast set. Contrastive elements must also be selected from an available set that is mentioned explicitly in the discourse, ideally in the preceding discourse, but often in HPH, in the discourse that closely follows. Contrast sets cannot be derived from the world of shared experience.

Another example of a fronted contrastive element occurs in 1QS II.1*.

(76) 1QS II.1*

রহমত হস্তর [গ্রিয়ে যুলন মুযলম ওয়ে যুলম]

wrḥmy ḥṣdw [g]ml ’lynw m’wlm w’d ‘wlm
CONJ-compassion.MP mercy.MS-PRON.3MS [sh]ow.PF.3M to-PRON.1P from-forever.MS
CONJ-until forever.MS
But he [sh]owed to us his merciful compassions from forever until forever.

The fronted complement, "his merciful compassions," is a contrary-to-expectation element in the clause. The expected response to sins is judgment and punishment, but the speakers explain that instead they received merciful compassion. The preceding discourse for this clause is only fragmentarily preserved, so it is not clear if a contrastive constituent is mentioned in the
preceding discourse. The word מָשָׁט, "his judgment," which is preserved in 1QS I.26, serves as the rejected element of the contrastive set.

Given that example (76) ends a section of direct speech, a possible alternative explanation is that this is a use of word order inversion to create a higher poetic style that ends a discourse segment. However, since the contrastive explanation is effective, there is no need to appeal to this explanation.

*Restrictiveness Marking*

Two clauses in 1QS VII.5-6(a), 6 demonstrate the fronting of a restrictive element. Both of these occur in subordinate clauses. In these clauses, the "contrast" is with something implicit that is not mentioned in the discourse. This is not technically "contrast" within Erteschik-Shir's model, but is properly termed "restrictiveness." Restrictive elements, unlike contrastive elements, may draw from shared knowledge and experience to establish a set from which they are selected. Their "contrast" with the non-selected set is not exclusive, such that other members of that set may also satisfy the claim of the restrictive clause.²²⁸ ¹QS VII.5-6(a) and VII.6²²⁹ are shown below.

(77) 1QS VII.5-6(a)

\[
\text{w'm br'h ytrmh} \\
\text{CONJ-if (in)-comrade deceive.IMPF.3MS} \\
\text{And if he deceived a comrade}
\]

²²⁸ Cf. §2.4.3.
²²⁹ See note 569 in the appendix regarding the text of 1QS VII.6.
1QS VII.6

And if he deceived in the wealth of the Yahad resulting in its loss

The different cases classifying potential types of "deception" (the precise meaning of שחרמה is unknown) are not necessarily exclusive and are not selected from a contrast set available from the discourse, and so they are best classified as restrictive rather than contrastive.

Cleft Sentences

Three of the clauses with a fronted non-topic fit well with the information structure framework expected of a cleft sentence.\(^{230}\) In these clauses the fronted cleft constituent reads well as the informational focus, while the cleft clause makes good sense as the topic. Two consecutive clauses in 1QS IX.24-25 illustrate this structure well, although the second of the two is partially fragmentary.

\(^{230}\) These occur in 1QS IV.15(a), 15(b); IX.24(b). There is also a fragmentary cleft sentence in 1QS IX.25(a)*. Whether these examples of "cleft sentences" are interpreted as clefts or as fronted informational foci is up to the discretion of the reader. The cleft reading fits better within Erteschik-Shir's assumptions, but the informational foci reading is simpler in the sense that the Qumran Hebrew "cleft" is not marked by any explicit grammatical structure to distinguish it from fronting. The examples that read well as clefts and those that read well as fronted informational foci are essentially identical.
(79) 1QS IX.24(b)

 uomo ʾråny ḥṣ ḫlw
 CONJ-only will.MS God to-PRON.3MS desire.IMPF.3MS
 And he will desire only the will of God for him.

(80) 1QS IX.25(a)*

 wkwʾ lʾmry ḫw ṣrw
 [conj-with-al] word.MP mouth.MS-PRON.3MS be_pleased.IMPF.3MS
 [And] he will be pleased [with al]l the words of his mouth.

In (79), the cleft constituent is the verbal complement ṭlw ʾråny ḥṣ ḫlw, "only the will of God for him." The topic is the combination of the verb and the null subject, יתפכ, "he shall desire". This concept is established as a topic by the introductory clause in 1QS IX.21, בְּבּוֹכָל אָמָרְי פִּיו מִדֶּרֶך, "These are the precepts of the way for the Instructor in these times, with respect to his loving as well as his hating." The same analysis applies to (80), where the cleft constituent is the null subject and verb combination יָרֶצֶה, "he shall take pleasure (in)".

The presence of the cleft structure is more ambiguous in two consecutive clauses in IV.15, but when alternative options are considered, the cleft reading remains the most felicitous one. One of these cleft clauses is provided above in example (70), and it is repeated again here along with the cleft clause that follows it and one clause that precedes it.
In these are the generations of all the sons of man. And all their (humanity's) hosts inherit their (the spirits') divisions through their (humanity's) generations. And in their paths they walk.

All three clauses in (81) communicate the same basic idea: that everyone's fate is bound up with the spirits. The first clause is a copula clause, where the predicate has been fronted ahead of the subject. The topic of this clause can be taken as the subject, התולדות כל בן איש, "the generations of all the sons of man." The PP בְּלָה, "in these (the spirits)," is best taken as the informational focus, the non-topic portion of the clause. It has most likely been fronted as a non-topic (which is, in this case, equivalent to the informational focus of the clause). The two subsequent clauses have the same structure: the informational focus is fronted, and the remaining portion of the clause, the cleft clause, is the topic.

231. A similar sequence of three clauses with fronted adjuncts occurs in 1QS III.25-26.
A contrastive interpretation of these fronted complements depends upon the existence of some alternative to the spirits as the salient element in these statements (e.g. as the location of the inheritance of the hosts of the sons of man, etc.). There is a reasonable argument to be made for this reading, but it seems more likely to me that the intention is simply to assert that the spirits direct the inheritance of humankind, rather than set the spirits against some other entity that performs this task. If there were a foil to the spirits presented in the treatise, then the repeated emphasis of the contrast would be more plausible. As it stands, a simple emphasis on the assertion itself that the spirits control human destiny seems more likely.

I will also mention that the repetition of three clauses in succession with similar structure has a poetic (parallelistic) aspect. However, in these clauses from 1QS, information structure motivations for fronting are still present. This is not necessarily the case in 1QM.

Clause-final Attentive Focus

The other three clauses with a fronted non-topic seem to have been moved from an original clause-final position in order to permit attentive focus to fall on the new clause-final element. The motivations for fronting are still present. Two examples come from 1QS IV.1.

(82) 1QS IV.1(a)

\[wbkwl \ ʿlwytyh \ yrṣh \ ʿl’d\]

**CONJ**-in-all deed.**FP-PRON.3FS** be_pleased.**IMPF.3MS** to-forever

And in all its (the one spirit's) deeds he will be pleased forever.

232. These occur in 1QS IV.1(a), I(c); IX.24(a). There is also a fragmentary clause with clause-final attentive focus in 1QS IX.25(c)*.
And all its (the other spirit's) paths he hates forever.

The basic word order for (82) would place the complement last, because this order maximizes the ratio of IC's to non-IC's in the CRD of the vP (cf. §2.3 and §4.4). However, the most natural position for a constituent in attentive focus is the clause-final position. The fronting of a non-top-ic is apparently used to leave the short temporal phrase in clause-final position where it is happier to accept attentive focus (stress) marking. The same analysis applies to (83). Examples (84) and (85) also illustrate this phenomenon, although example (85) is fragmentary.

And he willingly accepts all that is done against him.

Alternative explanations for these clauses with final attentive focus, as with many of the clauses with fronted complements, involve poetic paralellism. As can be seen in Table 16, clauses with fronted complements in 1QS tend to occur in clusters. This may signify that a fronted comple-
ment is interpreted as a clause with a high literary style, and thus the use of fronted complements in parallel clauses may be a technique used to shift into a higher literary register. Nevertheless, the information structure patterns of these clauses are interpretable without recourse to a poetic explanation, and the repetition of a clause pattern does not obviate the information structure characteristics of the component clauses.

In sum, fronted complements may be shift topics, contrastive constituents, restrictive constituents, or non-topics. Non-topics may be cleft constituents (indicating that the remainder of the clause is the topic) or simply non-topics that are fronted to permit another constituent to occur last and receive attentive focus. It should be noted that clauses with fronted complements often occur in clusters, which may indicate that the poetic register is associated with the use of fronted complements. The data from 1QM argue more strongly than the data from 1QS in favor of the latter conclusion. The table below summarizes the features of pre-verbal complements in the corpus.

Table 17: IS Features of Pre-verbal Complements in the 1QS Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IS Feature</th>
<th>Main Clauses</th>
<th></th>
<th>Subordinate Clauses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Fragmentary</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
<td>Non-Fragmentary</td>
<td>Fragmentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAF</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2.3.3. Allosentences: IS features of post-verbal complements in 1QS

The allosentences for the clauses with fronted complements in 1QS are clauses with post-verbal complements and no other fronted constituents. All clauses with fronted complements have only one pre-verbal constituent (the fronted complement), and the allosentences must be identical to the clauses with fronted complements in every respect except for the presence of the fronted complement in order to be a minimal pair. The exclusion on pre-verbal constituents in the allosentences includes LDC’s, since there is no left-dislocation in the clauses with fronted complements.

There are 101 post-verbal complements of a finite verb in 1QS.233 Forty-nine of these occur in clauses with a pre-verbal subject, complement, or adjunct,234 leaving 52 eligible post-verbal complements which create allosentences for the 14 clauses with pre-verbal complements.

Pre-verbal complements can be grouped into five categories based on their IS features, as outlined above: shift topics, contrastive constituents, restrictive constituents, non-topic clefts, and non-topics that shift the clause-final attentive focus. It is possible to identify allosentences for each of these categories except for the restrictive constituents.

__________________________

233. This figure does not include six clauses that depend on biblical quotations and allusions, which occur in 1QS II.2-3, 3(a), 3(b), 3(c), 4, 16 (Lange and Weigold 2011: 268).

234. These clauses (49) occur in 1QS I.11-13 (2x), 16-18; II.19-20, 21-23; III.15, 16, 17, 17-18, 25(a), 25(b); IV.1(a), 1(c), 16-17, 18(a), 18-19, 24(c), 24(d), 24-25, 25; V.7-8, 20-22, 26(b); VI.3-4, 4(b), 4-6, 7-8, 11-12, 13-14, 14-15, 15-16, 16-17, 17(b), 18, 18-20, 21, 21-22(b), 24-25(b); VII.6-7, 15-16, 17(b), 19-20, 20(a), 22-24; VIII.11-12(a), 16-17, 21-22; IX.7(a), 8-9(a). Fragmentary examples (3) occur in 1QS II.1*; IV.25-26*; VI.27–VII.1*. Four of these clauses are subordinate clauses: 1QS IV.16-17, 18(a), 25; V.26(b).
An allosentence for a clause with a pre-verbal shift topic is a clause with a post-verbal shift topic. There is one constituent in 1QS that can arguably be considered a post-verbal shift topic, and it occurs in 1QS VI.6-7. The constituent is in a place where the ten are present."

(86) 1QS VI.6-7
An allosentence for a clause with a pre-verbal contrastive constituent is a clause with a post-verbal contrastive constituent. Post-verbal contrastive constituents are extremely rare, suggesting that nearly all or possibly all contrastive constituents are fronted to a pre-verbal position. The only example of a post-verbal contrastive complement that I located in the HPH corpus occurs in 1QS VI.20(a). Here the contrast is with a constituent that follows rather than one that precedes, so this definition of "contrast" deviates from that put forward by Erteschik-Shir in one respect. The post-verbal constituent, "in his hand (authority)," referencingidée המברק, "the overseer," in 1QS VI.20(a) contrasts with על הרבים, "upon (the authority of) the many," which is fronted in the subsequent clause.

235. This is not true for restrictive constituents, which are much more common.
An allosentence for a clause with a fronted restrictive constituent is a clause with a post-verbal constituent that could be construed as restrictive. Judging whether a post-verbal complement has the "restrictiveness" feature is a difficult and relatively subjective determination because the contrast set is not present in the discourse, but only in the shared conceptual universe of author and audience. The subjective nature of this determination may be an argument against including fronted constituents with the restrictiveness feature as evidence for IS-motivated fronting at all. However, I argue that it is normally possible to identify restrictive allosentences by asking the question, "Is there some unnamed alternative set of constituents within the reasonable expectation to be included in place of the constituent in question?" In my judgment, the answer to that question is often "no." Perhaps this is due to the repetitive nature of these texts, or perhaps it results from the expectations of the shared conceptual universe of the authors and audiences of these texts. However, frequently the answer is yes, and an argument can be made for excluding these clauses from the evidence.

Surprisingly, including pre-verbal constituents with the restrictiveness feature as evidence of IS-motivated fronting sometimes decreases the statistical significance of the data in favour of IS-motivated fronting. This is because often there are more post-verbal constituents with the re-
strictiveness feature than pre-verbal constituents. For example, this is true for complements in 1QS.

An allosentence for a clause with a pre-verbal non-topic cleft is a clause with a post-verbal non-topic constituent that is the only non-topic in the clause. In a cleft sentence, the entire clause must be topical with the exception of the pre-verbal cleft constituent. In an allosentence for a cleft sentence, the entire clause must be topical with the exception of one post-verbal constituent. Allosentences for cleft sentences with adjunct clefts can be found outside 1QS, in 1QM. An example from 1QM VIII.2-3 is shown below. In the context of a text that outlines various battle positions, the only non-topic information in this clause is the post-verbal adjunct המשורבה הרמאשותה, "along the first battle line." The idea that they are going to station themselves at their positions is already known from the preceding context.

(88) 1QM VIII.2-3

באו ללד המשורבה הרמאשותה לתחייב על מעמד

\text{wb w lyd hm rkh hr yšwnh lhtyś b l m mdm}

\text{CONJ-go.pf.3p to-hand ART-battle_line.FS ART-first.FS to-station.oneself.INF upon position-PRON.3MP}

And they shall go along the first battle line to station themselves at their positions.

An allosentence for a clause with a fronted non-topic that shifts the clause-final attentive focus is a clause with a penultimate constituent that could be reasonably interpreted as an attentive focus.

With the exception of pronominal subjects (cf. 1QS III.17-18), there is no evidence that continued topics are fronted in the HPH corpus. Therefore, clauses with a post-verbal continued
topic are included with the group of clauses where there is no evidence of an IS feature that motivates fronting.

The features of complements in the set of allosentences for clauses in prose 1QS with pre-verbal complements are shown below.

Table 18: Allosentences for clauses with fronted complements in the prose 1QS corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subordinate Clauses</th>
<th>Main Clauses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relevant comparison with the set of 52 allosentences involves the ratio between the number of clauses where the post-verbal complement evidences a feature that can directly motivate fronting and those where it does not evidence such a feature.

Of the 52 allosentences, 23 are subordinate clauses.\(^{236}\) Of the three pre-verbal complements in subordinate clauses, one is contrastive and two are restrictive.\(^{237}\) The post-verbal complements

\(^{236}\) These subordinate clauses (23) occur in 1QS V.4-5, 10, 11(a), 14, 15(a), 16, 19(b), 20, 22; VI.1, 4-5, 14, 17(a), 25-26; VII.4(b), 5(a), 9, 13(c), 17(c); VIII.20, 22; IX.8-9(b), 10-11(b). None of these clauses demonstrate evidence of syntactic influence from biblical quotations or allusions. Three fragmentary subordinate clause allosentences occur in 1QS VI.27(b)*; VII.24-25*; VIII.15*.

\(^{237}\) The contrastive pre-verbal complement occurs in 1QS IV.22. The restrictive pre-verbal
plements in the 23 allosentences include three continued topics, four restrictive complements, and sixteen with no IS-related features.\textsuperscript{238} The small number of pre-verbal complements means that there is not enough data to analyze statistically to make a conclusion about the nature of fronting in subordinate clauses. Table 19 below compares pre-verbal and post-verbal complements in subordinate clauses in 1QS.

Table 19: Pre-verbal and Post-verbal complements in 1QS Subordinate Clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 29 main clauses with post-verbal complements, 12 have a complement that is the topic of the clause. Eleven of these are continued topics and one is a shift topic.\textsuperscript{239} None of the

\textsuperscript{238} The three continued topics occur in 1QS V.14-15(a), 15(a); VIII.20. The four restrictive complements occur in 1QS VI.17(a); VII.5(a), 9; VIII.22. The allosentences with complements that have no IS-related features related to fronting (16) occur in 1QS V.4-5, 10, 11(a), 16, 19(b), 20, 22; VI.1, 4-5, 14, 25-26; VII.4(b), 13(c), 17(c); IX.8-9(b), 10-11(b). Three fragmentary allosentences with no IS-related features occur in 1QS VI.27(b)\textsuperscript{*}; VII.24-25*; VIII.15*. Note that the clause-final complement in 1QS V.16 violates the EICT and is in attentive focus position (cf. example (111)).

\textsuperscript{239} The post-verbal complement topics (12) occur in 1QS II.5-6, 8(a), 15-16; III.18; IV.17; V.23; VI.6-7, 15, 20(a); VIII.18(a), 18-19, 23-24. The topic in 1QS VI.6-7 is less certain, in that the post-verbal complement is a locative PP. The post-verbal shift topic complement occurs in 1QS VI.6-7. The other eleven post-verbal topic complements are continued topics.
post-verbal complements are contrastive. Allosentences do occur for cleft constituent complements, non-topic complements fronted to change the constituent in clause-final attentive focus, and for fronted restrictive complements. Allosentences for clefts (2): 1QS II.17; VI.25. Allosentences for clause-final attentive focus (4): 1QS II.6-7; V.8-10, 18-19; V.26–VI.1. Two of these have large final constituents that would not normally be fronted due to their length: 1QS II.6-7; V.8-10. Allosentences for restrictives (8): 1QS II.16-17; IV.20, 20-21, 21-22; V.16-17; VI.2(a), 20-21; VIII.24-25. Allosentences with no IS features (3): 1QS II.9; IV.24(a); V.13. Fragmentary allosentences occur in 1QS IV.26* (allosentence for a fronted restrictive complement); IX.25(b)* (allosentence for a clause with fronting to permit clause-final attentive focus).

The pre-verbal complements in 1QS IV.22; VII.5-6(a), and 6 are not represented in this table because these are subordinate clauses.

Table 20: The best interpretations of main clauses with fronted complements and the relevant allosentences, where complements have features that could motivate direct fronting of the complement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-final Attentive Focus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: The best interpretations of main clauses with fronted complements and the relevant allosentences, where complements do not have features that could motivate direct fronting of the complement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No IS Features</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22 summarizes the relevant figures for statistical analysis.

**Table 22: Comparison of main clauses with pre-verbal complements with their allosentences.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic / Contrast / Cleft / Clause-final attentive focus / Restrictiveness</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic / No IS Features</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This evidence cannot be analyzed statistically because one of the categories has no data (pre-verbal complements with no features of IS-motivated fronting). The presence of a zero in one category renders statistical calculations impossible. This only supports the hypothesis more strongly, of course, because all pre-verbal complements exhibit an IS feature that could motivate fronting. A statistical calculation can be approximated by substituting a "one" for the "zero." When this is done, the evidence is statistically significant in favour of IS-motivated fronting of complements in main clauses in 1QS.242

It should be noted that none of the 11 pre-verbal complements are "light prepositional phrases." A light PP is a monosyllabic combination of a preposition and an enclitic pronoun. Light PPs are sometimes analyzed as phonological clitics to the end of a finite verb. Since there are no pre-verbal light PPs, it cannot be known if these lexemes are restricted from the option of being fronted due to their clitic status. To be conservative, it is worth performing a calculation

242. For this comparison, p < 0.05.
with the light PPs removed from the set of allosentences. There are two light PP complements in 1QS.243

An additional conservative step is to remove simple pronominal complements that are enclitic to the verb from the calculation as well. In Biblical Hebrew, the allosentence for a clause with an enclitic complement would be one where the pronoun cliticizes to a clause-initial definite object marker rather than to the finite verb. The use of the definite object marker with an enclitic pronoun is rare in Qumran Hebrew, and when it does occur, it does not usually mark the complement of a finite verb. Most of its uses in HPH mark the complement of an infinitive or a participle.244 Its use with a finite verb is much more common in Biblical Hebrew. The movement away from this construction with a finite verb may be influencing the absence of pre-verbal complements that are pronominal. Therefore, it is worth checking the calculation when allosentences with enclitic pronouns as verbal complements are removed. There are four allosentences with an enclitic pronoun complement of the finite verb in 1QS.245

All of the allosentences with complements that are light PPs or enclitic pronouns are continued topics, so six continued topics need to be removed from the post-verbal data. The adjusted figures are shown in Table 23.

243. These occur in 1QS II.15-16 (דע) and III.18 (תב).
244. There is one definite object marker with an enclitic pronoun in 1QS (1QS V.18), which marks the complement of an infinitive.
245. These occur in 1QS V.23; VI.15, 20(a); VIII.18-19. A fragmentary example occurs in 1QS IV.26*. 
Table 23: Comparison of clauses with pre-verbal complements with their allosentences once enclitic pronoun complements and light PPs are removed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic / Contrast / Cleft / Clause-final attentive focus / Restrictiveness</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic / No IS Features</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, these data can only be analyzed statistically if a "one" is substituted for the zero. When this is done, the data are no longer statistically significant.\(^{246}\) The odds of a statistical correlation are only about 91%, where 95% certainty is necessary for statistical significance.

In sum, the evidence for complement fronting on the basis of IS features in the 1QS corpus is mixed. There is a statistically significant correlation in favor of IS-motivated fronting when light PP and enclitic pronoun complements are included in the set of allosentences, but not when they are excluded. Nevertheless, it is important to bear in mind that every pre-verbal complement has one of the IS features that is suspected to motivate fronting; in other words, there is no evidence that a complement can precede a finite verb without possessing at least one of these features.

4.3.2.4. Adjunct Fronting

The criteria of frequency and distribution indicate that the basic position for adjuncts is post-verbal. However, temporal adjuncts favour pre-verbal positions to an exceptional degree. This is

\(^{246}\) For this comparison, 0.05 < p < 0.1.
almost certainly due to their tendency to be fronted as stage topics (see below). For this reason, temporal adjuncts will be treated separately.

4.3.2.4.1. Temporal adjuncts

The clause-initial temporal phrases in the 1QS corpus are listed in Table A6. As would be expected for temporal phrases, these adjuncts do not have contrastive or restrictive features. In some cases, a contrastive reading is possible, but it is almost never necessary. The most likely explanation for the clause-initial position of these phrases is that they are stage topics.

In order to understand the significance of these temporal phrases, it is useful to view them in the context of all temporal phrases in 1QS I.1–IX.26a, including those that occur in clauses without finite verbs. All temporal phrases and words in 1QS are listed in Table A7. In the World Atlas of Language Structures, Dryer comments on temporal expressions when discussing the order of Object, Oblique, and Verb as follows: "... in many languages [temporal expressions] exhibit positional properties different from other obliques, often occurring at the beginning of the clause" (Haskelmat et al., 2005: 342). In an information structure analysis, this cross-linguistic phenomenon can be understood in terms of the fronting of a stage topic because temporal phrases are often stage topics. In the Hebrew of 1QS, temporal phrases are not always clause-initial. However, certain types of temporal phrases are always clause-initial, and this correlation is likely due to the tendency for certain types of prepositional phrases to function as stage topics, while other types are less likely to function as stage topics.
Of the 47 temporal phrases in 1QS that occur in non-fragmentary clauses, three phrases occur in subordinate clauses,⁴⁷ leaving 44 phrases that occur in non-fragmentary main clauses.

Table 24: Meanings and Positions of Temporal Phrases in Main Clauses in 1QS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clause-initial</th>
<th>Non-clause-initial</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before/After/When</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During/While</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Until/Forever/Again</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twenty-two of these 44 temporal phrases are clause-initial.⁴⁸ Nineteen of 20 temporal phrases that refer to an instantaneous point in time, whether absolute time or relative time, are clause-initial.⁴⁹ These clause-initial phrases indicate that some event will take place either at the point in time when some condition is met or immediately before or after that moment. Eleven of these phrases use the ב, 'in'-type preposition;⁵⁰ four use the adverb ʾḥr, meaning "afterwards";⁵¹

---

²⁴⁷ Temporal phrases occur in subordinate clauses in 1QS I.17-18; V.26; VII.22-24.
²⁴⁸ Clause-initial temporal phrases (23) can be found in 1QS I.18-19; II.12-13; III.15, 16; IV.18-19, 23; V.20-22; VI.4-7, 11-12, 15-16, 16-17, 18, 21; VII.19-20, 20(a), 20-21, 21(b); VIII.10-11, 12-14, 19a; IX.2, 3-5, 5-6. Included in this list are three "during" phrases (1QS VI.11-12; VII.19-20, 20a) and one deictic "until" phrase (1QS IV.23). 1QS I.18-19 uses a copular verb, and 1QS IX.3-5 uses an infinitive.
²⁴⁹ Temporal phrases referring to an absolute or relative point in time (20) can be found in 1QS I.18-19; II.12-13; III.15, 16; IV.18-19(a); V.20-22; VI.4-7, 10, 15-16, 16-17, 18, 21; VII.20-21, 21(b); VIII.10-11, 12-14, 19; IX.2, 3-5, 5-6. The one temporal phrase that is not clause-initial is a subordinate clause that modifies a main clause finite verb (cf. 1QS VI.10).
²⁵⁰ Cf. 1QS I.18-19; III.16; IV.18-19; VI.16-17, 18, 21; VII.20-21; VIII.10-11, 12-14; IX.3-5, 5-6.
²⁵¹ Cf. 1QS VI.15-16; VII.21(c); VIII.19; IX.2.
one uses \(ky\)', meaning "when";\(^{252}\) one uses \(lpny\), meaning "before";\(^{253}\) and two use a \(whyh\) clause, which can literally be translated "and it will happen when."\(^{254}\) Whether these \(whyh\) clauses are in fact separate clauses or are part of the modified clauses that follow is beyond the scope of this study, but they do precede the clause with which the temporal reference is concerned. An example of a clause-initial temporal phrase that references an instantaneous point in time is provided below.

(89) 1QS III.15

\[
lwpny\; hywtm\; hky\; kwl\; mh\text{šbtm}
\]

And before they came to be, he ordained all of their thoughts.

The only temporal phrase that references an instantaneous point in time but is not clause-initial uses the \(trm\) (\(ṭ\rm\)), "before," preposition to introduce a subordinate clause with a finite verb (cf. 1QS VI.10 below).

(90) 1QS VI.10

\[
l\; ydbr\; \ʾy\; btk\; dbry\; trm\; yklh\; \ʾhyhw\; ldbr
\]

A man shall not speak in the middle of the words of his companion, before his brother finishes speaking.

\(^{252}\) Cf. 1QS V.20.

\(^{253}\) Cf. 1QS III.15.

\(^{254}\) Cf. 1QS II.12-13; VI.4-7.
This clause is also unusual in that it uses a temporal phrase as an appositive to a locative phrase with a temporal sense, "in the middle of the words of his companion." A comparison of this clause with example (89) is instructive. Although the temporal phrase in (90) references an instantaneous point in time, it modifies the finite verb of the main clause rather than the entire main clause CP. A typical stage topic temporal phrase modifies the entire CP, setting the temporal stage for the predication itself. On the other hand, the scope of the temporal phrase in (90) is limited to the vP. This is evident from the negation. If the temporal phrase were to modify the CP, the command would be satisfied as long as a man (any man) did not speak at any point before his brother finished speaking. As the temporal phrase modifies the vP, the command can only be satisfied if a man never speaks before his brother finishes speaking. The scope of the temporal phrase explains why it is not fronted as a stage topic.

In contrast with these "definite point in time" temporal phrases, only two of seven temporal phrases with a meaning such as "during" or "while" are clause-initial. Both use the ב (bet) preposition, but more significantly, both have the contrastive feature. In 1QS VII.19-20 and VII.20(a), the two clause-initial temporal phrases, בְּשַׁוְנָה, "during the first (year)," and בְּשַׁנְיָה, "during the second (year)," are contrasted with one another. Of the five durative temporal phras-
es that are not clause-initial, three begin with -בּ and two are bare noun phrases with no prepo-
sition. There is also one such phrase that occurs in a subordinate clause.

Two phrases are ambiguous between durative and "definite moment" type meanings. One
is clause initial (1QS I.18-19) and one is not (1QS II.8(a)). Given the strong correlation of "defi-
nite moment" meanings with clause-initial word order and the absence of "during" type
meanings except where contrastive semantics are involved, it is likely that I.18-19 should be
translated using "after" or "when," while II.8(a) should be translated with "during," "while," or
"as."

(91) 1QS I.18-19

וֹסֵעָתָם בְּבוֹרֵחֵי וַיִּהְוֵה וַיהוָה וְלֶוִיֵּים וְ בֵּית־בְּרֵי מִבְּרֶכֶם אֲלֵי־שָׁעָה וַאֲלֵי־כִּלְלָה־אֲמִית

And after they enter the covenant, the priests and the levites shall repeatedly bless
the God of salvation and all of his deeds of truth.

(92) 1QS II.8(a)

לֹא שָׁעָה אֲלֵי בַּקּוּרְאוֹבָה

May God not show you favour as you cry out.
Of the 17 temporal phrases with meanings similar to "until," "forever," and "again," only one is clause-initial. This phrase is הנה עד, "until now" (IV.23), and it is probably fronted as a stage topic due to the deictic reference of the particle הנה, "now." The other phrases are not fronted as stage topics because such meanings do not set a sufficiently specific temporal stage for the action. It might be argued that "until" conveys a specific reference to an instantaneous point in time; however, "until" necessarily involves the performance of an action throughout a duration of time before ending the action at a specific point in time. It is the durative aspect of "until" that classifies it as non-specific and does not lead to the fronting of "until" temporal phrases as stage topics.

In sum, the twenty-two clause-initial temporal phrases can be described using three correlations. First, in terms of their semantics, temporal phrases introduced by the אחר preposition or the -ב preposition with meanings similar to "before," "at that time," or "after" are always fronted as stage topics. Second, temporal phrases with meanings similar to "during" and "while" are not normally clause-initial, but the cases that are clause-initial correlate with the contrastive feature. Other types of temporal phrases, such as those with meanings like "until" (עד), "forever" (לנצח or לנצח), or again (עוד) are not normally clause-initial. The one exception uses the phrase הנה עד, "until now" (1QS IV.23), which is probably clause-initial due to its deictic reference. This data

260. The clause-initial temporal phrase with the meaning "until" (1) occurs in 1QS IV.23. Non-clause-initial temporal phrases with meanings similar to "until," "forever," and "again" (16) occur in 1QS I.6; III.22-23; IV.1(a), 1(c), 13-14, 18-19(b), 25; VII.2(a), 17, 22-24; VIII.18, 23, 26-27 (2x); IX.1, 10-11. A fragmentary clause-final temporal phrase meaning "for all eternal assemblies" occurs in III.26–IV.1*.
can be summarized with the statement that temporal phrases that reference an absolute or relative point in time (now, before, after, etc.) are fronted as stage topics, while temporal phrases referring to temporal duration (during, while, until, etc.) are not. Note that in contrast with the rest of this study, this generalization is valid for both finite verb clauses and copular clauses. Note also that the clause-initial preference of the "after" and "at that time" type of temporal phrase takes precedence over the verb-first tendency of modal verbs of instruction in every case.

4.3.2.4.2. Non-temporal adjuncts

There are 28 pre-verbal adjuncts in 1QS that are not temporal. To test for all of the possibilities within Erteschik-Shir's framework, it is necessary to check if the fronted adjunct is a topic, shift topic, contrastive, restrictive, or a non-topic. What I believe to be the best interpretation for each of these clauses is provided below.

Shift Topics

Four of the non-temporal pre-verbal adjuncts are best interpreted as shift topics. In two cases (1QS V.3-5; IX.7(b)), the pre-verbal adjunct is the same: על פרת, meaning "on their authority," literally translated as "upon their mouth." In each case, the preceding text concerns the authority

261. Cf. 1QS V.26(b); VI.15-16, 16-17, 18, 21; VII.20-21, 21(c); VIII.10-11, 12-14, 19; IX.2, 5-6.

262. These occur in 1QS II.19; III.25(b); IV.18(a), 24(b), 24(c), 24(d), 24-25, 25; V.3-5; VI.2(b), 3(a), 3(b), 3-4, 4(a), 4(b), 9-10, 11-12, 16(b), 20(b); VII.2-3, 3(b), 16, 17-18(b), 20(b); VIII.24(b); IX.1(a), 7(b), 9-10.

263. These occur in 1QS V.3-5; VI.3-4, 11-12; IX.7.
of a certain group. The fronted adjuncts seize upon this topic and then comment upon what is to be done upon a certain group's authority. Both clauses are provided below.

(93) 1QS V.3-5

By their authority the decision of the lot will go out for every word, for law, and for wealth, for acting truthfully together and humility, justice and judgment, and merciful love and walking carefully in all their ways, in which a man should not walk in the stubbornness of his heart to wander after his heart and his eyes and the thought of his inclination.

(94) 1QS IX.7(b)

And by their authority the lot will go out for every decision of the men of the Yahad.
The other two non-temporal pre-verbal adjuncts that are shift topics are also stage topics. These are locative PPs that set the scene by indicating where a certain instruction is valid. One of these clauses is provided below.

Contrastive Adjuncts

Five of the non-temporal pre-verbal adjuncts are best interpreted as contrastive adjuncts. An example of a contrastive adjunct in context is provided below.

264. These occur in 1QS VI.3-4 (בָּמוֹשׁ הָרְבִּים; VI.11-12 (בָּמוֹשׁ הָרְבִּים)).

265. It is possible to interpret bमwशׁ bहर्बym as a temporal phrase rather than a locative phrase. WAC translates the phrase-initial bet preposition with "during." DSSSE translates it with "in."

266. These occur in 1QS IV.24(b) (כִּֽכְרֵשֶׁר בֹּנְדֵל עֶֽזְלָ; 24(כ) (כ), 24(ד) (כ), 24(ב) (כ) ופֶּֽרֶנֶת אָֽיָּשׁ בָּרְמָה, 24-25 (ב); VI.12.0 (כ) רוּחֵב). Note that in 1QS IV.24(b) I read the consonant that precedes a yod rather than a waw, following Qimron (2010). Thus יְךְ הבָּרְמָה introduces a new clause rather than serving as a resumption in a left-dislocation structure.
The contrastive element is the fronted constituent על הרבים, "into (the account of) the many."
This contrasts with the phrase בויד, "in his authority" shown above in example (96). The pronoun in this phrase refers back to הרChartData המ사업 על המלאכת הרבד ев, "the man who oversees the work of the many" (IQS VI.18-20). The contrast is between two possible locations for the placement of the property of an initiate into the community. The first possibility is to place it in an account under the control of the overseer, and the second is to place it in the account of the many, the community as a whole. The option of placing the property על הרבדים, "into the account of the many," is known from the phrase ויהי הרבדים, "the wealth of the many," in IQS VI.17(b).

Restrictive Adjuncts

Seven of the pre-verbal non-temporal adjuncts are best interpreted as restrictive adjuncts. An example is shown below from IQS VII.2-3.

(97) IQS VII.2-3

And if against one of the priests who is written in the book he spoke in wrath, then he shall be punished for one year.

267. These occur in IQS IV.25 (בד בבד); VII.2(b) (בפומת ומכות בитет ביספ); VII.3(a) (בפומת ומכות בiteur ביספ); VII.16 (ברבים); VII.17-18(a) (על ירה); VIII.24(a) (בפומת); IX.1(a) (על שנה סאהת).
In the subordinate clause, the pre-verbal adjunct, "against one of the priests who is written in the book," is a restrictive adjunct because it is not compared with a well-defined set of exclusive alternatives. Instead, it is simply one of many possible ways to commit a sin, many of which result in similar punishments.

**Cleft Constituents**

Nine of the non-temporal pre-verbal adjuncts are best interpreted as cleft constituents. In the prototypical cleft, the fronted, cleft constituent is the informationally new portion of the clause, while the remainder, the cleft clause, is the topic of the larger clause (cf. §2.4.4.4). An example is provided below.

(98) 1QS III.25(a)

וחושכ אור רוחות בראוה והואה עשה מעשה

conjunction-pron.3ms create.pf.3ms spirit.fp light conjunction-conjunction upon-pron.3fp

And he created spirits of light and darkness.
And it is upon them that he founded every work.

The relevant clause is the second one in example (98), which begins with the fronted adjunct עליהן, "upon them (the spirits)." It is possible to conceive of the referent of the pronoun within the fronted adjunct, "spirits of light and darkness," as the topic of the clause. However, this con-

---

268. These occur in 1QS III.25(b) (עליהן); IV.18(a) (ללא חזה;) VI.2(b) (חזר; VI.3(a) (חזר; VI.3(b) (חזר; VI.4(a) (איש חוממות; VI.4(b) (ב; VI.16(b) (כאמור יהיהцикл על עץ הרובס; VII.20(b) (חזר).
ception does not fit within Erteschik-Shir's (2007) conception of topic and focus. Within Erteschik-Shir's framework, "By analogy with \( \phi \)-features, [topic and focus features] may percolate to the maximal projection of the lexical item they are assigned to" (2007: 63, emphasis added; see also Erteschik-Shir 2006). For example, a topic or focus feature assigned to N when N is selected from the lexicon will percolate to NP, and a topic or focus feature assigned to V will percolate to VP. Erteschik-Shir grants two exceptions to this rule: a feature assigned to N will percolate to its extended projection, DP, and likewise from I to CP (Erteschik-Shir 2007: 63 n. 58). The feature does not percolate from N to PP, which would be necessary in example (98) to front עליהון as a topic. In general, this leaves the possibility that the entire PP is the topic, but that reading is not a good fit in this example.

The best reading of the second clause in example (98) is the cleft reading. Distinguishing between contrastive or restrictive constituents and cleft constituents can be difficult, but the distinction is significant. A cleft constituent is simply the informational focus of the clause, while the remainder of the clause is the topic. On the other hand, a contrastive constituent is characterized by its exclusive application to the clause in relation to some other element or set of elements. In the cleft reading, עליהון is the new information in the clause, and the topic is everything that follows, "he founded every work." The idea that God "founded every work" belongs to the shared knowledge of the author and audience, and hence is eligible as a topic. The interesting claim of this clause is that it was upon the two spirits that God founded every work.

A contrastive reading would differ slightly in that the significant aspect of עליהון would be the relationship between it and other hypothetical possibilities. Given some alternative location
for the founding of every work, which I will call $X$, a contrastive reading entails the implied statement that it was upon the two spirits, *and not* $X$, that God founded every work. Since there is no readily available idea to substitute for $X$ that makes sense in the discourse, the cleft reading, which does make good sense, is preferred here. Similar arguments can be made for the other cleft sentences.

A summary of the characteristics of non-temporal, pre-verbal adjuncts is provided in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Main Clauses</th>
<th>Subordinate Clauses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, 25 of 28 non-temporal pre-verbal adjuncts have features associated with fronting.

---

269. *Main Clauses*—Shift topic (2): 1QS V.3-5 (על פיהם); IX.7(b) (על פיהם). Stage shift topic (2): 1QS VI.3-4 (Seleccione el mejor título); VI.11-12 (bombear el título). Contrast (5): 1QS IV.24(b) (על חכמה פזמה); IV.25 (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25 (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (על חכמה פזמה; IV.25(b) (على روح). 

*Subordinate Clauses*—Restrictiveness (7): 1QS IV.25 (בדבר); VII.2(b) (באמרו זה בדְּרֶשׁ); VII.3(a) (באמרו זה בדְּרֶשׁ); VII.16 (באמרו זה בדְּרֶשׁ); VII.17-18(a) (על רוח); VIII.24(a) (באמרו זה בדְּרֶשׁ); IX.1(a) (على روح). Cleft (1): 1QS IV.18(a) (לאו הוא וה).
4.3.2.4.3. Allosentences for clauses with pre-verbal non-temporal adjuncts

The allosentences for clauses with pre-verbal non-temporal adjuncts are those clauses that are identical in every respect except for the absence of a pre-verbal adjunct and the presence of at least one post-verbal adjunct. Therefore any clause with a pre-verbal constituent other than a complementizer particle cannot be considered an allosentence. Clauses with pre-verbal temporal adjuncts are not included since these are discussed separately in §4.3.2.4.1. Further, all pre-verbal infinitive clause adjuncts in 1QS are temporal clauses. In other words, there are no pre-verbal infinitive clause adjuncts that are not temporal adjuncts. Therefore, clauses where the only post-verbal adjuncts are infinitive clauses should not be included as allosentences for clauses with pre-verbal adjuncts. Commands and prohibitions that are governed by the relative particle complementizer אשר are treated as main clauses.\(^{270}\) Allosentences with two post-verbal adjuncts are counted twice, and the IS features of each adjunct are considered independently.

When examining the allosentences, the important data points are the IS features of the post-verbal adjuncts. If the post-verbal adjuncts possess the same features that were found in the pre-verbal adjuncts, then there is no evidence of IS-motivated fronting. If they do not possess these features, then there is evidence of IS-motivated fronting. Table 26 presents the IS characteristics of the post-verbal non-temporal adjuncts in the relevant allosentences.

\(^{270}\) Cf. Qimron 2008: §400.11.
Table 26: Allosentences for clauses with non-temporal pre-verbal adjuncts in 1QS\textsuperscript{271}  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Main Clauses</th>
<th>Subordinate Clauses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the data for main clauses shows that the distinction in main clauses is not quite statistically significant. The odds of a statistical correlation are only about 87%, where 95% certainty is necessary for statistical significance. This means there is not statistically significant evidence of IS-motivated adjunct fronting in 1QS.\textsuperscript{272} The data is presented in Tables (27) and (28) below.

\textsuperscript{271} \textit{Main Clauses}—Contrastive (1): 1QS VI.20(a). Restrictive (12): 1QS IV.16-17; V.12-13, 14-15(a), 15-16 (2x), 23 (2x); VI.2(a), 7-8, 18-20; VIII.18-19; IX.10-11(a). Clause-final attentive focus (4): 1QS II.14-15; IV.19; VI.6-7; VII.2(a). None (9): 1QS II.14-15; IV.21-22 (2x); V.16-17; VI.1, 14-15; VIII.11-12(a) (2x), 23-24. The main clause allosentence in 1QS VIII.23-24 already demonstrates clause-final attentive focus on the post-verbal adjunct itself. There is one fragmentary clause with two post-verbal adjuncts with no IS-related features in 1QS V.25-26* (2x). \textit{Subordinate Clauses}—Restrictive (12): 1QS VI.16(a), 24-25(c), 25-26; VII.4(b), 10, 12(a), 13(b), 14(b); VIII.11-12(b), 17 (2x), 22. Clause-final attentive focus (1): 1QS V.1. A fragmentary example of a clause-final attentive focus allosentence occurs in 1QS VI.27(b)*. None (18): 1QS I.2-3; IV.19-20; V.11-12 (2x), 16; VI.24 (3x), 24-25(a); VII.5(a), 8(c), 13(c), 15(b), 17(c), 18-19(c); VIII.16, 18(b), 20. A fragmentary subordinate clause with no features of IS-motivated fronting occurs in 1QS VIII.15*.

\textsuperscript{272} For this calculation, p > 0.1. Note that including the two fragmentary clauses from 1QS V.25-26* would make the data statistically significant with p < 0.05.
Table 27: The best interpretations of main clauses with fronted non-temporal adjuncts and the relevant allosentences, where the adjuncts have features that could motivate direct fronting of the adjunct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clauses with pre-verbal Adjuncts</th>
<th>Allosentences</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28: The best interpretations of main clauses with fronted non-temporal adjuncts and the relevant allosentences, where the adjuncts do not have features that could motivate direct fronting of the complement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clauses with pre-verbal Adjuncts</th>
<th>Allosentences</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29: Comparison of clauses with pre-verbal adjuncts with their allosentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic / Contrast / Cleft / Clause-final attentive focus / Restrictiveness</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic / No IS Features</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was the case with complements in 1QS main clauses, classifying restrictiveness as a non-motivating feature would shift the data sharply in favour of IS-motivated fronting.
Comparing the data for subordinate clauses shows that the distinction in subordinate clauses is statistically significant. This provides evidence that adjunct fronting in subordinate clauses is motivated by IS features in 1QS.\textsuperscript{273} Adjunct fronting in subordinate clauses is almost always motivated by restrictiveness; there is only one exception where the fronted adjunct is a cleft. The data is presented in Tables (30), (31), and (32) below.

Table 30: The best interpretations of subordinate clauses with fronted non-temporal adjuncts and the relevant allosentences, where the adjuncts have features that could motivate direct fronting of the adjunct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clauses with pre-verb Adjuncts</th>
<th>Allosentences</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31: The best interpretations of subordinate clauses with fronted non-temporal adjuncts and the relevant allosentences, where the adjuncts do not have features that could motivate direct fronting of the complement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clauses with pre-verb Adjuncts</th>
<th>Allosentences</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{273} For this calculation, \( p < 0.05 \). To complete this calculation, it is necessary to substitute a 'one' for the 'zero' in Table (32).
Table 32: Comparison of clauses with pre-verbal adjuncts with their allosentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic / Contrast / Cleft / Clause-final attentive focus / Restrictiveness</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic / No IS Features</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although classifying restrictiveness as a non-motivating feature would sharply improve the evidence for IS-motivated fronting in main clauses, it would eliminate all evidence for IS-motivated fronting in subordinate clauses. Even in subordinate clauses, however, it should be noted that restrictive constituents are not normally fronted. However, when a constituent is fronted, it appears to result from the restrictiveness feature in most cases.

Aside from temporal adjuncts, there are no correlations when the type of adjunct is considered. Adjunct fronting does not correlate with the status of the adjunct as an adjunct of purpose, manner, means, location, cause, or other type. Neither does the presence of modal verbs (i.e. verbs with irrealis mood) have an impact on the fronting of adjuncts. Modal verbs occur with both pre-verbal and post-verbal adjuncts with similar frequency.²⁷⁴

²⁷⁴ In this analysis, future tense verbs are not considered modal verbs. Among pre-verbal adjuncts, 15 of 28 (54%) occur with modal verbs. These occur in 1QS II.19; VI.2(b), 3(a), 3(b), 3-4, 4(a), 4(b), 9-10, 11-12, 16(b), 20(b); VII.20(b); IX.1(a), 7(b), 9-10. Among the allosentences for clauses with pre-verbal adjuncts, 20 of 58 (35%) occur with modal verbs. These occur in 1QS V.14-15(a), 15-16 (2x), 16, 16-17; VI.1, 2(a), 6-7, 14-15, 18-20, 24 (3x); VII.2(a); VIII.11-12(a), 11-12(b), 18-19, 20, 23-24; IX.10-11(a). Two examples occur in a fragmentary clause in 1QS V.25-26* (2x).
4.3.3. Subjects and SV/VS Order

4.3.3.1. Subordinate Clauses

The question of basic word order is most difficult with respect to the order of subject and verb. Holmstedt (2009a) outlines the difficulties involved for determining whether SV or VS is the basic word order in BH. Although the debate continues with respect to main clauses in BH, there is a consensus that VS is the basic word order in BH subordinate clauses. Some scholars hold this to be true because they take VS to be the basic word order in all clauses. Holmstedt (2009a) argues that VS is the basic word order in BH subordinate clauses because BH has a triggered inversion (TI) typology (cf. §3.1.1.2). In a triggered inversion language, the presence of a complementizer or fronted constituent triggers VS order, which is an inversion from the basic SV word order. Holmstedt (2013b) tentatively argues with data from select books of the HB that there was a diachronic shift from VS order in early texts to SV order in later texts, and that the more frequent VS order in subordinate clauses may result from a greater resistance to language change in subordinate clauses than in main clauses (2013b: 21).

In the 1QS corpus, clauses with complementizers (subordinate clauses) demonstrate VS word order in the vast majority of clauses, as in BH. Fronting of complements and adjuncts in subordinate clauses in 1QS is not used to mark topics, as demonstrated above. This is expected, because a topic will normally be introduced in a main clause rather than a subordinate clause.
There are 17 subordinate clauses in the 1QS corpus with a finite verb and an overt subject. Sixteen of these clauses have VS order. The one clause with SV order occurs in 1QS IV.16-17.

(99) 1QS IV.16-17

כיז אל שם יב בבד עד קצ אהרון

Indeed, God has placed them equally until the last era.

There are two plausible explanations for the pre-verbal position of the subject in this clause. It is possible that אל, "God," is a shift topic, given that it is probably the topic of the clauses that follow this one, while it is absent from the clauses that precede. This would require interpreting (99) as a main clause rather than a subordinate clause. This is plausible because כיז can function as an exclamative particle (glossed with "indeed") rather than as a causal subordinating complementizer. Within the TI typology, however, the deictic כיז does not trigger VS inversion, so if we assume that SV is the basic word order, there is not necessarily any need to explain the SV order of this clause as long as כיז is not a subordinating particle.

It is also possible that כיז is introducing a subordinate clause here and אל is fronted for contrast. In this interpretation the fronting would be emphasizing that it is God who sets the boundaries for the activities of the two spirits rather than the spirits themselves. The smoothest,

275. Three of these subordinate clauses (cf. 1QS VI.10; VII.14(a), 23) do not have an overt complementizer, either because they occur late in a list of conjoined clauses governed by a complementizer, or because they are relative clauses without an overt relative marker. The other thirteen clauses occur in 1QS V.4-5; VI.16(a), 18-19, 21-22(a), 24-25(a); VII.8(a), 18-19(c); VIII.16, 18(b), 20, 25(a), 25(b); IX.10-11(b).
most natural reading is the topic shift reading, meaning that this clause is probably not truly a subordinate clause. Unfortunately, the clause does not provide any information about whether the basic word order is SV or VS; either point of origin would lead to the clause in example (99).

This example indicates how a close attention to information structure can assist in the interpretation of other parts of the clause. In this case, a deictic reading of כיא is suggested by the information structure characteristics of the pre-verbal subject that follows כיא.

The sixteen subjects in subordinate clauses with VS order do not have the characteristics of fronted constituents. There is no reason to interpret any of these constituents as contrastive, restrictive, or informational foci. Which of these sixteen subjects are the topic of the main clause is slightly more difficult to determine. Twelve of these subordinate clause subjects are clearly not the topic of the main clause.276 In one clause (1QS VI.24-25(a)), the subject of the subordinate clause is clearly the topic. With the other three clauses, there is some degree of ambiguity.

In the remaining three of these subordinate clauses (found in 1QS VII.18-19(c), 23; VIII.25(b)), the subject of the subordinate clause references the main clause topic with an anaphoric pronoun.277 In two of these clauses (1QS VII.18-19(c), 23) the subordinate clause is a relative clause that modifies the main clause subject, and the subject of the relative clause references the main clause subject with an enclitic possessive pronoun. These subjects are not topics strictly speaking both because the entire subject is not the topic and because of the recursive na-

276. These occur in 1QS V.4-5; VI.10, 16(a), 18-19, 21-22(a); VII.8(a), 14(a); VIII.16, 18(b), 20, 25(a); IX.10-11(b).

277. The preceding context of 1QS II.26–III.1 (which has been removed from the corpus), which contains the main clause topic, is partially fragmentary.
ture of the topic reference within the topic of the main clause. The example from 1QS VII.18-19(c) is shown below.

(100) 1QS VII.18-19(c)

ארֶשׁ חוּדֹ יִשְׂרָאֵל וְלַעֲרֹב פָּנֵי יָהָד בְּמוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל יְשִׁירֵהוּ לָלֶב

REL tremble.IMPF.3FS spirit.FS-PRON.3MS from-foundation ART-Yahad to-betray.INF
in-truth.FS CONJ-to-walk.INF in-stubbornness heart-PRON.3MS

(The man) whose spirit trembles before the foundation of the Yahad resulting in betraying the truth to walk in the stubbornness of his heart...

Here the subject of the subordinate clause, רוחו, "his spirit," references the head of the relative clause, יושב, "the man," which is also the subject and topic of the main clause.

In sum, there is not enough SV data in subordinate clauses to determine the motivation for SV order, and even the motivation of the one SV example in (99) is somewhat unclear.

4.3.3.2. Main Clauses

Among main clauses with a finite verb and an explicit subject, there are 22 clauses with SV order and 15 clauses with VS order.278 The subject is the topic in at least 20 of 22 SV clauses; in the other two clauses, it is uncertain whether the subject is the topic. The subject is the topic in only two of the 15 VS clauses. This data is summarized in Table (57) below.

278. The SV clauses (22) occur in 1QS I.11-13, 16-18; II.15, 18(a), 19-20, 20, 21-23; III.17, 17-18, 24-25, 25(a); V.7-8; VI.4-6, 7-8, 8, 8-9, 11, 17(b); VII.22-24; VIII.16-17; IX.1-2, 7(a). The VS clauses (15) occur in 1QS II.8(a), 14-15, 15-16, 23(a); IV.19, 20; V.15-16, 18-19; VI.6-7, 10, 12-13, 13-14; VIII.7-8, 23-24; IX.8-9(a). There is also a fragmentary VS clause in 1QS I.24-26*. A VS clause that depends upon biblical syntax (cf. Deut 29:20) occurs in 1QS II.16. As outlined in §4.1.1.2, columns X and XI have been set aside as poetic text.
Table 33: The topicality of the subject in SV and VS clauses with a finite verb in the 1QS corpus.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Subject</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data demonstrate an extremely statistically significant distinction between SV and VS main clauses with respect to the topicality of the subject.

In thirteen of fifteen cases, the subject of a VS clause is not the topic. The two exceptions occur in 1QS VI.12-13 and VIII.7-8.

(101) 1QS VIII.7-8

\[
bl yzd'z\ 'ysdwtyhy
\]

Its foundations will not be made to tremble.

If this subject, "its foundations," is the new topic, then typically it would be pre-verbal.

The fact that it is post-verbal suggests that perhaps this NP is not actually the topic of the clause,

---

279. The exceptions are as follows. The SV clause with a continued topic is found in 1QS III.17-18. The SV clauses where it is uncertain if the subject is the topic are found in 1QS I.16-18; II.15. The VS clauses with subjects that are shift topics are found in 1QS VI.12-13 and VIII.7-8. One fragmentary SV clause where it is uncertain if the subject is the topic is found in 1QS IV.25-26*.

280. For this calculation, p < 0.0001.
as it appears at first. Rather, the referent of the enclitic pronoun -יהי, "its," which is השם ההודן, "the tested wall, the precious cornerstone" (1QS VIII.7-8) is probably a continued topic. This scenario may suggest that the clause in example (101) is a null-headed relative clause that modifies השם ההודן בבחון multic, "the tested wall, the precious cornerstone." It is also possible that this shift topic subject has not been fronted simply because the fronting of a shift topic is optional. All IS-related fronting is optional within Erteschik-Shir's framework, so the presence of a post-verbal shift topic is no surprise from a theoretical perspective. However, the pre-verbal position of shift topics is so consistent in 1QS that some degree of suspicion is warranted. Nevertheless, there is a degree of ambiguity, so this subject has been counted as a shift topic in order to err on the side of caution.281

The clause in 1QS VI.12-13 involves left dislocation and has been referenced above in example (56) on page 143. I repeat it here for ease of reference.

281. It should also be noted that the subject in example (101) is an insertion into the manuscript. Also, within the corpus of this study, the negation particle בל, "not," only occurs here and in the following clause in 1QS VIII.8. This particle may resist fronted constituents in prose, although it does permit fronting in the poetry of the Hodayot (cf. 1QHa XIV.23-24, 30, 38).
And every man who has a word to speak to the many who is not at the station of the man who is questioning the congregation of the Yahad, the man shall stand up on his feet.

The verb עמד is a modal verb of instruction in an instructional discourse. Assuming a basic order of VS, there is no surprise here. Assuming a basic order of SV, the modal verb causes VS order, and then the left dislocation takes place to mark topic shift. The use of LD to mark topic shift obviates the need to front the resumptive subject to mark topic shift, which would be redundant.

These two exceptions prove the rule that all subjects that are shift topics are placed in front of the verb.

The one subject in an SV clause that is a continued topic (rather than a shift topic) occurs in 1QS III.17-18. The clause is provided below within its context; the second clause, והוא תבל למשה תבל, "And he created mankind for the government of the world," is the clause of interest.
And he provides for them (all things) in all their delights. And he created humanity for the government of the world, and he established for him two spirits for him to walk around in until the appointed time of his visitation.

In this clause it is surprising that the pronoun הוהו, "he," is used. The preceding clause has the same subject as this clause, so it is not necessary to repeat the pronoun to indicate a change in topic. The fact that there is no aversion to dropping the pronoun here is demonstrated in the very next clause, where the expected structure is found. This clause also keeps the same subject and uses a clause-initial wayyiqtol past narrative verb form outlier שים with a null subject.

One might also wonder if the pronoun is included for contrastive purposes, but there is no need to contrast God with some other potential creator of humankind.

The key to understanding this shift is the change in verb tense. The preceding clause, which begins הוהו כללם, "and he provides for them," is referring to the present, while the clause of interest is referring to the past. There is also a significant shift at this point from the subject of הוותה כל בני איש לכלד על התולדות, "the generations of all the sons of man, according
to all the kinds of their spirits" (1QS III.13-14), to a discussion of רוחות, "two spirits" (1QS III.18). The inclusion of the pronoun creates a disjunction between the two sections of discourse that would not be present if a wayyiqtol were used.

Unfortunately, the use of the pronoun as the subject makes this clause unhelpful for determining basic word order. There are no allosentences with a post-verbal subject pronoun in 1QS or even in HPH to serve as a point of comparison, so little can be gained from this data.

Nearly all clauses in the 1QS corpus with SV order and a finite verb have subjects that are shift topics, and these clauses do not provide any help with identifying whether SV or VS word order is basic, because the potential that shift topic fronting has taken place rules these clauses out as evidence of a basic SV order. Neither do the VS clauses provide useful evidence. Of the sixteen VS clauses with a finite verb, thirteen have irrealis mood, which would trigger VS inversion in the TI model (cf. §3.1.1.2 and §3.1.1.3), so these clauses are not evidence of a ba-

---

282. Fassberg (2013b: 60) cites 1QS II.13 as an example of an irrealis yiqtol verb with SV order. This clause has been excluded from the corpus and should not be used as the basis for an argument regarding SV/VS order in HPH due primarily to its dependence upon Deut 29:18. It is also excluded due to the uncertain reading of the verb and the use of היה, which is sometimes a copula.
sic VS order. One of the three clauses with realis mood, 1QS VIII.7-8, has been discussed above (cf. example (101)). The remaining two clauses are found in 1QS IV.19, 20.

The clauses in 1QS IV.19, 20 are introduced by the complementizer מ, which is normally translated as "then." The word מ is not a subordinating complementizer, but it may be a particle that triggers VS inversion in HPH. The possibility that this particle may trigger VS-inversion nullifies the usefulness of these clauses; they cannot serve as evidence that VS order is basic.

In the fragmentary clause in 1QS I.24-26*, four verbs occur in succession, with a shared subject that follows.

(104) 1QS I.24-26*

We have committed iniquity, [we have transgressed,] we [have sinned,] we [and] our [father]s before us . . .

---

283. Many of these clauses are also negated. Irrealis VS clauses negated with לא occur in 1QS II.8(a), 23(a); V.15-16, 18-19; VIII.23-24; IX.8-9(a). 1QS IX.8-9(a) also involves LD of the subject with full NP resumption. Irrealis VS clauses negated with ד occur in 1QS VI.6-7, 10. Irrealis clauses using weqatal as the main verb occur in 1QS II.14-15, 15-16; VI.12-13. The clause in 1QS VI.12-13 also involves LD of the subject with full NP resumption. An irrealis yiqtol verb is used in 1QS VI.13-14 along with LD of the complement-theme with resumption in the verbal pronominal suffix. The clause in 1QS II.16 (a text dependent upon Deut 29:20 that has been removed from the corpus) may use the waw conjunction with an irrealis yiqtol or perhaps even a wayyiqtol verb.

284. There is also a fragmentary clause with realis mood in 1QS I.24-26*.

285. The particle מ also appears in 1QS III.11, where there is no explicit subject. This text belongs to the didactic curse text of 1QS II.25b–III.12 and has been removed from the corpus.
This text partially depends on 1Kgs 8.47 and 2Chr 6.37 (Lange and Weigold 2011: 266), but there is no pronominal subject in the biblical parallels, so the syntax of VS order is authentically from the correct period. The fragmentary nature of this section complicates the analysis, but the portions that are preserved and the biblical texts provide confidence about the basic structure. Similar to the clauses that exhibit so-called "first-conjunct agreement" in BH, these clauses are best interpreted with a "pro-and-adjunct analysis" (cf. Holmstedt 2009b). Specifically, what appears to be the subject—"מלפנינו תינו [ואבו] אנו, "we [and] our [fath]ers before us"—is actually an adjunct, while the subject for each of the preceding verbs is the null subject pro.

In sum, there is little evidence available to help determine whether SV or VS order is basic in 1QS.286 In all other cases, complicating factors such as triggered inversion and shift topic subjects cloud our ability to identify the basic word order with respect to subject and verb.

286. Fassberg (2013b: 58) argues that "[in the Dead Sea Scrolls] the number of sentences in which one finds SV suggests that this sequence is not the marked order that it is in Classical Hebrew." Setting aside the disputable claim regarding Classical (Biblical) Hebrew (cf. Holmstedt 2005; 2009a; 2011), it must be emphasized that the number of clauses cannot be the determinative factor in choosing basic word order (cf. §3.1.1.1 regarding the frequency criterion). The pragmatic argument should carry more weight, and pre-verbal subjects in the corpus of study bear features associated with fronting (topicality, contrast, restrictiveness, etc.) more frequently than post-verbal subjects, to a statistically significant degree. In Fassberg's examples from 1QS II.18-20, all subjects are shift topics. Two of the subjects are also contrastive in relation to one another (הכהנים, "the priests," and הלויים, "the Levites"). Either of these features would likely be enough to motivate fronting in HPH. Yet I must argue in the final analysis that the range of clause types in the corpus is too limited to conclude that either SV or VS order is basic.
4.4. **Post-verbal Word Order**

The data in 1QS accords with the hypothesis that the EICT influences post-verbal word order.

Before the data in support of the EICT can be examined, however, the scope of the EICT must be considered. Certain grammatical restrictions take priority over the operation of the EICT in HPH. There are two specific constituent types that do not adhere to the EICT: subjects and light PPs.

Post-verbal subjects in 1QS are always the first post-verbal constituent in the clause, with two exceptions. First, an enclitic pronoun that attaches to the finite verb will precede the subject of the verb.287 Second, a "light PP" always precedes any post-verbal subject.288 There are two clauses in 1QS that do not follow these rules. First, in 1QS IV.19, the subject follows a PP wherein the complement of the preposition is the noun נצח ("forever"). Second, in 1QS VI.6-7, the subject follows a locative PP with a complex complement of the preposition.

A "light PP" consists of a preposition and an enclitic pronoun combination that appears to cliticize to the verb that immediately precedes it. An example of a light PP is provided below.

---

287. Subjects immediately following a verb with an enclitic pronoun occur in 1QS II.8(a); IV.25; VI.13-14. This also occurs in 1QM II.16, which depends upon Deut 29:20 for its syntax.

288. Subjects immediately following a light PP occur in 1QS II.15-16; VI.3-4, 18-19, 21-22(a), 24-25(a); VIII.20.
(105) 1QS II.15-16

רבדק בּוּ כל אלהים התורה והברית

And all the curses of this covenant shall cling to him.

In this clause, the preposition -ב (b-) and its enclitic pronoun -ו (-w), "to him," immediately follow the verb and cliticize to it phonologically. ב also immediately precedes the subject of the clause. This is the required position for a light PP.

Importantly, not all preposition–enclitic pronoun combinations are light PP's, so it requires a close analysis of word order to identify them. Light PPs can be identified by taking note of which preposition–pronoun combinations which immediately follow the finite verb they modify also precede a post-verbal subject. In the absence of a post-verbal subject with a given light PP candidate, a light PP can also be identified in cases where the PP should otherwise be clause-final according to the EICT. Based on these two criteria, the following table classifies preposition–pronoun combinations in 1QS and their status as light PP's.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Morpheme</th>
<th>Light PP?</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>after-PRON.3MP</td>
<td>ʾḥryhm</td>
<td>אחריהם</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>1QS II.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after-PRON.2MS</td>
<td>ʾḥrykh</td>
<td>אחריה</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>1QS II.6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-PRON.3MS</td>
<td>ʾlwhyhy</td>
<td>אלוהיה</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>1QS V.25-26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-PRON.3MS</td>
<td>bw</td>
<td>ב</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1QS II.15, 15-16; IV.24(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-PRON.3MP</td>
<td>bm</td>
<td>בם</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1QS IV.22; V.11-12; VI.24, 24-25; VIII.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-PRON.3MS</td>
<td>lw</td>
<td>ל</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1QS III.18; IV.20-21; VI.13, 18-19, 21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before-PRON.3MS</td>
<td>lpyw</td>
<td>לפני</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>1QS VI.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from-PRON.3MP</td>
<td>mw</td>
<td>מעל</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1QS VI.1.3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upon-PRON.3MS</td>
<td>ʾlyw</td>
<td>עליה</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1QS IV.21-22; V.26–VI.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upon-PRON.1P</td>
<td>ʾlynw</td>
<td>עלייה</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>1QS II.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with-PRON.3MS</td>
<td>ʾmw</td>
<td>עמו</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>1QS V.14-15(a); VII.24-25*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The morpheme לכה does not behave like a light PP in 1QS II.4, but due to the biblical influence on this passage we cannot rely upon the evidence (Lange and Weigold 2011: 268).\(^{289}\)

The EICT governs the word order of all post-verbal clause-level constituents other than subjects and light PPs. The basic rule is that the largest constituent as measured in terms of nodes in a phrase marker will be placed last in the sequence. An example is provided below.

---

289. Light PPs occur in two clauses that depend upon biblical texts for their syntax. First, לכה, lkh, to-PRON.2MS, "to you (ms)" occurs in 1QS II.4. Second, לפני, lpyw, before-PRON.3MS, "before him" occurs in 1QS II.12.
No one of the men of the Yahad shall turn, upon their word, to any law or judgment.

In this clause, the constituent sequence is as follows:

The verb is followed by a NP and two PPs. The NP is the subject of the clause, so it is not governed by the EICT. The EICT selects the PP that will minimize the IC/NIC ratio within the vP when placed in final position. In practice, this is equivalent to selecting the "heaviest" or "largest" of the two PPs because in both PPs the MNCC is the first node in the phrase marker. To determine which PP is the largest, it is necessary to examine the phrase marker for each PP.

PP₁ contains 5 nodes while PP₂ contains 9 nodes. Therefore PP₂, the largest PP, is placed in clause-final position.

In most cases the EICT produces the same results that would be obtained by weighing the constituents in terms of syllables. However, the EICT is slightly more predictively accurate than
the method of syllable counting. For example, the EICT correctly predicts post-verbal word order of the following example, while syllable counting does not.

(109) 1QS II.19-20

הכהנים יעברו ברשונה לפי רוחותם זו אחר זו
hkwhnym y'bwrr bršwnh bsrk lpy rwhtmn zh ʿhr zh
ART-priest.MP cross_over.3MP in-first.FS in-rule.MS according_to spirit.FP-PRON.3MP
DEM.MS after DEM.MS
The priest shall cross over in the first position in the rule according to their spirits, one after another.

The final two post-verbal constituents are לפי רוחותם ("according to their spirits") and זה אחר זה ("one after another"). The former is five syllables in length while the latter is four syllables in length, so the former constituent is longer in terms of syllables. However, the phrase marker of the final constituent is larger.

(110) Phrase markers for the final two clause-level constituents in 1QS II.19-20

PP[ p לפי DP[ N רוחות D מ ]] NP[ N זה CP[ C Ø COP-PP[ COP Ø PP[ P אחר DP[ D Ø N זה [[[ ]]]]]

Here the former constituent has five nodes in its phrase marker while the latter has eleven, explaining why the EICT has placed זה אחר זה in clause-final position. The need for three null heads in the NP constituent—a null complementizer, a null copula, and a null determiner—increase the size of the phrase marker to the point where it is easily the largest in the clause.

There are 79 finite clauses in 1QS where the EICT is relevant. These are clauses with multiple post-verbal constituents that are neither subjects nor light PP's. Most of these clauses
(66 of 79 = 84%) evidence the word order that is predicted by the EICT.\textsuperscript{290} However, several clauses do not (13 of 79 = 16%).

In most cases where the post-verbal word order of a clause does not match what is predicted by the EICT, the final constituent is out of position because it is the attentive focus of the clause. We saw this happening by means of fronting in §4.3.2.3.2, in examples (82)–(85) (cf. 1QS IV.1(a), I(c); IX.24(a), 25(c)*), where a constituent was fronted in order to leave a smaller constituent in the clause-final, attentive focus position. It is not technically correct to say that this constituent is "marked" as the attentive focus, but its status as the focus is evident because the post-verbal word order violates the EICT. Normally it is not possible to identify an attentive focus in HPH because attentive focus is usually indicated only with vocal stress, which is not preserved in the text. These are relatively unusual cases where the flexibility permitted in adjunct placement and the general applicability of the EICT work together to provide insight into the placement of attentive focus. This overriding of the EICT in order to focus a constituent is similar to scrambling, although it should not be confused with scrambling. Scrambling overrides a basic typological word order, but in this case the word order being adjusted normally involves

\textsuperscript{290} Of these 66 clauses that follow the EICT, six involve a "tie," where the final two constituents are of equal size. These "ties" occur in 1QS II.9; IV.20; VI.4(b), 24; VII.9; VIII.17. The other 60 clauses, where the final constituent is clearly the largest, occur in 1QS I.11-13, 16-18; II.5-6, 6-7, 14-15, 16-17, 19-20, 21-23; III.17-18, 18; IV.17, 19-20, 20-21; V.3-5, 4-5, 7-8, 8-10, 10, 11-12, 12-13, 13, 15(a), 15-16, 16-17, 18-19, 20, 20-22, 23; VI.12(a), 4-6, 7-8, 14-15, 16-17, 18, 18-20, 20-21, 21-22(a), 25-26; VII.2(a), 5(a), 8(a), 13(c), 14(b), 15(b), 15-16, 18-19(c), 23-24; VIII.10-11, 11-12(a), 12-14, 16, 18(a), 18(b), 18-19, 22, 26-27; IX.2, 5-6, 8-9(b), 10-11(b). There are five fragmentary clauses that obey the EICT in 1QS II.1*; V.25-26*; VI.26*, 27(b)*; VIII.15*. Clauses with a clause-final subordinate clause were not included (cf. 1QS V.14-15(a); VI.10). Clauses that depend upon biblical texts were not included (cf. 1QS II.3, 4, 12); these clauses obey the EICT (1QS II.12 involves a tie).
adjuncts and is not typological. The original word order is less fundamental to the clause structure than would be the case with scrambling.

An example of clause-final attentive focus overriding the EICT is shown below.

(111) 1QS V.16

וֹאָשֶׁר לֹא יוֹכֵל מְזוֹנָה בָּלָם

CONJ-REL NEG eat.IMPF.3MS from-property.MS-PRON.3MP anything
And he shall not eat anything from their property.

Placing לָם ("anything") in clause-final position even though it has a smaller phrase marker than the preceding constituent מְזוֹנָה ("from their property") indicates that it is in focus.

In all, there are eight clauses in 1QS where violation of the EICT can be used to identify a constituent placed in the clause-final attentive focus position.291

This leaves five clauses where the EICT is violated, yet the final constituent is not a likely focus constituent.

In 1QS IV.16-17, the penultimate constituent is the phrase בֶּד בֶּד, which is often glossed in English with "separately," but which consists of a noun בֶּד, "solitude," followed by a prepositional phrase בֶּד בֶּד, "in solitude," that contains the original noun. When the phrase marker is drawn for a PP modifier of an NP, a null relative complementizer and null copula are included, bringing the total number of nodes in the phrase marker for בֶּד בֶּד to nine. The final constituent

291. These clauses (and their focused constituents) occur in 1QS V.16 (禱); VI.24-25(b) (禱); VII.5(a) (禱); VII.12(a) (禱); VII.22-24 (禱); VII.23-24 (禱); VIII.23-24 (禱); VIII.25(a) (禱); IX.1-2 (禱); IX.2-2 (禱).
in this clause has only seven nodes. If the phrase בבד הבד is taken as a grammaticalized adverb meaning "separately," then its phrase marker only has one node and this clause satisfies the EICT.

In two of these clauses (1QS IV.21-22; VI.9-10), each of the final two constituents are large and close in size. It is plausible that for large constituents, it is less important for the brain to choose the order that permits slightly more efficient processing. In 1QS IV.21-22, the two final constituents have 29 and 27 nodes, and the difference in the total number of nodes in the CRD is between 39 and 37 when everything within vP is considered. In 1QS VI.9-10 the two constituents have 22 and 18 nodes, and the difference in the total number of nodes in the CRD is between 25 and 21.

In the relative clause in 1QS VII.4(b), it is unclear what motivates the post-verbal word order. The clause is והאיש אשר תווה בֵּל מְסֵפָה אֵין רֵעֵהוּ בַּדְּעֵהוֹ, which when woodenly translated to preserve the word order reads, "The man who accuses unjustly his comrade knowingly." The post-verbal constituents have three, five, and three nodes in their phrase markers. The final constituent, בַּדְּעֵהוֹ, "knowingly," has an unexpected final character aleph that imitates the Aramaic definite article, and if this aleph is treated as an article, the EICT is satisfied. It may be that this word was added later in the editing process, but it is impossible to know. There is no evidence that permits an explanation of this clause.

Similarly, in 1QS IV.19, the purpose of the post-verbal word order is opaque. In this case, even the meaning of the clause is somewhat unclear. The clause is אַזֶּה לָצֵּא אָמַת בֵּל, "Then truth will come forth forever [into] the world." In this reading, the post-verbal constituents have
three, one, and one nodes. Woodenly translated, the clause reads "Then will come out forever truth world." The verb is feminine singular, as are the final two nouns, "truth" and "world," so it is also possible that the clause reads "Then the world will come out to eternal truth." In this reading, the post-verbal constituents have seven and one nodes. Another possibility would be to take the final two nouns as a construct chain, reading "Then the truth of the world will come out forever." All readings are strange because the subject is expected to immediately follow the verb unless there is an enclitic pronoun or a light PP attached to the verb. This clause appears scrambled, although there appear to be no information structure related features connected with the scrambling.

The following table summarizes the predictive capacity of the EICT for the vP in 1QS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clauses satisfying the EICT</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Focus</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammaticalization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Final Constituents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

292. Note that the noun מַיִל, translated "world," does not accept the definite article in Hebrew.
It may be that in the preceding analysis I have applied the EICT too broadly, because I left out one consistent characteristic of post-verbal word order in 1QS. If one of the post-verbal clause-level constituents is an infinitive phrase, then the infinitive phrase occurs in clause-final position.\footnote{293} If infinitive phrases modifying finite verbs are required to occur in clause-final position, then there are fewer clauses to which the EICT applies. Of the 79 clauses considered in Table 35, 28 involve a clause-final infinitive phrase that modifies the main verb.\footnote{294} Thus there would be 51 clauses within the scope of the EICT. The characteristics of these clauses are summarized below in Table 36.

\footnote{293. If there are multiple post-verbal infinitive phrases, they occur in the final two positions, and the EICT adjudicates between them; cf. 1QS IV.26* (this clause is partially fragmentary).
294. These 28 clauses occur in 1QS I.11-13, 16-18; II.16-17, 21-23; III.17-18, 18; IV.20-21, 21-22; V.3-5, 4-5, 12-13, 13, 23; VI.4-6, 7-8, 9-10, 14-15, 20-21, 21-22(a); VII.14(b), 18-19(c), 23-24; VIII.12-14, 18(b), 26-27; IX.5-6, 8-9(b), 10-11(b). Two fragmentary clauses occur in 1QS VI.26*; VIII.15*. A clause that depends upon biblical syntax occurs in 1QS II.12.}
Table 36: The application of the EICT to the vP in 1QS in clauses without an infinitive phrase modifying the verb.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clauses satisfying the EICT</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Focus</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammaticalization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Final Constituents</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table compares the percentage of clauses that satisfy the EICT with and without including clauses with clause-final infinitive phrases.

Table 37: Clauses that satisfy the EICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Description</th>
<th>Satisfy EICT</th>
<th>Do not satisfy EICT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Including clauses with an infinitive phrase in final position</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluding clauses with an infinitive phrase in final position</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another way to look at the data is in terms of the clauses explained and unexplained by the EICT theory when infinitive phrases are included and excluded. Clauses that do not satisfy the EICT but do fit with a final focus analysis have been explained by the theory, and I also con-
sider the grammaticalization explanation sufficient to explain 1QS IV.16-17. Unexplained clauses include those in the "large final constituents" category (1QS IV.21-22; VI.9-10) and those I have labeled "unclear" (1QS IV.19; VII.4(b)). The table below compares the percentages of explained and unexplained clauses when clauses with final infinitive phrases are included and excluded.

Table 38: Explained and unexplained clauses under the EICT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Explained</th>
<th>Unexplained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Including clauses with an infinitive phrase in final position</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluding clauses with an infinitive phrase in final position</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Tables 37 and 38 indicate, there is little difference in the effectiveness of the EICT when clauses with final infinitive phrases are excluded. There is no good evidence available to suggest whether infinitive phrases must be clause-final or whether infinitive phrases happen to be clause final simply because they are typically larger than other constituents. The two clauses in the "large final constituents" category, where an infinitive phrase that is not quite the largest verbal modifier in the clause, may suggest that the rule that infinitive phrases modifying a verb must be clause-final is in effect, but the evidence is weak. I prefer to assume that there is such a rule, but I see no good reason to take a stand on one side or the other of this issue.

The nature of post-verbal word order in 1QS can be summarized as follows.

(1) If there is an enclitic pronoun attached to the main (finite) verb, it is (naturally) the first post-verbal constituent.
(2) If there is a "light PP" in the clause, it immediately follows the finite verb as a phonological clitic. In 1QS, light PP's include מאתם, לו, ובם, and עליו (cf. Table 61). There are no clauses with both an enclitic pronoun and a light PP modifying the finite verb.

(3) If there is a post-verbal subject, it appears immediately following any enclitic pronoun or light PP modifying the main verb. Two unexplained exceptions to this rule occur in 1QS IV.19 and VI.6-7.

(4) If there is a post-verbal infinitive phrase modifying the main verb, it is the final clause-level constituent in the clause. If there are two such phrases, they are the final two clause-level constituents (cf. 1QS IV.26*).

(5) If there are two or more post-verbal clause-level constituents that have not been assigned positions in items (1) through (4), then the largest constituent in terms of the number of nodes in the phrase marker is selected by the EICT and placed in clause-final position.

(6) If rule (5) has been applied, then a constituent that was eligible to be selected by the EICT but was not selected due to its relatively small size can be assigned attentive focus by moving it to clause-final position.

4.5. Right-dislocation

There are no clear cases of right-dislocation in 1QS.
5. 1QM (The War Rule, Cave 1 Manuscript)

5.1. Preliminary Issues

5.1.1. Fragmentary Clauses

There are many fragmentary clauses in 1QM and 1QpHab. In many cases these have been left out of the analysis entirely, but in some cases I have included them. The analysis in this chapter will distinguish fragmentary clauses from those that are completely preserved, and the main analysis will only consider non-fragmentary clauses. All fragmentary clauses are marked with an asterisk (*) when the relevant clauses are cited or listed. Clauses that are fragmentary but where the missing text can be supplied by the Cave 4 manuscripts 4Q491–4Q496 have been marked with a double asterisk (**). Such cases were identified by consulting Qimron 2010. These are listed below in Table (39).

295. The results of the investigations of 1QM do not change substantially with the inclusion or exclusion of fragmentary clauses.

296. Qimron 2010 uses the number twenty (Hebrew כ) to identify the column that Burrows 1951 labels nineteen (XIX); I follow Burrows in labeling the final column XIX.
Table 39: List of 1QM references supplemented by or taken completely from other scrolls (and retained)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1QM Reference</th>
<th>Alternate Reference</th>
<th>Text Supplied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QM II.14**</td>
<td>4Q496 xiii 4</td>
<td>... במש יפת במשו...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XIII.9**</td>
<td>4Q495 ii 1</td>
<td>... נל בחרנה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(poetic corpus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XIV.5**</td>
<td>4Q491 viii–x 3</td>
<td>נבורה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(poetic corpus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XIV.9-10**</td>
<td>4Q491 viii–x 7</td>
<td>[ה[ז] חו]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(poetic corpus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XIV.10(a)**</td>
<td>4Q491 viii–x 7</td>
<td>נגרת .. נ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(poetic corpus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XIV.10(b)**</td>
<td>4Q491 viii–x 7</td>
<td>בוחרה ו Nghịי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(poetic corpus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XVI.4(a)**</td>
<td>4Q491 xi.2 2</td>
<td>[ה]מעל[המוה]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XVI.4(b)**</td>
<td>4Q491 xi.2 2</td>
<td>[יו]רא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XVI.15-16**</td>
<td>4Q491 xi.2 13</td>
<td>[ש[ע]ת [ב]ר[י] אתא]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(poetic corpus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XIX.7(a)**</td>
<td>4Q492 i 7</td>
<td>[בנהת עמי] הבננה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(poetic corpus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XIX.9-11**</td>
<td>4Q492 i 9-10</td>
<td>בוקר יווה ידמקו...ברח[ב] אלא</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.2. Removing Biblical Quotations and Allusions

Table 40 lists the biblical quotations and allusions that have been removed from the 1QM corpus.297

297. All biblical quotations and allusions in 1QM are identified based on the tables in Lange and Weigold (2011: 321–326). Many clauses in 1QM share phrases in common with biblical texts, but these phrases are normally below the clause level. For example, the phrase בֶּן הַשָּׁמֶשׁ, "linen garments," appears in 1QM VII.10 and in Gen 41:42, but in the larger clause in 1QM VII.9-11, the phrase is buried in a very large clause-final subject, and the clause is not dependent upon Gen 41:42 for its clause-level syntax in any way. Clauses that allude to biblical texts but do not depend upon their clause-level syntax are included from 1QM I.4 (Dan 11:11, 44); I.6(b) (Ezra 9:14); I.12 (Dan 12:1); II.6 (Deut 31:10); II.7-8 (Num 31:3); II.8-9 (Lev 25:4); II.10-11 (Gen 10:23); II.11 (Gen 10:22); II.12 (Gen 10:22); II.12-13 (Gen 10:22); III.2 (Num 10:2);
Table 40: Finite Verb, Non-Copular Clauses in 1QM that Depend Upon Biblical Texts and are Excluded from the Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Location</th>
<th>Biblical Parallel</th>
<th>Hebrew Clause</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.6(a)</td>
<td>Isa 31:8</td>
<td>נפל אשór</td>
<td>wnpî ‹swr</td>
<td>And Assyria shall fall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.9(c)</td>
<td>Jer 23:20</td>
<td>לאшибאמפדעלדד</td>
<td>lw’ yšyb ’pw ’d klwtm</td>
<td>He will not turn back his anger until their destruction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.11-12</td>
<td>Lev 12:4</td>
<td>אשרהלמדאודיום</td>
<td>w‘l hmqdŠ lw’ yby’wm</td>
<td>And into the sanctuary they shall not bring them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.2-3(b)</td>
<td>Deut 20:3</td>
<td>ברכהבלמלדמהעומר</td>
<td>bqrbkm ltnlhm w’mḏ hkwtn</td>
<td>When you approach the battle, the priest will stand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.2-3(c)*</td>
<td>Deut 20:3</td>
<td>והביאוםהל沌לאמואר</td>
<td>wdbr ’l h’m l’mw[r Šm] h yš’l t’mh qrbym hwywm ltnlhm ’l ’wybykmh</td>
<td>And he shall speak to the people, saying, &quot;Hear, Israel, you are approaching today the battle against your enemies.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.3(a)</td>
<td>Deut 20:3</td>
<td>אלתריא</td>
<td>’ḥ tyrw</td>
<td>Do not be afraid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.3(b)</td>
<td>Deut 20:3</td>
<td>אלרךלבכמה</td>
<td>w‘l yrk bbkmh</td>
<td>And do not let your heart be timid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.4-5</td>
<td>Deut 20:3-4</td>
<td>[א]לעשרמקנס</td>
<td>[w‘l t’rwš ṭmnyhm ky’ ’lwykm hwlk ’mkm ltnlhm lkm ’m ’wybykmh ’lwšy’ ’tkmh</td>
<td>And do not tremble before them because God is walking with you to fight for you against your enemies to deliver you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III.3-4 (Num 31:26); III.4-5 (Num 10:2); III.5-6 (Num 10:35; Ps 68:2); IV.4-5 (Ps 33:2; 144:9); IV.6 (Deut 33:21; Judg 5:11; 1Sam 12:7; Mic 6:5); IV.7 (Hab 2:16; Zech 14:13); IV.8 (Deut 32:3); VI.1-2* (Nah 3:3); VI.2 (Nah 3:3); VI.2-3 (Nah 3:3); VI.3 (Nah 3:3); VI.6 (Num 24:18); VII.5-6 (Deut 23:11); VII.7 (Deut 23:15); VII.9-11 (1Sam 17:21; Gen 41:42; Lev 16:4; Ex 26:1; 36:8; 39:28-29); IX.7-8 (Lev 21:6, 11-12); IX.8-9* (Lev 21:6, 11-12); X.1-2* (Deut 7:21-22); X.2-3(a) (Deut 20:3); X.2-5 (Deut 20:5); X.9 (Deut 7:6; 14:2); XI.1-2 (1Sam 17:45-47; 2Sam 21:19); XI.2-3* (2Sam 8:1); 1Chr 18:1); XI.3-4 (Ps 106:43, 47; Neh 9:28); XI.9-10 (Ex 15:4); XI.10 (Isa 66:2; 62:1; Zech 12:6); XII.1-2* (Deut 7:6; 14:2); XII.11(b) (Num 24:8); XII.13(a) (Zech 9:9); XII.13(c) (Ps 47:12; 97:8); XII.14(b) (Isa 49:23; 60:14); XIII.7(b)* (1Kgs 8:21); XIV.2(b) (Num 19:19); XIV.2-3 (Num 19:19); XIV.4-5 (Deut 7:9); XIV.5-6* (Ezra 9:14; 2Sam 22:35; Ps 18:35); XIV.7 (Ps 119:1; Prov 11:20); XIV.8-9* (Deut 7:8-9; Ps 17:7; 31:22); XIV.16 (Ps 21:14); XV.7(b) (Deut 31:6); XVI.1(a)* (Jer 25:29; Hag 1:11); XVII.2* (Lev 10:1-3); XVIII.2 (Isa 24:20); XIX.4(b) (Isa 6:3); XIX.5(a) (Zech 9:9); XIX.5(b)* (Ps 48:12; Ps 97:8).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Location</th>
<th>Biblical Parallel</th>
<th>Hebrew Clause</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X.6-7*</td>
<td>Num 10:9</td>
<td>מִלְחַמָּה תֹאָבִים מִלְחַמָּה</td>
<td>ky’ tbw’ mlḥmh b’škmnh l hr bwr w[tmh b]ḥswˌrw t’kmn</td>
<td>When you enter battle in your land against the adversary who is attacking you, you shall sound the trumpets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.7</td>
<td>Num 10:9</td>
<td>נַעֲצוּתֵמָּה לְפָנֵי אֲל֣וֹחֲנֵמָּה</td>
<td>wnzkrtmh lpny ʾlwhym</td>
<td>And you will be remembered before your God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.8</td>
<td>Num 10:9</td>
<td>נְשׁוּעָתֵמָּה וְעֵצָמָּה</td>
<td>wnwšʿ tm mʾy</td>
<td>And you will be delivered from your enemies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.8-9</td>
<td>Deut 3:24</td>
<td>לְפָנֵי בָּאָרְכֵּכֶּם וְיִשָּׁרֵי שָבָּע</td>
<td>lwhl ḥṣ ṭwr ṭkw ṭsw ḥṣ whrw</td>
<td>who does (works) like your great works and like your strong deeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.5</td>
<td>Deut 8:17</td>
<td>לְפָנֵי בָּאָרְכֵּכֶּם וְיִשָּׁרֵי שָבָּע</td>
<td>lwhl ḥṣ ṭwr ṭkw ṭsw ḥṣ whrw</td>
<td>And neither our power nor the might of our hand acted in strength, because it was in your power and in the might of your great strength.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.6(a)</td>
<td>Num 24:17</td>
<td>דְרַק כָּבָּד מֵעָקָב</td>
<td>drk kwkb myʾqwb</td>
<td>A star will come from Jacob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.6(b)</td>
<td>Num 24:17</td>
<td>קֵן שְׂפָתָם מִישָׁרֵל</td>
<td>qm šḥt myšʾr l</td>
<td>A scepter will arise from Israel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.6(c)</td>
<td>Num 24:17</td>
<td>נַעֲצוּתֵמָּה וְעֵצָמָּה</td>
<td>wnwšʿ tm mʾy</td>
<td>And it will crush the temples of Moab.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.6(d)</td>
<td>Num 24:17</td>
<td>יֵשְׁרֵר כָּבָּד בְּנֵי שֵׁית</td>
<td>wyqr qr kw bny šyt</td>
<td>And it will shatter all the sons of Seth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.7(a)</td>
<td>Num 24:19</td>
<td>וְיִדְרֶד מֵעָקָב</td>
<td>wyrd myʾqwb</td>
<td>And it will descend from Jacob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.7(b)*</td>
<td>Num 24:19</td>
<td>הַאֲבִד שָרֵי [ד מ] הַעַר</td>
<td>whḥyd šry[d m] ʿhr</td>
<td>And it will destroy the remains of the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.7(c)</td>
<td>Num 24:18</td>
<td>יָשְׁרֶל שָׂמָּע הָיוֹל</td>
<td>wyšʾrl šḥ ḥy</td>
<td>And Israel will do valiantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.11-12</td>
<td>Isa 31:8</td>
<td>מְנַפֶּל אֵשֶׁר בִּבְרֵי אֲשֶׁר אֲשֶׁר קָרָב</td>
<td>wndpl šwr bhr bwr ʿšy</td>
<td>And Assyria will fall by a sword (that is) not (of) a man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.10(a)</td>
<td>Judg 5:12</td>
<td>שֻׁמְנַה גָּבָּר</td>
<td>qwmn gbwr</td>
<td>Rise, warrior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.10(b)</td>
<td>Judg 5:12</td>
<td>בָּשָׂה שֵׂפָכִים אֵשֶׁר בָּבֹד</td>
<td>šbh šbykh ʿšy kbwd</td>
<td>Take your captives, man of glory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.11(a)</td>
<td>Gen 49:8; Deut 33:29</td>
<td>מִלְחַמָּה בָּאָרְכֵּכֶּם לְפָנֵי אֲל֣וֹחֲנֵמָּה</td>
<td>tn ydkh bʾwr ṭwbykh wrglkh l bmrty hll</td>
<td>Place your hand on the neck of your enemies, and your foot upon backs of slain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.11-12</td>
<td>Deut 32:42</td>
<td>חֲרוֹבָּה חָיָל בָּשָׂר</td>
<td>wḥrbkh twʾkl bšr ʾšmh</td>
<td>And your sword will devour guilty flesh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause Location</td>
<td>Biblical Parallel</td>
<td>Hebrew Clause</td>
<td>Transliteration</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.12-13</td>
<td>Isa 6:3</td>
<td>מִלְּאַ הַארְצוֹ בְּבֵדַ וּנְתַהֲלוּ הַכְּפָה בְּמַעֲנֵי תַּשְׁרִים אֶת הַכְּפָה הַלְּכֹהֵת וְיָמַן הַכְּפָה וּבְהַרְכֵּז מַעֲשֶׂה</td>
<td>ml' ʾrškh kbwd wnhlkkh brkh hwnw mngh blqwytkh ksp wzhb wbny hps bhyk[w]tykh</td>
<td>Fill your land with glory and your inheritance with blessing, a multitude of cattle in your plots of land, silver and gold and precious stones in your palaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.13-14*</td>
<td>Isa 60:11</td>
<td>פַּתְחֵי שֵׁשׁ [רְדָו] תַּמִּד מֶלֶכֶתְהֵי הַלְּבֵנָה וּפֶרַעְלְנָה בְּבִישַׁלְכֵיהָ וּכְסִיָּף וְזֹהֵב וְאָבִין וְזֹהֵב וּבְהַרְכֵּז</td>
<td>mṭḥ ʾš[rk t]myd lhḥy' ʾbʿk hyl gwym</td>
<td>Open [your] gates continually to bring to you wealth of nations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.14(a)</td>
<td>Isa 60:10</td>
<td>מָלְכוּתֵךְ וְנִשְׁמָאָה</td>
<td>mlkyhm yšrtwk</td>
<td>And their kings will serve you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.13</td>
<td>Ps 35:9</td>
<td>נִשְׂמָאָה בְּשׁוֹעֲרֵךְ</td>
<td>wnšḥ byšwṭkh</td>
<td>And we will rejoice in your deliverance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV.4(a)</td>
<td>Ps 34:4</td>
<td>וּרְכֵם שֶם בֵית שָמוֹה</td>
<td>wrmmnw šmw byd šmh</td>
<td>And they shall exalt his name together with joy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV.7(c)</td>
<td>Deut 31:6</td>
<td>הָזַק</td>
<td>ḥsqw</td>
<td>Be strong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV.7(d)</td>
<td>Deut 31:6</td>
<td>אַמְצָא</td>
<td>wṃsw</td>
<td>And be courageous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV.8(a)</td>
<td>Deut 20:3; 31:6; 2Sam 13:28</td>
<td>אל תירא</td>
<td>ʾl tyrw</td>
<td>Do not be afraid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV.8(b)</td>
<td>Deut 20:3</td>
<td>אַל תַּחֲפֹז</td>
<td>wʾl ṭhpz</td>
<td>And do not hasten (away).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV.8(c)</td>
<td>Deut 20:3; 31:6</td>
<td>אַל תַּעֲבֹרָה מַפְטָרָה</td>
<td>wʾl tʾrwʾ ṭmpyḥ</td>
<td>And do not be terrified before them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV.11-12*</td>
<td>Ps 37:2</td>
<td>וּכְלֵי יַקְם הַגָּוָה מִטָּרָה מִטָּרָה [בְּ] [תַּמִּר]</td>
<td>wkwl yqwm hwtwm mhr ymlw [kn]š bq[ys]</td>
<td>And every creature of destruction quickly shall wither [like a blossom] in summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.8(b)*</td>
<td>Jer 14:7; Ps 109:21</td>
<td>נַחֲלָה אֲלֵיהוֹ הֶלְזֹרֵק</td>
<td>wʾth ʾl h[ṣd]q ʿṣyth [lnʾn] šmkḥ</td>
<td>And you, the God of righteousness, acted for the sake of your name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX.3</td>
<td>Gen 49:8</td>
<td>תִּן יָדְךָ בֵּן אוֹרִיךְ</td>
<td>tn ydkh bʾwrp ʾwybk</td>
<td>Place your hand on the neck of your enemies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX.4(a)</td>
<td>Deut 32:42</td>
<td>וְחָרַב חוֹאֲלָה בֵּשַׁר</td>
<td>whrbk twʾkl bsʾr</td>
<td>And your sword shall devour flesh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX.6</td>
<td>Isa 60:10</td>
<td>מָלְכוּתֵךְ וְשָרַתּוּ</td>
<td>mlkyhm yšrtwk</td>
<td>And their kings will serve you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.3. Removing Poetic Texts

The poetic corpus in 1QM contains those passages which are direct speech addressed to God and which focus on praise of God. These portions of text evidence distinct word order patterns involving the interweaving of appositives and the use of vocatives. This corpus consists of 1QM X.8–XII.18; XIII.7–18; XIV.8–19; XVIII.6–15; XIX.2–8. The beginning and ending of each section of poetic corpus are shown in the table below.

Table 41: Boundaries of the Poetic Corpus in 1QM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beginning of Poetry</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
<th>End of Poetry</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X.8</td>
<td>כמוכה</td>
<td>XII.18</td>
<td>end of column XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.7</td>
<td>אבותינו [אתה]</td>
<td>XIII.18</td>
<td>end of column XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV.8</td>
<td>[رياضة] או בשער</td>
<td>XIV.19</td>
<td>end of column XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.6</td>
<td>ברכה השם</td>
<td>XVIII.15</td>
<td>end of column XVIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX.2</td>
<td>[קומת הר 어디</td>
<td>XIX.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.2. Constituents with Fixed Position

5.2.1. Complementizers

As in 1QS, complementizers in 1QM are always clause-initial. Complementizers in finite verb clauses in 1QM include כָּא הוא, *ky*, "because," "indeed"; אַשְּר, *ʿšr*, relative marker; בָּאשֶׁר, *kʾšr*, "as"; גם, *gm*, "also"; וַיַּאֲשֶׁר, "surely".

---

298. In the prose corpus: 1QM I.10; II.8; VII.6; IX.8; X.1-2*, 6; XIII.5; XV.1*, 9*, 12*; XVI.15*; XVIII.6-7*; XIX.1. In the poetic corpus: 1QM X.17*; XI.1, 1-2 (2x), 13, 17*; XII.1, 8; XIV.14*; XVIII.10, 12-13*. In the set of removed clauses that depend upon biblical syntax: 1QM X.4-5; XI.5.

299. In the prose corpus: 1QM II.11, 13; III.13, 14; V.17*; VII.4, 6; X.1-2*, 6; XIV.3(b); XVII.2*; XVIII.5*. In the poetic corpus: 1QM X.9, 16*; XI.4. In the set of removed clauses that depend upon biblical syntax: X.8-9.

300. In the poetic corpus: 1QM XI.5-7*.

301. In the poetic corpus: 1QM XI.3-4.

302. In the poetic corpus: 1QM XI.1.
5.2.2. Negation Particles

A negation particle modifying a verb immediately precedes the verb. In 1QM XI.5, which depends upon biblical syntax (cf. Deut 8:17), a negation particle appears that does not immediately precede the verb; however, neither does it modify the verb.

5.2.3. Infinitive Phrases that Modify a Finite Verb

Any post-verbal infinitive phrase that modifies a finite verb is the final clause-level constituent within its clause. The only post-verbal exception is a penultimate infinitive phrase that precedes the verb; however, neither does it modify the verb.

303. In clauses with finite non-copular verbs, clause-initial negation particles are found in the following locations. With לָּא (ʾl): 1QM XV.8-9. With לָּא (ʾl): 1QM IX.7-8, 8-9*. In the poetic corpus: 1QM XI.10-11. In the set of removed clauses that depend upon biblical syntax: 1QM III.9(c). Non-clause-initial negation particles in clauses with finite non-copular verbs are found in the following locations. With לָּא (ʾl): 1QM II.8-9; VII.3-4, 4-5, 5-6, 7. In the poetic corpus: 1QM XIV.9-10**. In the set of removed clauses that depend upon biblical syntax: 1QM VII.11-12.

304. The relevant clause from 1QM XI.5 is the following: ולוא מכות ועוז ידו עשה חיל בם, הבחרה ונתן חלחלה חזרל wlwʾ khwʾnw wʾswm ydwʾ ʿš ḥyl kyʾ bkwhʾkh wbʾwz ḥlkh ḥgdwl, "And it is not our power or the might of our hands that have done powerfully but rather by your power and by the might of your great strength." This clause depends upon Deut 8:17. The assertion of the clause is not that "our power and the might of our hands have not done powerfully," implying that they have tried and failed. The point is that the deed was done "by your power," and not in some other way. To achieve this reading, it is necessary to interpret this clause as a cleft. The cleft reading requires the assumption of a null copula and null relative in this clause such that the negation is modifying the null copula rather than the finite verb: "It is not our power." The motivation for a cleft is to mark a subject as a non-topic, and this reading makes sense in 1QM XI.5. By marking the subject חוחה ועוז ידו, "our power and the might of our hands" as a non-topic, the topic of the larger complex clause becomes מוחה ועוז חלחלה, "your power and the might of your strength." In this way the larger clause becomes primarily a statement about the power of God rather than a statement about human power.

305. Cf. 1QM I.2-3*, 4, 6(b)*, 12, 13, 13-14*; II.4-6, 7-8; VII.3-4, 10-11; VIII.2-3, 6-8, 8-9,
cedes a clause-final subordinate finite verb clause (cf. 1QM II.8-9). Some infinitive phrases are fronted as scene-setting Topics. All are temporal phrases. One clause has a fronted infinitive phrase as well as a clause-final infinitive phrase (1QM VIII.6-8).

5.2.4. Subordinate Clauses with a Finite Verb

A subordinate clause with a finite verb is always the final constituent in the clause.

5.3. The Left Periphery

5.3.1. Left-dislocation

Unlike 1QS, 1QM has no unambiguous cases of left-dislocation. There are five clauses in 1QM where it is possible that non-canonical LD is used, but there is no way to distinguish these possible cases of non-canonical LD from double fronting.

9-10; X.5-6*; XIV.3(a), 5-6*; XVI.8; XVII.6*, 10, 11*.
306. Cf. 1QM IV.6, 7, 8, 9, 11-12, 13-14; VII.9-11, 13-14; VIII.6-8; IX.3; XIV.2(a); XVI.6-7.
307. Cf. 1QM III.9(a) (quoted speech), 10(a) (quoted speech); IV.3-4(a) (quoted speech); XVII.8-9* (ד); XIX.9-11** (ם). I consider phrases that begin with one clause type and are conjoined to a finite verb clause to maintain the character of the initial clause type. For example, in 1QM VIII.6-8, the clause-final constituent is an infinitive phrase that is continued by a finite clause: "ע ד"ה ש ת ה ר מ ת ה_m
5.3.2. Fronting (Preposing)

5.3.2.1. Double Fronting

One of the most likely places to find helpful information about word order and information structure is in clauses with two pre-verbal constituents. Such clauses are candidates for a double fronting analysis. Before concluding that two elements can be fronted in the same clause, I will explore all alternative possibilities in order to be certain that double fronting is taking place. In this section, I will include the poetic corpus in the analysis because several of the most interesting examples can be found there.

Clauses that may involve double fronting are found in the prose corpus in 1QM II.2, 3, 4; and in the poetic corpus in 1QM XIII.10, 11-12; XIV.12; XVIII.12-13*.\(^{310}\) Two of these clauses (1QM XIII.10 and XVIII.12-13*) have unique characteristics.

5.3.2.1.1. 1QM XVIII.12-13* (poetic corpus)

1QM XVIII.12-13* (which is within the poetic corpus) is unique because the pre-verbal NP occurs in second position rather than in the clause-initial position. The best interpretation of this clause is to take this NP as an adverbial modifier of the clause-initial adverb, such that there is in fact only one pre-verbal constituent, one that includes an appositive.

\(^{310}\) I do not list 1QM XI.3-4 here because I interpret מָן as a complementizer rather than a verbal modifier. There is also a clause in 1QM XV.12 that appears to be a potential double fronting clause, but is too fragmentary to evaluate. 1QM XVIII.12-13* is missing its end, but all that is missing is the completion of a subordinate כָּא-clause. The beginning of the clause provides enough information to identify two pre-verbal constituents, the verb, and three post-verbal constituents (including the כָּא-clause).
And now, today, it is incumbent upon us to pursue their multitude, because you [. . .]

Translators normally interpret the pre-verbal NP humor, "the day" or "today," as the subject of the verb אֵאָרֵב, "it urges." Wise, Abegg, and Cook (2005) translate "Now the day is pressing upon us [to] pursue their multitude." García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997: 143) translate "And now there approaches us the day of pursuing their mob." If humor is indeed the subject, then its presence after another pre-verbal constituent forces a double fronting interpretation. This is because if basic word order is VS, then the fronting of the subject would be required to obtain a pre-verbal subject. On the other hand, if the basic word order is SV, the fronting of the temporal adverb would trigger VS-inversion, so the presence of the pre-verbal subject would still indicate the fronting of the subject.

However, it is best not to interpret humor as the subject because there is no motivation to front the subject into a pre-verbal position. The presence of a pre-verbal temporal adjunct referring to a point in time ("now") is easily explained because such temporal phrases are typically pre-verbal in HPH. But the clause-initial now removes all the available motivations for the fronting of humor as a subject. Normally it would be possible to front the subject as a topic or a shift topic, but the fronted temporal adjunct is already the topic (a stage topic) in this clause. The NP humor is not contrastive, restrictive, or an informational focus. It cannot be a fronted non-topic
that marks a null stage topic because there is already a non-null stage topic. And there is no need to mark the subject directly as a non-topic because the topic "the day" or "today" is already known from the clause-initial temporal adverb "now". The translation of García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997: 143) reflects a larger subject with an extraposed modifier, "the day of pursuing their mob." Unfortunately this reading does little to solve the problem of finding a motivation for the fronting of the subject; if it is only the head noun of the subject phrase that is fronted, the problem is no different.

The absence of a good motivation for the fronting of the subject suggests that it is not truly the subject. It is better to interpret as an adverb meaning "today" which serves as an appositive modifier of "now." The subject is an expletive null subject. With the main verb "to urge," and an expletive null subject, the clause should be translated, "And now, today, it is incumbent upon us to pursue their multitude, because you [. . .]." This interpretation also has the advantage of conceptual simplicity, because the idea that "it is urgent" to pursue them is less obtuse than the idea that "the day urges us" to pursue them.

From a larger perspective, an important result of this interpretation is that double fronting is not involved in this clause, and there is no evidence here of an X–Subject–Verb structure in 1QM.

5.3.2.1.2. 1QM XIII.10 (poetic corpus)

1QM XIII.10 (which is within the poetic corpus) is a unique case because the clause-initial NP is the complement-theme (direct object) rather than the subject. This is helpful because without
overt resumption, left-dislocation can be definitively ruled out when the clause-initial constituent is a verbal complement.\footnote{311}

\begin{quote}
(113) 1QM XIII.10

\textit{wšr mʾwr mʾz pqdth lʾwzrnw wb[g . . . ]}

\textit{conj-prince light from-then appoint.pf.2ms to-help.inf-pron.1p conj-[. . . ]}

And the prince of light, from of old you appointed to assist us . . .
\end{quote}

Double fronting seems at first to be an inevitable interpretation of this clause. However, in this clause it is possible that the PP in a NP–PP–Verb structure modifies the NP rather than the verb (cf. 1QS IV.18(b) in §4.3.2.2). Such a reading would produce the subject \textit{wšr mʾwr mʾz}, "the prince of light (who is) from of old." While this is theoretically possible, it is much smoother to interpret \textit{wšr mʾwr mʾz}, "from of old," or "long ago," as a verbal modifier, which entails simply that God appointed the prince of light a long time ago.

1QM XIII.10 cannot involve LD of any type because there is neither overt resumption nor the possibility for null resumption since the clause-initial NP is not the subject. By process of elimination, the only satisfactory syntactic interpretation of this clause involves double fronting.

The temporal phrase \textit{wšr mʾwr mʾz} would normally be a stage topic, as are pre-verbal temporal phrases general. However, if \textit{wšr mʾwr mʾz} is the clause topic, what can be done with the clause-initial verbal complement? In this clause, the IS status of the complement-theme as a topic is indeterminate

\footnote{311. Left-dislocation always requires overt resumption when the dislocated element is a complement of the verb. See §4.3.1, especially note 163 and §4.3.1.1.}
based on an analysis that ignores word order.\textsuperscript{312} However, no other possibilities fit the context. There is no need to mark the complement as a non-topic since it is not a subject. The NP is not contrastive or restrictive. The complement does not make sense in its context as an informational or attentive focus. Therefore, the fronting can only indicate that \\ר
משוער is a shift topic.

In Erteschik-Shir's framework, it is permissible for a clause to have multiple topics. The only stipulation is that each clause must have one main topic and one main focus.\textsuperscript{313} The main topic in this clause is the complement \ר
משוער, "the prince of light," while the stage topic temporal phrase is a secondary topic. If a framework with only one topic is preferred, then the complement should be understood as the topic, while the temporal phrase has lost its original topic status by virtue of the fronting of the other constituent.

The conclusion to be drawn from 1QM XIII.10 is that double fronting is possible in 1QM within the poetic corpus. In this case, both fronted constituents are topics, and the first of the two is the clause's main topic.

5.3.2.1.3. Subject–X–Verb Clauses

The remaining five clauses (four from the prose corpus and one, 1QM XIII.11-12, from the poetic corpus) all begin with a Subject–X–Verb pattern. To determine if these clauses involve left-
dislocation of the subject (with null subject resumption) or fronting of the subject, I will use the same criteria I used to distinguish left-dislocation from fronting in IQS.  

314.

Table 42: Fronting or Dislocation? Clause-initial subjects followed by a conjunction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a(i)</th>
<th>a(ii.)</th>
<th>a(ii.)</th>
<th>b(i)</th>
<th>b(ii)</th>
<th>b(iii.)</th>
<th>b(iv.)</th>
<th>c(i)</th>
<th>c(ii)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QM II.2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM II.3</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM II.4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XIII.11-12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(poetic corpus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XIV.12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(poetic corpus)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(114) Research Questions Regarding Left-Dislocated Constituents (LDCs)

(a) simplifying LD:
   (i) *Is the LDC discourse-new/rhematic?*
   (ii) Is the resumption in a position disfavoured for discourse-new entities?
      (a) *Is the resumption a subject?*
      (b) *Is the resumption a possessive?*
(b) resumptive pronoun topicalization (RPT):
   (i) *Is the LDC the main clause topic?*  
      i.e. Is the LDC given? AND Does it satisfy the aboutness criterion?
   (ii) *Would preposing be difficult or impossible?*

314. I do not include 1QM XVIII.12-13 (from the poetic corpus) in this analysis because left-dislocation is not a potential interpretation; in an LD clause, the LDC must be clause-initial. 1QM XIII.10 (from the poetic corpus) cannot be left-dislocation because there is no resumption.

315. Column (b (ii)) regarding whether preposing is difficult or impossible is not answerable because it is not known if double fronting is permitted. If it is permitted, then fronting the subject over the already fronted constituent would be acceptable, but otherwise not.

316. The preceding context of 1QM II.2 is fragmentary, so there is no evidence available to evaluate whether the subject has been selected from a set.

317. This question is also used to assess the presence of topic marking.
(iii) Is the LDC selecting exclusively or non-exclusively from a set?  
(a) Is the LDC selecting exclusively from an available set?  
(b) Is the LDC selecting non-exclusively from an available set?  
(iv) Is the LDC a shift topic or a continued topic?  
(a) Is the LDC a shift topic?  
(b) Is the LDC a continued topic?  
(c) poset-inference triggering LD:  
(i) Is a poset relationship available to the LDC?  
(ii) If there is a poset, is the relationship contrastive?  

In all five clauses with Subject–X–Verb structures, the subject is a shift topic. Only one clause (in 1QM II.2) has the characteristics of simplifying LD, and there are no clauses that exhibit poset-inference triggering LD. The criteria for resumptive pronoun topicalization (category (b)) are not relevant because these clauses do not have resumptive pronouns. It was concluded in Chapter 4 that in 1QS, LD is a topic-shift-marking device. Since all of the cases of double fronting in 1QM use pre-verbal shift topic subjects as far as it can be determined, and there are no clear counter-examples, the possibility that these clauses are further examples of topic-shift-marking LD, akin to those clauses in 1QS with a pre-verbal subject followed by a conjunction, cannot be ruled out on the basis of information structure.

Nevertheless, there is no need to appeal to LD to explain these clauses. This construction would be otherwise unknown from a syntactic perspective. When LD occurs in 1QS, a conjunction or complementizer is used at the boundary between the LDC and the main clause, while in

318. Selecting exclusively entails contrast. Selecting non-exclusively entails restrictiveness. Cf. § 2.4.3.
319. This question is only relevant if it is determined that topicalization is taking place, in order to qualify the nature of the topicalization.
320. This question is also used to assess the presence of contrast marking.
1QM it is only an adjunct or complement that intervenes. This is not enough to require an LD interpretation in the 1QM examples. In 1QM II.2 and possibly in 1QM II.4\textsuperscript{321} that constituent is a PP adjunct of manner; in 1QM II.3 the constituent is an NP adjunct of manner; in 1QM XIII.10 (poetic corpus) it is a temporal adjunct; in 1QM XIII.11-12 (poetic corpus) it is a locative complement PP; and in 1QM XIV.12 (poetic corpus) it is a causative adjunct PP. Such constructions do not occur elsewhere in the HPH corpus, and better explanations are available.

1QM XIII.11-12 (poetic corpus) can easily be read as two separate clauses rather than as one larger clause with double fronting. In fact, Garcia Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997: 135) translate this text as two separate clauses: "All the spirits of his lot are angels of destruction, they walk in the laws of darkness."

(115) 1QM XIII.11-12

ובולروحגורלותובשלחוקוחושךוחלבך

\textit{wkwl rw}hy gwrlw ml’k\textit{y hbl h\textit{hwqy hw\textit{sk ythlkw}}}

\textit{CONJ-all spirit.CSTR.MP lot-PRON.3MS angel.CSTR.MP destruction in-statute.CSTR.MP darkness go\_about.IMPF.3MP}

And all the spirits of his lot are angels of destruction. In statutes of darkness they go about.

Elsewhere this text has been treated as one complete clause; cf. Wise, Abegg, and Cook (2005: 160), "All the spirits of his lot, the angels of destruction, walk in accord with the rule of dark-

\textsuperscript{321} In the clause in 1QM II.4, it is unclear whether there are two pre-verbal constituents. As in 1QM XIII.10, it is uncertain whether the PP that follows the subject modifies the subject or the verb. The clause begins, "רואים משמורות של פקודת בהילק, "And the chiefs of their divisions with their appointed ones will take their stand. . . "}
ness." Interpreting this text as two separate clauses is the simpler reading and avoids the need to posit complex information structure patterns with few parallels elsewhere in HPH.

Like 1QM XIII.11-12, 1QM XIV.12 (poetic corpus) can be translated as two separate clauses.

(116) 1QM XIV.12

And we are your holy people. We will praise your name for your works of truth.

In this case, most translators have chosen to translate the text as a single clause. However, splitting this text into two clauses is at least equally acceptable, if not preferable. From the perspective of the larger discourse, the text is fragmentary, but it's arguable that the larger discourse context in 1QM XIII–XIV uses short verbless clauses beginning with a conjunction and the first person plural independent pronoun אֲנִי as a structuring device, such that each verbless clause with אֲנִי introduces an expository section (cf. 1QM XIII.6, 12; XIV.8, 12).

322 Wise, Abegg, and Cook (2005: 161) translate "But we, Your holy people, shall praise Your name for Your works of truth." García Martínez and Tigchelaar (1997: 137) translate "We, your holy people, will praise your name for the deeds of your truth." Such a reading does

323 1QM XIII.6, "We are an [eter]na[l] people," is followed by exposition of the idea of an eternal people. 1QM XIII.12 (poetic corpus), "We are in the lot of your truth," is followed by an exposition of election. 1QM XIV.8 (poetic corpus), "We are the remnant of your people," is followed by an exposition of a surviving and preserved remnant. 1QM XIV.12 (poetic corpus), "We are your holy people," is followed by an exposition of what the holy people must do, written in the form of promises to behave as holy people, praising and serving God at the appropriate times and places. If this interpretation is correct, the use of "but" in English
not require a double fronting construction. Since there is a simple alternative to double fronting available, it is best to be conservative and set this example aside when evaluating double fronting in 1QM.

After setting aside 1QM XIII.11-12 and XIV.12 (both from the poetic corpus), the three Subject–X–Verb clauses that remain occur in 1QM II.2-4 (from the prose corpus). All three have the same Subject–Adjunct–Verb structure, although unlike the first two clauses, the third clause in 1QM II.4 seems to have one or two post-verbal adjuncts. The first two clauses, in 1QM II.2 and II.3, end with the finite verb, while the third, in 1QM II.4, does not.

(117) 1QM II.2

And the twenty-six chiefs of the divisions shall serve in their divisions

(118) 1QM II.3

And the chiefs of their divisions shall serve, each man in his office
And the chiefs of their divisions shall take their stand with their appointed ones on their festivals, on their new moons, on the sabbaths, and on all the days of the year, from the age of fifty and above. These shall take their stand over the burnt offerings and over the sacrifices in order to arrange . . .

The clause-initial subjects in (117), (118), and (119) can be understood as fronted shift topics with little difficulty based on the discourse context. However, the motivations for fronting the adjuncts "in their divisions," "each man in his office," and "with their appointed" are more difficult to identify. The distinctions among these adjuncts do not seem significant enough to emphasize. This is especially true in 1QM II.3, where the adjunct "each man in his office" is so tepid as to be semantically unnecessary. The information provided by these adjuncts seems so uninteresting that the probability is greater that these adjuncts have been fronted as non-topics, to create a certain type of information structure. In 1QM II.2 and II.3, a good interpretation is to take the clause-final verb ישה, "they shall serve," as an attentive focus, where the pre-verbal adjunct has been fronted as a non-topic in order to permit the verb to occupy a clause-final attentive focus position.324 The attention of the reader is thereby focused on the basic act of service performed by

324. For an explanation of fronting for the purpose of clause-final attentive focus, see §4.4. For examples of fronting for clause-final attentive focus elsewhere in HPH, see examples (82)–
the chiefs, thereby emphasizing the significance of duty and obligation to God in general rather than any specific manifestation of it for any specific group.

This interpretation cannot apply to 1QM II.4, where the verb is probably not the final element in the clause. There is much room for interpretation here, however, because there are two verbal adjuncts which may modify either the clause that precedes them or the clause that follows them. These two adjuncts occur at the end of 1QM II.4: "on their festivals, new moons, and Sabbaths, and on all days of the year"; and "from the age of fifty upwards" (Wise, Abegg, and Cook 2005: 149). If both of these adjuncts modify the posterior clause, then the verb would indeed be the final element in the double fronting clause in 1QM II.4. This would permit us to apply to 1QM II.4 the final attentive focus interpretation that we used for 1QM II.2 and II.3. However, applying both adjuncts to the posterior clause would create another clause with double fronting in 1QM II.4-6, and assigning the motivations for fronting in that clause would be difficult. In my opinion, the best rendering from a syntactic perspective is to place the first adjunct with the anterior clause and the second adjunct with the posterior clause. This grouping has several advantages. First, it allows II.4 to satisfy the EICT. Otherwise, if both adjuncts were placed with the anterior clause, the final constituent of that clause would not have the largest phrase marker. Second, it connects the enclitic pronouns of the first adjunct more closely with their antecedent in the anterior clause. Third, it provides a suitable function for the second adjunct "from the age of fifty
upwards." In this reading, the phrase "from the age of fifty upwards," is a verbal adjunct that has been fronted because of its restrictive feature. As a restrictive adjunct that modifies the main clause in 1QM II.5-6, it marks sacrifice as a specific duty to be performed only by those aged fifty and above.

Additionally, the phrase "with their appointed ones," can be taken as a modifier of the subject "the chiefs of their divisions," just as easily as it could be a verbal modifier. In this use, the preposition "with," is "close in meaning to ḫ," the conjunction, and this use of ḫ is common in the Dead Sea Scrolls. This would eliminate the second pre-verbal element in this particular clause. An approximate translation of 1QM II.4-6 would then be "The chiefs of their divisions and their appointed ones shall take their stand on their festivals on their new moons, on the sabbaths, and on all the days of the year. From the age of fifty and above, these shall take their stand over the burnt offerings and over the sacrifices to arrange the incense of soothing odor according to the will of God, in order to atone for all of his assembly and to fatten themselves before Him continually at the table of glory." This creates the restrictive distinction that while all of the chiefs and their appointees have roles to play on the festivals, only those aged fifty and above are permitted to preside specifically over the sacrifices—a point that is missed by the standard translations. The structure of 1QM II.4 should be [Subject (including the NP-modifying PP)] [Verb] [Conjoined Temporal Adjunct], while that of 1QM

II.4-6 should be [Restrictive "Temporal" Adjunct] [Subject Pronoun] [Verb] [Locative Complement] [Conjoined Adjunct of Purpose].

In sum, double fronting does occur in 1QM in at least three cases: 1QM II.2, 3 (prose corpus); and 1QM XIII.10 (poetic corpus). It is possible to explain some structures in 1QM that appear to use double fronting by appeal to an unusual form of left-dislocation, but this is unnecessary and without parallel. Several structures that appear to involve double fronting can be better interpreted by regrouping clauses or reassigning adjuncts in ways that translators have not typically done. For example, in this way 1QM II.4-6 (prose corpus) and 1QM XIII.11-12; XIV.12; and XVIII.12-13 (poetic corpus) can be straightforwardly explained without double fronting. At the end of the analysis, three clauses in 1QM clearly use double fronting, and these are found in 1QM II.2, 3; and XIII.10. The clauses in 1QM II.2, 3 (prose corpus) should be understood as [Shift Topic, Subject] [Non-Topic, Locative Adjunct] [Verb] structures, where the fronting of the non-topic locative adjuncts are motivated by the placement of the verb ישרת, "they shall serve," in clause-final, attentive focus position.327 The clause in 1QM XIII.10 (poetic corpus) should be

327. Fassberg (2013: 59–60) lists five clauses that utilize double fronting in CD III.3-12 as support for the suggestion that HPH demonstrates SV basic order. Yet there are features in all five of these clauses that could motivate SV order even if VS order were basic. Three of these occur in succession in CD III.9-10 and share a nearly identical structure with 1QM II.2, 3: [Shift Topic, Subject] [Non-Topic, Causative Adjunct] [Verb]; the only distinction is that in CD III.9-10, the adjuncts are causal rather than locative. Like 1QM II.2, 3, these clauses also front the adjunct in order to place the verb in the clause-final attentive focus position. The focused verbs in CD draw the attention to the concept of perishing and being cut off, emphasizing it further by ending three short clauses in succession with reference to the concept. Cf. CD III.9(a), והלכים וב_nbrת, "And their sons, because of it, perished."; CD III.9(b), והלכים וב_nbrת, "And their kings, because of it, were cut off."; and CD III.9-10, והלכים וב_nbrת, "And their warriors, because of it, perished." The fourth clause utilizes a shift topic subject, which is a possible motivation of subject fronting, and the PP that follows it should be taken as a modifier of the
understood as a [Shift Topic, Direct Object Complement] [Stage Topic, Temporal Adjunct] [Verb] [Adjunct] structure, where the clause-initial shift topic is the main topic of the clause and the stage topic which follows it is a Non-Topic. Fronting a stage topic normally marks a clause as an "all-Focus" clause. In this case, where a Topic has already been fronted ahead of it, it marks the remainder of the clause as Focus, excluding the clause-initial Topic. The stage topic occurs in a pre-verbal position, as is typical for temporal phrases that refer to a point in time rather than a duration of time.

5.3.2.2. Temporal Adjuncts

Most of the temporal phrases in the 1QM corpus are pre-verbal.328 As with 1QS, I analyze temporal phrases in relation to the entire clause and not only the verb, since the conclusions I draw about their placement in the clause are valid for copula (or "verbless") clauses as well as for verb-
bal clauses. Of the pre-verbal temporal phrases, the only non clause-initial phrase is from the poetic corpus: the phrase منذ, "long ago," in 1QM XIII.10. This clause is discussed in detail above (cf. §5.3.2.1.2).

The table below lists the prepositions used to introduce temporal adjuncts in all clause types in 1QM.\footnote{In 1QM XVI.15-16**, the temporal phrase is preceded by the complementizer (it is a subordinate clause).} For clauses with a finite-verb, the phrase is listed in the left-hand column if it is pre-verbal, and in the right-hand column if it is post-verbal. For other clause types, the phrase is listed in the left-hand column if it is clause-initial, and in the right-hand column if it is clause-final.\footnote{Only three temporal phrases in 1QM are neither clause-initial nor clause-final. In 1QM XIII.10 (poetic corpus), the temporal phrase is pre-verbal but not clause-initial (cf. §5.3.2.1). In 1QM I.8-9* and II.4, the temporal phrases are post-verbal but not clause-final.} Exceptions are marked in bold type.
Table 43: Temporal Prepositions in 1QM: Clause-initial/pre-verbal, Clause-final/post-verbal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Preposition</th>
<th>Clause-Initial/Pre-Verbal</th>
<th>Clause-Final/Post-Verbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אָחָר, &quot;after&quot;</td>
<td>I.3; VI.4(c); VIII.2, 13-14; XIV.2(a); XVI.3-4; XVII.10</td>
<td>I.2-3*; II.6; III.1, 2, 2, 7; VII.3-4, 5-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ב, &quot;at,&quot; &quot;on,&quot; &quot;when,&quot; &quot;in&quot; (clause-initial); &quot;during,&quot; &quot;when&quot; (clause-final)</td>
<td>I.4, 8-9*, 9-10, 10-11; II.6-7, 8-9, 9(a), 10, 10-11, 11, 12, 12-13, 13, 13-14*, 14**; III.4, 10(a); IV.6, 7, 8, 9, 11-12, 13-14; V.3; VII.9-11, 13-14; VIII.6-8; IX.3, 7*; XIV.2(b); XVI.6-7; XVIII.3-4*; XIX.9-11**. In the poetic corpus: XIII.8-9*, 10(b)**.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ל, &quot;on/during&quot;: II.4</td>
<td>I.8-9*; II.4. In the poetic corpus: XIII.7(a).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לַאֵל, &quot;before&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td>XIV.3(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מ, &quot;from,&quot; various temporal translations</td>
<td>XVI.15-16**. In the poetic corpus: XIII.10; XVIII.10.</td>
<td>In the poetic corpus: XVIII.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>דָּע, &quot;until&quot;</td>
<td>I.8; VIII.1-2, 6-8, 11-13; XVI.5*; XIX.9. In the poetic corpus: XI.1-2, 6-7, 10-11.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>וּשְּפִּי, &quot;after,&quot; &quot;during&quot;: XIV.8-9*</td>
<td>VIII.10-11; XVI.8. In the poetic corpus: XIV.8-9*.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עִתֵּה, &quot;now (today)&quot;</td>
<td>In the poetic corpus: XVIII.12-13*.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>II.9(b)</td>
<td>II.7-8332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

331. 1QM I.2-3* is fragmentary due to a missing word in the middle of the clause, but the basic structure is clear. This is an interesting exception, because a temporal phrase denoting a specific point in time such as this is nearly always clause-initial. It may be that the temporal phrase is postposed due to its length or in order to mark it as a final attentive focus.

332. The temporal phrase in 1QM II.7-8, "year after year," is best interpreted as a modifier of the preceding NP תובע התובע לע המלעה: "the directives of war," rather than a modifier of the main verb יחלו: "they shall prepare." This both fits the context best and also allows the clause to satisfy the EICT.
As in 1QS, temporal phrases that reference an instantaneous moment in time, whether absolute or relative (now, before, after, etc.), are generally fronted as stage topics, while temporal phrases referring to temporal duration (during, while, until, etc.) are generally not. In 1QM, the few exceptions prove the rule. 1QM XIII.10 (poetic corpus) involves double fronting, as discussed above (cf. example (113)). The best explanation for מָזָּ as a special particle is that it is a stage topic that has become a secondary topic due to the fronting of a shift topic. Unfortunately, the scarcity of double fronting constructions makes this difficult to analyze. In 1QM II.6, a shift topic is fronted, and the temporal PP introduced by the ב preposition is post-verbal, even though it is normally expected to be pre-verbal. It cannot be the case that the shift topic has taken its pre-verbal position away because of the counter-example in 1QM XIII.10. This suggests that the temporal phrase has been shifted to the clause-final position in order to place it in attentive focus; otherwise it would be pre-verbal. In 1QM XIV.3(b) the לפני phrase would normally be pre-verbal, but temporal phrases are not necessarily fronted as stage topics in subordinate clauses.

Finally, the series of eight pre-verbal ב temporal phrases in II.8–13 (as well as the two additional in fragmentary clauses that follow) unexpectedly carries a durative sense. 333 This sug-
gests that these temporal phrases have been fronted as contrastive elements rather than as stage topics. A representative example from 1QM II.8-9 is provided below.

(120) 1QM II.7-9

macro šby yšr’l yhlwšw lhm ‘nšy hyl ls’t lšb’ kpy t’wkw tmlhnh šnh bšnh
whšny hšmtym lw’ yhlwšw ls’t lšb’ ky’ šbt mnh h’lyšr’l
from-all tribe.cstr.mp Israel equip.impf.3mp for-pron.3mp man.cstr.mp valor to-go_out.inf to-war according_to confirmation.fp art-battle year in-year
conj-in-year.cstr.fp art-remission.fp neg equip.impf.3mp to-go_out.inf to-war because sabbath rest pron.3fs for-Israel

From all the tribes of Israel they shall equip for themselves men of valor to go out to war according to the confirmations of the battle year after year. But during the years of remission they shall not equip [men] to go out to war because [it is] a sabbath of rest for Israel.

The fronted, constrastive temporal phrase has been underlined in example (120). This temporal phrase, "during the years of remission," contrasts with the temporal phrase from the preceding clause, "year after year." The remaining clause-initial temporal phrases in 1QM II.8-13 also have similar contrastive features which provide the most likely explanation for the clause-initial position of these temporal phrases. The general tendency of durative temporal phrases to appear in a post-verbal and/or clause-final position makes the contrastive features of these temporal phrases easier to identify and permits a more confident assertion that the contrastive features are the motivations for the frontings of the durative temporal phrases in 1QM II.8-13.

An awareness of the tendencies of temporal phrases can also aid with translation. The clause-initial phrase "with all our generations," in 1QM XIV.8-9* (poetic corpus) is given a temporal sense by both Wise, Abegg, and Cook 2005 ("throughout") and García
Martínez and Tigchelaar 1997 ("during"), although it was likely not conceived in a temporal sense by the Hebrew writer, given that a durative temporal phrase such as this would normally be post-verbal.

In general, there are no surprises regarding temporal phrases in 1QM vis-à-vis 1QS. Temporal phrases that refer to an instantaneous point in time, whether absolute or relative, are generally clause-initial and/or pre-verbal. Temporal phrases that refer to duration or an indefinite time are generally clause-final and/or post-verbal. Exceptions to these tendencies result from IS motivations such as contrastive topic-fronting or placing a constituent in the final attentive focus position.

5.3.2.3. Fronting of Complements in the 1QM Prose Corpus

5.3.2.3.1. Main clauses

About seven percent of verbal complements in finite verb clauses in the 1QM prose corpus are pre-verbal.\(^{334}\) Tables 44 and 45 outline the figures for fragmentary and non-fragmentary clauses.

---

334. Six out of 88 verbal complements are pre-verbal (6.8%). When fragmentary clauses are included, 8 of 112 complements are pre-verbal (7.1%). In 1QS, 18 of 137 verbal complements are pre-verbal (13.1%).
Table 44: Verbal Complements in Non-fragmentary Finite Verb Clauses of the 1QM Prose Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Clauses</strong></td>
<td>335</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subordinate Clauses</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 45: Verbal Complements in Finite Verb Clauses of the 1QM Prose Corpus (including fragmentary clauses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Clauses</strong></td>
<td>337</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subordinate Clauses</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

335. Pre-verbal (6): 1QM II.1-2, 6; IV.11, 12-13; V.3; VI.4(a). Post-verbal (78): 1QM I.3; II.1-2, 7-8, 10, 10-11, 11, 12, 12-13, 13; III.2, 3(a), 3(b), 3-4, 4-5, 5-6, 6, 7-8, 8, 8-9, 9(a), 9(b), 10(a), 10-11, 13-14; IV.1, 1-2, 2-3, 3-4(a), 4-5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11-12, 13-14; VI.2, 2-3, 3, 6, 8(a); VII.4-5, 9-11, 13-14, 16; VIII.2, 3, 3-4, 4, 5, 6-8, 8-9, 9-10, 13-14; IX.3, 3-4, 6, 7-8, 13-14; XIII.1, 2-3; XIV.2(a), 2(b), 2-3, 3(a), 3-4, 4-5; XVI.1(b), 3-4, 4(c), 4-5, 6-7, 8, 11, 13(b); XVII.1, 13-14; XVIII.4, 6(a).

336. Post-verbal (4): 1QM VII.5-6; VIII.8; IX.2; XIV.3(b). Cf. §5.3.2.3.3.

337. Pre-verbal (8): 1QM II.1-2, 6; IV.11, 12-13; V.3; VI.4(a); XIV.5-6*; XVI.3*. Post-verbal (93): 1QM I.2-3*, 3; II.1-2, 7-8, 10, 10-11, 11, 12, 12-13, 13; III.2, 3(a), 3(b), 3-4, 4-5, 5-6, 6, 7-8, 8-9, 9(a), 9(b), 10(a), 10-11, 13-14; IV.1, 1-2, 2-3, 3-4(a), 4-5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11-12, 13-14; VI.1-2*, 2, 2-3, 3, 6, 8(a); VII.4-5, 9-11, 13-14, 16; VIII.2, 3, 3-4, 4, 5, 6-8, 8-9, 9-10, 13-14; IX.1*, 3, 3-4, 6, 7-8, 8-9*, 13-14; X.5-6*; XIII.1, 2-3; XIV.2(a), 2(b), 2-3, 3(a), 3-4, 4-5, 5**; XVI.1(b), 3-4, 4(a)**, 4(c), 4-5, 6-7, 8, 11, 13(b); XVII.1, 6* (2x), 11*, 12-13*, 13*, 13-14, 14(a)*, 14(b)*; XVIII.4, 6(a); XIX.9-11**. Pre-verbal complements in the poetic corpus (3) occur in 1QM XI.10; XII.1-2*; XIV.10(a)**. Post-verbal complements in the poetic corpus (11) occur in 1QM XI.7-9* (2x), 9-10; XII.1-2*; XIV.8-9*, 9-10** (2x), 10(b)**, 10-11, 11-12, 12. One pre-verbal complement that depends upon biblical syntax occurs in 1QM VII.11-12. Post-verbal complements that depend upon biblical syntax (2) occur in 1QM VII.11-12; XIV.4(a).

338. Post-verbal (11): 1QM VII.5-6; VIII.8; IX.2; X.1-2* (2x); XIV.3(b); XVI.1(a)*, 15-16**; XVII.9(a)*, 9(b)* (2x).
This data strongly suggests, as expected, that the pre-verbal position is the marked position for verbal complements, while the post-verbal position is the unmarked position.

When the possible motivations for pre-verbal positioning of verbal complements are examined, the evidence suggests that pre-verbal complements in the 1QM prose corpus have been fronted from one or more of four possible motivations: (1) marking a shift topic; (2) contrast marking; (3) restrictiveness marking; and (4) creating a cleft sentence. The fronting of a complement to permit an attentive focus constituent to occur in clause-final position, which occurs in 1QS, does not occur in 1QM. The IS and poetic features of pre-verbal complements in 1QM are listed below in Table 46.

Table 46: Pre-verbal Complements in the 1QM Prose Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Contrast</th>
<th>Restrictiveness</th>
<th>Cleft</th>
<th>CFAF</th>
<th>Poetic Parallelism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.1-2</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.6</td>
<td>shift topic</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.11</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.12-13</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.4(a)</td>
<td>shift topic</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV.5-6*</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.3*</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2 (+1 frag.)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (+1 frag.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

339. However, this does occur with adjuncts in 1QM (cf. §5.3.2.4.1).
340. This clause has a stage topic (למלחמה בצאתם).
341. This clause has a stage topic (למלחמה בRestore the balance).
The results can be seen in the final line of the table, where the number of fragmentary clauses are included in parentheses.

**Shift Topics**

Two of the fronted complements are topics, and the context permits us to identify these as shift topics.\(^{342}\) Both of the shift topics are anaphoric pronouns. 1QM VI.4(a) is shown below as an example.

\[(121)\ 1QM\ VI.4(a)\]

\begin{verbatim}
 kwl ʾlh ytylw šbʿ pʿmym
 all DEM.P throw.IMPF.3MP seven time.MP
 All of these they will throw seven times.
\end{verbatim}

\(^{342}\) These clauses occur in 1QM II.6; VI.4(a). In 1QM II.1-2 the context is too fragmentary to identify whether the topic is a shift topic or a continued topic. One pre-verbal shift topic complement occurs in a fragmentary clause in 1QM XVI.3*. One pre-verbal shift topic complement occurs in the poetic corpus in 1QM XIV.10(a)**.
Contrastive and Restrictive Complements

There are no pre-verbal contrastive complements in the 1QM prose corpus.\(^{343}\) Two of the pre-verbal complements are restrictive.\(^{344}\) One pre-verbal restrictive complement is shown below as an example.

(122) 1QM IV.11

\(wprwš šnwm\ yktwbw 'm kwl srkm\)

\(\text{CONJ-list name.FP-PRON.3MP write.IMPF.3MP with all order-PRON.3MP}\)

And the list of their names they shall write with all their order.

The restrictive complement, "the list of their names," does not have an exclusive contrast relationship with anything explicitly mentioned in the discourse, and it does not necessarily exclude the writing of anything else, as evidenced by the preceding and following context.

343. One pre-verbal contrastive complement occurs in a text that depends upon biblical syntax in 1QM VII.11-12. Although this clause parallels the syntax of Lev 12:4, it does fit well into the context as a pre-verbal contrastive constituent. In 1QM VII.11-12, the pre-verbal complement \(\text{ל אל המקדש}\), "to the sanctuary," contrasts with \(\text{ל אל בֵּית המששׁות}\), "to (the space) between the battle lines" in 1QM VII.9. According to the text, the latter is the correct place for the priests to be at that time, while the former, in contrast, is not where the priests belong.

344. The pre-verbal restrictive complements occur in 1QM IV.11, 12-13. One pre-verbal restrictive complement occurs in a fragmentary clause in 1QM XIV.5-6*. Two pre-verbal contrastive complements occur in the poetic corpus in 1QM XI.10; XII.1-2*. 
Cleft Sentences

One of the fronted complements is a non-topic fronted to mark a cleft sentence, where everything that is not fronted serves as the topic. The final clause in the example below is the cleft sentence.

(123) 1QM V.3

srk lsdr dgly hnlmhm bhml' šb'm lhšym mʾrkt pnym 'l ʾlp ʾyš tʾsr hmrk
rule for-order banner.mp.cstr art-war when-be_filled.inf army-pron.3mp
to-make_complete battle_line.fs.cstr front on thousand man be_formed.impf.3fs
ART-battle_line.fs
Rule for the order of the banners of war: when their army is complete, to complete a front battle line. It is of a thousand men that the battle line shall be formed.

Since the fact that a battle line shall be formed is already known before the final clause is reached, this is topical information. Fronting the only non-topical information in the clause, על איש אלף, "of a thousand men," creates a cleft structure.

5.3.2.3.2. Allosentences in main clauses

Before conclusions can be drawn about IS-motivated fronting in the 1QS prose corpus, the allosentences for clauses with pre-verbal complements must be examined to demonstrate a statistically significant distinction between the pre-verbal and post-verbal complements with respect to their IS features.

345. The cleft sentence is found in 1QM V.3. One cleft sentence occurs in the poetic corpus in 1QM XI.13.
The allosentences for the clauses with fronted complements are clauses with post-verbal complements and no fronted constituents. There are 22 allosentences for the 8 main clauses (plus 4 fragmentary clauses) with pre-verbal complements in the 1QM prose corpus.

Table 47: Complements with IS features that could directly motivate fronting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

346. One clause with an additional fronted constituent in addition to a fronted complement occurs in the poetic corpus in 1QM XIII.10; cf. §5.3.2.1.2.

347. These are found in the following clauses. Shift Topic (1): 1QM II.9(b). Continued Topic (1): 1QM XVIII.4 (partial continued topic). Contrast (2): 1QM VIII.3; IX.6. Restrictiveness (8): 1QM VIII.4; IX.7-8; XIII.1; XIV.3(a); XVI.4(a), 4-5, 13(b); XVIII.6(a). Cleft (1): 1QM XIV.2-3. Clause-final attentive focus (1): 1QM XIV.3-4. None (8): 1QM III.9(a), 9(b); VIII.3-4, 5; IX.3-4; XIII.2-3; XIV.4-5; XVII.1. 1QM III.9(b) is quoted speech. In two of the clauses, the post-verbal complement is a light-PP that immediately follows the main verb. One of these has no relevant features (1QM IX.3-4). The other is the continued topic (1QM XVII.4).


350. Pre-verbal (2): 1QM IV.11, 12-13. Post-verbal (8): 1QM VIII.4; IX.7-8; XIII.1; XIV.3(a); XVI.4(a), 4-5, 13(b); XVIII.6(a).


Table 48: Complements without IS features that could directly motivate fronting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic(^{353})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No IS Features(^{354})</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 49: Comparison of 1QM main clauses with pre-verbal complements with their allosentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic / Contrast / Cleft / Clause-final attentive focus / Restrictiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic / No IS Features</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In clauses with features that could directly motivate fronting, 3 of 15 complements are pre-verbal. In clauses without such features, 1 of 10 complements are pre-verbal. The distinction between these two ratios is not statistically significant.\(^{355}\) There is little noticeable difference between the features of the pre-verbal and post-verbal clauses.

As was the case in 1QS, if restrictiveness is not considered as a motivating feature of fronting, the evidence in favor of IS-motivated fronting becomes stronger. However, once restrictive clauses are removed (and possibly even before their removal), the amount of available data is too small to produce a meaningful result.

---

354. Pre-verbal (1): 1QM II.1-2 (fragmentary context). Post-verbal (8): 1QM III.9(a), 9(b); VIII.3-4, 5; IX.3-4; XIII.2-3; XIV.4-5; XVII.1.
355. For this calculation, \( p < 0.1 \).
5.3.2.3.3. Subordinate clauses

Verbal complements in subordinate clauses are nearly always post-verbal in 1QM. The one exception appears in a fragmentary clause in the poetic corpus with the subordinator כיא, "because" (cf. 1QM XI.13*, poetic corpus). The distributions of verbal complements with the three subordinators אשר (relative particle), כיא ("because," ) and עד ("until") are provided in Table 50.

Table 50: Distribution of Verbal Complements with Complementizers in the 1QM prose corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal (fragmentary)</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אשר</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (+2 frag.)</td>
<td>2 (+2 frag.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כיא</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 (+2 frag.)</td>
<td>0 (+2 frag.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>עד</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (+3 frag.)</td>
<td>2 (+3 frag.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (+7 frag.)</td>
<td>4 (+7 frag.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since there is no pre-verbal complement in a subordinate clause in the 1QM prose corpus, there is not sufficient evidence to argue for IS-motivated complement fronting in subordinate clauses in 1QM. The only pre-verbal complement in a subordinate clause in 1QM occurs in a fragmentary clause in the poetic corpus (cf. 1QM XI.13*).

---

356. Post-verbal complements are found in 1QM VII.5-6; XIV.3(b). Post-verbal complements in fragmentary clauses (2) occur in 1QM X.1-2* (2x). One post-verbal complement occurs in a clause that depends on biblical syntax in 1QM X.8-9.

357. Post-verbal complements are found in fragmentary clauses in 1QM XVI.1(a)*, 15-16**. Two post-verbal complements are found in the poetic corpus in 1QM XI.13*; XVIII.10. One pre-verbal complement is found in the poetic corpus in 1QM XI.13*.

358. Post-verbal complements are found in 1QM VIII.8; IX.2. Post-verbal complements in fragmentary clauses (3) occur in 1QM XVII.9(a)*, 9(b)* (2x).
5.3.2.4. Fronting of Non-temporal Adjuncts

The criteria of frequency and distribution indicate that the basic position for adjuncts is post-verbal. However, temporal adjuncts favour pre-verbal positions to an exceptional degree. This is almost certainly due to their tendency to be fronted as stage topics. For this reason, temporal adjuncts are treated separately from other adjuncts in section 5.3.2.2 above.

5.3.2.4.1. Pre-verbal non-temporal adjuncts

There are at least 30 pre-verbal adjuncts in the 1QM prose corpus that are not temporal. To test for all of the possibilities within Erteschik-Shir's framework, it is necessary to check if each fronted adjunct is a topic, shift topic, contrastive, restrictive, or a non-topic. What I believe to be the best interpretation for each of these clauses is provided below.

*Stage (Shift) Topics*

Two of these clauses have fronted adjuncts that function as stage topics. (Stage topics are considered a subset of shift topics.) Most stage topics are temporal adjuncts. I interpret these two

359. Pre-verbal non-temporal adjuncts (30) occur in 1QM I.12, 13; II.2, 3, 7-8; III.2, 3(a), 3(b), 3-4, 4-5, 5-6, 6, 7-8, 8, 8-9, 9(a), 10-11, 13-14; IV.1, 1-2, 2-3; VI.1(b), 2, 2-3, 3, 6, 8(b); IX.14-15; XIV.7; XVI.1(b). A clause where it is uncertain whether a pre-verbal adjunct is present is found in 1QM II.4. In the poetic corpus, pre-verbal non-temporal adjuncts occur in 1QM XIV.11-12, 12.

360. These occur in 1QM I.12; VI.1(b).
stage topics as locative adjuncts, but an argument can be made for interpreting these as temporal adjuncts. Such an argument would mean that all stage topics are temporal in 1QM.

(124) 1QM I.12

\[
wbkwlv s\textit{rwmt}lw' nhy\textit{th} km\textit{w}hs'h 'd tw\textit{m}h l\textit{pd}wt 'w\textit{lm}ym
\]

CONJ-in-all distress.FP-PRON.3MP NEG occur.PF.3FS like-PRON.3FS hastening to complete.INF-PRON.3FS for-redemption future_time.MP

In (during?) all their distresses, nothing like it has occurred, hastening to its completion for eternal redemption.

(125) 1QM VI.1(b)

\[
w\textit{hr}ymy m\textit{s}'w s\textit{lw}hs'h d\textit{g}ly b\textit{yn}ym
\]

CONJ-after-PRON.3MP go_out.IMPF.3MP three division.CSTR.MP infantry.MD

And after them three divisions of infantry shall go out.

Restrictive Stage Topics

There are twenty clauses with fronted adjuncts that can be interpreted as both stage topics and restrictive elements.\(^{361}\) (Stage topics are considered a subset of shift topics.) All twenty of these clauses have the same syntactic and semantic structure, beginning with a locative adjunct meaning "on the trumpet/sign [of some ordinal number or type]," then continuing with the verb יכותב, "they shall write," and ending with the phrase that is to be written. It is unclear if the locative adjuncts are fronted because they are stage topics or because they are restrictive elements.

\(^{361}\) These occur in 1QM III.2, 3(a), 3(b), 3-4, 4-5, 5-6, 6, 7-8, 8, 8-9, 9(a), 10-11, 13-14; IV.1, 1-2, 2-3; VI.2, 2-3, 3; IX.14-15.
Interpreting these clauses with final attentive focus is a less attractive option because in many cases the EICT would place the phrase to be written in clause-final position even if the locative phrase were post-verbal.\textsuperscript{362} In the end, it is not possible to determine whether these locative adjuncts have been fronted as stage topics or as restrictive elements, because they have features of both. Either or both of these motivations may be at work.

An example of this type of clause is provided below.

\textbf{(126) 1QM III.2}

\begin{center}
'\text{ல հսվրտ մզր հ’dի հետսակնե վրա կրիա անլ}\\
\text{On trumpet.}_{\text{FP}}\text{ assembly }_{\text{ART}}\text{-congregation write.}_{\text{IMPF.3MP}}\text{ called.}_{\text{MP. CSTR}}\text{ God}\\
\text{On the trumpets of the assembly of the congregation they shall write, }\text{"The called of God."}
\end{center}

\textit{Restrictive Constituent}

One clause has a fronted adjunct that is restrictive, but is probably not a stage topic. This clause occurs in 1QM I.13, where the clause-initial phrase "(in) three lots," describes the manner or periods of the battle during which the sons of light will emerge victorious. These three lots are compared with the next three lots, which are won by the army of Belial, as well as the seventh lot (cf. 1QM I.13-15). These are restrictive because these are not the only three lots where the sons of light are victorious—they are also victorious in the seventh lot.

\begin{center}
\textsuperscript{362} Cf. 1QM III.4-5, 5-6, 6, 8, 8-9, 9(a), 13-14; IV.1-2, 2-3; VI.2-3, 3.
\end{center}
šlwš gwrlwt yhzqw bny ʿwr lngwp ršʾh
three lot.FP stand_firm.IMPF.3MP son.CSTR.MP light to-defeat.INF wickedness
(In) three lots the sons of light will stand firm to defeat wickedness.

_Clefts_

Two of the clauses are best interpreted as clefts, although these clauses are difficult to interpret. In these clauses a non-topic is fronted and the remainder of the clause (the non-fronted portion) serves as the topic.363 The two clauses are provided below.

(128) 1QM II.7-8
mkwl šbty yšrʾl yhlwšw lhm ʿnšy hyl lʾt lšbʾ kpy tʾwbdwt hmlḥmh šnh bšnh
from-all tribe.CSTR.MP Israel equip for-PRON.3MP man.CSTR.MP strength to-go_out.INF
to-war as-mouth.CSTR.MS assembly.FP ART-battle year in-year
From all the tribes of Israel they shall equip for themselves men of strength to go out to war according to the assemblies of battle year after year.

(129) 1QM VI.8(b)
mzh wmzh yʾmwdw sdryhm
from-DEM.MS CONJ-from-DEM.MS stand.IMPF.3MP formation.MP-PRON.3MP
On one side and on the other their formations will stand.

In example (128), the fronted adjunct is מוכֹל שֶבֶטִי ישֶרֶל יָהלִּש וְלָה, "from all the tribes of Israel." The motivation for fronting here is murky because there is no clear element of contrast in the preceding or subsequent text. However, it is possible that the verb and the post-verbal material were

363. These occur in 1QM II.7-8; VI.8(b).
considered given information at this point, since the necessity of training and deploying troops for battle had already been discussed in more general terms. As a cleft, with the non-topical "from all the tribes of Israel" brought to the pre-verbal position, this clause would read smoothly.

In example (129), the necessity for formations to stand in some location or another can be assumed as given information. The new, focal information in this clause is the locative phrase מזוה מזוה, translated here as "on one side and on the other." The following text goes into more detail about this location, and it may be read as a separate clause or as a right-dislocated appositive to מזוה מזוה. The latter is a legitimate possibility because this postposed information is given and heavy material which goes into easily derivable detail about how many horsemen will be positioned on each side once they have been split into two groups with seven rows each.

*Fronting for Clause-Final Attentive Focus*

Four of these clauses have fronted adjuncts that are fronted as non-topics in order to permit another constituent to occupy the clause-final attentive focus position.364 Two of these occur as the second of two fronted constituents (cf. 1QM II.2, 3). In each case, the first fronted constituent is a stage topic subject. A full analysis of these two clauses can be found above in §5.3.2.1.3 and examples (117) and (118). One of the other two clauses with fronting that permits a new final attentive focus is shown below.

---

364. These occur in 1QM II.2, 3; VI.6; XVI.1(b). In the poetic corpus, one fronted constituent that permits a change in clause-final attentive focus occurs in 1QM XIV.11-12.
And with the holy ones of his people he shall act powerfully.

In example (130) the final attentive focus is הלי, "powerfully." The pre-verbal constituent "with the holy ones of his people," would occupy the clause-final position if it were post-verbal due to the EICT. Therefore it must be fronted in order to permit "powerfully" to occupy the clause-final attentive focus position. The other use of this structure, in 1QM XVI.1(b), is similar to example (130).

*Unknown*

The motivation for fronting in 1QM XIV.7 is difficult to identify. It is difficult to be sure if the fronted adjunct is contrastive or restrictive because the preceding context is fragmentary. What remains of the clause that precedes it in the first half of 1QM XIV.7 seems to suggest that poetic parallelism may be in play as well. The clause is given below.

(131) 1QM XIV.7

And by those who are perfect of way all nations shall come to an end.
5.3.2.4.2. Allosentences for clauses with pre-verbal non-temporal adjuncts

The allosentences for clauses with non-temporal pre-verbal adjuncts are those clauses that are identical in every respect except for the absence of a pre-verbal non-temporal adjunct and the presence of at least one post-verbal non-temporal adjunct. Clauses where the only post-verbal non-temporal adjunct is a clause-final infinitive phrase or subordinate clause are not included in the set of allosentences because infinitive phrase adjuncts nearly always occur in clause-final position in HPH and it is not clear that the pre-verbal position is grammatical for these constituents.\(^{365}\) Clauses where the post-verbal non-temporal adjunct is probably a light PP are not considered because there are no examples of fronted light PPs in 1QM.\(^{366}\) Clauses that occur in the poetic corpus of 1QM are not considered.\(^{367}\) Clauses that have two pre-verbal constituents will not be considered because there is no evidence that triple-fronting is grammatical in HPH.\(^{368}\)

---

\(^{365}\) Clauses with a clause-final non-temporal adjunct infinitive phrase can be found in 1QM I.6(b)*; VIII.10-11; X.5-6*; XIV.5-6*; XVI.3*. Clauses with a clause-final adjunct subordinate clause can be found in 1QM XI.15 (poetic corpus); XIX.9-11**. Clauses with a clause-final adjunct subordinate clause and a penultimate non-temporal adjunct infinitive phrase can be found in II.8-9; IX.7-8.

\(^{366}\) Clauses where the post-verbal non-temporal adjunct is probably a light PP occur in 1QM IX.6; X.9 (להמה); XI.9-10 (להמה, poetic corpus); XII.14(b) (לָהָם, poetic corpus); XVI.4-5 (לָהָם), 5-6* (לָהָם). Of these PPs only לָהָם does not have evidence in 1QM supporting the assertion that it is a light PP (cf. Table 61). The clause in 1QM X.9 (poetic corpus) is a subordinate clause.

\(^{367}\) Clauses in the poetic corpus that could be allosentences occur in 1QM XII.13(b); XIII.7-8; XVIII.8(a)*; XIX.13. Potential allosentences in the poetic corpus that depend upon biblical syntax occur in 1QM XII.11(a), 13-14*.

\(^{368}\) One clause with a post-verbal non-temporal adjunct and two pre-verbal constituents occurs in 1QM II.5-6 (where an LDC and the subject are pre-verbal). Three such clauses occur in the poetic corpus in 1QM XIII.9** (with pre-verbal subject and vocative); XIII.10 (with pre-
Clauses with some other pre-verbal constituent, such as a temporal adjunct, a complement, a subject, or a vocative, will be considered separately.

There are 19 allosentences for clauses with a pre-verbal non-temporal adjunct and no other pre-verbal constituent. These clauses have no pre-verbal constituent and at least one post-verbal non-temporal adjunct that is not a clause-final infinitive phrase or subordinate clause. Two of these are subordinate clauses (cf. 1QM IX.13-14; XIV.3(b)). The following table charts whether the features of the motivations for fronting are present in the allosentences. To have the potential to function as a cleft, the post-verbal non-temporal adjunct must be new information while the remainder of the clause contains given information. To have the potential for clause-final attentive focus, the post-verbal non-temporal adjunct must be clause-final and the penultimate clause constituent must be a good candidate for attentive focus.

Comparing the clauses with fronted non-temporal adjuncts and no other pre-verbal constituents with their allosentences reveals the following data.
Table 51: The best interpretations of main clauses in 1QM with fronted non-temporal adjuncts and the relevant allosentences, where the adjuncts have features that could motivate direct fronting of the complement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clauses with pre-verbal Adjuncts</th>
<th>Allosentences</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 52: The best interpretations of main clauses in 1QM with fronted non-temporal adjuncts and the relevant allosentences, where the adjuncts do not have features that could motivate direct fronting of the complement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clauses with pre-verbal Adjuncts</th>
<th>Allosentences</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing this data shows that the distinction is highly statistically significant.\(^{371}\)

---

371. For this calculation, \( p < 0.001 \).
Table 53: Comparison of 1QM main clauses with pre-verbal non-temporal adjuncts with their allosentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic / Contrast / Cleft / Clause-final attentive focus / Restrictiveness</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic / No IS Features</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, if may be that the 20 repetitive stage topic clauses regarding the writing on the trumpets are skewing the data. If these 20 clauses are removed, the distinction is still statistically significant.\(^{372}\) Once again, the data becomes much more clearly significant if restrictiveness is not included as a feature that motivates fronting.

There are 35 allosentences for clauses with a pre-verbal non-temporal adjunct and one other pre-verbal constituent.\(^{373}\) There are two such clauses in 1QM, in 1QM II.2, 3, and in these

\(^{372}\) For this calculation, p < 0.05.

\(^{373}\) There are 35 clauses with a post-verbal non-temporal adjunct and a pre-verbal constituent that is not a non-temporal adjunct. Where the pre-verbal constituent is a temporal adjunct (16): 1QM I.4, 10-11; III.10(a); IV.6, 7, 8, 9, 11-12, 13-14; VII.9-11; VIII.2, 6-8, 13-14; XVI.3-4, 8; XVII.10. Where the pre-verbal constituent is the subject (13): 1QM II.4; VI.8(a), 9; VII.3-4, 4-5, 5-6, 7; VIII.8-9, 9-10; IX.1, 5-6; XVII.8, 13-14. Where the pre-verbal constituent is a verbal complement (6): 1QM II.1-2; IV.11, 12-13; VI.1.2, 10.

In the poetic corpus, there are six allosentences of this type: 1QM XII.13(a) (with pre-verbal vocative); XIII.9-10 (with pre-verbal complement); XIII.10-11 (with pre-verbal subject); XIV.10-11 (with pre-verbal subject); XVIII.7 (with pre-verbal complement); XIX.5(a) (with pre-verbal vocative).

In addition, there are 15 such clauses that are fragmentary*. Where the pre-verbal constituent is a verbal complement (6): 1QM XI.2-3*; XII.1-2*; XIII.7(b)*; XIV.10(a)**; XVIII.7-8*, 13.* Where the pre-verbal constituent is a temporal adjunct (4): 1QM I.8-9*; II.13-14*, 14**; XIV.8-9*. Where the pre-verbal constituent is the subject (3): 1QM VI.1.2*; XVI.1(a)*; XVIII.2-3*. Where the pre-verbal constituent is a vocative (2): 1QM XVII.8-9*, XIX.7(a)**.
clauses a non-topic locative adjunct has been fronted in order to permit the verb to occupy the clause-final attentive focus position. Since there are only two clauses of this type with non-temporal adjunct fronting, there is not enough data to determine whether the distinction in features of the allosentences is statistically significant.

5.3.2.5. 1QM Poetic Corpus: Fronting of Complements and Adjuncts

The poetic corpus in 1QM contains those passages which are direct speech addressed to God and which focus on praise of God. These texts are frequently found alongside other texts that also directly address God, but the subject matter of these texts focuses more directly on praise of God rather than on historical retelling of God's deeds. This corpus consists of 1QM X.8–XII.18; XIII.7–18; XIV.8–19; XVIII.6–15; XIX.2–8 (cf. §5.1.3). It is difficult, if not impossible, to identify IS-related motivations for the ten fronted complements within this corpus, three of which are slightly fragmentary. All fronted complements within this corpus appear to be fronted for the purpose of poetic parallelism, as outlined in Table 54.

374. These clauses are found in 1QM XI.1-2, 2-3*; XIII.7(a), 7(b)*, 9-10, 10, 11-12; XVIII.7, 7-8*, 13*. 
Table 54: Pre-verbal Complements in the 1QM Poetic Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Contrast</th>
<th>Restrictiveness</th>
<th>Cleft</th>
<th>Clause-final Attentive Focus</th>
<th>Poetic Parallelism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XI.1-2</td>
<td>fc</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.2-3*</td>
<td>fc</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.7(a)</td>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.7(b)*</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.9-10</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.10</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.11-12</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.7</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.7-8*</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.13*</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (+4 frag.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the passages with pre-verbal complements in the 1QM poetic corpus, 1QM XI.1-4 is the best preserved passage. A close examination of this passage shows that IS-motivated features are not present in the fronted complements, leaving poetic parallelism as the only remaining possibility to explain the fronted complements in these clauses. These lines of poetry are provided in example (132). In the English translations, the pre-verbal constituents are underlined.
Indeed yours is the battle.

And by the strength of your hand their corpses have been shattered without burial.

And Goliath the Gittite, a mighty warrior, you delivered into the hand of David your servant because he trusted in your great name and not in sword or spear, because yours is the battle.

And the Philistines he subdued many times in your holy name.

And also by the hand of our kings you saved us many times because of your compassions and not according to our deeds, in which we did evil, and the actions of our transgressions.
The clauses in the text above have the following word orders:

- Adjunct–Verb–Subject–Adjunct (1QM XI.1)
- Complement–Verb–Complement–Adjunct (1QM XI.1-2)
- Complement–Verb–Adjunct–Adjunct (1QM XI.2-3)
- Complementizer–Adjunct–Verb–Complement–Adjunct–Adjunct–Adjunct (1QM XI.3-4)

None of the IS-related motivations for fronting apply to these four clauses.

Table 55 below shows that complements are fronted at a much higher rate in the poetic corpus than in the prose corpus of 1QM (cf. Table 44 above). In the prose corpus, 7% of complements are pre-verbal (6 of 88). On the other hand, in the poetic corpus 33% of complements are pre-verbal (6 of 18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main Clauses</td>
<td>6 (+4 frag.)</td>
<td>11 (+5 frag.)</td>
<td>17 (+9 frag.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Clauses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 (+4 frag.)</td>
<td>12 (+5 frag.)</td>
<td>18 (+9 frag.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The allosentences for clauses with pre-verbal complements in the poetic corpus demonstrate that there is no statistically significant evidence that can be used to argue for a correlation between pre-verbal complements and poetic parallelism in the poetic corpus. This is because

---

375. Pre-verbal (6): 1QM XI.1-2; XIII.7(a), 9-10, 10, 11-12. Post-verbal (11): 1QM XI.1-2, 3-4; XII.10-11, 11(b), 15; XIII.7-8, 9-10, 10-11 (2x); XIX.4(b) (2x). Pre-verbal fragmentary (4): 1QM XI.2-3*; 7(b)*; XVIII.7-8*, 13*. Post-verbal fragmentary (5): XIII.9**, 12-13*; XVIII.6-7*, 8(a)*; XIX.7(b)*. Clauses with post-verbal complements that depend upon biblical syntax (15): 1QM XI.5; XII.10(b), 11(a) (2x), 11-12, 12-13 (5x), 13-14*; XIX.3, 4(a), 6.

post-verbal complements are also involved in poetic parallelism in all relevant allosentences. These clauses are listed with their IS-related features in Table 56.\(^{377}\)

Table 56: Allosentences for Main Clauses with Pre-Verbal Complements in 1QM Poetic Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Contrast</th>
<th>Restrictiveness</th>
<th>Cleft</th>
<th>Clause-final Attentive Focus</th>
<th>Poetic Parallelism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XII.10-11</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.11(b)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.15</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX.7(b)*</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, I have not found any correlation between fronted complements in the poetic corpus of finite verb clauses in 1QM and any feature of the clause or fronted constituent.

There are only three fronted adjuncts in the 1QM poetic corpus.\(^{378}\) This is not enough data to reach significant conclusions about the fronting of adjuncts in the 1QM poetic corpus. However, the fronted adjunct in 1QM XIV.11-12 is particularly interesting because it involves an example of fronting for the purpose of reassigning the clause-final attentive focus.

---

377. Potential allosentences that depend on biblical syntax (5) occur in 1QM XII.10(b), 11(a); XIII.13; XIX.3, 4(b). All five of these clauses are good candidates for poetic parallelism.

378. These are found in 1QM XI.1, 3-4; XIV.11-12. The fronted adjunct in 1QM XI.3-4 is contrastive. The clause in 1QM XI.1 could be a cleft, or it may be that the adjunct is fronted as contrastive with XI.3-4. 1QM XIV.11-12 evidences fronting of a non-topic for the purpose of allowing another constituent to occupy the clause-final attentive focus position.
In example (133) the final attentive focus is Lebanon, "shame." If the pre-verbal adjunct Lebanon, "to their honoured ones," were post-verbal, it would occupy the clause-final position due to its greater syntactic complexity, as per the EICT. Fronting this adjunct permits "shame" to function as the attentive focus of the clause.

5.3.3. Subjects and SV/VS Order

5.3.3.1. Subordinate Clauses

Only one subordinate clause in the 1QM corpus has an explicit subject and finite verb, and it occurs in the poetic corpus and has SV order. The subordinator is כָּא and it is found in 1QM XVI-II.10.

(134) 1QM XVIII.10 (poetic corpus)

כָּא אָ[ר]חַ ידֶעַת לְמוּעָדוֹן

For you knew our appointed time.

The use of a pronominal subject explains the SV order. The context is fragmentary, so the motivation for the use of a pronominal subject rather than a null PRO in this clause can only be guessed. One possible explanation is that the pronominal subject references a shift topic. Normally a shift topic would not be found in a subordinate clause. However, since the complemen-
tizer כיא was inserted into the manuscript, the argument that this clause was or is not really a subordinate clause has some weight.

A reconstructed clause with SV order that is very similar to example (134), also having a pronominal subject, can be found in 1QM XIII.18* (poetic corpus).\textsuperscript{379} In 1QS, 16 of 17 finite subordinate clauses with an explicit subject have VS order. Finding two of two subordinate clauses with SV order in the 1QM poetic corpus is therefore surprising, but there is too little data to draw any conclusion from it, especially given the fragmentary nature of the text and context and the poetic nature of the text. It is perhaps an intriguing characteristic in light of the rarity of subordinate clauses modifying the main clause in 1QM in general.

There is also one finite verb clause with SV order in the prose corpus in 1QM XVI.11 that is probably a subordinate clause, but the context is too fragmentary to be certain.\textsuperscript{380}

5.3.3.2. Main Clauses in Narrative Prose

As I noted earlier, determining whether SV or VS order is basic in main clauses is one of the most difficult tasks relating to word order in HPH. Among main clauses with a finite verb and an explicit subject in the 1QM narrative prose corpus, there are 17 clauses with SV order and 32 clauses with VS order.\textsuperscript{381} (These figures do not include the three such clauses that occur in quot-
ed speech; these will be discussed separately below.)

Table 57 outlines the relationship between the topicality of the subject and its position before or after the finite verb in main clauses in the 1QM prose corpus.

When fragmentary clauses are included, there are 25 clauses with SV order and 49 clauses with VS order. Clauses with SV order (25) can be found in 1QM I.2-3*; II.2, 3, 4, 5-6; VI.1-2*, 8(a), 9; VII.3-4, 4-5, 5-6, 7, 16; VIII.8-9, 9-10; IX.1, 5-6; X.5-6*; XVI.8-9*; XVII.8, 12-13*, 13*, 13-14, 14*; XVIII.2-3*. Clauses with VS order (49) can be found in 1QM I.6(b)*, 8-9*, 10-11, 13, 13-14*; II.9(a), 9(b), 13-14*, 14*; III.9(b), 10(b); IV.3-4(b); V.3; VI.1(b), 4(c), 8(b); VII.9-11, 13-14, 15*; VIII.2, 3, 3-4, 5, 6-8, 10-11, 13-14, 14*; IX.1*, 3, 3-4, 6; XIV.2(a), 3-4, 7; XV.4*, 6-7; XVI.3-4, 4(b)**, 4(c), 4-5, 5-6*, 6-7, 13(a); XVII.8*, 10, 11*; XVIII.2, 3-4*, 4.

One SV Clause occurs in the poetic corpus: 1QM XIV.10-11. One fragmentary SV clause that depends on biblical syntax occurs in 1QM XV.11-12*. One VS clause that depends on biblical syntax occurs in 1QM I.6(a).

---

382. The subjects of these direct speech clauses cannot be judged as shift topics or continued topics because they are isolated clauses with no discourse context. These three clauses occur in 1QM III.9(b), 10(b); IV.3-4(b). Cf. §5.3.3.3.

383. The poetic corpus has been set aside from this analysis. In the 1QM poetic corpus, there is one SV clause with a shift topic subject (1QM XIII.11-12) and one SV clause with a continued topic subject (1QM XIII.10-11). There are two VS clauses where the subject is a non-topic (1QM XI.1; XII.14(b)). Clauses in the poetic corpus with a finite verb and explicit subject that depend on biblical syntax occur in 1QM XI.5; XII.11-12; XIX.4(a), 6.
In order to determine whether SV or VS order is basic, it is necessary to isolate clauses that could not have their subject-verb word order determined by some other factor. Unfortunately, as was the case in 1QS, there are no such clauses in the 1QM narrative prose corpus. All of the SV clauses and all of the VS clauses have at least one feature that could motivate SV or VS order, respectively, regardless of whether the basic word order is SV or VS.

The SV clauses in the 1QM narrative prose corpus all have at least one feature that could motivate SV order in the event that the basic word order were VS. This renders these clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Subject</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 57: The topicality of the subject in SV and VS clauses with a finite verb in the 1QM corpus.

384. The SV clauses with shift topic subjects (16) are found in 1QM II.2, 3, 4, 5-6; VI.8(a), 9; VII.3-4, 4-5, 5-6, 7, 16; VIII.9-10; IX.1, 5-6; XVII.8, 13-14. (Identifying a shift topic in 1QM IX.1 is less certain because the context is fragmentary.) One SV clause with a continued topic subject occurs in 1QM VIII.8-9. An SV clause with a continued topic subject occurs in the poetic corpus in 1QM XIV.10-11.

The VS clauses with shift topic subjects (9) are found in 1QM VIII.3-4, 5; IX.3-4, 6; XVI.4(c), 4-5, 13(a); XVIII.2, 4. The VS clauses with continued topic subjects (6) are found in 1QM I.13; V.3; VI.8(b); VIII.3; XIV.3-4; XV.6-7. The VS clauses with non-topic subjects (16) are found in 1QM I.10-11; II.9(a), 9(b); VI.1(b), 4(c); VII.9-11, 13-14; VIII.2, 6-8, 10-11, 13-14; IX.3; XIV.7; XVI.3-4, 6-7; XVII.10. One VS clause with a subject of uncertain topicality (1) is found in 1QM XIV.2(a). Clauses with VS order in quoted speech (3) are not included in the table. These occur in 1QM III.9(b), 10(b); IV.3-4(b) (cf. §5.3.3.3). A VS clause with a continued topic subject occurs in the poetic corpus in 1QM XI.3.
unhelpful for determining the basic order of subject and verb. Sixteen of the seventeen SV clauses have shift topic subjects; the other clause has a contrastive, continued subject.\footnote{In the poetic corpus, an SV clause occurs with a pronominal subject in 1QM XIV.10-11.}

An example of a shift topic subject in the narrative prose of 1QM is provided below.

(135) 1QM VI.8(a)

שבעה סדרי פרשים יעמדו גג הרמה ליום המשנה ולימנו
\(\text{wšb'}h \text{ sdry pršym } y'mwdw \text{ gm hmrh lymyn } \text{ hmrk}h \text{ wlšm'wlh}\)  
\text{CONJ-seven row.MP.CSTR horseman.MP stand\_in\_position.IMPF.3MP also PRON.3MP to-right}  
\text{ART-battle\_line CONJ-to-left}  
And seven rows of horsemen shall stand in position, they too, to the right of the battle line and to the left.

The SV clause with a contrastive, continued topic is found in 1QM VIII.8-9.

(136) 1QM VIII.8-9

הכוהנים יראו بشש חצוצרות זחלים קהל ודר סרדו מלאתקה
\(\text{whkwhnym } \text{ yr}yw \text{ bšš ḥšwrw̱t ḥhllym qwl } \text{ ḥd trw̱d lnšš mḻm̱h}\)  
\text{CONJ-art-priest.MP sound.IMPF.3MP on-six trumpet.FP ART-slain.MP sound.MS sharp.MS}  
\text{cut\_short.PTCP.PASS.MS to-direct.INF battle}  
And the priests shall sound upon the six trumpets of the slain with a sharp, staccato sound in order to direct the battle.

The VS clauses likewise provide no useful data for determining the basic order of subject and verb, because all of them are candidates for VS-inversion under a triggered inversion analysis (cf. §3.1.1.2). There are 35 VS clauses in the 1QM narrative prose corpus. Thirteen of these clauses appear to use a \textit{weqatal} verb that is required to be clause-initial (with the exception of
left-dislocated constituents). Verbs with irrealis mood are expected to use VS order even if HPH is SV-basic under a triggered inversion (TI) analysis, so these clauses do not provide useful data for determining the basic order. Furthermore, in 1QM, all nine shift topic subjects that are not pre-verbal occur with weqatal verbs. An example of a clause with a weqatal verb and a shift topic is provided below.

(137) 1QM IX.6

\[ wtp\, lhm\, hkw\, nym\, b\, hsw\, r\, w\, hmrdwp \]

\texttt{CONJ-blown.FF.3MP for-PRON.3MP ART-priest.MP on-trumpet.FP ART-pursuit}

And the priests shall blow for them on the trumpets of pursuit.

Nine of the thirteen clauses with irrealis mood and VS order utilize shift topic subjects. Of the four remaining clauses, three occur with continued topic subjects and one occurs with a non-topic subject.
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All of the 19 VS clauses in the 1QM narrative prose corpus that do not use a *weqatal* verb do possess a pre-verbal non-subject constituent. Like the use of irrealis mood, the fronting of a non-subject constituent is also a trigger for VS-inversion within a TI analysis. Therefore these clauses would be expected to demonstrate VS order irrespective of whether the basic word order were SV or VS. Assuming basic SV order, fronting a non-topic would trigger inversion to VS order. Assuming basic VS order, the original VS order would be preserved. Fifteen of these nineteen clauses have fronted stage topics; the other four clauses have a variety of types of fronted constituents. One of the clauses with a fronted stage topic is shown below.

(138) 1QM I.10-11

*On [that day] a congregation of gods and a congregation of men will engage one another, resulting in great carnage.*

390. The VS clauses that do not use a *weqatal* verb and have a fronted stage topic can be classified as follows. Two of the clauses with fronted stage topics utilize continued topic subjects (1QM VIII.13-14; IX.3). Twelve of the clauses utilize non-topic subjects that probably would have been shift topics if not for the presence of a stage topic (1QM I.10-11; II.9(a), 9(b); VI.1(b), 4(c); VII.13-14; VIII.2, 6-8, 10-11; XVI.3-4, 6-7; XVII.10). 1QM VII.9-11 also uses a non-topic subject and a fronted stage topic, but this clause has already been counted among the VS clauses because it also has a *weqatal* verb. One of the clauses has a subject with uncertain topicality status (1QM XIV.2(a)).

391. Of the four VS clauses without fronted stage topics, one contains a fronted verbal adjunct of manner and a continued topic subject (1QM I.13); one contains a fronted complement of material with a passive verb and a continued topic subject (1QM V.3); one contains a fronted locative verbal complement and a continued topic subject (1QM VI.8(b); I interpret this clause as a cleft sentence); and one uses a fronted adjunct of means to create a cleft sentence where the verb and subject function together as the topic (1QM XIV.7).
Even when the poetic corpus of 1QM is included, there is still no useful data among the individual VS clauses. One clause (found in 1QM XII.14(b)) is probably a subordinate clause, although the context is too fragmentary to be certain. Another clause (in 1QM XI.1) has a pre-verbal adjunct that has been fronted as a cleft constituent.

In sum, all narrative prose clauses in 1QM with a finite verb and explicit subject have at least one feature that would override the influence of a hypothetical basic SV or VS order due to fronting or triggered inversion. All VS clauses have either a weqatal verb or a non-subject pre-verbal constituent, while all SV clauses contain both realis mood verbs and shift topic subjects. Therefore none of these clauses can be taken to preserve the original basic word order, and there is no evidence on the constituent level in the narrative prose of 1QM to determine whether SV or VS order is basic.392

5.3.3.3. Quoted Speech

Three clauses with finite verbs and explicit subjects (found in 1QM III.9(b), 10(b); IV.3-4(b)) occur in direct speech, in quotations describing the phrases written on the trumpets for battle, such that these topics are not true shift topics within their immediate discourse context. These clauses written on trumpets stand alone, in fact, and have no discourse context at all on their discourse level. These three clauses could potentially provide rare examples of the kind of clause

392. In BH, it is common for a topicalized or contrastive subject to precede a modal perfect verb. However, unlike BH, in HPH this only occurs with modal imperfect verbs (modal yiqtol) and not with modal perfect verbs (modal qatal). This suggests that the modal perfect verb has grammaticalized into the weqatal form and is required to stand in clause-initial position (left-dislocations excluded) with the proclitic we- morpheme. See §5.3.3.5.
that can give a window into the basic word order of a language; however, the potential for irre-
alis mood again clouds the issue. The three relevant clauses are the first of the two clauses in
(139), the short clause in (140), and the clause in (141).

(139) 1QM III.9(b)(c)

:\n
"God has struck all the sons of darkness, he shall not cause his wrath to return, until they are exterminated."

(140) 1QM III.10(b)

"God has reassembled."

(141) 1QM IV.3-4(b)

"The position of the wicked has come to an end by the strength of God."

When taken in isolation, the first clause, "God has struck all the sons of darkness" (1QM III.9(b)), meets many of the expectations of a basic word order clause as outlined by Siewierska (1988:8): the clause is "stylistically neutral, independent, indicative . . . with full noun phrase (NP) participants, where the subject is definite, agentive and human, the object
is a definite semantic patient, and the verb represents an action, not a state or an event." The second clause, אֵל אָסַף, "God has re-assembled," is similar to the first clause, but it lacks an object. The verb אָסַף, "to gather, assemble," nevertheless "represents an action, not a state or event"; normally אָסַף takes a complement referencing the thing gathered or assembled, so it is proper to conceive of this clause with a null NP complement for the verb. The third clause (cf. 1QM IV.3-4(b)) has a similar structure but lacks an agentive subject, an object that serves as patient, and an action verb.

The major complication for all three of these clauses is that the verbs are best interpreted as irrealis qatal verbs, such that the VS order results from triggered inversion. The nature of the modality in these three clauses relates to the nature of banner statements, which are often statements of habitual actions. There are many banner quotations in 1QM III and 1QM IV, but only three use a finite verb, suggesting that the banner statements are intended to refer to general truths or to events that have occurred repeatedly rather than singular occurrences. In BH, habitual semantics patterns with irrealis mood and motivates triggered inversion, and the same process is probably operational in these three clauses.

393. Cf. also Holmstedt (2011: 13). One minor deviation from these expectations is that the subject in 1QM III.9(b) is divine rather than human; however, Siewierska's inclusion of "human" as a characteristic of the basic subject was intended in distinction from an animal or inanimate subject rather than from gods. The use of "God" as the subject rather than a human is no reason to expect a deviation from basic word order.

394. If so, this clause and the others like it in 1QM III.10(b); IV.3-4(b) are evidence that the weqatal is not a distinct gram in HPH, and the irrealis weqatal verbs should be interpreted as a וּ- conjunction followed by an irrealis qatal.

5.3.3.4. Pre-verbal Non-topic Subjects and Post-verbal Shift Topics

It is interesting that no SV clauses utilize non-topic subjects. On this front, the distribution in 1QM is the same as that in 1QS: non-topic subjects are never pre-verbal in main clauses (zero of 13 in 1QS; zero of 13 in 1QM). At first glance, this would seem to suggest that VS order is basic, since it would seem that the only way for a subject to become pre-verbal is to be fronted as a topic. In Biblical Hebrew this situation is explained by citing the use of the wayyiqtol as a narrative past tense, because the wayyiqtol requires a verb-first word order which often supercedes a pre-verbal placement of the subject. In HPH, however, the wayyiqtol is far less common than it is in BH. Nevertheless, this situation can be explained without appealing to basic VS word order due to the pro-drop feature of HPH.\textsuperscript{396} When subjects are not shift-topics, they normally do not appear in the clause at all because they are removed via the pro-drop mechanism. In other words, the very presence of an explicit subject in the sentence is nearly enough to identify it as a shift topic due to the expectation that pro-drop will occur if the subject is a continued topic. For this reason, there is little to be learned from the absence of pre-verbal non-topic subjects that is useful for determining the basic word order of subject and verb.

Although pre-verbal non-topic subjects do not occur in 1QM, post-verbal shift topic subjects are relatively common. In 1QS, there are only two post-verbal topic subjects out of 22 topic subjects, for a post-verbal rate of 9\%. In 1QM, however, that number rises to 18 out of 36, for a post-verbal rate of 50\% for subject topics. This is quite a significant distinction in distribution.

\textsuperscript{396} Cf. Naudé 1991.
This is perhaps less surprising for continued topics than for shift topics, given the cross-linguistic tendency of shift topics to be pre-verbal. Even for shift topics, however, 10 of 26 are post-verbal in 1QM (38%). Why are so many shift topic subjects post-verbal in 1QM?

The only clauses in which a shift topic appears in a post-verbal position involve triggered inversion, whether due to a modal (we)qatal or modal yiqtol verb or due to a fronted verbal modifier such as a stage topic. This suggests that the fronting of a shift topic may be mandatory in HPH, because the only clauses in which shift topics are not fronted involve mechanisms that would supercede shift topic fronting. It is not possible to say conclusively that shift topic fronting is mandatory; all that can be said is that there is no evidence to the contrary. However, shift topic fronting is not expected to be mandatory from a cross-linguistic perspective. In order to align HPH with cross-linguistic expectations that topic fronting is optional rather than required, it is necessary to assume that SV is the basic word order. This would result in a system where all subjects are pre-verbal unless superceded by triggered inversion.

The reason that more shift topics are post-verbal in 1QM than in 1QS is that in 1QM, more clauses are verb-initial in order to link them to the preceding clause temporally or sequentially. As we will see in the following section, the data in 1QM suggests that VS order is chosen over SV order in order to link a clause to the preceding clause sequentially or temporally. This is done more often in 1QM than in 1QS because the precise sequence of battle procedures is frequently significant in 1QM, while 1QS contains a greater proportion of unsequenced, atemporal instructions.
5.3.3.5. Discourse Sequentiality and Temporality

Based on the extant clause types in 1QM, an author who is composing a clause with the semantics of instruction and a shift topic has three options for the clause structure: a fronted stage topic (or other verbal modifier) with VS order; an irrealis (we)qatal verb with VS order; or an imperfect verb with SV order. The meanings of the latter two types of clause structures appear to be identical on the clause level: an irrealis (we)qatal verb and an imperfect verb are indistinguishable semantically as verbs of instruction, and both clause types utilize a shift topic subject. For this reason it is important to compare these two sets of clauses to look for differences that might motivate the choice of one clause type over another. Consider the following two examples. The first uses an imperfect verb with SV order, while the second uses an irrealis (we)qatal verb with VS order.

(142) 1QM VIII.9-10

And the Levites and all the people of the rams' horns shall sound a great battle war-cry with one sound to melt the heart of the enemy.

397. SV clauses with an imperfect verb and a shift topic (16) occur in 1QM II.2, 3, 4, 4-6; VI.8(a), 9; VII.3-4, 4-5, 5-6, 7, 16; VIII.9-10; IX.1, 5-6; XVII.8, 13-14. VS clauses with an irrealis (we)qatal verb and a shift topic (9) occur in 1QM VIII.3-4, 5; IX.3-4, 6; XVI.4(c), 4-5, 13(a); XVIII.2, 4. A VS clause with an irrealis (we)qatal verb and a shift topic occurs in a biblical text in 1QM I.6(a).
It is not obvious at first why an author would choose one of these structures over another. As we will see, the evidence hints that the choice may be related to the discourse connections between clauses, i.e., which clauses are discourse-dependent on others. After reviewing the data, I will conclude that VS order is selected in order to indicate a temporal and sequential connection with the preceding clause.

The following table shows which VS clauses with a shift topic subject and an irrealis *(we)qatal* verb have the potential for sequential or temporal connections with the preceding clause.\(^{398}\)

---

\(^{398}\) A sequential connection means that the event described in the VS clause can be interpreted as subsequent to or logically resulting from the event described in the preceding clause. A temporal connection means that the event described in the VS clause can be interpreted as simultaneous with the event described in the preceding clause.
Table 58: Discourse Connections with the Preceding Clause in VS Clauses with a Shift Topic Subject and an Irrealis (We)qatal Verb in the 1QM Prose Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IQM Reference</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Potential for Sequential Connection (e.g. &quot;then&quot;)</th>
<th>Potential for Temporal Connection (e.g. &quot;when&quot;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIII.3-4</td>
<td>יָגוּר יָנוֹשָׁה דֶּלַל בִּינֶה מִן הַשָּׁעְרִין</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.5</td>
<td>וְקָעֵה הָכֵהוֹנִים בַּחֲנָבְרָתָן ַכָּל מַרְוְדֶד יִדֶּשֶׂר</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.3-4</td>
<td>יָגוּר אֶלְיוֹבָא כִּל לַאֶשֶּׁה בַּבְּרִימָה מַדָּעְבֵּה</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.6399</td>
<td>וְקָעֵה לָהֵמָה הָכֵהוֹנִים בַּחֲנָבְרָתָן הָמְרַדוֹק</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.4(c)400</td>
<td>וְקָעֵה רַאֶסִיס בִּי הַמַּעְרַבּה</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.4-5</td>
<td>וְקָעֵה לָהֵמָה הָכֵהוֹנִים הָרֹעֲשׁ סָרְר</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.13(a)</td>
<td>וְנַגְּנֵה הָוָּאָרָא</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.2</td>
<td>וְנִפְלֶל בִּי פְּתַלַאִי קֹם</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.4</td>
<td>וְנָגָפְסַף אָסָהָבָא כִּל מַעְרַבַּה הָמְלָהָמָה</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven of the nine clauses have a potential sequential connection to the preceding clause, and seven of the nine have a potential temporal connection. All nine clauses have the potential for either a sequential or temporal connection. Within this small data set, the distribution of sequential and temporal characteristics strongly favours the presence of a connection.

When SV clauses are examined in a similar fashion, the results are significantly different.

399. An alternative interpretation would be to take לָהֵמָה as the topic rather than the subject הָכֵהוֹנִים.
400. An alternative interpretation would be to read a null subject here and take רַאֶסִיס as an adjunct.
Table 59: Discourse Connections with the Preceding Clause in SV Clauses with a Shift Topic Subject and an Imperfect Verb in the 1QM Prose Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IQM Reference</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Potential for Sequential Connection (e.g. &quot;then&quot;)</th>
<th>Potential for Temporal Connection (e.g. &quot;when&quot;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.2</td>
<td>ירשון המשמרות שנהשו ועשרת ינשמורות יישרה</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3</td>
<td>ירשון השבטים אובד חודה מחודשולתוליםmidd</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4</td>
<td>ירשון משמרות שנהשו ופוקידות ינישבי הלוגרימם</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4-6</td>
<td>מבמבшим שנהשו ועשרת ינישבי הלוגרימם</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.8(a)</td>
<td>שמענה סדרי י싨(002)מעון פיום למם המערבח</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.9</td>
<td>מאמרי תרי עוה עכם אלף מערבח ונתים הבינה</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.3-4</td>
<td>כל окруג וחושאת לעבר יהא תלמותו צאצאים</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.4-5</td>
<td>כל מס彈 אוצר אור וחושאת לעבר יהא תלמותו צאצאים</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.5-6</td>
<td>כל יארש לח יישר משמר יבם הלומדה</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.7</td>
<td>כל окруג דב רח יהודה אריא סבכה כול מחיתים</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.16</td>
<td>הימים אשני ביכר צין ק𬒔(060)מעון העלאד</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.9-10</td>
<td>הימים קהל ויד פורד לעבר הלומדה יהלימי כלעט</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.1</td>
<td>כל ימע תרי מיך המ Shrעת</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.5-6</td>
<td>כל אלוהירדוע למשמיי יבם הלומדה לעבר</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.13-14</td>
<td>אממי הברינ ישלום יד ביב הלומדה</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In these clauses, the fragmentary nature of the context makes it impossible to determine whether a temporal or sequential connection is possible or likely.
SV clauses seem generally to lack temporal and sequential relationships with the context. Most clauses that may have a temporal or sequential connection with the preceding clause occur within a fragmentary context where it is impossible to know whether such a connection is likely.⁴⁰¹ Only one clause, found in 1QM VIII.9-10, clearly demonstrates such potential. However, in no other clauses in the 1QM corpus is a relation between the SV clause and its context based on temporality or sequentiality.

Table 60: Comparison of SV and VS Clauses with a Shift Topic Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SV Clauses</th>
<th>VS Clauses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential for Temporal or Sequential Connection</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Potential for Temporal or Sequential Connection</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distinction between the VS and SV data sets in this regard cannot be calculated statistically due to the presence of a 'zero' in one of the categories. If a 'one' is substituted for the zero in order to permit a calculation, then the distinction is shown to be highly statistically significant.⁴⁰² This distinction between SV and VS clauses with respect to their relationships to their discourse contexts suggests that the governing factor in the choice of word order is probably the situation of the clause in its discourse context rather than the topicality of the subject or lack thereof.

The question then becomes one of markedness. Is the SV order marked, or is it VS order that is marked? All of the VS clauses demonstrate a temporal or sequential connection to the dis-

---

⁴⁰¹ These clauses are found in 1QM VII.16; IX.1; XVII.13-14.
⁴⁰² For this calculation, p < 0.0001.
course context, while one SV clause varies in this respect. Therefore it is slightly more likely that VS is the marked order, chosen in order to indicate a temporal or sequential connection with the preceding clause. This would tentatively point toward SV as the basic word order. However, when there is only one SV clause (in 1QM VIII.9-10) that varies from the norm, drawing a conclusion about basic word order is statistically unwarranted.

5.3.3.6. Screnock 2011

John Screnock published an excellent study of the order of subject and verb in 1QM that deserves a full treatment here. Screnock's work goes beyond most publications that focus on syntax in its thorough research and meticulous documentation of methodology and data, which makes it an extremely helpful and useful resource, even though in the final analysis I disagree with his conclusions. Screnock helpfully cites references for all of his data, which makes it possible to retrace his steps and evaluate his argument piece by piece.

Screnock's first conclusion (2011: 36) is that the distribution of 45% subject-first, 27% verb-first, and 27% other-constituent-first clauses among clauses with full NP subjects suggests a basic SV order, since it would be strange to emphasize the subject 45% of the time. However, Screnock omitted clauses with no explicit subject when calculating the percent of clauses that emphasize the subject. Due to the availability of pro-drop in HPH, a clause that does not emphasize the subject will frequently have no explicit subject, but only a PRO subject. Since full NP subjects can often be omitted in HPH, it is not surprising that full NP subjects would be emphasized frequently. The very presence of a full NP subject in HPH inherently involves some
emphasis, because if the subject were not a shift topic or a contrastive constituent, it would probably not have been merged into the phrase structure in the first instance. Even some of the clauses with VS order probably have a subject that carries emphasis, but SV order has been superceded by triggered inversion resulting from a modal perfect verb or a non-subject pre-verbal constituent such as a stage topic.

Screnock also points out a distinction between the uses of the Qal stem intransitive verb תקע (tq, "to blow the trumpet"), which occurs in VS clauses in 15 of 16 occurrances, and the Hiphil stem transitive verb רוע (rw, "to shout, raise the war-cry"), which occurs in SV clauses in 6 of 8 occurrances. Screnock argues that this distinction is indicative of a VS-inversion triggered by intransitive verbs such as תקע. He separates all clauses with an explicit subject and verb into those with transitive/ditransitive verbs and those with intransitive verbs, and concludes that intransitive verbs appear in VS clauses far more often, while transitive and ditransitive verbs prefer SV order. This is his second major conclusion.

After reviewing the data that Screnock has accumulated, I would argue that the evidence is not strong enough to conclude that SV and VS order is affected by the transitivity of the main verb and that SV and VS order is better explained in terms of shift topic fronting, VS-inversion, and temporal and sequential connectedness. Where Screnock extends VS-inversion to clauses with an intransitive main verb (2011: 40), I would limit VS-inversion to clauses with modal verbs and fronted constituents. I have three reasons for this conclusion.

403 Screnock includes many fragmentary clauses in his analysis that I have excluded (2011: 34). For example, only two of the eight clauses with רוע are fully preserved.
First, the use of רוּע in six SV clauses is limited to essentially the same pair of clauses repeated three times within the text. The only time this pair of clauses is completely preserved is in 1QM VIII.8-9, 9-10. These two clauses are provided above in examples (136) and (142), respectively. The germane aspect of these two clauses with respect to word order is not transitivity, but rather their use of the clause-initial contrastive subjects הכהנים (hkwhnym, "the priests") and הלוים והלוים והעם והשופרות (hlwyym wkwl 'm hšwprwt, "the Levites and all the people of the rams' horns"), respectively. Only the second of these two subjects is a shift topic, but their juxtaposition permits the contrastive fronting of both subjects. Accounting for SV order in terms of contrastive subject fronting explains all six of the SV clauses with רוּע.

Second, there is a distinction between the uses of תקע and רוּע in the text that tends to promote the use of תקע in VS clauses and is unrelated to transitivity. Throughout the instructions for battle, תקע consistently refers to low, legato directives given while the participants are arranging themselves for battle. On the other hand, רוּע refers either to a sharp, staccato sound or to a loud war-cry. The first is sounded by the priests as a signal for combat to begin, while the second is sounded by the Levites and those with rams' horns during the battle. More generally, תקע is used when preparing for battle and has the potential to refer to a relatively quieter sound, while רוּע is used at the beginning of the battle and during the battle and must be very loud. For this reason, תקע tends to occur in long lists of sequenced instructions that describe complex procedures

404. The three pairs of SV רוּע clauses occur in 1QM VIII.8-9, 9-10; XVI.7*, 7-8*; XVII.12-13*, 13*. 
for arranging battle lines, and therefore VS order is useful to connect the sequences of steps together. In contrast, דשא occurs at climactic moments of the battle, and it is performed nearly simultaneously by two distinct groups. At these points, the important aspect of the instruction to emphasize is the distinction between the sharp, staccato sound made by the priests and the loud war-cry made by the others. For this reason, SV order is used in order to contrast the two groups of agents who are blowing the horns.

Third, Screnock's larger treatment of transitive and intransitive clauses depends on some debatable choices regarding the inclusion or exclusion of certain clause types and the classification of certain verbs as transitive or intransitive. For example, XVS clauses—that is, clauses where a fronted verbal modifier triggers VS-inversion—with an intransitive verb are counted as evidence in favour of intransitive VS clauses. All XVS clauses should be excluded due to the effect of triggered inversion (cf. §3.1.1.2 in this study), which supercedes any effect of verb transitivity. Biblical quotations (1QM XI.6 (2x), 11), negated clauses (1QM X.3), and clauses where the verb itself was reconstructed (1QM I.4; VIII.16; XII.18, 20; XV.18; XIX.10) should also have been excluded from the data set of intransitive verbs in VS clauses. Also, the verb יָפַר is a problematic verb to qualify as intransitive, because it normally takes one or two complements (Screnock notes the difficulty here). There are also some Hiphil and Piel verbs that might be bet-

405. XVS clauses with an intransitive verb that should not have been counted as VS clauses have verbs which are found in 1QM I.12; II.9, 13, 14; V.3 (Niphal verbs); 1QM I.13; VI.1, 4, 8; VII.14; VIII.2, 10, 14; IX.3; X.2, 6; XIV.7; XVI.3; XVII.10; XVIII.5 (counted by Screnock as Qal intransitive verbs).
ter classified as intransitive, such as הֶבְרָה (šrt, Piel, "to serve"), דבר (dbr, Piel, "to speak"), and הָשָׁה (hšh, Hiphil, "to be silent").

Even if all of these changes are made, the evidence in favor of a correlation between verb intransitivity and VS order is either statistically significant or very nearly so. I do think Screnock has identified a real trend in 1QM that transitive verbs do occur more often in SV clauses while intransitive verbs do occur more often in VS clauses. I do not think this is a result of triggered VS-inversion, however, but I think this is a secondary effect of the nature of SV and VS clauses. SV clauses normally use shift topics, and it seems that when a shift topic is introduced it is more likely to be performing a transitive action rather than an intransitive one, perhaps because more information is needed in order to incorporate a shift topic into the discourse. VS clauses normally have a temporal or sequential connection to the preceding discourse, and there seems to be a correlation between this feature and intransitive verbs. The intransitive verbs that are most commonly used in true VS clauses in 1QM are עֲנֵד (md, "to stand"), 406 יצא (yṣš, "to go out"), 407 נָגֵש (ngš, "to approach"), 408 and נָפֵל (npl, "to fall"). 409 These are verbs of motion that are most commonly used in 1QM to provide directions for preparing for battle, with the exception that נָפֵל is used to foretell what peoples will die in the war. These intransitive verbs happen to be used most commonly to provide sequenced instructions, and this is probably the reason for the correlation with

---

406. Cf. 1QM XV.4; XVI.4(c).
407. Cf. 1QM VII.9; VIII.3; IX.3.
408. Cf. 1QM XVI.13(a); XIX.11.
409. Cf. 1QM I.6(a) (biblical); XVIII.2.
VS order. It is possible that this correlation between VS order and intransitivity and between SV order and transitivity extends to other texts beyond 1QM as well. However, this would not necessarily indicate that triggered inversion is the motivation for the correlation.

5.4. Post-verbal Word Order

As in 1QS, Hawkins' Early Immediate Constituent Theory (EICT) governs the word order of all post-verbal clause-level constituents other than subjects and light PP's. The basic rule of the EICT is that the largest constituent as measured in terms of nodes in a phrase marker will be placed last in the sequence of post-verbal constituents.

There are 27 finite clauses in 1QM where the EICT is relevant. These are clauses with multiple post-verbal constituents that are neither subjects nor light PP's. Nearly all of these clauses (26 of 27 = 96%) evidence the word order that is predicted by the EICT. However, one clause does not (1 of 27 = 4%).

The one clause in 1QM that does not satisfy the EICT is presented below in (144).

410. Of these 26 clauses, three involve a "tie," where the final two constituents are of equal size. These "ties" occur in 1QM VII.4-5; VIII.2-3; IX.8-9. The other 23 clauses, where the final constituent has the largest phrase marker, occur in 1QM I.4; II.1-2, 5-6, 7-8, 8-9; VI.8(a); VII.3-4, 5-6; VIII.5, 6-8, 8, 8-9, 9-10, 13-14; IX.7-8; X.5-6; XIII.1; XIV.3(b); XVI.8; XVII.6, 11, 13-14; XVIII.6(a).

In addition, six fragmentary clauses that satisfy the EICT occur in 1QM I.2-3*, 8-9*; II.13-14*; VI.1-2*; XVI.1(a)*; XVII.8-9*. 1QM VI.1-2* involves a tie. Clauses in the 1QM poetic corpus that satisfy the EICT occur in 1QM XI.1-2, 2-3, 3-4, 5-7; XIII.10-11; XIII.7-8; XVIII.8(a)*. 1QM XIII.7-8 involves a tie. Clauses that depend on biblical texts and satisfy the EICT occur in 1QM XI.5; XVI.4(a).
For they will surround the tower on the three [sides] of the front with three hundred shields.

Of the two verbal modifiers at the end of the clause, the latter has a smaller phrase marker, violating the EICT.

The penultimate clause-level constituent has nine nodes in its phrase marker while the ultimate constituent has only seven. This deviation from the EICT could be explained if a null preposition is assumed for NP verbal modifiers that function as adverbial phrases.

Adding a null preposition would require nine nodes in the final constituent, creating a tie between the two final constituents, which would satisfy the EICT.

As in 1QS, post-verbal subjects and light PP's do not necessarily adhere to the EICT. Post-verbal subjects are generally the first post-verbal constituent in the clause, even when they have a phrase marker that is large enough to place them in clause-final position according to the EICT. The only constituent that consistently prevents a subject from occupying the first position
following the finite verb (other than an enclitic pronoun attached to the verb) is a "light" prepositional phrase, which consists of a preposition and an enclitic pronoun attached to the preposition. Light PP’s appear before subjects when both occur in the post-verbal material.

There is no theoretical framework for identifying a light PP. Some combinations of prepositions and enclitic pronouns could, in theory, be too large to behave as a light PP. The only sure method of identification is to find a PP that appears after a finite verb and before an explicit subject. The following table lists each of the combinations of prepositions and enclitic pronouns in 1QM and whether there is evidence that each one functions as a light PP.

Table 61: Prepositions with enclitic pronouns in 1QM and their status as light PP's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Morpheme</th>
<th>Light PP?</th>
<th>Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>after-PRON.3MP</td>
<td>ʾḥryhm</td>
<td>אחריהם</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM II.2, 3, 13; IV.6, 7; VI.1, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-PRON.3MP</td>
<td>ʾlyhm</td>
<td>אליהם</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1QM IX.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-PRON.3MS</td>
<td>ʾlyw</td>
<td>אליהם</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM XV.10; 1QM XIII.12 (poetic corpus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-PRON.2FS</td>
<td>ʾlyk</td>
<td>אליך</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM XII.13-14* (biblical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with-PRON.3MS</td>
<td>ʾtw</td>
<td>אתו</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM XVIII.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with-PRON.2MS</td>
<td>ʾtkh</td>
<td>אתכה</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM XII.2 (poetic corpus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with-PRON.3MP</td>
<td>ʾtm</td>
<td>אתם</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM VII.5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with-PRON.1CP</td>
<td>ʾtnw</td>
<td>אתנה</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM XIX.1; 1QM XII.8 (poetic corpus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-PRON.3MS</td>
<td>bw</td>
<td>בו</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM I.9, 10; V.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-PRON.3MP</td>
<td>bm</td>
<td>בו</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM I.2; XVI.11; 1QM XI.17 (poetic corpus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with-PRON.1CP</td>
<td>bnw</td>
<td>בו</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM XVIII.8(a)* (poetic corpus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like-PRON.3MS</td>
<td>kmwh</td>
<td>כמות</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM I.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like-PRON.3FS</td>
<td>kmwhh</td>
<td>סמוה</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM XVIII.10 (poetic corpus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloss</td>
<td>Transliteration</td>
<td>Morpheme</td>
<td>Light PP?</td>
<td>Occurances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like-PRON.2MS</td>
<td>kmwkh</td>
<td>בַּמּוֹתָה</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM X.8 (biblical); XIII.13 (biblical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-PRON.3MP</td>
<td>lhm</td>
<td>לָה</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1QM II.7, 8; VIII.2, 6, 13, 16; XVI.4-5, 5-6; XVII.10&lt;sup&gt;411&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-PRON.3MP</td>
<td>lhmh</td>
<td>לָהֵמַה</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1QM IX.6, 9; XVI.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-PRON.3MS</td>
<td>lw</td>
<td>לֵי</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM I.6, 10; XVII.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-PRON.2MS</td>
<td>lk</td>
<td>לָל</td>
<td>yes (poetic corpus)</td>
<td>1QM XII.14(b) (poetic corpus); 1QM XIX.6 (biblical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-PRON.2MS</td>
<td>lkh</td>
<td>לָלָה</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM X.9; XI.1, 2, 4, 14; XII.2; XIII.9**, 14; XIV.14; XVIII.13* (all from poetic corpus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-PRON.2MP</td>
<td>lkm</td>
<td>לָלֶם</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM X.4 (biblical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-PRON.3MP</td>
<td>lmw</td>
<td>לָלֶמו</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM XII.3 (poetic corpus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-PRON.1P</td>
<td>lnw</td>
<td>לָנ</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM X.1 (prose corpus); 1QM XI.5, 5-7*, 7-9*; XVIII.7 (2x); XVIII.11, 12 (poetic corpus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from-PRON.2MS</td>
<td>mi’tkh</td>
<td>מְסאתָה</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM XI.4 (poetic corpus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upon-PRON.3MP</td>
<td>lyhm</td>
<td>עַלְיָם</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM II.13; VI.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with-PRON.3MP</td>
<td>mhym</td>
<td>עָמַם</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM I.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with-PRON.3MP</td>
<td>mhymh</td>
<td>עָמַהָמֶה</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1QM VII.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with-PRON.3MS</td>
<td>‘mw</td>
<td>עּוֹמ</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM XIII.1; XV.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with-PRON.2MP</td>
<td>‘mkm</td>
<td>עַמְמָמָם</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM X.4 (biblical)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with-PRON.1CP</td>
<td>‘mnw</td>
<td>עַמְנָנ</td>
<td>no evidence</td>
<td>1QM XVIII.10, 11 (poetic corpus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 62 lists only the preposition and enclitic pronoun combinations for which there is evidence of light PP behaviour, in order of occurrence.

<sup>411</sup> In 1QM XVII.10 the subject מוהים has been inserted into the manuscript in front of the light PP לָהֵם, likely violating the accepted word order of the author's language. The fact that a clause where an insertion is one of the rare exceptions that violates the standard word order helps significantly to prove the rule regarding the light PP.
### Table 62: Light PP’s in 1QM (poetic corpus included)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Hebrew Morpheme</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QM VII.13-14</td>
<td>עמהמה</td>
<td>with them (MP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM VIII.2</td>
<td>لهم</td>
<td>for them (MP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM VIII.6-8</td>
<td>لهم</td>
<td>for them (MP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM VIII.13-14</td>
<td>لهم</td>
<td>for them (MP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM IX.3-4</td>
<td>אליהם</td>
<td>to them (MP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM IX.6</td>
<td>להמה</td>
<td>for them (MP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XII.14(b) (poetic corpus)</td>
<td>לך</td>
<td>to you (MS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XVI.3-4</td>
<td>להמה</td>
<td>for them (MP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XVI.4-5</td>
<td>لهم</td>
<td>for them (MP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XVI.5-6</td>
<td>لهم</td>
<td>for them (MP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM XVIII.4</td>
<td>אלהים</td>
<td>to them (MP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In three clauses in 1QM, the subject is not placed immediately after the finite verb or light PP. Two of these clauses involve "heavy" subjects, suggesting that a heavy subject can be postponed to the end of the clause. In 1QM I.10-11, the subject "אלהים וקהלת אמנים," "a congregation of gods and a congregation of men," has eleven syllables, and it is postponed over the verbal modifier "ל交流合作," "resulting in great carnage," which has 5 syllables. In 1QM VII.9-11, the subject is very large, consisting of 78 syllables. In terms of syllables, these are the two largest post-verbal subjects in 1QM that do not immediately follow the finite verb. All others contain 9 syllables or less and immediately follow a light PP or enclitic pronoun. Similarly, in 1QS no subject is unexpectedly clause final, and all subjects that do not immediately follow the finite verb are 8 syllables or less in length (cf. 1QS IV.19; VI.6-7).
One clause in 1QM XIV.3-4 involves a subject that is separated from the finite verb by the particle שם, a one-syllable locative particle meaning "there." This particle does not consist-
tently behave like a light PP in Biblical Hebrew, but in 1QM it does appear immediately after a
finite verb whenever it occurs in a clause with a finite verb. Perhaps its anaphoric character and
its "lightness" in terms of syllables draw it towards the finite verb in the same way that light PP's
are attracted to that location.

Another exception to the EICT is the use of direct speech. Quoted speech always occurs
in clause-final position regardless of the size of its phrase marker.412

Poetry does not necessarily adhere to the EICT. In the 1QM poetic corpus, there are four
clauses where the EICT is applicable. Only one of these clauses satisfies the EICT, while the oth-
er three do not.413 An example of a poetic clause that violates the EICT is provided in (147).

(147) 1QM XII.10-11

wšwl šlkh 'wšý hyl
CONJ-rob.IMPV.MS spoil-PRON.2MS do-PTCP.MS.CSTR valor
"And rob your spoil, you who do valiantly."

412. Clauses in 1QM that would violate the EICT if not for the direct speech exception can be
found in 1QM III.10(a); IV.7, 8, 9, 13-14.
413. The clause that satisfies the EICT occurs in 1QM XIV.10-11. The three clauses that do
not satisfy the EICT occur in 1QM XII.10-11, 13(b); XIX.4(b). Biblical clauses in the poetic
corpus that satsify the EICT occur in 1QM XII.13-14; XIX.3. Biblical clauses in the poetic
corpus that do not satisfy the EICT occur in 1QM XII.10(b), 11(a), 12-13.
Poetic clauses that do not satisfy the EICT in 1QM typically deviate as a result of the use vocatives or the use of interlaced appositive structures. Deviation from the EICT could serve as a useful criterion for distinguishing poetry from prose in general, if the distinction in 1QM turns out to be characteristic of Hebrew in general. In 1QM, 97% of prose clauses where deviation is possible (38 of 39) satisfy the EICT, while only 25% of poetic clauses where deviation is possible (1 of 3) do so.

5.5. Right-dislocation

There are no clear cases of right-dislocation in 1QM.\footnote{414}
6. 1QpHab (The Habakkuk Pesher)

6.1. Preliminary Issues

6.1.1. The Pesher Genre

1QpHab contains much less useful data for an examination of word order than can be found in 1QS and 1QM. This is partly because 1QpHab is a shorter text, and partly because the text is fragmentary enough to create doubt about the syntactic structure and discursive context of many of the clauses, but another important factor is the nature of the pesher genre itself.

A pesher text such as 1QpHab consists of a series of quotations of a sacred text interspersed with interpretations that explain a hidden meaning of the sacred text that corresponds to contemporary events. This technique of alternating quotations and explanations is referred to as the "lemma : interpretation" method. In 1QpHab, the sacred text is the first two chapters of the book of Habakkuk from the Hebrew Bible.

Although there is some important data to be gleaned from 1QpHab, for the purposes of this study on word order and information structure, the pesher genre is less useful than the legal and instructional texts of 1QS and 1QM. A large portion of the pesher text consists simply of quotations from the book of Habakkuk, and these are not relevant because they date from a different period. A pattern that breaks up the flow of the discourse with regular quotations from another source inhibits the ability for complex sequences that require techniques such as topic shift, contrast marking, and cleft sentences. Perhaps most importantly, the interpretation portions of the text are problematic for this study because most of them occur within subordinate clauses.
Each interpretation is introduced with one of several introductory formulae, many of which introduce (potentially) lengthy subordinate clauses. Given that this study is primarily focused on main clauses with finite verbs rather than subordinate clauses or verbless clauses, the problem presented by 1QpHab becomes clear after a glance at Table 63, which lists the introductory formulae used in 1QpHab.

Table 63: Interpretation Formulae in 1QpHab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Syntax of the Interpretation</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>על פServiceProvider על [ _____ ]</td>
<td>Its interpretation is concerning [ _____ ].</td>
<td>null copula clause</td>
<td>1QpHab II.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אשר פServiceProvider</td>
<td>Its interpretation is that [ _____ ].</td>
<td>subordinate clause</td>
<td>1QpHab IV.1-2, V.7; VI.3, 6; VII.7, 15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>על ההבדל פServiceProvider על [ _____ ]</td>
<td>Its interpretation is that the matter is concerning [ _____ ].</td>
<td>null copula clause</td>
<td>1QpHab XII.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>על פServiceProvider על [ _____ ] אשר</td>
<td>Its interpretation is concerning [ _____ ] which [ _____ ].</td>
<td>null copula clause followed by subordinate clause</td>
<td>1QpHab III.4; IV.5, 10-11*; V.9-10; VI.10; VII.4, 10-11; VIII.1, 8; IX.4-5, 9*; XI.4; XII.12; XIII.1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>על פServiceProvider [ _____ ] אשר</td>
<td>Its interpretation is [ _____ ] which [ _____ ].</td>
<td>null copula clause followed by subordinate clause</td>
<td>1QpHab XII.7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>על פServiceProvider [ _____ ] אשר</td>
<td>Its interpretation is [ _____ ] which [ _____ ].</td>
<td>null copula clause followed by subordinate clause</td>
<td>1QpHab X.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>על פServiceProvider [ _____ ]</td>
<td>Its interpretation is that the matter is that [ _____ ].</td>
<td>subordinate clause</td>
<td>1QpHab V.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>על פServiceProvider על [ _____ ] אשר</td>
<td>Its interpretation is that the matter is concerning [ _____ ] which [ _____ ].</td>
<td>null copula clause followed by subordinate clause</td>
<td>1QpHab X.9; XII.12-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A further wrinkle is presented by the difficulty of knowing precisely when the clause introduced by the interpretation formula has ended. It is often impossible to know whether the beginning of a new clause is a second main clause or a subordinate clause that continues the main clause that began with the introductory formula. In fact, only one clause is sufficiently disconnected conceptually from a pesher formula to be definitively labeled a main clause in its own right, and this is the final clause of the scroll, which occurs in 1QpHab XIII.2-4. For this reason, nearly the entire analysis of the word order of 1QpHab could be taken as an analysis of word order in subordinate clauses rather than main clauses.

The difficulty in distinguishing between main and subordinate clauses presents an added difficulty for drawing conclusions about the nature of word order in 1QpHab given that word order patterns in ancient Hebrew are often distinct in main and subordinate clauses. The relative rarity of fronted shift topics in 1QpHab may suggest that most of these clauses are subordinate clauses given that topic shift is normally associated with main clauses, which carry a topic thread through a discourse. For the sake of providing as much information as possible in this study, in cases where it is unclear whether a clause is a main clause or a subordinate clause, I will assume that the clause is a main clause.

415. Clauses which are difficult to identify with confidence as either subordinate clauses or main clauses are found in 1QpHab III.5-6, 10-12*, 12-14*; IV.2, 2-3, 3, 6, 7, 7-8, 8-9, 11-12, 12-13*; V.4, 4-5, 5-6, 6-7, 11-12(a); VI.4-5; VII.7-8, 8, 12-14; VIII.9-10(a), 10, 10-11*, 11(a), 11(b), 12, 12-13*; IX.6-7; X.4, 5(a), 5(b); XI.6-8, 13-14, 14-15*; XII.3-4, 4-5, 5-6, 8-9, 9-10, 14.
6.1.2. Removing Biblical Quotations and Allusions

Table 64 lists the biblical quotations and allusions that have been removed from the 1QpHab corpus.\textsuperscript{416}

Table 64: Finite Verb, Non-Copular Clauses in 1QpHab (other than lemmata) that Depend Upon Biblical Texts and are Excluded from the Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Location</th>
<th>Biblical Parallel</th>
<th>Hebrew Clause</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XI.13</td>
<td>Deut 10:16</td>
<td>נמי לא את עורLESS than lt לבר</td>
<td>kyʾ lwʾ ml ʾt ʿwr~lт lbw</td>
<td>For he did not circumcise the foreskin of his heart.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1.3. The Poetic Corpus

No poetic corpus has been set aside in 1QpHab as was done for 1QS and 1QM because the text of 1QpHab is similar in style throughout all of the interpretation segments. Several of its sequences utilize poetic techniques, but the prose expectations for information structure patterns are maintained throughout. First, nearly all of the clauses in this text can be classified easily within one of the information structure patterns outlined within the model of Erteschik-Shir. Second, this text conforms completely to the EICT, unlike the poetic portions of 1QS and 1QM. 1QM, for example, violates the EICT due to its use of vocatives and interlaced appositives, which are absent from 1QpHab. Based on the relationship between word order and information

---

\textsuperscript{416} All biblical quotations and allusions in 1QpHab (other than the lemmata taken from Habakkuk) are identified based on the table in Lange and Weigold (2011: 330). One clause that alludes to a biblical text but does not depend upon its clause-level syntax is included from 1QpHab XIII.2 (Ezek 20:32).
structure in 1QpHab, it is best to characterize this text as a prose text that makes use of poetic techniques without releasing itself from the expectations of prose.

6.2. Constituents with Fixed Position

6.2.1. Complementizers

Complementizers in 1QpHab are always clause-initial. Complementizers in finite verb clauses in 1QM include כִּי, ky', "because," "indeed"; מסֶר, ʾšr, relative marker; הבשֶר, kʾšr, "as"; and בעבור, bʾbwr, "so that," "as a result".420

6.2.2. Negation Particles

A negation particle modifying a verb always immediately precedes the verb.421

417. Cf. 1QpHab VII.12-14; XI.13. A clause governed by a non-adjacent כִּי particle occurs in 1QpHab XI.13-14.

418. Cf. 1QpHab III.9-10; IV.1-2, 5-6, 11; V.3, 5-6, 7-8, 10, 11-12(b); VI.10-11; VII.4-5, 7, 8, 11-14; VIII.1-3, 11(c); IX.5, 9-12*, 11-12; X.3-4, 9-13; XI.4-6, 12-14; XII.3, 5-6, 8, 9-10, 13-14; XIII.2. Clauses governed by a null relative particle or by a non-adjacent כִּי due to conjunction of clauses are found in 1QpHab IV.2, 2-3, 3, 6; V.4, 4-5, 11-12(a); X.4, 5(a), 5(b); XI.6-8; XII.8-9, 14.

419. Cf. 1QpHab VII.13-14*; VIII.9-10(b).


421. In clauses with finite non-copular verbs, clause-initial negation particles are found in the following locations. With לָו (lw): 1QpHab V.3, 7-8, 11-12(a); VII.11-14; XI.13. Non-clause-initial negation particles in clauses with finite non-copular verbs are found in the following locations. With לָו (lw): 1QpHab VII.2; XII.14.
6.2.3. Infinitive Phrases that Modify a Finite Verb

Any post-verbal infinitive phrase that modifies a finite verb is the final clause-level constituent within its clause.\textsuperscript{422} The only exception is the result of a clause-final subordinate finite verb clause (cf. 1QpHab IX.9-12*).

6.2.4. Subordinate Clauses with a Finite Verb

A subordinate clause with a finite verb is the final constituent in the clause.\textsuperscript{423} The only exception involves fronting of a temporal subordinate clause to the clause-initial position as a scene-setting topic (cf. 1QpHab VIII.9-10(a)).

6.3. The Left Periphery

6.3.1. Left-dislocation

There is no clear use of LD in 1QpHab.\textsuperscript{424}

\textsuperscript{422} Cf. 1QpHab III.10-11*; IV.7, 12-13*; VII.1-2; X.9-13; XI.4-6, 6-8, 13-14; XII.13-14.
\textsuperscript{423} Cf. 1QpHab VII.12-14 (Camb) IX.6-7 (Camb); XI.12-14 (Camb) XII.5-6 (Camb)
\textsuperscript{424} In 1QpHab VII.2, LD is possible, but unlikely. If the enclitic pronoun רוח ("him" or "it") on the verb הודו references the complement theme of the clause, גן ("the end of the time"), then this is LD of the complement theme. However, it is much more probable that the enclitic pronoun references Habakkuk, who is the hypothetical recipient of the message.
6.3.2. Fronting (Preposing)

6.3.2.1. Double Fronting

There is no double fronting extant in 1QpHab.

6.3.2.2. Temporal Adjuncts

In the well-preserved portions of 1QpHab there are 5 pre-verbal temporal phrases and 5 post-verbal temporal phrases. In general they support the hypothesis that pre-verbal temporal phrases reference an instantaneous point in time while post-verbal temporal phrases reference a duration of time. References in bold represent a deviation from what is expected.

Table 65: Temporal Phrases in the 1QpHab Prose Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal Preposition</th>
<th>Pre-Verbal</th>
<th>Post-Verbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>אחר, &quot;afterwards&quot;: XI.1-2</td>
<td>XI.1-2 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ב, &quot;during&quot;: V.5-7, 7-8; &quot;when&quot; (duration): V.10; VII.11-14; &quot;at&quot;: XI.6-8; &quot;on&quot;: XII.14; XIII.2-4</td>
<td>XI.6-8; XIII.2-4 (2)</td>
<td>V.5-7, 7-8, 10; VII.11-14; XII.14 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בסך, &quot;when&quot; (instant): VIII.9-10</td>
<td>VIII.9-10 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>בי, &quot;in&quot; (during): IX.6-7</td>
<td>IX.6-7 (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

425. All temporal phrases in 1QpHab occur in clauses with finite verbs.
Eight of ten temporal phrases in 1QpHab fit expectations. Temporal phrases referencing instantaneous moments in time are clause-initial and fronted as stage topics, with one exception. The temporal adjunct in 1QpHab XII.14 is expected to be pre-verbal but is post-verbal.

(148) 1QpHab XII.14

\[\text{המשפט לָא יְלַלְמוּ בֵּית} \text{הַשָּׁפֶט}\]

\textit{whmh lw' yšylwm bywm hmšpt}

CONJ-PRON.3MP NEG deliver.IMPF.3MP-PRON.3MP on-day ART-judgment

But they will not deliver them on the day of judgment.

One potential reason that the temporal adjunct (bywm hmšpt, "on the day of judgment") is not pre-verbal could be to give the phrase final attentive focus, leading the reader to meditate on the importance of the day of judgment. Another reason could be the use of a pronominal subject that occupies the pre-verbal position as the topic and thereby prevents the fronting of a stage topic. It is also possible to interpret this as a durative temporal phrase, "during the day of judgment."

Temporal phrases referencing durations of time are not clause-initial in 1QpHab, with one exception. The temporal adjunct in 1QpHab IX.6-7 is expected to be post-verbal but is pre-verbal.

(149) 1QpHab IX.6-7

\[\text{ולא며דית} \text{הימים להות הון עם שָׁלָל בַּד} \text{חִיל} \text{בָּיָם} \text{בַּחֲמֹת} \text{בַּיִם} \text{בְּיִלְּחֵם}\]

\textit{wl'hryt hymym yntn hwnm 'm šlm byd hyl hkty'ym ky' hmh ytr h'ymym}

CONJ-to-last ART-day.MP be_given.IMPF.3MS wealth-PRON.3MP with plunder-PRON.3MP into-hand army ART-Kittim.MP CAUSE PRON.3MP remainder ART-people.MP

But in the last days their wealth together with their plunder will be given into the hand of the army of the Kittim because they are the remainder of the peoples.
The pre-verbal position of the phrase referring to "the last days" is likely fronted in order to contrast it with the implied time of the events of the preceding clause (cf. 1QpHab IX.4-5), wherein "the latter priests of Jerusalem . . . will gather property and unjust wealth from the spoils of the nations."

6.3.2.3. Pre-verbal Non-temporal Adjuncts

Excluding fragmentary clauses, there are eight pre-verbal adjuncts in the fully preserved clauses of 1QpHab that are not temporal. When slightly fragmentary clauses are included, the number rises to eleven. To test for all of the possible motivations for pre-verbal adjuncts within Erteschik-Shir's framework, it is necessary to check if the fronted adjunct is a topic, shift topic, contrastive, restrictive, a non-topic cleft, or a non-topic that permits clause-final attentive focus. Most non-temporal pre-verbal adjuncts in 1QpHab are non-topics that have been fronted as cleft constituents. What I believe to be the best interpretation for each of these clauses is provided below.

_Shift Topic Fronting_

Topic fronting occurs in two consecutive clauses in 1QpHab X.4-5. Topic fronting of adjuncts is relatively rare in 1QpHab. This may be due to the relatively high quantity of text that is tied up in

426. These occur in 1QpHab III.5-6*, 10-11*; IV.6, 7, 7-8, 11; V.4-5; IX.9-12*; X.4, 5(a), 5(b). The missing text in the five fragmentary clauses is limited in most cases to one or two missing characters. 1QpHab III.10-11* is missing four characters in the middle of the clause-final adjunct of purpose.
subordinate clauses within *pesher* formulae. The main topic thread of a discourse is typically carried by main clauses, so the relative scarcity of main clause text would be expected to reduce the number of shift topics. These two clauses with fronted topics can be taken as main clauses rather than subordinate clauses, which explains why they are able to utilize topic fronting.

(150) 1QpHab X.4

*wmšm yʿlnw lmšpt*

CONJ-from-there raise.IMPF.3MS-PRON.3MS for-judgment

And from there he will raise him up for judgment.

(151) 1QpHab X.5(a)

*wbtwm yršyʿnw*

CONJ-in-midst-PRON.3MP condemn.IMPF.3MS-PRON.3MS

And in their midst he will condemn him.

The first fronted topic, "from there," refers back to *המקדש בית*, "the place of judgment," which is the lynchpin of the interpretation of Hab 2:10 that takes place in 1QpHab X.3-5. The remainder of this clause, "he will raise him up for judgment," is non-topical at that point in the discourse, so this cannot be a cleft sentence. It is tempting to take the fronted topic as a continued topic, given that its antecedent *המקדש בית* plays a central role in the preceding clause. The preceding clause begins with "Its interpretation is," and it may be that the true topic of the preceding clause is the lemma from Hab 2:10. In that case *משם* should be taken as a shift topic. From the broader perspective of HPH, this is preferable because there is no other example of a pre-verbal continued topic in the corpus.
The second fronted topic, "in their midst," is topical information contained within the preceding interpretation in the phrase רבים עמים בתוכם, "in the midst of many peoples." This fronted adjunct is clearly a shift topic. The remainder of that clause, ירשעת, "he will condemn him," is non-topical at that point in the discourse.

Another example of shift topic fronting may occur in 1QpHab III.10-11*. This clause is difficult to parse in terms of information structure.427

Cleft Sentences

There are five pre-verbal adjunct clefts in non-fragmentary clauses in 1QpHab and one that occurs in a fragmentary clause.428 One of these is shown below in 1QpHab X.5(b).

(152) 1QpHab X.5(b)


cleft

wbʾš gwpryt yšptnw

CONJ-in-midst-PRON.3MP condemn.IMPF.3MS-PRON.3MS CONJ-with-fire brimstone judge.IMPF.3MS-PRON.3MS

And it is with fire and brimstone that he will judge him.

In this clause the topical information that follows the fronted constituent, ירשעת, "he will judge him," is topical because it occurs in the preceding interpretation, which refers twice in 1QpHab

427. The best interpretation is probably that the clause-initial PP מระยะ, "from a distance," is the topic of the clause, in reference to מרחוק, "from afar," in 1QpHab III.7 in the quotation of Hab 1:8-9. The rest of the clause may be considered non-topical because although parts of it appear in the preceding clauses (e.g. נש, "vulture"), the clause-level constituents are each discourse new when considered as whole units.

428. In non-fragmentary clauses, pre-verbal non-temporal adjunct clefts occur in 1QpHab IV.6, 7, 7-8, 11; X.5(b). In fragmentary clauses, pre-verbal non-temporal adjunct clefts occur in 1QpHab III.5-6*.
X.4 to judgment against the guilty party using the word השפט, which shares the root משפט, "to judge," with the verb in 1QpHab X.5b. The cleft constituent, באש נפריה, "with fire and brimstone," is new, non-topical information that is not included in the preceding verse quotation or interpretation. For this reason, I have translated this clause as a cleft sentence in (152) above: "And it is with fire and brimstone that he will judge him."

When the three clauses from 1QpHab X.4-5 that we just examined are compared (see (150), (151), and (152) above), we see that all three clauses utilize a pre-verbal adjunct, but the first two clauses utilize a different information structure pattern than the third clause. The syntactic structures are parallel, but the information structures diverge. The similarities and differences are shown in the following table.

Table 66: Syntactic and IS Patterns in 1QpHab X.4-5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Syntactic Structure</th>
<th>Information Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QpHab X.4</td>
<td>[Adjunct] [Verb] [Complement] [Adjunct]</td>
<td>[Topic] [Non-topic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QpHab X.5(a)</td>
<td>[Adjunct] [Verb] [Complement]</td>
<td>[Topic] [Non-topic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QpHab X.5(b)</td>
<td>[Adjunct] [Verb] [Complement]</td>
<td>[Non-topic] [Topic]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section of text is an example of the use of established information structure patterns even within a "poetic" text. In this case, the "poetic" repetition evidenced in the parallelism of syntactic structure does not obviate the use of "prose" information structure patterns.

Two clauses in 1QpHab IV.7-8 can also be interpreted as clefts. The information that follows each of the fronted constituents is, in a broad sense, topical because it is referenced in the verse citation from Habakkuk 1:10. The English translations below have been written to reflect a cleft interpretation.
In (153), the phrase, "with a great people," is non-topical information in that it is not mentioned in the preceding clauses, and it has been fronted as a cleft constituent. The remaining material in the clause, "they will surround them to seize them," is given and therefore topical because it is explained in the quotation from Habakkuk 1:10 that occurs in 1QpHab IV.3-4: "And it laughs at every fortress, for it has piled up dirt and [cap]tured it." In (154), the phrase, "with terror and dread," is new and non-topical and is fronted as a cleft constituent. The remainder of the clause, "they [the fortresses] will be given into their hand," is given, topical material based on Habakkuk 1:10 as quoted in 1QpHab IV.4.
Additional cleft sentences occur in 1QpHab III.5-6*, 429 IV.6, 430 and IV.11. 431

**Contrastive Constituents**

A fronted contrastive adjunct occurs in 1QpHab V.4-5.

(155) 1QpHab V.4-5

\[ \text{wbtwkhtm y's}mw \text{ kl ršy} \ 'mw \]

\[ \text{CONJ-at-rebuke-PRON.3MP suffer_for_one's_guilt.IMPF.3MP all wicked.MP.CSTR} \]

\[ \text{people-PRON.3MS} \]

And at their rebuke all of the wicked of his people will be suffer for their guilt.

429. In 1QpHab III.5-6*, the reconstructed adjunct בַּעֲלֵם תֶּרֶםה, "with deceit and treachery," is a non-topical cleft. The remainder of the clause, יָלְנוּ עַל כָּל הָעָנִים, "they conduct themselves with all the peoples" (WAC 2005: 82), is not present in the preceding discourse, but it is topical as a permanently available topic. The concept of self-conduct as such is already shared by the writer and the audience and does not need to be introduced into the discourse to become topical. An example of a cleft clause translation would be "And it is with deceit and treachery that they conduct themselves with all the peoples."

430. In 1QpHab IV.6, the verb שָׁהַך, "to laugh," is topical based on its appearance in the quotation from Habakkuk 1:10 that occurs in 1QpHab IV.4. The noun לָעָז, "derision," is new to the recent discourse and non-topical. A verb with the same root, לָעָז, does appear in 1QpHab IV.2, but because this is outside of the current lemma:interpretation pair, it is non-topical from the perspective of 1QpHab IV.4-9. An example of a cleft sentence translation would be "And it is with derision that they laugh at them."

431. In 1QpHab IV.11, the clause-final verb עָבָר, "to pass," is topical based on its occurrence in the quotation from Hab 1:11 that is found in 1QpHab IV.9. The reconstructed pre-verbal adjunct [בַּעֲשֵׁת בַּעֲשֵׁת אַשְׁמֵת], "with the advice of the house of [their] sin," is new to the discourse and non-topical. An example of a cleft sentence translation would be "And it is with the advice of the house of [their] sin that they pass through."
The pre-verbal PP בתוכחתם, "at their rebuke," implies a contrast between the enclitic pronominal suffixם-, "their" (which refers to בחירו, "his chosen," 1QpHab V.4), and הגוים, "the peoples" (1QpHab V.3).

**Pre-verbal Subordinate Clause**

A pre-verbal subordinate clause adjunct modifying the main clause CP occurs in 1QpHab IX.9-12*.

(156) 1QpHab IX.9-12*

Because of the iniquity [he did to] the Teacher of Righteousness and the men of his council, God put him into the hand of his enemies to afflict him with an affliction of consuming despair because he had condemned his chosen one.
Parsing out the structure of the main and subordinate clause(s) in this excerpt is challenging because a second subordinate clause appears in clause-final position. A full treatment of the second subordinate clause can be found below in §6.4.

6.3.2.4. Pre-verbal Complements

There are four pre-verbal complements of finite verbs in 1QpHab.

Cleft Sentences

One cleft sentence occurs in 1QpHab IV.2-3.

(157) 1QpHab IV.2-3

bmlkym wšrym yt’tw
at-king.MP CONJ-prince.MP mock.IMPF.3MP

It is kings and princes that they mock.

In 1QpHab IV.2-3, "kings and princes" (מלך ושרים) are new to the discourse, while the concept of mocking is not. This gives the clause a cleft structure. Like 1QpHab X.4-5, 1QpHab IV.2-3 uses information structure patterns in the service of poetry.

Table 67: Syntactic and IS Patterns in 1QpHab IV.2-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Syntactic Structure</th>
<th>Information Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QpHab IV.2a</td>
<td>[Verb] [Complement]</td>
<td>[Topic] [Non-topic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QpHab IV.2b</td>
<td>[Verb] [Complement]</td>
<td>[Topic] [Non-topic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QpHab IV.2-3</td>
<td>[Complement] [Verb]</td>
<td>[Non-topic] [Topic]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QpHab IV.3</td>
<td>[Verb] [Complement]</td>
<td>[Topic] [Topic]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Contrastive Clauses

One fronted contrastive complement occurs in 1QpHab, shown below.

(158) 1QpHab V.4

\[ wbyd \ bhyrw \ ytn \ l \ t \ mšpt \ klw \ hgwym \]
\[ \text{CONJ-into-hand chosen-PRON.3MS give.IMPF.3MS God DOM judgment all ART-nation.MP} \]

And into the hand of his chosen will God give the judgment of all the nations.

In this case, "the hand of his chosen," is contrasted with "the peoples" (1QpHab V.3), as the possible alternative for who will have the power to judge all the nations. Example (155) above involves an anaphoric pronoun that refers to בחירו and also contrasts with the same constituent, העדות.

Restrictive Clauses

Two fronted restrictive complements occur in 1QpHab.432

(159) 1QpHab VII.2

\[ w‘t \ gmr \ hqs \ lw’ \ hwd‘w \]
\[ \text{conj-dom end art-era neg cause_to_know.pf.3ms-pron.3ms} \]

But the end of the era he did not reveal to him.

432. Fronted restrictive complements occur in 1QpHab VII.2; VIII.12. Another fronted restrictive complement occurs in a fragmentary clause in 1QpHab VIII.12-13*. 
This fronted complement, קץ תמר הכהן, "the end of the era," is a restrictive complement because it is not exclusive. There are other things as well that were not made known to Habakkuk, and a contrast set of everything that was revealed to Habakkuk is not provided in the preceding text.

The clause with a fronted restrictive complement in 1QpHab VIII.12 is also a good candidate for final attentive focus. However, since the fronting of the pre-verbal complement could be motivated by restrictiveness alone, this clause does not provide evidence for fronting for the purpose of final attentive focus in 1QpHab.⁴³³

6.3.2.5. Allosentences for Fronted Complements and Non-temporal Adjuncts

Unlike the analyses of 1QS and 1QM, I will combine fronted complements and non-temporal adjuncts into one set of clauses for the purpose of comparison with allosentences in 1QpHab. I do this for two reasons. First, the small data set in 1QpHab would render the comparison of allosentences for fronted complements invalid. Second, there is no appreciable difference between the behaviours of these two categories (complements and non-temporal adjuncts) in 1QS and 1QM, and it is likely that their clause positions are governed by similar sets of expectations in HPH.

Table 68 lists all pre-verbal non-temporal complements and adjuncts in 1QpHab, the types of their fronted constituents, and the types of clauses in which they occur (i.e. main or subordinate clauses).

⁴³³ The fronted contrastive complement in this clause is עמים הרע, "wealth of nations." The contrastive aspect of this phrase involves the nations; until this point only the wealth of violent men has been brought into the discourse. This clause cannot be a cleft because the remainder of the clause contains some non-topical information as well.
Table 68: IS Clause Types where an Adjunct or Complement Precedes a Finite Verb in 1QpHab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference in 1QpHab</th>
<th>Main or Subordinate Clause</th>
<th>Pre-verbal Constituent</th>
<th>Constituent Type</th>
<th>Clause Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.5-6*</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>גַּנֵּל מֶרֶם</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Cleft Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.10-11*</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>מְמוּרַת</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Shift Topic Fronting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.2-3</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>בִּמְלֵלֶים וּשְׁרוֹם</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Cleft Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.6</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>נָלַע</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Cleft Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.7</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>בּוֹשׁ רָב</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Cleft Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.7-8</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>בָּאָמְתָה פֶּדַה</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Cleft Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.11</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>בְּעֵשֶׁת בֵּית אַשְׁמֵן</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Cleft Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.4</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>בְּרֵד בְּהֵר</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Contrast Fronting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.4-5</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>בְּתֹכֶלֶם</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Contrast Fronting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.2</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>אֵין גֵר הָכָו</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Restrictiveness Fronting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.12</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>מַעְיָה עִמָּש</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Restrictiveness Fronting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.12-13*</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>דְרֵי תָּעִיב תְבָּת</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Restrictiveness Fronting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.9-12*</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>בַּ[ט] [ט] מְרוֹדָה הֲוֵדָך</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Pre-verbal Subordinate Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.4</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>מָשָׁה</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Shift Topic Fronting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.5(a)</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>בָּרֹכְם</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Shift Topic Fronting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.5(b)</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>בָּאֶשׁ גְנוֹרָה</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Cleft Sentence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 69 summarizes the data. Table 70 summarizes the data with fragmentary clauses included.
Table 69: Pre-verbal Complements and Non-temporal Adjuncts in Finite Verb Clauses of the 1QpHab Corpus, with fragmentary clauses excluded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main Clauses</th>
<th>Subordinate Clauses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complements</td>
<td>Non-temporal Adjuncts</td>
<td>Complements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Clause</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 70: Pre-verbal Complements and Non-temporal Adjuncts in Finite Verb Clauses of the 1QpHab Corpus, with fragmentary clauses included

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Main Clauses</th>
<th>Subordinate Clauses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complements</td>
<td>Non-temporal Adjuncts</td>
<td>Complements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate Clause</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allosentences for these clauses are those with a post-verbal complement or adjunct and no pre-verbal constituent. An allosentence for a cleft sentence is one where the post-verbal adjunct or complement is a non-topic while the rest of the clause contains topical material. In 1QS and
IQM, subordinate clauses were excluded from the analysis. However, because there is one pre-verbal subordinate clause in 1QpHab (in 1QpHab IX.9-12*), allosentences with a post-verbal subordinate clause that modifies a finite verb are included here. Such allosentences occur in 1QpHab VII.12-14; XI.12-14; and XII.5-6.

Table 71: Allosentences for Clauses with Pre-verbal Complements and Non-temporal Adjuncts in 1QpHab

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference in 1QpHab</th>
<th>Main or Subordinate Clause</th>
<th>Post-verbal Constituent</th>
<th>Constituent Type</th>
<th>Characteristics of IS-motivated Fronting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.9-10*</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>הארון</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.9-10*</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>הבטש[היס]ובכהמש</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.1-2</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>על ביבס</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.2</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>על נבכריס</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.3</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>בבש רב</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.5-6</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>על מצארי העמיס</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.3</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>את עמו</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.3</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>בינ הרגו</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.5-6</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>את התוות</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.5-6</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>בער לוהי</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Clause-final Attentive Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.7-8</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>אשר עיניס</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.7-8</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>בקן הרשעה</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.10</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>בהющуюו מארה הרצק</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.11-12(a)</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>על אשת אחוב אשר מסת את החזור בוחך בול[ות]</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.11-12(b)</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>את החזור</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.11-12(b)</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>בוחך כל[ות]</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Clause-final Attentive Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference in 1QpHab</td>
<td>Main or Subordinate Clause</td>
<td>Post-verbal Constituent</td>
<td>Constituent Type</td>
<td>Characteristics of IS-motivated Fronting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.1-2</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>אתה הותם</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.1-2</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>על בול שללשם</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.1-2</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>רוח התים</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.10-11</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>רבי</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.10-11</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>בחרבת</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.10-11</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>נערי אسريים ו堞ים</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.1-2</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>אלא חקפוק</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.1-2</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>להתחב את הבוחת על</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.4-5</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>את כולם רבי יערעיי נבואש</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.11-14</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>Más בהדאה האמת</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.12-14</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>כל🤣 هل קצל אל לנו</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none (vP-modifying subordinate clause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.13-14*</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>ברי ערמות</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.1-3</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>מבהים המשפש</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.1-3</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>מעבר עלמל א-cornerס</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.10</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>את אל</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.10-11*</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>בהקהל</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.10-11*</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>בברור היה</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.11(b)</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>הוה אנשי חמס ואחיד механиз</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.11(b)</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>באלא</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.5</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>הוה גבעת</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.5</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>משלאlage</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.11-12</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>על בחררים</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.3-4</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>אתמשמש</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.3-4</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>בה GHC עמקו לביס</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference in 1QpHab</td>
<td>Main or Subordinate Clause</td>
<td>Post-verbal Constituent</td>
<td>Constituent Type</td>
<td>Characteristics of IS-motivated Fronting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.9-13*</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>רבם</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.9-13*</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>لبבות ערי寿鸟_segments</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.12-13</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>лимפשיה אש</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.12-13</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>אשר גורמי והורמים את</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.4-6</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>שאר מוריה העצקים</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.4-6</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>כלולו בשבע חמשה אחית</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.12-14</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>מזכרו</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.12-14</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>בליבי בהנקה והמענה</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none (vP-modifying subordinate clause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.13</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>את והקורות לבר</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.13-14</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>ברוריה והוריה</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.13-14</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>למען ספת העמאת</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.3</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>על האיבות</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.5-6</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>לכללה</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.5-6</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>אסף מהם לכלות    אובונים</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none (vP-modifying subordinate clause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.8</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>מעשי תועפות</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.8-9</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>או מקדר אל     אובונים</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.9-10</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>וה אובונים</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.13-14</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>לטובוס והשתחות להוה</td>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.2</td>
<td>subordinate</td>
<td>את האביב ואוהUPI</td>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Adjuncts: 21 Sub. (and 7 fragmentary) 27
Total Complements: 25 Sub. (and 5 fragmentary) 32
Totals: 46 Sub. (and 12 fragmentary) 59
Table 72: Allosentences for clauses with fronted complements and non-temporal adjuncts in the prose 1QpHab corpus, fragmentary clauses excluded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Subordinate Clauses</th>
<th>Main Clauses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFAF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the allosentences to the clauses that evidence fronting shows a significant distinction between the two sets of clauses.

Table 73: Complements and Non-temporal Adjuncts in Main Clauses in 1QpHab with IS features that could directly motivate fronting, fragmentary clauses excluded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleft</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause-final Attentive Focus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 74: Complements and Non-temporal Adjuncts in Main Clauses in 1QpHab without IS features that could directly motivate fronting, fragmentary clauses excluded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No IS Features</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In clauses with features that could directly motivate fronting, 9 of 12 complements and non-temporal adjuncts are pre-verbal. In clauses without such features, 1 of 8 complements are pre-verbal. The distinction between these two ratios is highly statistically significant.\(^{434}\)

Table 75: Comparison of 1QpHab main clauses with pre-verbal complements and non-temporal adjuncts with their allosentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic / Contrast / Cleft / Clause-final attentive focus / Restrictiveness</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic / No IS Features</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore there is highly statistically significant evidence for IS-motivated fronting of complements and non-temporal adjuncts in 1QpHab.

There are no pre-verbal complements or non-temporal adjuncts with IS-motivated fronting features in non-fragmentary subordinate clauses 1QpHab. Therefore it is not possible to conduct a statistical analysis of subordinate clauses.

---

\(^{434}\) For this calculation, \(p < 0.01\).
6.3.3. Subjects and SV/VS Order

6.3.3.1. Subordinate Clauses

There are 14 subordinate clauses in 1QpHab with an explicit subject and a finite verb. Two of these use SV order and the other 12 use VS order.435

The SV subordinate clause in 1QpHab XII.14 utilizes SV order due to its pronominal subject.

The SV subordinate clause in 1QpHab VII.12-14 is an example of topic shift. The topic shifts from אנשי האמת עושי ה תורה, "the men of truth, doers of the law" (1QpHab VII.10-11) to כל קריא אל, "all the times (eras) of God."

6.3.3.2. Main Clauses

There are five clauses in 1QpHab that have the potential to be main clauses and have an explicit subject and a finite non-copular verb. All five clauses use VS order.436 Of these five clauses, only 1QpHab XIII.2-4 can be confidently identified as a main clause (cf. §6.1.1).

435. The two clauses with SV order occur in 1QpHab VII.12-14; XII.14. The twelve clauses with VS order occur in 1QpHab V.3, 4, 4-5; VII.4-5, 7, 8, 11-14; VIII.1-2; IX.9-12*; X.3-4; XI.12-14; XII.8
436. These clauses occur in 1QpHab VII.1-2; VIII.9-10(a); IX.6-7; XI.1-2; XIII.2-4.
Table 76: The topicality of the subject in main and subordinate SV and VS clauses with a finite verb in the 1QpHab corpus.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Subject</th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic</td>
<td>1(^{437})</td>
<td>1(^{438})</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic</td>
<td>1(^{439})</td>
<td>4(^{440})</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-topic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10(^{441})</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2(^{442})</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately there is little to be learned from SV and VS order in 1QpHab, given that there are only two SV clauses and both are subordinate clauses. If subordinate clauses are included in the analysis in 1QpHab, shift topics are fronted at a 50% rate (1 out of 2).\(^{443}\)

It is clear that for complements, adjuncts, and subjects, shift topic fronting is far less common in 1QpHab than in 1QS and 1QM. This may result from the fact that almost all of the

\(^{437}\) Cf. 1QpHab VII.12-14 (subordinate clause).

\(^{438}\) Cf. 1QpHab VII.7 (subordinate clause).

\(^{439}\) Cf. 1QpHab XII.14 (subordinate clause with pronominal subject).

\(^{440}\) All four continued topics are enclitic pronouns. Cf. 1QpHab VII.11-14 (דָּיִם; subordinate clause); VIII.9-10(a) (לְלָם; main clause); IX.6-7 (רְחִינִים עָם שְׁלָלִים; main clause); XI.12-14 (ךְָנָל; subordinate clause).

\(^{441}\) Cf. 1QpHab V.3, 4, 4-5; VII.4-5, 8; VIII.1-2; IX.9-12; X.3-4; XII.8; XIII.2-4. All of these are subordinate clauses except 1QpHab XIII.2-4. In most of these clauses הָא, "God," is the subject. Such clauses occur frequently due to the nature of the pesher genre.

\(^{442}\) Cf. 1QpHab VII.1-2 (main clause); XI.1-2 (main clause). The information structure is uncertain because the context is fragmentary for both of these clauses.

\(^{443}\) In 1QM, shift topics have a pre-verbal rate of 62% (16 of 26) in main clauses. In 1QS, shift topics have a pre-verbal rate of 90% (19 of 21). There are no SV main clauses in 1QpHab, so a direct comparison with these figures is not possible.
non-biblical text of 1QS is contained within subordinate clauses introduced by [אשֶר] (pšrw 'šr, "It's interpretation is that") or some variation thereof. The vast majority of topic fronting in 1QS and 1QM occurs in main clauses.

6.4. Post-verbal Word Order

In general, post-verbal word order in 1QpHab follows the expectations of the EICT as well as the exceptions that have been established by 1QS and 1QM. The rare exception provides an interesting insight into the use of final attentive focus at the conclusion of the document.

Post-verbal subjects in 1QpHab are always the first post-verbal constituent in the clause that is not an enclitic pronoun or a light PP. ⁴⁴⁴

The evidence for the use of PPs as light PPs is listed below in Table 34.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Morpheme</th>
<th>Light PP?</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to-PRON.3MP</td>
<td>ʾlyhm</td>
<td>אליהם</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>1QpHab XI.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-PRON.3FS</td>
<td>bh</td>
<td>בה</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1QpHab XII.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to-PRON.3MP</td>
<td>ʾlhwm</td>
<td>להם</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1QpHab VII.14; XI.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at--PRON.3MP</td>
<td>ʾlyhm</td>
<td>עליהם</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>1QpHab IV.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴⁴⁴. Post-verbal subjects that immediately follow the verb (12) occur in 1QpHab V.3, 4, 4-5; VII.1-2, 7, 8, 11-14; VIII.9-10(a); IX.6-7; X.3-4; XI.12-14; XIII.2-4. Post-verbal subjects that are preceded only by an enclitic pronoun that is attached to the main verb (3) occur in 1QpHab VII.4-5; VIII.1-2; IX.9-12. Post-verbal subjects that are preceded only by a light PP (2) occur in 1QpHab XI.1-2 (with להם) and XII.8 (with בה).
All of the potential light PP's in 1QpHab immediately follow the verbs they modify, but it is not possible to identify them all definitively as light PP's because only two are followed by explicit subjects.

The EICT predicts that the clause-level constituent with the largest phrase marker will be placed in clause-final position. There are 21 clauses in 1QpHab where a choice can be made regarding the order of post-verbal clause-level constituents that do not include subjects or light PPs. Of these 21 clauses, 20 follow the EICT, and one does not follow the EICT.445 This works out to 95% of clauses that follow the EICT and 5% of clauses that violate it. When fragmentary clauses are included, a similar distribution results.446

445. Clauses that follow the EICT (20) occur in: 1QpHab V.3, 5-7, 7-8, 11-12(b); VI.1-2, 10-11; VII.1-2, 11-14, 12-14; VIII.1-2; IX.5, 6-7; X.3-4, 9-13, 12-13; XI.1-2, 4-6, 12-14, 13-14; XII.5-6. In four of these clauses the last two clause-level constituents have phrase markers of identical size: 1QpHab VI.1-2; IX.6-7; X.3-4; XI.13-14. The one clause that does not follow the EICT occurs in 1QpHab XIII.2-4.

446. When fragmentary clauses are included, 23 of 25 clauses (92%) follow the EICT. Fragmentary clauses that follow the EICT (3) occur in: 1QpHab III.9-10*, 10-11*; VIII.10-11*. The fragmentary clause that does not follow the EICT occurs in 1QpHab IX.9-12*, which was discussed in §6.2.3 and example (156) in §6.3.2.3. This main clause includes a postposed subordinate clause בָּנָבוּ הַשָּׁם הַרְשִׁיעָהּ עַל בָּהָיוֹר, "because he had condemned his chosen one," and this clause has a smaller phrase marker than the clause-level infinitive phrase that precedes it. The clause-final placement of this subordinate clause may be motivated by the desire to place it in final attentive focus. However, the best explanation is probably that post-verbal subordinate clauses are generally placed in clause-final position without necessarily following the EICT. A subordinate clause that modifies the CP is pre-verbal in every case in the corpus, and for this reason it is likely that the second subordinate clause in 1QpHab IX.9-12* modifies the infinitive vP headed by עִנָּתָה, "to afflict," rather than the main clause CP.
The one clause that violates the EICT does so for a specific reason that serves to affirm the relevance of the EICT to the entire document of 1QpHab. This clause is found in 1QpHab XIII.2-4.

(160) 1QpHab XIII.2-4

ויביַמְוִיָּמ הַמָּשַׁפְּט יַקְלֵית לָאָל אִת בָּלֵי יָפֹרְדֵי חוּבִים וַאֲת הָרַשְׁעֵים מִן הָאָרֶץ

wbywm hmšpt yklh 'l 'tw kwl 'wbdy hšbym w't hršym mn h'ṛš

CONJ-on-day ART-judgment destroy.IMPF.3MS God DOM all serve.PTCP.MP.CSTR ART-idol.MP
CONJ-DOM ART-wicked.MP from ART-earth

And on the day of judgment God will destroy all the servants of idols and the wicked from the land.

The clause-final constituent כִּי אָרֶץ, "from the land," should be placed in the first position after the verb in order to satisfy the EICT. By virtue of its location after the much larger constituent אֲת כָּל יוֹבְּרֵי הָעֲבָדִים וַאֲת הָרַשְׁעֵים, "all the servants of idols and the wicked," the attentive focus it receives becomes obvious. In general, by placing a small constituent in clause-final position and violating the EICT, it becomes clear that the clause-final constituent has been intentionally marked for attentive focus. The clause-final position is an attentive focus position in every clause, but when the EICT is violated, the attentive focus placed on that constituent is brought into increased relief.

In this particular clause, the attentive focus on the phrase "from the land" directs the reader's ultimate attention to the location of destruction rather than the longer phrase detailing who will be destroyed. This serves an important purpose at the end of the text, where the attentive focus is that much greater because the clause-final position also serves as the discourse-final position for the entire document. The very act of violating the EICT in the final clause of the scroll
helps to draw the discourse to a close. Conceptually speaking, focusing on the location of the destruction rather than on the ones destroyed helps to end the text on a subtly positive and hopeful note because it serves as a reminder that not everything is destroyed. Only the wicked and the idol worshippers are destroyed, leaving the chosen to enjoy the land, which is not destroyed.

Finally, there is one example of a postposed constituent in 1QpHab. In 1QpHab VI.10-11, an appositive to a noun is postposed.

(161) 1QpHab VI.10-11

אשָר יָאָבְדוּ רְבֵּים בָּהֹרָב וּרְעִים אֱשִּׁישׁים הָכוֹנִים וְשׁיָמְתָּה
ויָשַׁמְבוּ נַעְרֵי לָבוֹא מַגֵּזִים וַחֲנוֹן וְךֹקָּה

וטף נשים וּזְקֵנִים אָשִׁישִים נְעָרִים בֵּחרֶב רֹבֶים וְתֵמִים

REL destroy.IMPF.3MP many.MP with-sword boy.MP man.MP CONJ-old_man.MP woman.FP CONJ-children

...who destroy many with the sword, boys, men, and old men, women and children.

This clause satisfies the expectations of the EICT because its final constituent has the largest phrase marker among all of the post-verbal clause-level constituents. One effect of postposing this appositive phrase is to place it in attentive focus. Since the phrase consists of five conjoined nouns and the entire phrase is in the clause-final position from the perspective of the clause level, each one of the five nouns receives attentive focus. This leads the reader to meditate on the cruelty of the killings carried out by the Kittim. If the clause were rearranged so that, for example, the anchor of the appositive were to follow בֵּחרֶב, "by the sword," and stand adjacent to this large phrase, it would share the clause-final position with the appositive since the anchor and appositive pair would occupy the clause-final position together. This would remove some of the attention from the individual people groups named in the conjoined phrase.
6.5. **Right-dislocation**

There is no clear case of right-dislocation in 1QpHab.
7. Excursus: Daniel 8–12, MT

7.1. Introduction

As the studies in chapters 3–6 have illustrated, the relationship between word order variation and information structure can be subtle and complex. A language learner will typically only become comfortable with this feature of the language at a late stage in the learning process. Sentences that do not conform to expectations regarding information structure will often be entirely grammatical, meaning that even if a non-native speaker has mastered the vocabulary and grammar of the language, he might still use word orders that communicate disjointed information structure patterns. For example, in their studies on adult French and German learners of English, Mary Carroll and Monique Lambert (2003: 285) conclude regarding adult second language learners, "the relevance of grammaticised systems of meanings in information structure pointedly illustrates why native-speaker narratives sound native-like and those of second language learners, though formally correct, do not." For this reason, in the study of ancient texts, identifying a failure to grasp the finer nuances of variable word order phenomena and their relationship to information structure may be a signal that the author does not have the linguistic acumen of a native speaker. I suggest that such a situation is manifest in much of the Hebrew of the last five chapters of the book of Daniel, where the primary author\(^\text{447}\) is a native Aramaic speaker who is not

\(^{447}\) As I outline below in §7.1.1, I divide the text of Daniel 8–12 into three sections which appear to be composed by different authors. My analysis applies only to a selected corpus which makes up the majority of the text.
well-versed in the grammaticised systems of information structure meanings in his L2 language of Hebrew, but is significantly influenced by the word order of his L1 language.

It is generally agreed that the Hebrew of Daniel 8–12 is relatively "poor." The view of Driver is generally accepted, that the author of these chapters was "more at home in Aramaic than in Hebrew" (Driver 1900: lxii; Collins 1993: 23 n. 138). I suggest that the author's familiarity with writing in Standard Literary Aramaic, which is typically verb-final due to prestige-related influence from Akkadian, influenced his choice of word order. This is not to say that the author of Daniel 8–12 was using ungrammatical clauses or malformed syntax. On the contrary, his Hebrew is in most cases "formally correct," so it can be assumed that he knows the grammatical requirements of the language. Yet in clauses where word order is variable in Hebrew and there are no obvious rules or restrictions, the word order profile of Daniel 8–12 is unusual.

Specifically, in clauses where the order of subject and verb is variable, Daniel 8–12 uses an uncommonly simple system of two hierarchical rules to determine the order of subject and verb. The first rule with the highest priority is to avoid verb-final clauses. The second rule, which only comes into play if the first rule is not determinative, is to use subject–verb order. I suggest that the tendency to avoid verb-final clauses results from an intention, whether conscious or unconscious, to distinguish Hebrew from the L1 language, Standard Literary Aramaic, at a point that marked a distinctive, obvious, and characteristic difference between the two languages: Standard Literary Aramaic is verb-final, while Hebrew is not. The secondary preference for subject–verb

order may come from a tendency to use the typical order of the L1 language at a point where the difference between the two languages was more subtle and not distinctive.

7.1.1. The Composition of the Text

The composition of the text of Daniel 8–12 is not uniform and suggests multiple authors. Most importantly, the use of language is not consistent. The prayer in Daniel 9:3-19 "flows smoothly, full of traditional phrases and free of Aramaisms, and it contrasts sharply with the difficult Hebrew that is characteristic of Daniel," according to John Collins (1993: 347). This leads Collins to conclude that the prayer "was not composed for the present context" but was likely copied from elsewhere by the author of the rest of Daniel 9 (1993: 348). For this reason the text of this prayer will be excluded from the primary analysis in this paper. Similarly, the angelic discourse of Daniel 11:2–12:4 is unique in that "the quality of the Hebrew . . . is exceptionally poor."449 The distinctive subject matter of this passage, which is a generally accurate partial history of the Hellenistic period, together with its exceptionally poor Hebrew, suggests a different author from the rest of Daniel 8–12.

Once these two passages are excluded, the corpus under consideration is limited to Dan 8:1–9:2; Dan 9:20–11:1; and Dan 12:5-13. This totals 68 verses, and I will refer to these verses as the primary corpus. The prayer in Daniel 9 and the angelic discourse in Daniel 11–12 constitute 65 verses, and I will refer to these two passages together as the secondary corpus.450 I will ef-

450. This is not meant to imply that the prayer and the angelic discourse form a unity. I am
fectively treat Daniel 8–12 as if it were composed by three authors: the author of the primary corpus, the author of the prayer in Daniel 9, and the author of the angelic discourse in Daniel 11–12.

7.1.2. Locating Clauses of Interest

The order of subject and verb is one of the most interesting word order phenomena in ancient Hebrew due to its variability and complexity. There are several clause types where the order of subject and verb is inflexible, and several types where variation is possible. All three authors in Daniel 8–12 are aware of the restrictions placed on the order of subject and verb and do not violate them in cases where the order is inflexible.451

There are 101 clauses in the primary corpus with both an explicit subject and a non-copular, non-participial verb. In 41 of these 101 clauses, the order of subject and verb can be predicted on the basis of four grammatical restrictions of the language that affect SV/VS order. These restrictions are listed below in Table 78.452

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rule</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>451.</td>
<td>I do not include vocatives as subjects in clauses with imperative verbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452.</td>
<td>The rules in Table 78 are valid for all of Daniel 8–12. Clause-initial conjunctions have been ignored.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 78: Restrictions on SV/VS Order in Daniel 8–12

(1) wayyiqtol verbs are always clause-initial.453
(2) A clause may not have more than two pre-verbal elements, negation particles excluded. Therefore, if there are two pre-verbal non-subjects, the verb must precede the subject.454
(3) Jussive verbs always precede the subject.455
(4) qatal verbs with irrealis mood (including future tense) always precede the subject.456

The authors of Daniel 8–12 are also aware of the general tendencies regarding the order of verb and subject following a subordination particle, complementizer, or other clause-initial particle in standard Biblical Hebrew. Following the complementizers אשר (ʾăšer, relative particle), כי (kî, "for, because"), and היך (hêḵ, "how?") clauses are generally verb-initial.457 However, following the particles הנה (hinnēh, "behold") and אבל (ʾăḇāl, "but, however") the subject pre-
cedes the verb when a subject is present. These patterns generally accord with standard Biblical Hebrew, where the subordination particles כְּ and אֵשֶׁר are normally followed by VS order, while הנה and אבל do not demonstrate such a preference.

Once the clauses with subordinating particles and the clauses that are governed by Table 78 are set aside from the set of 101 clauses with an explicit subject and a finite verb in Daniel 8–12, there are 33 clauses remaining in the primary corpus and 27 clauses remaining in the secondary corpus for a total of 60 clauses in Daniel 8–12. These clauses are important for one characteristic: they are of the type where both subject-verb (SV) and verb-subject (VS) orders occur in Daniel 8–12 without any grammatical restriction. In other words, these are the clauses where the reason for a particular choice of SV or VS order is unclear from the surface phenomena within the clause. Therefore, these are the clauses where it is most interesting to study the order of subject and verb.

460. Regarding אבל, cf. 1Kgs 1:43; 2Chr 19:3. In 2Chr 1:4, the verb precedes the subject, but this happens only because there is a fronted complement. Regarding הנה, cf. Josh 2:2; Judg 19:22; Ps 83:3; 92:10.
461. Cf. Dan 8:1, 4, 8 (2x), 9, 11, 12, 22, 23, 27; 9:1, 23 (2x), 24, 26 (2x), 27; 10:1, 3, 7 (2x), 8 (3x), 12, 13, 17; 12:5, 7, 8, 10 (3x).
462. Cf. Dan 9:11, 13; 11:2, 4, 5, 6 (2x), 8, 10, 11, 14 (2x), 15, 22, 25, 26, 32, 33, 35, 40, 41, 44; 12:2, 3, 4 (2x).
463. Of the 27 clauses in the secondary corpus, only two come from the prayer in Daniel 9 (Cf. Dan 9:11, 13).
7.2. Word Order and Information Structure in Daniel 8–12

As we have seen, SV and VS order are difficult to analyze because it is not clear from the beginning which order is basic. Nevertheless, the data from 1QS, 1QM, and 1QpHab lead us to expect that subject topics and contrastive subjects are more likely to be clause-initial and pre-verbal in finite verb clauses than the reverse. However, in the 60 clauses of interest in Daniel 8–12 there is no evidence of any distinction between SV and VS order with respect to the topicality or contrastiveness of the subject. In spite of the general expectation for subjects to be interpretable as topics, only 31 of the 40 subjects in SV clauses (77.5%) make good sense as topics, while 18 of the 20 subjects in VS clauses (90%) make good sense as topics. Contrary to expectation, a VS clause is actually more likely to use a subject topic than an SV clause. A good example of a subject that is not a topic occurs in Dan 8:4.

(162) Daniel 8:4

וָכָּל-חַיּוֹת לֹא־יַעַמְדוּ וְכָל־חַיּוֹת

CONJ-all-beast.PL NEG-stand.IMPF.3MP to-face.PL-PRON.3MS
And no beast could stand before it.

The topic of the discourse is the antecedent of the final pronoun, "it", which is the ram that was introduced in the preceding verse. It is easy to interpret the significance of this clause in its context if it is about the ram, but it is very difficult to understand its purpose if it is about "all

464. The SV clauses where the subjects are probably not topics are in Dan 8:4, 12; 10:3, 13, 17; 11:22, 26, 41, 44.

465. The VS clauses where the subjects are probably not topics are in Dan 11:6; 12:10.
beasts." Again, contrary to expectation, in Daniel 8–12 an SV clause is more likely to use a non-topic subject than a VS clause.

When Daniel 8–12 is divided into the primary and secondary corpora, there is still no correlation with topicality. Table 79 compiles the data.466

Table 79: Topicality of the Subject in Daniel 8–12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SV Primary Corpus</th>
<th>VS Primary Corpus</th>
<th>Total Primary Corpus</th>
<th>SV Dan 11:2–12:4</th>
<th>VS Dan 11:2–12:4</th>
<th>Total Dan 11:2–12:4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Topic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Non-topic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total SV: 29/38 = 76% of subjects are topics
Total VS: 17/20 = 85% of subjects are topics

This data suggests that SV/VS order is completely unrelated to the topicality of the subject in Daniel 8–12. There is no statistically significant correlation.467

466. Tables in Chapter 7 examine data from only 58 clauses rather than 60. This is because only two clauses are located in the prayer of Dan 9:3–19. There is not enough relevant data in Dan 9:3–19 to permit us to draw conclusions about word order, and so these clauses have been omitted.

467. SV/VS order is independent of the topicality of the subject. For the primary corpus, the correlation tends towards VS order as the marker of subject topicality (opposite of the expectation), and p > 0.20. For Dan 11:2–12:4, p > 0.70.
Likewise, the contrastiveness feature shows no preference for pre-verbal subjects, as shown below in Table 80. There is no statistically significant correlation between word order and the contrastiveness of the subject.\textsuperscript{468}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SV Primary Corpus</th>
<th>VS Primary Corpus</th>
<th>Total Primary Corpus</th>
<th>SV Dan 11:2–12:4</th>
<th>VS Dan 11:2–12:4</th>
<th>Total Dan 11:2–12:4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contrastive Subject</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-contrastive Subject</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total SV: 16/38 = 42% of subjects are contrastive
Total VS: 8/20 = 40% of subjects are contrastive

Whether the subject is rhematic or thematic is also insignificant for SV/VS order.\textsuperscript{469}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SV Primary Corpus</th>
<th>VS Primary Corpus</th>
<th>Total Primary Corpus</th>
<th>SV Dan 11:2–12:4</th>
<th>VS Dan 11:2–12:4</th>
<th>Total Dan 11:2–12:4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rhematic Subject</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic Subject</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total SV: 19/30 = 63% of subjects are rhematic; Total VS: 10/17 = 59% of subjects are rhematic

\textsuperscript{468} SV/VS order is independent of the contrastiveness of the subject. For the primary corpus, the correlation tends towards VS order as the marker of contrastive subjects (opposite of the expectation), and p > 0.60. For Dan 11:2–12:4, p > 0.50.

\textsuperscript{469} SV/VS order is independent of the rhematicity of the subject. For the primary corpus, p > 0.70. For Dan 11:2–12:4, p > 0.60.
In sum, as much as it is possible to explain all SV clauses using a variety of information structure explanations, it is equally possible to explain all VS clauses using the same logic.

The fact that this sort of distribution—where the order of subject and verb has no relationship to information structure—is not typical can be demonstrated by comparing Daniel 8–12 to the prose portions of 1QS, 1QM, and 1QpHab studied in Chapters 4–6, which are roughly contemporary with Daniel 8–12.470 In these texts there is a strong correlation between SV order and the status of the subject as a shift topic.

The two clauses in Daniel 8–12 with fronted objects (cf. Dan 8:9; 9:26) do not demonstrate any of the features of fronting that would be expected based on the data from 1QS, 1QM, and 1QpHab. As is the case with many clauses in Daniel with marked word order, these two fronted objects are best amenable to an "attentive focus" interpretation, where the author seems to be marking the fronted constituents as especially profound, worthy of attention or, in some cases, meditative contemplation. This feature is impossible to verify statistically because there is little empirical data that can be used to identify its presence. Nevertheless, a comparison with HPH is useful, because it is not necessary to appeal to attentive focus to explain fronting in HPH. In fact, attentive focus is more useful in HPH as a word order motivation when it is assigned to clause-final position rather than clause-initial position, and this is the opposite of what we find in Daniel 8–12.

470. Collins (1993: 38) dates the addition of chapters 8–12 to the book of Daniel to the years 167–164 B.C.E., although the composition of most of the text predates this period. Most of the composition and redaction of 1QS was complete by 100 B.C.E.; cf. Metso (1997: 153–54).
7.3. A Dispreference for Verb-final Clauses

The failure of information structure to shed any light on the order of subject and verb in Daniel 8–12 indicates that other explanations should be considered. There is in fact a very strong correlation that is completely unexpected on the basis of our knowledge of Biblical and Hellenistic Period Hebrew. This feature is the presence of a post-verbal complement of or adjunct of the main finite verb. In cases where a post-verbal modifier is present, SV order is strongly preferred. In cases where it is not present, VS order is preferred. There is no known parallel for this pattern elsewhere in BH or HPH.

Another way to describe this correlation is to say that in a clause in Daniel 8–12 where the subject precedes the verb, the verb is normally followed by some modifier X. Two examples are shown below.

(163) Daniel 8:8 (SVX)

עַד־מְאֹד הִגְדִּיל הָעִזִּים וּצְפִיר
û-ṣāḇî r ḥāʾizzûm hîgîl ‘aḏ-mârōḏ
CONJ-male_goat ART-goat.PL grow.IMPF.3MS up_to-power
S V X
And the male goat grew very great.

(164) Daniel 8:4 (SNVX)

לְפָנָיו לֹא־יַעַמְדוּ וְכָל־חַיּוֹת
wā-kol-ḥayyōṯ lōʾ-ya’amdu lā-pānāy-š
CONJ-all-beast.PL NEG-stand.IMPF.3MP to-face.PL-PRON.3MS
S N V X
And no beast could stand before it.
On the other hand, in clauses where the verb precedes the subject, the subject is normally not followed by any modifiers.

(165) Daniel 8:11 (VS)

מִקְדָּשׁוֹ מְכוֹן וְהֻשְׁלַךְ

wǝ-hušläk mǝḵôn miqädāš-ô

"and the place of his sanctuary was overthrown"

The data from Daniel 8–12 regarding the presence and absence of at least one post-verbal modifier of a finite verb is compiled in Table 82 below.

Table 82: The Presence of a Non-Fronted Verbal Modifier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SV Primary Corpus</th>
<th>VS Primary Corpus</th>
<th>Total Primary Corpus</th>
<th>SV Dan 11:2–12:4</th>
<th>VS Dan 11:2–12:4</th>
<th>Total Dan 11:2–12:4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total SV: 31/38 = 82%  Total VS: 4/20 = 20%

Even within the secondary corpus, this is a statistically significant correlation. Within the primary corpus, however, this is a highly statistically significant correlation, with a probability of

accuracy that is higher than 99.9%.\footnote{472} I propose that the best way to explain this correlation is by accepting SV as the default order, an order which is sometimes ignored for the purpose of avoiding a verb-final clause. I suggest that the author did this in order to differentiate literary Hebrew from the language of writing he knew best, Standard Literary Aramaic, which is a verb-final language.

The explanatory power of this model increases when the exceptions to the rule are examined more closely. On the surface, there are 47 clauses that align with the majority and 11 exceptions. Three of the exceptions have textual peculiarities (Dan 8:22; 10:8; 11:6) which make it impossible to be confident that they represent the work of the principal author(s) of Dan 8–12. Each of the three clauses raises textual questions that cannot be easily dismissed, and these three clauses should therefore be set aside.\footnote{473}

\footnote{472} SV/VS order is dependent upon the presence of a post-verbal modifier of the finite verb. For the primary corpus, \( p < 0.001 \). For Dan 11:2–12:4, \( p < 0.01 \).

\footnote{473} In Dan 8:22, if the Greek text is accepted, then a pronominal suffix has been lost, perhaps due to haplography, that would transform this clause into a case of left-dislocation if restored. (This problem may be related to the strange form \( yaʿāmōḏnā \), which is made even more strange by the presence of the standard form at the beginning of the verse. The \( yod \) of the verbal prefix may have originally been the \( waw \) suffix.) In Dan 10:8, the phrase \( wālō’ nišʿar-bī kōh \) is the exceptional clause, but it appears very near to another clause in the same verse with nearly identical meaning, \( wālō’ ʿāṣartī kōah \). The apparatus to BHS speculates that one or both should be deleted. There is not enough information to reconstruct the history of this text, but the oddity of having the same event narrated twice in rapid succession is enough to require an openness to the possibility that the clause in question is a late addition. In Dan 11:6, the issue is whether the prepositional phrase at the end of the verse, \( bāʾittîm \), belongs with the preceding clause (where it creates an exception) or the following clause (where it does not). The presence of a \( waw \) conjunction before the verb that follows \( bāʾittîm \) requires the former, but reading this \( waw \) as a \( yod \) in line with the Greek version would not change the meaning of the clause. It would simply convert the verb from a \( weqatal \) form to a \( yiqtol \) form. The phrase \( bāʾittîm \) is unusual for two reasons. First, it does not appear in isolation elsewhere in Biblical Hebrew, but only in a more
Two other exceptions have pronominal subjects (cf. Dan 8:27; 12:8). Pronominal subjects have a distinct word order distribution cross-linguistically, and these two clauses can be explained by a preference to place pronominal subjects before the verb that outweighed the desire to avoid verb-final clauses.474

This rule eliminates two exceptions, but adopting it creates an additional exception in Dan 12:5, where a pronoun follows the verb in a VS clause. It is instructive to examine Dan 12:5 alongside of Dan 10:7, which is one of the exceptions with VS order. Both of the clauses begin with the phrase *weraʾūṯ ʾānî*. This phrase consists of a conjunction, a *qatal* verb indicating past tense, and the first person singular subject pronoun. The phrase can be roughly translated with "And I saw." The syntax here, where a subject pronoun follows the verb, is unusual in Biblical Hebrew. It is also less common for a *qatal* verb at the front of a clause to indicate past tense rather than future. What this rare syntax suggests is that the author of these passages was familiar with chapters 2–5 of the book of Qohelet, where the phrase *raʾūṯ ʾānî* is used four times in the past tense, twice with the conjunction (cf. Qoh 2:13; 4:4) and twice without (cf. Qoh 2:24; 247.5).

474. The word order in Dan 11:8, *wahūʾ šānîm yaʿāmōd mīmmelek haṣṣāʾpōn*, may have been influenced by the word order of Standard Literary Aramaic, where temporal PPs typically appear after the subject (or topic) and before the predicate (or comment); cf. Yakubovich (2011: 377).
As a non-native Hebrew speaker, it is not surprising that the author of Dan 8–12 would mimic, whether consciously or not, a Hebrew text with which he was familiar. After accounting for textual problems, pronominal subjects, and the phrase raʾîṯi ʾănî, five exceptions remain (Dan 11:10, 32, 40, 41; 12:10). Only one of these occurs in the primary corpus: the final clause in Dan 12:10, wəhammaškilîm yāḇînû, "but the wise will understand." In this clause, it could not be more clear that the writer intends to contrast hammaškilîm, "the wise," with the phrase kol-rəšāʾîm, "all of the wicked ones," in the preceding clause. Together the two clauses read, wəlōʾ yāḇînû kol-rəšāʾîm wəhammaškilîm yāḇînû, "None of the wicked will understand, but the wise will understand." The prominent position of these verses at the end of the book together with the obvious contrast suggest that this unusual word order is marked, whether it be for contrastive focus or for discourse purposes.

The other four exceptional clauses (Dan 11:10, 32, 40, 41) are in the angelic discourse, part of the secondary corpus. Two of these clauses are clearly contrastive (Dan 11:10, 32), while the other two are not (Dan 11:40, 41). There is no obvious explanation for the unusual word order of these four clauses. This is not a problem for the thesis of this chapter, which focuses main-

475. The inverted phrase, ʾănî raʾîṯî, also occurs in Biblical Hebrew, but only once, in Job 5:3.
476. In fact, it is the norm in Qohelet for the first person singular subject pronoun ʾănî to follow the verb, contrary to standard Biblical Hebrew, where it more commonly precedes the verb. This is related to the author's thought experiment involving his lēḇ, his heart, and is an unusual case. See Holmstedt 2009c.
477. It may even be the case that these two clauses constituted the end of the book at one point, before the addition of the final three verses concerning the number of days that will follow the šiqquṣ, the abomination.
ly on the primary corpus. This is not to say that my conclusions are not relevant for the secondary corpus, especially the angelic discourse of Dan 11:2–12:4. The angelic discourse does evidence the same general pattern as the primary corpus, but less consistently.

Table 83 below shows that the pattern involving a post-verbal modifier in Daniel 8–12 does not occur in the prose portions of 1QS.

Table 83: Presence of a Post-verbal Modifier in SV and VS clauses in 1QS 1–9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SV</th>
<th>VS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

478. It is certainly possible that the author of Dan 11:10, 32 intended to mark these subjects for contrastive focus. In Dan 11:40, 41, the unusual word order may relate to the change in perspective that most critical scholars believe to take place at Dan 11:40: the preceding text takes place in the past and present from the perspective of the author, while v. 40 shifts to the prediction of future events (Collins 1993: 388). Another interesting speculation is that the exceptional fronted elements in these verses—the verb š’r (Hitpa’el), "to whirl away," and the noun rabbôt, "many"—have been fronted to mark them for "attentive focus." The Greek translation of Symmachus, according to Jerome, suggests a possible retroversion to ribbôt, "ten thousand," which may have been an Aramaic loanword (cf. HALOT, ribbô, ribbô). With attentive focus, the author intends simply to place the fronted element in the foreground of the reader's attention, for purposes of contemplation or meditation. In this case, these two words may appear at the front of the clause to emphasize the extent of the immanent devastation. On attentive focus, see Gundel (1999). In her use of Gundel (1999), Moshavi (2010: 36) separates psychological focus from attentive focus, but according to Gundel, psychological focus is a focus of attention, so in my view there is no need for a separate category.

479. The prose portions of 1QS are roughly equivalent to the first nine columns of the manuscript. The final two columns contain poetry.
In 1QS 1–9, SV clauses have a similar pattern to that in Daniel 8–12. However, VS clauses demonstrate the opposite tendency to that in Dan 8–12. The presence of a post-verbal modifier has no correlation at all with the order of subject and verb in 1QS.

In conclusion, in Daniel 8–12, in clauses where variation between the order of subject and verb is grammatically permissible, there is a strong correlation between the order of subject and verb and the presence of a post-verbal modifier. When it comes to the mental processes of the author who produced this correlation, it seems reasonable to propose that the verb-final structure of Standard Literary Aramaic influenced the author's choice of word order. The simplest explanation is that this scheme is an accurate reflection of the author's imprecise and incomplete knowledge of Hebrew. In light of research in second language acquisition, it is not surprising...

---

480. SV, Present (18): 1QS I.11-13, 16-18; II.15, 19-20, 20, 21-23; III.17, 17-18, 24-25, 25(a); V.7-8; VI.7-8, 8, 8-9, 11, 17(b); VII.22-24; IX.7(a); SV, Absent (1): 1QS II.18(a). VS, Present (17): 1QS II.5-6, 8(a), 15-16, 23(a); IV.15(a), 23; V.3-5, 18-19; VI.1, 3-4, 6-7, 10, 11-12, 18; VII.20-21; VIII.23-24; IX.7(b); VS, Absent (0).

481. The text of 1QS has a distinct character in that there is only one clause with explicit subject and verb and no post-verbal modifier (1QS II.18(a)). However, this does nothing but highlight how unusual it is for a text to have so many clauses (15) consisting of nothing but a verb followed by a subject, as we see in Daniel 8–12. This also highlights the preference of Daniel 8–12 for SV order, even in cases where a verbal modifier or negation particle appears at the front of the clause.

482. Finding evidence in linguistic research of a corollary for a specific set of circumstances that closely mirrors this one in modern language is difficult. However, there is certainly evidence for the broader phenomenon. Cf. especially M. Carroll and C. von Stutterheim, "Typology and information organisation: perspective taking and language-specific effects in the construal of events," pp. 365-402 in A. G. Ramat, ed., Typology and Second Language Acquisition (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003). Carroll and Stutterheim study three second language acquisition relationships (L1English–L2German, L1German–L2English, L1Spanish–L2German) and conclude that "the acquisition of the individual grammatical means of a language does not automatically entail target-language-like principles in information organisation" (Carroll and von Stutterheim 2003: 366).
that the SV order of Aramaic would be prioritized in situations where the word order in Hebrew
could vary, simply because this is how the author was accustomed to construct clauses and there
was no restriction in Hebrew to prevent it. In this case, the author was composing Hebrew in
an "Aramaic" style. On the other hand, the overzealous avoidance of verb-final clauses that over-
rides this preference for SV order is a case where the author is writing in a style of Hebrew that
can best be called "anti-Aramaic." It is at the most obvious point of distinction between the two
languages that the author has used "anti-Aramaic" word order, overcompensating for the differ-
ence in the hope that he would not give away his true linguistic background as an Aramaic
speaker with a non-native knowledge of Hebrew.

483. Again quoting Carroll and von Stutterheim, "learners retain the underlying principles of
their source language, and even at very advanced stages of acquisition we find evidence of the
way speakers accomodate the grammatical means found in the target language to basic principles
of the source language" (Carroll and von Stutterheim 2003: 366).
8. Synthesis and Conclusions

In this final chapter, I will begin by summarizing my conclusions regarding Hellenistic Period Hebrew (HPH) as a whole, using the data from the entire corpus selected from 1QS, 1QM, and 1QpHab. I will then examine how this relates to the linguistic framework outlined in Chapter 3.

8.1. Word Order and Information Structure in Hellenistic Period Hebrew

8.1.1. Constituents with Fixed Position

8.1.1.1. Complementizers

Complementizers in the corpus are always clause-initial. The complementizers that introduce main clauses in the corpus are רָא, "then"; גֵם, "also". Complementizers that introduce subordinate clauses are אם, "if"; אשר, relative marker; ובוּר, "so
that," "as a result", ḫēṣar, kʾšr, "as", ḫāʾ, kyʾ, "because," "indeed"; ʾy ʾš ṭ, "unless." For more information on complementizers, see §4.2.1; §5.2.1; and §6.2.1.

8.1.1.2. Negation Particles

If a finite verb clause is negated, the negation particle always immediately precedes the finite verb and follows any complementizer (though not necessarily immediately). The exceptions prove the rule: where the negation particle does not immediately precede the finite verb, it does not modify the finite verb. The negation particle modifying a finite verb is not necessarily

texts, ḫēṣar is found in 1QM X.9, 16*; XI.4. The use in 1QM X.8-9 depends upon biblical syntax.


489. Cf. 1QS I.2-3; VI.16(a); VIII.16; 1QM XI.5-7*; 1QpHab VII.13-14*; VIII.9-10(b). Cf. also 1QS III.10 in the removed text of 1QS II.25(b)–III.12.

490. Cf. 1QS IV.16-17, 18(a), 19-20, 22, 25; V.11(a), 13-14, 15(a), 20, 26(b); VI.4-5; IX.1(a); 1QM I.10; II.8; VII.6; IX.8; X.1-2*, 6; XIII.5; X.1*, 9*, 12*; XVI.15*; XVIII.6-7*; XIX.1; 1QpHab VII.12-14; XI.13. Cf. also 1QS II.26–III.1; III.6-7 in the removed text of 1QS II.25(b)–III.12. In poetic texts, cf. also 1QM X.17*; XI.1, 1-2(2x), 13, 17*; XII.1, 8; XIV.14*; XVIII.10, 12-13*. A clause governed by a non-adjacent ḫēṣar particle occurs in 1QpHab XI.13-14.

491. Cf. 1QS V.14; 1QM XI.1(a).

492. In clauses with finite non-copular verbs, clause-initial negation particles are found in the following locations. With בָּלָה (bl): 1QS VIII.7-8, 8. With לִיוֹ (lw): 1QS II.8(a), 8(b), 23(a), 23(b); III.13-14, 14-15(a), 15-16, 16, 16-17, 18, 18-19, 19(a); V.26–VI.1; VII.2(a), 8(a), 17(a); VIII.23, 23-24, 25(a), 26-27; IX.8-9(b); 1QM IX.7-8, 8-9*; 1QpHab V.3, 7-8, 11-12(a); VII.11-14; XI.13. (Cf. also 1QS II.25-26*; III.1(a), 3(a), 4(a), 4(b), 4-5, 5; V.4-5, 11(a) in the removed text of 1QS II.25(b)–III.12. 1QM III.9(c) depends on biblical syntax. 1QM XI.10-11 occurs in the poetic corpus.)

493. In 1QS IV.18(a), the post-verbal negation particle modifies the adverb יִֽיחֹד, yḥd, "together," rather than the verb. In 1QM XI.5, which depends upon a biblical text (Deut. 8:17), the negation particle does not precede the verb, but it modifies the null copula clause at the head of a cleft sentence.
clause-initial following the complementizer. Other clause constituents, such as the subject, will precede the negation particle if they have been fronted.494

8.1.1.3. Infinitive Phrases that Modify a Finite Verb

It is possible for an infinitive phrase to be fronted. Most (perhaps all) fronted infinitive phrases are clause-initial scene-setting Topics.495 Any post-verbal infinitive phrase that modifies a finite verb is normally the final clause-level constituent within its clause.496 (One clause in 1QM VIII.6-8 has both a clause-initial infinitive phrase and a clause-final infinitive phrase.) A post-verbal infinitive phrase that is not clause-final is the penultimate constituent and is either fol-

494. Non-clause-initial negation particles in clauses with finite non-copular verbs are found in the following locations. With בֹּשָׁה (bōśa): 1QS VI.1, 3-4, 10-11, 11-12, 17(b); VIII.11-12(a), 16-17; IX.8-9(a). With אֲלָה (ʾalah): 1QS VI.16-17, 20(b); VII.19-20, 20(a)*, 22-24; IX.1(b), 9-10; 1QM II.8-9; VII.3-4, 4-5, 5-6, 7; 1QpHab VII.2; XII.14. (Cf. also 1QS III.1(b), 2, 3-4 in the removed text of 1QS II.25(b)–III.12. 1QM VII.11-12 depends upon biblical syntax. 1QM XIV.9-10** is in the poetic corpus.)

495. Cf. 1QS III.15, 16; VI.15-16, 16-17, 18, 21; VIII.10-11, 12-14; 1QM IV.6, 7, 8, 9, 11-12, 13-14; VII.9-11, 13-14; VIII.6-8; IX.3; XIV.2(a); XVI.6-7. All of these phrases are clause-initial except for the phrase in 1QS VI.15-16, where the infinitive phrase is an appositive to the clause-initial temporal adverb אחרidentally, "afterwards."

496. Cf. 1QS I.11-13, 16-18, 24-26*; II.8(a), 8(b), 16-17, 21-23; III.17-18, 18; IV.20-21, 21-22; V.3-5, 4-5, 12-13, 13, 22, 23; VI.4-5, 4-6, 7-8, 9-10, 14-15, 20-21, 21-22(a), 21-22(b), 26*; VII.6, 8(a), 14(b), 18-19(c), 23, 23-24; VIII.12-14, 15*, 18(b), 26-27; IX.5-6, 8-9(b), 9-10; 1QM I.2-3*, 4, 6(b)*, 12, 13, 13-14*; II.4-6, 7-8; VII.3-4, 10-11; VIII.2-3, 6-8, 8-9, 9-10; X.5-6*; XIV.3(a), 5-6*; XVI.8; XVII.6*, 10, 11*; 1QpHab III.10-11*; IV.7, 12-13*; VII.1-2; X.9-13; XI.4-6, 6-8, 13-14; XII.13-14. 1QS VI.4-5 ends with a two-part conjoined phrase, and each part contains a complement theme followed by an infinitive phrase that modifies the verb along with its complement pair: כִּי יְהוּדֵי (yehuḏe) אֲלָה לֶאֶבֶן אֶת הָרָדָה לִשְׁתֹּת (ʾalah laḇen et ḥuradath lišṭāt), "(when they arrange) the table for eating or the wine for drinking." (Cf. also 1QS III.1(a), 3(a), 6-7, 8-9, 9-11 in the removed text of 1QS II.25(b)–III.12. 1QS II.12 depends upon biblical syntax.)
lowed by another, larger infinitive phrase (in terms of the size of the phrase marker) or by a clause-final subordinate finite verb clause. It is difficult to know if this distribution is based on grammatical restriction, the expectations of the Early Immediate Constituent Theory (EICT) and the tendency of infinitive phrases to be large, stylistic preference, or coincidence.

8.1.1.4. Subordinate Clauses with a Finite Verb

In 1QS, most subordinate clauses with a finite verb are clause-initial. The majority of these are conditional clauses introduced by מ ("if"); the only exception is a left-dislocated constituent that precedes a pre-verbal subordinate clause (cf. 1QS VII.18-19(b)).

---

497. Cf. 1QS IV.26*; IX.10-11(b).
498. Cf. IQM II.8-9; 1QpHab IX.9-12*.
499. For an explanation of the EICT, cf. §2.3; §4.4; §5.4; and §6.4.
500. Subordinate clauses with a finite verb are found in clause-initial position in the following locations. מ- clauses ("if"): 1QS V.13-14; VI.18-20, 21-22(b), 24-25(b); VII.2-3, 3(b), 5-6(b), 6-7, 8(b), 11-12*, 21(b); VIII.24(b); כיא- clause ("according as"): 1QS VI.16(b); כיא-clause ("because, when"): 1QS V.20; VI.4-6.
501. I consider phrases that begin with one clause type and are conjoined to a finite verb clause to maintain the character of the initial clause type. For example, in 1QS IV.21-22, the penultimate clause constituent is a verbal adjunct PP that begins with a null copula clause and is continued by a finite clause: "like waters of separation from (null copula with null relative) all false abominations and wallowing (finite verb) in a spirit of impurity." I do not assign this finite verb subordinate clause status at the main clause level.
Two subordinate clauses with a finite verb occur in clause-final position.502 These can be explained as clauses that modify the main verb of the clause rather than the entire main clause CP, as most subordinate clauses do.503

In 1QM and 1QpHab, most subordinate clauses with a finite verb are clause-final.504 The only exception involves the fronting of a temporal subordinate clause to the clause-initial position as a scene-setting topic (cf. 1QpHab VIII.9-10(a)).

8.1.2. Left-dislocation

Left-dislocation occurs in 1QS, where it is used as a topic-shift-marking device, but it is not clearly present in 1QM and 1QpHab. In 1QS, LD of a complement or a modifier of a complement occurs in six cases.505 An example is shown below.

502. A ﷐-clause ("lest") occurs in clause-final position in 1QS V.14-15(a), and a ﻚ-clause ("before") occurs in clause-final position in 1QS VI.10. There is also one relative clause below main-clause level that is extrapolated to the end of a clause (cf. 1QS VI.1).

503. Cf. §4.3.2.4.1.

504. Subordinate clauses with a finite verb are found in clause-final position in 1QM III.9(a) (quoted speech), 10(a) (quoted speech); IV.3-4(a) (quoted speech); XVII.8-9* (לָעַד); XIX.9-11** (כַּאֶשֶׁר); 1QpHab VII.12-14 (כַּאֶשֶׁר); IX.6-7 (כַּאֶשֶׁר); XI.12-14 (כַּאֶשֶׁר); XII.5-6 (כַּאֶשֶׁר). I consider phrases that begin with one clause type and are conjoined to a finite verb clause to maintain the character of the initial clause type. For example, in 1QM VIII.6-8, the clause-final constituent is an infinitive phrase that is continued by a finite clause: ﷌ וְקָרַב אֶלֶף הָאָוֶרֶת וְנָסַו יְדָם בְּבֵית הָהֶמָּה ﷌ כַּאֶשֶׁר, "until they approach (indefinite) the enemy's battle line and they stretch out (finite) their hand to their weapons of war".

505. Cf. §4.3.1.3 and §4.3.1.4. Canonical LD of a complement-theme (5): 1QS VI.13-14; VII.15-16, 17(b); VIII.11-12(a); VIII.21-22. Canonical LD of a modifier of the complement-theme (1): 1QS IV.1(b).
The overt resumption of the clause-initial constituent by the enclitic pronoun on the verb is a clear signifier of left-dislocation; I refer to this structure as "canonical LD." The interesting point is that in 1QS, there is no canonical LD of a subject. In 1QS, a left-dislocated constituent (LDC) that is a subject is never referenced within the clause by a resumptive pronoun. Instead, all subject LDC’s in 1QS make use of non-canonical LD structures. In these structures, the subject may be resumed within the clause by a full NP or by a null subject, and a conjunction or complementizer intervenes between the LDC and the main clause. The information structure features...

---

506. Cf. §4.3.1.3 and §4.3.1.4. LD of a subject with explicit DP resumption (2): 1QS VI.12-13; IX.8-9(a). LD of a subject with null resumption (10): 1QS VII.3-4, 4(a), 5(b), 8(d), 12(b), 13(a), 13-14, 14-15, 15(a), 18-19(b). In VII.18-19(b) the complementizer מ appears between the LDC and the main clause; in the other nine LD clauses with null resumption, the conjunction ו appears between the LDC and the main clause. It is also worth noting that all of these subject LDCs occur in the same discourse and share largely the same structure: the LDCs all include a relative clause; the main verb is the same in each clause (לָנַה); and all of the subjects are at least nine syllables in length.

507. One common definition of LD holds that overt resumption is required in all forms of LD. The question of the distinctive marker of LD is complex, and there is a debate in the literature over the question of whether LD is a transformational structure generated by means of movement of the LDC from a base-generated position within the main clause, or whether the LDC is generated in situ. Some differentiate between various types of LD, arguing that Hanging Topic LD (HTLD) involves in situ generation of the LDC and does not require the use of a resumptive pronoun, while other types, such as Clitic LD (CLLD) and Contrastive LD (CLD) involve movement of the LDC out of the main clause. For an in depth discussion of these issues see the
(IS-features) of these subject-initial clauses pattern with clauses utilizing canonical LD; that is, non-canonical LDs, like canonical LDs, are topic-shift-marking devices. An example is shown below.

(167) 1QS VII.18-19(b)

וְהָאֶפֶּשׁ אֲשֶׁר חוֹמוּעָתָו יְחֵזִיו מִפְּסְדוּת היהָדוּ לֶבַנְדוּ בָּאֶפֶּּרָה לָלֶבַנְדוּ בָּשֶׁרְיוֹת וּלְפָּרָא אַמָּה יְשָׁוֶּה שֵׁהָּ שֵׁהָּ

whʾyʾš ʾš tzwʾ rwhw myswd hyḥd lbgw dʾmt wllkt bšryrwt lbw ʾm yšwb wnʾnš šty šnym

CONJ–ART–man REL–tremble.IMPF.3FS spirit.FS–PRON.3MS from-foundation.MS
ART–Yahad.MS to-deal treacherously with-truth.FS CONJ–to-walk.INF
in-stubbornness.FS heart.MS–PRON.3MS if return.IMPF.3MS
CONJ–be_punished.PF.3MS two.FD.CSTR year.FP

And the man whose spirit trembles before the foundation of the Yahad so to deal treacherously with the truth and to walk in the stubbornness of his heart, if he returns, then he shall be punished for two years.

collection of essays in Anagnostopoulou et al. 1997. Within this volume, Cinque (1997: 95) argues that "In HTLD the lefthand phrase is used to bring up or shift attention to a new or unexpected topic." He states that in HTLD, "the 'resumptive element' can be a 'pronominal' name (or epithet, like that poor guy) or an ordinary pronoun, either tonic or clitic" (1997: 96). Further, he notes that only if the LDC is an object NP within the main clause is an explicit resumption required; in all other cases, the LDC may be resumed by means of a 'gap,' a null pronoun (1997: 114 n.6). This fits the HPH data well, where verbal complement LDCs utilize a resumptive pronoun while subject LDCs do not. Rodman (1997: 40) also outlines a structure in which resumption in LD is not required. He argues that LD is "a thematizing process," by which he means the LDC is presented early as the aboutness element in a clause (the Topic in Erteschik-Shir's terminology), and that "it is likely to be pronominalized as befits a thematic element, but nothing compels that the left dislocated, thematized element be repeated." The LD clauses in 1QS exhibit the characteristics of HTLD rather than those of other types of LD.
The most economical analysis is that canonical and non-canonical LDs are in complementary distribution with one another. Non-canonical LD structures are used when the LDC is a subject, and canonical LD structures are used in all other cases. The two structures share the identical function of marking a topic shift.

Prince's (1998) influential study of LD identifies three discourse functions of LD: simplifying, poset-inference triggering, and resumptive pronoun topicalization (RPT). A few cases of LD in 1QS can be explained as simplifying LD, and one can be identified as RPT. However, in 1QS, LD can be most economically explained as a topic-shift-marking device, and allosentences of LD clauses demonstrate a significant distinction with respect to the features of topic shift.

In 1QS we also find one "nested" LD structure, where a constituent is left-dislocated from within a LDC. Also, the analysis of allosentences for LDs of a complement-theme revealed that every complement-theme that is a main clause topic in 1QS is an enclitic pronoun on the main verb, suggesting that there may be a restriction against a topical, non-pronominal complement-theme.

In 1QM there are five Subject–X–Verb structures, where X is a complement or adjunct of the finite verb, that could conceivably be interpreted as LD on analogy with the non-canonical

508. Cf. §2.4.4.4
509. Cf. §4.3.1. This is an unexpected conclusion because I could not find evidence anywhere in cross-linguistic studies that LD serves to mark topic shift. Therefore this conclusion should be held rather loosely. Nevertheless, the topic shift hypothesis is easily the best fit and most economical explanation of the data. LD in 1QS occurs in 1QS IV.1(b); VI.12-13, 13-14; VII.15-16, 17(b), 18-19(b); VIII.11-12(a), 21-22; IX.8-9(a).
510. Cf. §4.3.1.5 and 1QS VIII.21-22.
511. Cf. §4.3.1.5.1.
LDs in 1QS. However, in 1QS these non-canonical LDs always place a conjunction or complementizer between the subject and the remainder of the clause, while the structures in 1QM do not do so. Therefore, it is more economical to interpret the five clauses in 1QM in other ways; for example, three of the clauses are best understood as cases of double fronting.

1QpHab boasts a single clause with LD potential (cf. 1QpHab VII.2), but the LD reading for this clause is unlikely to be correct.

8.1.3. Topic-shift-marking Lamed

In 1QS there is one use of a "topic-shift-marking lamed," which functions similarly to the English "as for" construction.

(168) 1QS IX.1(b)

ল্যান্ডস বি ডি রম লাও যাও জুড়

wlʾwšḥ byd rmh lwʾ yšwb ʿwd

CONJ-as_for-do.PTCP.MS with-hand.FS be_high.PTCP.FS NEG return.IMPF.MS again

As for the one who acted with a high hand (intentionally), he shall not return again.

512. Cf. 1QM II.2, 3, 4; XIII.11-12 (poetic corpus); XIV.12 (poetic corpus).
513. Cf. §5.3.2.1.3.
514. Cf. §6.3.1.
515. Cf. §4.3.1.1.6 and 1QS IX.1(b).
8.1.4. Fronting

Although the basic word order of subject and verb in Hellenistic Period Hebrew is uncertain, it is clear that VO is basic and that objects normally follow the verb.\(^{516}\) It can be safely assumed that a pre-verbal clause-level constituent that is not a subject, complementizer, or negation particle has been fronted and is utilizing a non-basic, marked word order.

Within the f-structure framework of Erteschik-Shir (2007), and in light of the data from the HPH corpus, most fronted constituents are fronted as a Topic. This does not necessarily mean that a fronted constituent is the main topic of the clause, although it may be the main clause topic, whether a shift topic or a continued topic. A fronted constituent may also have been fronted because of a contrastive or restrictive feature, which also qualifies it as a Topic within the f-structure framework. A non-Topic may also be fronted. This can happen in order to create a cleft sentence or to permit some other constituent to occupy the clause-final attentive focus position.

8.1.4.1. Double Fronting

Within the corpus, double fronting is essentially limited to 1QM. In 1QM, there are three clauses that are best understood as instances of double fronting.\(^{517}\) An example is shown below.

\(^{516}\) Cf. §4.3.2.3.1 and §5.3.2.3.1.

\(^{517}\) Double fronting occurs in 1QM II.2, 3; XIII.10 (poetic corpus). Cf. §5.3.2.1 for a treatment of other clauses that appear to use double fronting, but probably do not. The clauses in 1QM II.2, 3 should be understood as [Shift Topic, Subject] [Non-Topic, Locative Adjunct] [Verb] structures, where the fronting of the non-topic locative adjuncts are motivated by the placement of the verb ישרתו, "they shall serve," in clause-final, attentive focus position. The
Double fronting does not occur in 1QpHab, and it is unlikely that it occurs in 1QS. In 1QS, there are three clauses that appear to have two pre-verbal constituents. 518 Two of these are best interpreted as LD clauses, 519 and the other clause is probably a clause with only one true pre-verbal constituent, 520 because the pre-verbal PP modifies the subject that precedes it rather than the verb.

8.1.4.2. Adjunct Fronting (Temporal)

In this study, temporal adjuncts have been analyzed with a distinct methodology. Elsewhere in this study, only finite verb clauses have been considered, and other constituents have been analyzed with respect to their position relative to the finite verb. In contrast, temporal phrases have been analyzed in all clause types and with respect to their position either as "clause-initial" or

---

518. Cf. §4.3.2.2.
519. Cf. 1QS VII.18-19(b); VIII.21-22.
520. Cf. 1QS IV.18(b).
"non-clause-initial." This distinct methodology was chosen due to the observed universal preference for clause-initial position among all temporal phrases that reference an instantaneous moment in time, without regard for the type of clause.

Within 1QS, 1QM, and 1QpHab, temporal phrases that reference an instantaneous moment in time (whether absolute time or relative time) are normally clause-initial.\(^{521}\) An example of an instantaneous temporal phrase is shown below.

(170) 1QS III.15

\[
\text{לָפֶנָּם הָיוּ הָכִים כּלָּהָ כָּלָהָ כָּלָה儿
\text{wlpny hywtn hkyn kwl mhšbtm}
\]

CONJ-before be.INF-PRON.3MP ordain.PF.3MS all thought.FP-PRON.3MP

And before they came to be, he ordained all of their thoughts.

The clause-initial position can be explained in terms of the fronting of instantaneous temporal phrases as stage topics, perhaps because reference to an instantaneous point in time is necessarily an orienting element within the discourse. These fronted temporal phrases should be taken as modifiers of the main clause CP rather than the VP. The tendency of temporal phrases that reference instantaneous time to be clause-initial may be violated for a variety of reasons.\(^{522}\)

\(^{521}\) Cf. §4.3.2.4.1; §5.3.2.2; and §6.3.2.2. Clause-initial temporal phrases that reference a distinct moment in time occur in 1QS I.18-19; II.12-13; III.15, 16; IV.18-19(a); V.20-22; VI.4-7, 15-16, 16-17, 18, 21; VII.20-21, 21(b); VIII.10-11, 12-14, 19; IX.2, 3-5, 5-6; 1QM I.3, 4, 8-9*, 9-10, 10-11; II.6-7; III.4, 10(a); IV.6, 7, 8, 9, 11-12, 13-14; V.3; VI.4(c); VII.9-11, 13-14; VIII.2, 6-8, 10-11, 13-14; IX.3, 7*; XIII.8-9* (poetic corpus), 10(b)** (poetic corpus); XIV.2(a), 2(b), 8-9* (poetic corpus); XVI.3-4, 6-7, 8, 15-16**; XVII.10; XVIII.3-4*, 10 (poetic corpus), 12-13* (poetic corpus); XIX.9-11**; 1QpHab VIII.9-10; XI.1-2, 6-8; XIII.2-4.

\(^{522}\) Cf. §4.3.2.4.1; §5.3.2.2; and §6.3.2.2. Temporal phrases and clauses that reference an instantaneous moment in time but do not occur in clause-initial position are listed here with an
Temporal phrases that do not refer to an instantaneous point in time are normally post-verbal and non-clause-initial. Exceptions can be explained as fronting that has been motivated by a contrastive or restrictiveness feature or as a result of deictic reference. A clause with a pre-verbal, non-instantaneous temporal phrase is shown below. This phrase has been fronted due to its contrastive feature.

Explanation: 1QS VI.10 (the subordinate clause modifies the VP rather than the entire CP; cf. §4.3.2.4.1); 1QM II.6 (the temporal phrase is postposed to the clause-final attentive focus position); XIII.10 (double fronting positions the temporal phrase stage topic as a secondary topic); XIV.3(b) (the temporal phrase occurs within a subordinate clause); 1QpHab XII.14 (the temporal phrase is postposed to the clause-final attentive focus position).

523. Cf. §4.3.2.4.1; §5.3.2.2; and §6.3.2.2. Clause-final (or post-verbal) temporal phrases that reference a non-instantaneous duration of time occur in 1QS I.6; II.8(a), 19; III.22-23; III.26–IV.1*; IV.1(a), 1(c), 13-14, 18-19(b), 25; VI.11; VII.2(a), 17, 22-24; VIII.1, 18, 23, 26-27 (2x); IX.1-2, 21; 1QM I.2-3*, 8, 8-9*; II.4, 7-8; III.1, 2 (2x), 7; VII.3-4, 5-6; VIII.1-2, 6-8, 11-13; XI.1-2 (poetic corpus), 6-7 (poetic corpus), 10-11 (poetic corpus); XIII.7(a) (poetic corpus); XVI.5*; XVIII.7 (poetic corpus); XIX.9; 1QpHab V.5-7, 7-8, 10; VII.11-14.

524. Temporal phrases and clauses that reference continuous time and occur in clause-initial position have been fronted. These are listed here with the motivation for fronting: 1QS IV.23 (stage topic with deictic reference); VI.11-12 (restrictiveness feature); VII.19-20 (contrastive feature), 20(a) (contrastive feature); 1QM II.8-14 (contrastive features; this series of clauses includes 1QM II.8-9, 9(a), 10, 10-11, 11, 12, 12-13, 13, 13-14*, 14**); 1QpHab IX.6-7 (contrastive feature).

525. Contrast involves a comparison with one or more elements explicitly mentioned in the discourse and is exclusive, meaning that the statement applies only to the contrasted phrase. The temporal phrase "during the first (year)" is contrasted with another pre-verbal, constrastive, durative temporal phrase in the following clause in 1QS VII.20(a), "during the second (year)."

526. Restrictiveness involves a contrast with elements not mentioned in the discourse and is a non-exclusive contrast, such that the statement may apply to other circumstances as well. The phrase "during the session of the many" is contrasted with other possible times not mentioned in the discourse, but it is not marked as the only time when a man ought only to speak at the approval of the many and of the overseer.
During the first (year) he shall not touch the pure food of the many.

The patterning of instantaneous and durative temporal phrases can sometimes be used to identify the type of temporal reference intended. This can help identify the temporal phrase in 1QS I.18-19 as an "after" or "when" phrase and the temporal phrase in 1QS II.8(a) as a "during" or "while" phrase (cf. §4.3.2.4.1).

8.1.4.3. Complement Fronting

1QS demonstrates the full variety of types of complement fronting that is evidenced in the corpus. In 1QS, complement fronting takes place with shift topic complements, contrastive complements, restrictive complements, and non-topic complements. Some of the fronted non-topic complements in 1QS are fronted as cleft constituents, and others are fronted to allow another constituent to occupy the clause-final attentive focus position.\footnote{527} The allosentences for clauses with fronted complements in 1QS show a clear distinction between pre-verbal and post-verbal

\footnote{527. Cf. §4.3.2.3.2. Fronted shift topic complements occur in 1QS V.19(b); VI.1-2. Fronted contrastive complements occur in 1QS II.1*; III.20, 21; III.26–IV.1*; IV.22; V.12-13. (1QS IV.22 is a subordinate clause.) Fronted restrictive complements occur in 1QS VII.5-6(a), 6. (1QS VII.5-6(a), 6 are both subordinate clause.) Fronted non-topic cleft constituent complements occur in 1QS IV.15(a), 15(b); IX.24(b), 25(a)*. Fronted non-topic complements that permit another constituent to occupy the clause-final attentive focus position occur in 1QS IV.1(a), 1(c); IX.24(a), 25(c)*.}
complements with respect to the measureable features. Examples of two successive, fronted, contrastive complements from 1QS are shown below.

(172) 1QS III.20

\[ bdrky \ 'wr ythlkw \]
\[ \text{in-path.MP,CSTR light walk.IMPF.3MP} \]
They walk in paths of light.

(173) 1QS III.21

\[ wbdrky \ hwšk ythlkw \]
\[ \text{CONJ-in-path.MP,CSTR darkness walk.IMPF.3MP} \]
And they walk in paths of darkness.

In the 1QM prose corpus, complements are fronted with more limited motivations than in 1QS. Fronted complements in the 1QM prose corpus are shift topic complements, restrictive complements, or cleft constituents. A fronted cleft constituent is shown below in the final clause of example (174): "(It is of) a thousand men (that) the battle line shall be formed." In a cleft clause, everything that is not fronted serves as the topic.

528. Cf. §4.3.2.3. The data cannot be analyzed statistically due to the absence of pre-verbal complements without any features of IS-motivated fronting. However, when a statistical approximation is made, the data is statistically significant (p < 0.005).

529. Cf. §5.3.2.3.1. Fronted shift topic complements occur in 1QM II.6; VI.4(a); XIV.10(a)** (poetic corpus); XVI.1* (poetic corpus). Fronted contrastive complements occur in 1QM XI.10 (poetic corpus); XII.1-2* (poetic corpus). Fronted restrictive complements occur in 1QM IV.11, 12-13; XIV.5-6*. Fronted cleft constituent complements occur in 1QM V.3; XI.13* (a subordinate clause in the poetic corpus).
Rule for the order of the banners of war: when their army is complete, to complete a front battle line. It is of a thousand men that the battle line shall be formed.

In 1QM the correlation between the features of IS-motivated fronting and pre-verbal complements is strong, but not quite statistically significant. There is only one fronted complement in a subordinate clause in 1QM, and it is in a fragmentary clause.

1QpHab contains one fronted contrastive complement, two fronted restrictive complements, and one cleft constituent that is a complement. All of these occur in main clauses. There is not enough data available to consider the statistical significance of correlations with features of IS-motivated fronting.

530. Cf. §5.3.2.3.2.
531. Cf. §5.3.2.3.3. The clause is found in 1QM XI.13* (poetic corpus).
532. Cf. §6.3.2.4. The fronted contrastive complement occurs in 1QpHab V.4. The fronted restrictive complements occur in 1QpHab VII.2; VIII.12; VIII.12-13*. The fronted cleft constituent complement occurs in 1QpHab IV.2-3.
8.1.4.4. Adjunct Fronting (Non-temporal)

In 1QS, non-temporal adjuncts are fronted as shift topics, contrastive and restrictive constituents, and cleft constituents.\(^{533}\) An example of a fronted shift-topic adjunct in 1QS is shown below.

This fronted adjunct also functions as a stage topic, setting the scene.

(175) 1QS VI.11-12

There is no evidence of adjunct fronting to permit clause-final attentive focus on another constituent. As was true for complements in 1QM, the evidence in favour of IS-motivated adjunct fronting in 1QS is strong, but not quite statistically significant.\(^{534}\) The data would argue much more strongly in favour of IS-motivated adjunct fronting in 1QS if restrictiveness were classified as a non-motivating feature with respect to fronting.

---

533. Cf. §4.3.2.4.2. Fronted shift topic, non-temporal adjuncts occur in 1QS V.3-5; VI.3-4, 11-12; IX.7. Fronted contrastive, non-temporal adjuncts occur in 1QS IV.24(b), 24(c), 24(d), 24-25; VI.20. Fronted restrictive, non-temporal adjuncts occur in 1QS IV.25; VII.2(b), 3(a), 16, 17-18(a); VIII.24(a); IX.1(a). Fronted cleft constituent, non-temporal adjuncts occur in 1QS III.25(b); IV.18(a); VI.2(b), 3(a), 3(b), 4(a), 4(b), 16(b); VII.20(b).

534. Cf. §4.3.2.4.3.
In 1QM, non-temporal adjuncts are fronted as shift topics, restrictive constituents, clefts, and to place clause-final attentive focus on another constituent. There are twenty pre-verbal restrictive stage topics that all share the same sentence structure, and it is unclear if these are fronted due to the restrictiveness feature, due to their status as shift topics, or from both motivations. One of these clauses is shown below.

(176) 1QM III.2

邬 התצרות מקריאוشهדה חצוצרות על

_on trumpet.FP assembly ART-congregation write.IMPF.3MP called.MP.CSTR God

On the trumpets of the assembly of the congregation they shall write, "The called of God."

1QM adjuncts boast the largest concentration in the HPH corpus of fronting for the purpose of placing clause-final attentive focus on another constituent. An example of a fronted constituent that permits a shift in the clause-final attentive focus constituent is shown below.

535. Cf. §5.3.2.4.1. Fronted shift topic, non-temporal adjuncts occur in 1QM I.12; VI.1(b). Fronted restrictive, stage topic, non-temporal adjuncts occur in 1QM III.2, 3(a), 3(b), 3-4, 4-5, 5-6, 6, 7-8, 8, 8-9, 9(a), 10-11, 13-14; IV.1, 1-2, 2-3; VI.2, 2-3, 3; IX.14-15. A fronted restrictive, non-temporal adjunct occurs in 1QM I.13. Fronted cleft constituent, non-temporal adjuncts occur in 1QM II.7-8; VI.8(b). Fronted non-topic, non-temporal adjuncts that permit another constituent to occupy the clause-final attentive focus position occur in 1QM II.2, 3; VI.6; XIV.11-12 (poetic corpus); XVI.1(b).

536. In this example the final attentive focus is חלי, "powerfully." The pre-verbal constituent בקדושי עם, "with the holy ones of his people," would occupy the clause-final position if it were post- verbal due to the EICT. Therefore it must be fronted in order to permit "powerfully" to occupy the clause-final attentive focus position.
And with the holy ones of his people he shall act powerfully.

The allosentences for 1QM clauses with pre-verbal non-temporal adjuncts demonstrate a highly statistically significant distinction in favour of IS-motivated non-temporal adjunct fronting in 1QM. As usual, considering restrictiveness as a non-motivating feature would significantly increase the level of support in the data for the IS-motivated fronting hypothesis.

In 1QpHab, the six fronted non-temporal adjuncts in non-fragmentary clauses include two shift topics, one contrastive constituent, and three cleft constituents. There is also one pre-verbal subordinate clause adjunct in a fragmentary clause.

8.1.4.5. Fronting of Complements and Non-temporal Adjuncts (combined analysis)

Table 84 summarizes the data when all complements and non-temporal adjuncts in the corpus are considered together.

537. Cf. §5.3.2.4.2.
538. Cf. §6.3.2.3. Fronted shift topic, non-temporal adjuncts occur in 1QpHab III.10-11*; X.4, 5(a). A fronted contrastive, non-temporal adjunct occurs in 1QpHab V.4-5. Fronted cleft constituent, non-temporal adjuncts occur in 1QpHab III.5-6*; IV.6, 7, 7-8, 11; X.5(b). The pre-verbal subordinate clause adjunct occurs in 1QpHab IX.9-12*.
539. Table 84 is a summation of Tables 23, 29, 49, 53, and 75.
Table 84: Comparison of 1QS, 1QM, and 1QpHab main clauses with pre-verbal complements and non-temporal adjuncts with their allosentences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Features</th>
<th>Pre-verbal</th>
<th>Post-verbal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shift Topic / Contrast / Cleft / Clause-final attentive focus / Restrictiveness</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued Topic / No IS Features</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This data is very highly statistically significant.\textsuperscript{540} The probability of this distribution occurring by random chance is essentially negligible. This constitutes the best possible evidence for IS-motivated fronting of complements and non-temporal adjuncts in HPH.

8.1.5. Order of Subject and Verb

The evidence regarding the basic, underlying order of subjects and finite verbs is inconclusive. Although many clauses with full NP subjects and finite verbs are extant in 1QS and 1QM, there are many factors that limit the usefulness of the data. On the one hand, almost all subjects that precede a finite verb are shift topics. Exceptions are either pronouns or NPs with a contrastive feature. Therefore, it is possible that VS is the basic order and all pre-verbal subjects have been fronted as topics or as contrastive elements. An example of a clause-initial shift topic is shown below.

\textsuperscript{540} For Table 84, p < 0.00001.
And seven rows of horsemen shall stand in position, they too, to the right of the battle line and to the left.

On the other hand, all VS clauses contain either a modal verb or a pre-verbal non-subject constituent, and in a triggered inversion analysis, either of these would be expected to invert the word order from SV to VS. This precludes these clauses from consideration as evidence of basic VS order. An example of a modal verb clause with VS order is shown below.

And the priests shall blow for them on the trumpets of pursuit.

Other potential avenues for identifying a basic order also turn into dead ends. The VS word order of three clauses of quoted speech in 1QM III.9(b), 10(b); IV.3-4(b) seems at first to suggest that VS order is basic, given that these clauses possess most of the expected characteristics of basic word order clauses. However, the likelihood that these clauses use gnomic semantics returns the possibility that it is triggered inversion that has created VS order. On the other hand,

541. The one apparent exception, in 1QS VIII.7-8, is probably an unmarked subordinate clause.

542. A third, less significant problem is that many clauses are ambiguous with respect to their identification as main or subordinate clauses, especially in 1QpHab.
there is evidence of a correlation between VS order and temporality and sequentiality in the main discourse of 1QM. However, it is difficult to identify whether it is SV or VS that is the marked order, because only one clause provides evidence in one direction or the other.\(^{543}\) (It is an SV clause with a possibility of sequential semantics, hinting ever so slightly at a basic SV order).

In subordinate clauses, the majority of clauses with a finite verb and explicit subject utilize VS order.\(^{544}\) A few subordinate clauses have SV order.\(^{545}\) 1QM has only two subordinate clauses with an explicit subject and finite verb. Both have a pronominal subject and use SV order.

In main clauses, both SV and VS orders are present in large numbers, although, as explained above, this does not result in the ability to identify either SV\(^{546}\) or VS\(^{547}\) order as basic.

---

543. Cf. §5.3.3.5.

544. Cf. §4.3.3.1 and §6.3.3.1. Subordinate clauses with VS order occur in 1QS V.4-5; VI.10, 16(a), 18-19, 21-22(a), 24-25(a); VII.8(a), 14(a), 18-19(c), 23; VIII.16, 18(b), 20, 25(a), 25(b); IX.10-11(b); 1QpHab V.3, 4, 4-5; VII.4-5, 7, 8, 11-14; VIII.1-2; IX.9-12*; X.3-4; XI.12-14; XII.8.

545. Cf. §4.3.3.1; §5.3.3.1; and §6.3.3.1. Subordinate clauses with SV order occur in 1QS IV.16-17 (contrastive feature, or perhaps a main clause with topic shift); 1QM XIII.18* (poetic corpus; pronominal subject); XVIII.10 (poetic corpus; pronominal subject); 1QpHab VII.12-14 (topic shift); XII.14 (pronominal subject).

546. Cf. §4.3.3.2 and §5.3.3.2. Clauses with SV order occur in 1QS I.11-13, 16-18; II.15, 18(a), 19-20, 20, 21-23; III.17, 17-18, 24-25, 25(a); IV.25-26*; V.7-8; VI.4-6, 7-8, 8, 8-9, 11, 17(b); VII.22-24; VIII.16-17; IX.1-2, 7(a); 1QM I.2-3*; II.2, 3, 4, 5-6; VI.1-2*, 8(a), 9; VII.3-4, 4-5, 5-6, 7, 16; VIII.8-9, 9-10; IX.1, 5-6; X.5-6*; XVI.8-9*; XVII.8, 12-13*, 13*, 13-14, 14*; XVIII.2-3*.

547. Cf. §4.3.3.2; §5.3.3.2; and §6.3.3.2. Clauses with VS order occur in 1QS I.24-26*; II.8(a), 14-15, 15-16, 23(a); IV.19, 20; V.15-16, 18-19; VI.6-7, 10, 12-13, 13-14; VIII.7-8, 23-24; IX.8-9(a); 1QM I.6(b)*, 8-9*, 10-11, 13, 13-14*; II.9(a), 9(b), 13-14*, 14*; III.9(b) (quoted speech), 10(b) (quoted speech); IV.3-4(b) (quoted speech); V.3; VI.1(b), 4(c), 8(b); VII.9-11, 13-14, 15*; VIII.2, 3, 3-4, 5, 6-8, 10-11, 13-14, 14*; IX.1*, 3, 3-4, 6; XIV.2(a), 3-4, 7, 10-11 (poetic corpus); XV.4*, 6-7; XVI.3-4, 4(b)**, 4(c), 4-5, 5-6*, 6-7, 13(a); XVII.8*, 10,
In the case of SV and VS order in HPH, it may be best to hearken back to Dryer's (2007: 77) perspective on cases where the basic word order is in doubt: "... when there is such doubt, what is most important in describing a language is not the determination of the basic order, but the more detailed facts that lead to there being some doubt."

8.1.6. Order of Post-verbal Constituents

Several aspects of the order of post-verbal constituents are predictable in finite verb clauses.548 First, naturally, if an enclitic pronoun is attached to the finite verb, it will be the first post-verbal constituent in the clause. Second, "light PPs" tend to be attracted to the verb and will normally be the first non-clitic post-verbal constituent. A light PP is a prepositional phrase consisting of the combination of a clitic preposition and an enclitic pronoun. Some particular preposition and pronoun combinations clearly behave as enclitic pronouns based on the evidence in the corpus. Other such combinations may do so as well, but direct evidence is only present for those in the list.549 The criteria used to identify a light PP is that it must immediately follow the verb (excluding any enclitic pronoun attached to the verb) and must also precede a post-verbal subject, because sub-

11*; XVIII.2, 3-4*, 4; 1QpHab VII.1-2; VIII.9-10(a); IX.6-7; XI.1-2; XIII.2-4.
548. Cf. §4.4, §5.4, and §6.4.
549. With the exception of a clause in 1QS II.4 that has been strongly influenced by the priestly blessing of Numbers 6:24–26 (and removed from the corpus), there is no evidence of a preposition and enclitic pronoun combination in the corpus that does not behave like a light PP. Therefore it is entirely possible that all preposition and enclitic pronoun combinations in HPH behave as a light PP.
jects are normally the first post-verbal constituent in the absence of a light PP. An example of a light PP in a verbal clause is shown below.

(180) 1QS II.15-16

\[\text{וֹדֶבֶקּ בַּכָּל אֲלֹהָּו הַברִּיָּה} \]

\[\text{wdbqw bw kwl ʾlw} \]

CONJ-cling.PF.3p to-PRON.3MS all curse.FP ART-covenant.FS ART-this.FS

And all the curses of this covenant shall cling to him.

The following combinations evidence the behaviour of light PPs. Note the presence of four three-syllable words, indicating that a "light" PP does not need to be any "lighter" than three syllables, and it is not primarily the number of syllables that motivates "light PP" behaviour.

Table 85: Evidence-based List of Light PPs in the Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Light PPs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QS</td>
<td>בּ, בּ, לֹ, מַאתָּם, עלָּו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM</td>
<td>אַלִּיתָא, לֹה, לַהְמָה, לֹ, עַמָּהְמָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QpHab</td>
<td>בּ, לֹה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Texts</td>
<td>אַלִּיתָא, בּ, בּ, לֹה, לַהְמָה, לֹ, מַאתָּם, עלָּו, עַמָּהְמָה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like light PPs, post-verbal subjects are attracted to the verb. Throughout the corpus, post-verbal subjects have the third priority when it comes to verbal proximity, following only enclitic pronouns and light PPs in most cases. There are only five exceptions to this generalization.550 Two of these involve "heavy" subjects of 78 syllables (1QM VII.9-11) and 11 syllables (1QM

550. The five finite verb clauses with post-verbal subjects that follow another post-verbal constituent other than an enclitic pronoun or light PP occur in 1QS IV.19; VI.6-7; 1QM I.10-11; VII.9-11; XIV.3-4.
One contains the deictic adverb שם, "there," in the light PP position, suggesting that שם may behave as a light PP in HPH (cf. 1QM XIV.3-4). The positions of the other two post-verbal subjects remain unexplained (cf. 1QS IV.19; VI.6-7).

The clause-final position is also significant. The clause-final constituent, whatever it may be, receives attentive focus by virtue of being the final constituent spoken in the clause. Other than enclitic pronouns, light PPs, and subjects, post-verbal constituents are somewhat free to occur in any order. There are exceptions. For example, any quoted speech that serves as a clause-level constituent will always occur in clause-final position. Otherwise, the placement of almost any other post-verbal constituent in clause-final position is freely permitted for the purpose of allowing it to receive attentive focus.551

If this is not done, and no constituent is selected to receive attentive focus, the Early Immediate Constituent Theory (EICT) of Hawkins (cf. §2.3) usually determines which post-verbal constituent will occur in clause-final position. The EICT accurately predicts which constituent will be clause-final in 89% of clauses in the corpus where there are multiple post-verbal constituents that are not enclitic pronouns, subjects, or light PPs. Sixty percent of the outlying clauses (9 of 15) can be explained as intentional violations of the EICT for the purpose of placing a

551. This freedom is due to the flat branching structure of adjuncts, which live in "a different dimension" and can be rearranged without consequence within the phrase marker (cf. §2.2.1, p. 30). When the movement of constituents other than adjuncts is required, the fronting of a Non-Topic is used rather than rightward movement. Rightward movement (extraposition) is limited to "heavy" items (cf. 1QM I.10-11; VII.9-11). This coheres with the restriction of the LCA that only leftward movement is permitted (cf. §2.2.2, p. 35).
certain constituent in the clause-final attentive focus position. An example of such a clause is shown below.\textsuperscript{552}

(181) 1QpHab XIII.2-4

הארץ ממן הרשעים ואת העצבים עבודה יא להורשו

\begin{verbatim}
wbywm hmςpt yklh ʾlʾt kwl ḡbdy hʾšbym wʾt hrʾšʾym mn hʾrš
\end{verbatim}

And on the day of judgment God will destroy all the servants of idols and the wicked from the land.

If we remove clauses where clause-final attentive focus has been selected, then the EICT accurately predicts the clause-final constituent in 95% of applicable clauses. Five of the six clauses that are unexplained by the EICT or clause-final attentive focus occur in 1QS.\textsuperscript{553} Two clauses (cf. 1QS IV.21-22; VI.9-10) have two large constituents that are near in size, and it may be that the EICT loses influence as the constituents increase in size. One clause can be explained if grammaticalization is assumed (cf. 1QS IV.16-17). One clause can be explained if a null preposition is assumed (cf. 1QM IX.13-14).\textsuperscript{554} Two clauses have no clear explanation (cf. 1QS IV.19; VII.4(b)).

\textsuperscript{552} The clause-final constituent מִמן הָאָרֶץ, "from the land," should be placed in the first position after the verb in order to satisfy the EICT. By virtue of its location after the much larger constituent אֲלֵי יָבָד עַבְדֵי הָעַצְבֶּים וָעַבְדֵי הָרְשֻׁעִים, "all the servants of idols and the wicked," the attentive focus it receives becomes obvious.

\textsuperscript{553} Cf. §4.4.

\textsuperscript{554} Cf. §5.4. The fragmentary aspect of this clause is minor enough that the clause can be safely included in the analysis.
One postposed phrase occurs in the prose corpus, in 1QpHab VI.10-11. It is an appositive phrase. This satisfies the EICT, whereas the EICT would not have been satisfied otherwise. It also serves to place this constituent in attentive focus. 555

8.1.7. Poetic Texts

A poetic corpus was set aside in 1QM consisting of 1QM X.8–XII.18; XIII.7–18; XIV.8–19; XVIII.6–15; XIX.2–8 (cf. §5.3.2.5). The characteristics of this corpus evidence a distinct profile with respect to IS movement. Complements are fronted approximately three times more frequently in the poetic corpus. It appears that poetic parallelism plays a role, but this cannot be demonstrated statistically because poetic parallelism is also a feature of complements that are not fronted.

555. Fassberg (2013: 69–71) argues that six separate word order shifts in Second Temple Period Hebrew (which includes HPH) suggest a trend toward postposing "new" information (i.e., informational focus). These shifts are VS to SV; Infinitive–Object to Object–Infinitive; Title–Name to Name–Title; Numeral–Noun to Noun–Numeral; Measure–Material to Material–Measure; and reversed order in word pairs. Holmstedt (2014: 31–32, n.50) critiques Fassberg's argument as lacking a theoretical linguistic rationale for binding these patterns together as examples of focus postposing. The concept of focus is understood to be optional, and most of the structures listed by Fassberg fall under the umbrella of "syntactic" rather than "pragmatic" structures with respect to word order. Not all word order variations are pragmatically motivated; some are entirely syntactic in nature. Cf. Holmstedt (2005: 147 n. 34; 2009a: 112; 2011: 6). Holmstedt cites Bailey (1998: 10 n. 4) as a functionalist who recognizes this. To restate my own argument, the clause-final position does carry attentive focus, simply by virtue of being the last piece of the clause to resonate in the mind of the reader or listener, and HPH takes advantage of this primarily by (1) rearranging post-verbal adjuncts when desired (it is helpful if such rearranging violates the EICT as a signal that the placement was intentional); (2) fronting a Non-Topic that would otherwise have occupied the clause-final position; (3) postposing a heavy constituent (in the corpus, possibly due to the limited sample size, this is always the subject).
8.2. Implications of the Results

8.2.1. Implications for the Linguistic Model of HPH

8.2.1.1. Fronting in Subordinate Clauses

Although the distribution of IS fronting events differs with respect to subordinate and main clauses, the most economical interpretation of the evidence is that there is no grammatical distinction between IS fronting in subordinate clauses and IS fronting in main clauses. The distinct distributions are caused by the characteristics and tendencies of discourse rather than by syntactic requirements.

Although topic shift is the most common IS motivation for fronting in main clauses, most IS-motivated fronting in subordinate clauses is motivated by the restrictiveness feature.\(^\text{556}\) Other motivations are at play as well, including the use of a pronominal subject,\(^\text{557}\) topic shift,\(^\text{558}\) contrast,\(^\text{559}\) cleft,\(^\text{560}\) and one that is unclear.\(^\text{561}\) The broad distribution of types of motivation demon-

---

556. Subordinate clauses with fronting motivated by the restrictiveness feature of the fronted constituent (9) occur in 1QS IV.25; VII.2(b), 3(a), 5-6(a), 6, 16, 17-18(a); VIII.24(a); IX.1(a).
557. Subordinate clauses with fronting motivated by a pronominal subject (2) occur in 1QM XVIII.10; 1QpHab XII.14.
558. A subordinate clause with fronting motivated by topic shift (1) occurs in 1QpHab VII.12-14.
559. A subordinate clause with fronting motivated by contrast (1) occurs in 1QS IV.22.
560. A subordinate clause with fronting motivated by a cleft clause (1) occurs in 1QS IV.18(a). There is also a subordinate cleft in a fragmentary clause in 1QM XI.13*.
561. A subordinate clause with fronting having an unclear motivation (1) occurs in 1QS IV.16-17.
stratifies the absence of grammatical restriction, while the clustering of subordinate clause frontings around the restrictiveness feature suggests that this type of fronting is the most likely to occur in a subordinate clause. Shift topics are expected to be less common because main clauses would normally be expected to carry the topic forward. However, since all of these restrictive frontings occur in 1QS, and most occur within the repetitive discourse of 1QS VII, the clustering of restrictiveness frontings may simply be an accident of a small data set.

8.2.1.2. Resumption with Left-dislocated Subjects

As shown in §4.3.1.4, left-dislocated subjects never occur with a resumptive pronoun in the corpus, but left-dislocated non-subjects always occur with a resumptive pronoun. Left-dislocated subjects use explicit DP resumption (2 cases) or null resumption (10 cases). The question arises whether a restriction exists against pronominal resumption with left-dislocation of a subject. It is unclear what the motivation would be for such a restriction. A more economical theory would be that the PRO-drop nature of HPH has led to the elimination of most resumptive subject pronouns.

8.2.1.3. Weqatal and VS-inversion with Modal Verbs

As demonstrated in §5.3.3.5, clauses in instructional discourse with a shift topic subject either use a modal perfect verb, or "weqatal" verb, followed by the subject (VS) or begin with the shift topic subject and continue with a modal imperfect verb, or yiqtol verb (SV). In §5.3.3.5 I argued that there is no semantic distinction between these two clause types and that the choice between
the two has been made on a pragmatic level, where a VS clause with a modal perfect verb creates a temporal or sequential connection with the preceding clause.

I have referred to the so-called weqatal as the "modal perfect" conjugation following Cook (2012: 249–256), who argues that the so-called weqatal is in truth nothing more than an irrealis qatal (perfective) verb (cf. §3.1.1.3). Cook attributes the tendency of the irrealis qatal to occur following a conjunction, and thus to take the form weqatal rather than qatal, to the VS word order that is characteristic of irrealis verbs in Hebrew more generally. This correlation between irrealis mood and VS order is evidenced specifically by the irrealis yiqtol (imperfective) and the directive mood system (cohortative, imperative, and jussive forms).

However, in HPH, it surprisingly seems more appropriate to treat weqatal as a distinct conjugation rather than as an irrealis qatal that happens to follow a conjunction. The primary evidence for this comes from the consistent refusal of the weqatal (or modal qatal) to permit fronted constituents to precede it (left-dislocated constituents excepted), even when those constituents—most notably, shift topic subjects—are routinely fronted elsewhere. It seems that the weqatal, by analogy with the wayyiqtol, has finally taken on the characteristic that early grammarians (as well as most beginning Hebrew students) expected of it: that it must stand in clause-initial position and must begin with the conjunction-like proclitic uego-. This is the best way to account for the sharp distinction in HPH between irrealis yiqtol, which always follows any shift topic subject, and the weqatal (or irrealis qatal), which always precedes any shift topic subject.562

562. An interesting exception may occur in 1QM VII.9-11, where the large clause-initial stage topic precedes a verb that may be read as a waw followed by an irrealis yiqtol, a waw followed by a modal qatal, or a weqatal. The ambiguity is intriguing but unfortunately obscures any
As explained in §5.3.3.5, this state of affairs offers no aid in determining a basic word order of SV or VS. If SV order is basic, then this means that the language change from BH to HPH is that VS-inversion for modal verbs has ceased in HPH. If VS order is basic, then the language change is the resistance of weqatal to permitting fronted constituents such as shift topic subjects to precede it.

The requirement that weqatal stand in clause-initial position in HPH aligns with the observation that left-dislocation treats the waw conjunction as a clause boundary signifying the end of the left-dislocated constituent (LDC) and the beginning of the clause proper (cf. §4.3.1.3). The weqatal can be preceded by an LDC in HPH.

8.2.1.4. Order and Location of Movement Operations

All movement related to information structure takes place at PF. Only two IS constructions we have encountered are formed at LF.

The first is the topic-shift-marking lamed that occurs in 1QS IX.1(b) (cf. §4.3.1.1.6). Cross-linguistic expectations for this construction are that it does not involve movement and does not require resumption within the main clause at all, whether null pronominal, or otherwise.

The second is "left-dislocation" that utilizes full NP resumption. This construction is very similar to the topic-shift-marking lamed in that it does not result from movement. Only pronouns can be introduced at PF for the purposes of resumption in LD, so this construction is akin to a topic-shift-marking lamed without the use of the lamed preposition.

__________

attempts to draw conclusions from this clause.
The other types of movement we have encountered can be grouped into four categories: fronting (possibly accompanied by VS-inversion); left-dislocation; adjunct linearization; and postposing.

Fronting involves the movement of a constituent to the beginning of the clause. In prose, one non-topic may be fronted. A non-topic can be fronted for one of two reasons. First, it can be fronted to create a cleft sentence. In this sentence, the entirety of the non-fronted portion of the clause is marked with the topic feature, so that the entirety of the non-topic portion of the clause has been fronted as the cleft constituent. Second, a non-topic can be fronted in order to permit clause-final attentive focus to fall on some other constituent. The final constituent of a clause naturally receives attentive focus as the final constituent to be articulated. If some other constituent that would have occupied the clause-final position (perhaps as a result of the EICT) is fronted, it can allow another constituent to occupy that position instead.

In prose, one Topic can also be fronted. Three features may qualify a constituent as a Topic in the f(ocus)-structure framework: the "aboutness" characteristic, which qualifies a constituent as the topic of the clause; contrast; and restrictiveness. A special category of topics is the stage topic, which is often a temporal adjunct. Temporal adjuncts that reference a specific point in time rather than a duration of time are normally fronted as a stage topic. If both a non-topic and a topic are fronted, the non-topic is fronted first, followed by the topic, so that the topic is articulated before the non-topic (cf. 1QM II.2, 3). One clause in the poetic corpus involves two fronted topics: a shift topic followed by a stage topic (cf. 1QM XIII.10).
If the SV model of word order is accepted, the fronting of any constituent triggers inversion to VS order at the point when the constituent is fronted.

Left-dislocation may occur after all frontings have taken place. Left-dislocation of a subject does not involve a resumptive pronoun, but left-dislocation of any other constituent requires the use of a resumptive pronoun. This resumptive pronoun is provided at PF (Erteschik-Shir 1992).

Adjunct linearization is not governed rigidly given that adjunct branching is assumed to have a flat structure. The one governing principle that applies broadly to adjunct linearization in the post-verbal portion of the clause is Hawkins' Early Immediate Constituent Theory (EICT), which essentially states that the largest post-verbal constituent as measured by the size of its phrase marker must occur in clause-final position. Rearrangement of adjuncts in order to satisfy the EICT takes place at PF. It is possible for the EICT to be superceded by a desire to place a certain constituent in clause-final position for the purpose of allowing it to receive attentive focus. In such cases, the EICT is violated.

Postposing is the opposite of fronting, where a constituent is relocated to the clause-final position. This may be done in order to allow it to receive attentive focus or simply in order to make the clause more readable. Unlike adjuncts, subjects normally follow the verb as closely as possible and must be postposed in order to occupy clause-final position. Heavy subjects are postposed in 1QM I.10-11 and VII.9-11 (cf. §5.4).
8.2.2. Implications for the Diachronic Study of Hebrew

8.2.2.1. Left-dislocation

Holmstedt (2014) offers the only comprehensive theory of edge constituents in BH, including not only LD and RD, but also fronting and extraposition. He argues that LD serves the purpose of orienting the topic, while the resumptive constituent is thematic and sometimes possesses contrastive focus (2014: 43). Moshavi (2010: 96) notes a focusing function for LD, but not a topicalizing one, citing some examples that Khan (1988: 93–94) labels as contrastive. These two interpretations are somewhat opposed, as Holmstedt emphasizes the role of the LDC as a topic, and Moshavi emphasizes its role as a focus.

Muraoka (JM 2006: §156aa) argues that left-dislocation is sometimes motivated by the interests of poetic parallelism, e.g., to begin a series of clauses with the same phrasal category, as in Isa 1.7:

(182) Isaiah 1:7

אַרְצֶךָ שְׁמַקְתָּה שֵׁרֵפָתָה אֱלֹהֵי אַרְצֶךָ לְיַרְבּוּ אֵחָה

Your land is desolation. Your towns are burnt out by fire. Your ground, in your sight strangers are devouring it.

563. Khan's (1988: 67–104) study of preposing/fronting and LD in BH uses the terminology of "extraposition" for preposing and "pronominal agreement constructions with resumptive pronouns" for left-dislocation. Khan finds the two structures to be essentially interchangeable with respect to function (1988: 78), with the exception that LD requires a non-generic and highly individuated constituent whereas preposing does not (1988: 96–97). Functions shared in common include marking discourse boundaries ("opening" or "closing" a span); rhetorical devices including parallelism, chiasm, and intentional anaphora; and marking for contrast.
In his review of Gross (1987), Andersen (1988: 439) notes several instances where the use of LD permits lexical parallelism when a verb with a resumptive enclitic pronoun is repeated,\(^{564}\) referring anaphorically in successive clauses to the left-dislocated constituent.

Waltke and O'Connor suggest that LD in BH sometimes "allows a grammatically complex part of the clause to stand on its own, thus increasing clarity" (\textit{IBHS} §4.7c).

This range of significations of LD is much broader than that which is evidenced in the HPH corpus, where every use of LD can be explained in terms of shift-topic-marking. A diachronic analysis of LD in ancient Hebrew has unanswered questions. First, it will be important to test whether the evidence from early, classical, and late BH suggests that the significations of LD began with a wider range of functions and later narrowed towards the shift-topic-marking function. Second, it will be useful to specifically examine the left-dislocation of the subject in late BH. Overt resumption of a subject never occurs in LD structures in HPH, although it does occur in BH. Perhaps a diachronic shift can be identified away from the use of a resumptive pronoun with the left-dislocation of a subject.

8.2.2.2. Fronting (Preposing) in BH

The structures that I have analyzed here as the fronting of a Topic are well-documented in Biblical Hebrew. This includes shift-topic-marking (which is often treated in BH scholarship using the terminology of "topicalization") as well as contrast and restrictiveness marking (which are

---

\(^{564}\) Andersen (1988: 439) cites Gen 23.11; Lev 27.26; Deut 2.23; 7.15; 2Kgs 17.36; Isa 8.13; 43.7; 44.29; 56.6–7; 65.11–12.
usually grouped together in BH scholarship using the terminology of "focus marking"). However, these structures are insufficient to explain all of the fronting that takes place in HPH. To achieve explanatory adequacy, it is necessary also to posit two structures that involve the fronting of a non-Topic: (1) the cleft sentence and (2) fronting a non-Topic in order to alter the clause-final attentive focus constituent. The next step in a diachronic study of ancient Hebrew would be to establish whether these structures were also used in BH, and if so, when they appeared. The use of the clause-final position to mark attentive focus is common in HPH, which may indicate a shift from earlier stages of Hebrew. One important implication of this study is the possibility that BH scholarship in information structure may benefit from an emphasis on the distinction between contrast, restrictiveness, and attentive focus, which are often grouped together under the label of "focus" but may involve different types of marking structures in BH as they do in HPH.

8.2.2.3. Daniel 8–12

Chapter 7 of this study adds more evidence to the argument that Daniel 8–12 was not written by an author or authors with a native knowledge of Hebrew. The order of subject and verb in Daniel 8–12 suggest that the text was written in "anti-Aramaic," with a tendency to avoid verb-final clauses to an exaggerated degree, perhaps in an effort to mask the author's Aramaic background. Therefore its language should not be considered in any diachronic analysis of ancient Hebrew.
8.2.3. Implications for Interpretation

The use of the subject pronoun in 1QS III.17-18, "And he created humankind for ruling the earth," does not indicate a topic shift or a contrastive subject, as the use of a subject pronoun often does. It is used to create a disjunction between two sections of the discourse, one concerning the nature and rank of human beings, and the second concerning the two spirits. It also coincides with a time reference change from present to past. This disjunction would not be present if the simplest alternative construction, the wayyiqtol with omitted subject, had been used instead.565

In 1QM II.4-6 the War Rule sets aside sacrifice specifically as a duty for those aged fifty and above.566

In 1QM XIII–XIV, the use of short clauses beginning with ואנו seems to serve as a structuring device. Most English translations render the conjunction with "but." I argue that using "and" may be a better choice. Translating the text in 1QM XIV.12 as two separate clauses obviates the need for a double fronting interpretation and provides a text with a clear structure based on the short ואנו clauses.567

565. Cf. §4.3.3.2.
566. Cf. §5.3.2.1.3.
567. Cf. §5.3.2.1.3, especially note 323.
8.2.4. Implications for Research

The methodology applied in this study can also be applied to the Hebrew Bible to create IS profiles of specific texts and corpora, and it is my hope that this will indeed occur. Issues of particular interest include the importance of clitics and null syntactic heads for the linearization of ancient Hebrew (cf. §2.2.3 and §2.2.4); the question of whether syntactic inversion is used in BH (cf. §2.4.4.4); the use of resumptive pronouns with left-dislocated subjects (cf. §4.3.1.1.4 and §4.3.1.3); the transition of the modal perfect use of the qatal to the use of the weqatal as a distinct clause-initial conjugation (cf. §5.3.3.5); the IS motivations for fronting and left-dislocation; the application of the EICT; and the distinction between the syntactic profiles of prose and poetry.

It is especially important to consider the use of allosentences and tests for statistical significance when constructing arguments regarding the significance of word order for information structure. If this is done carefully, then it is possible to achieve a more useful description of the relationship between word order and information structure in Biblical Hebrew from both diachronic and synchronic perspectives.
Table A1: 1QS Finite Verb Clauses

Finite non-copular verb clauses in 1QS I.1–II.25a and 1QS III.13–IX.26a. Clauses that depend upon biblical syntax are included in small font. The text is taken from Qimron 2010.568

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1QS Clause Location</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.2-3</td>
<td>באשר זה יד משה אחד כל עבדיו הנהיאש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.11-13</td>
<td>ولو הנביאים לאאמתו ייבא כלCHK ויהוה בויחד יברר דעות לבמה והויכ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.16-18</td>
<td>ولو הבארס ברך יתבא בבריח לפני ולא השעיה כל רוח מהויכ יבואו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1*</td>
<td>ויהוי מ (*)(כ) על[ל] מעוז[ב] עד עוז[ב]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3(a)</td>
<td>ושומור[ב] כי וה[כ]ו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3(b)</td>
<td>וה[כ]ו ל[כ]ב[כ] מא[ת] יח[ב]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3(c)</td>
<td>יהונכ[ב] בע[ב] על[ל]ום</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

568. Qimron has a sophisticated system for indicating the level of preservation of each character (partially fragmentary, totally fragmentary, etc.), but I simply mark all fragmentary text of any type using brackets. Words that are joined together but should be separated are marked with '|', and spaces in the middle of a word that should be joined together are marked with '~'. Other scribal errors are marked with an asterisk '*' or with curly brackets '{}'. Biblical quotations and allusions are printed in a smaller font. I do not mark insertions. I do not mark uncertain readings (such as decisions between waw and yod), and I follow Qimron's text in uncertain readings. I do not include readable or partly readable erased text. Letters with erasure dots in the manuscript are simply omitted. Readings where I have deviated from Qimron's text are marked with angle brackets '<>'. This occurs in 1QS VI.7 (reading כライフ for חייפ) and VII.6 (Qimron omits 살아). Whether a clause is placed with the fragmentary or non-fragmentary clauses is a subjective decision based on the size of the lacunae, the nature of the lacunae, and the relevance of the lacunae to the syntax of the clause. Note that I did not include all of Qimron's reconstructions in my fragmentary clauses. Those that involved enough reconstruction to cast doubt upon the basic structure of the clause have been omitted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IQS Clause Location</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.4</td>
<td>לשון עלולים לא תולעיים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.5-6</td>
<td>יתביה אל תוצי ביר כל נקמי נקם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.6-7</td>
<td>ייפקד אדרכייה ביל בר ביל משהו נגולי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.8(a)</td>
<td>לא תיווהו אל בקרן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.8(b)</td>
<td>לא יטלחו לכם עונך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.9</td>
<td>ישא מפי תפוקת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.12</td>
<td>תברך בככל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.13</td>
<td>ובتطورיה אל אולא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.14-15</td>
<td>הנפשות וררח ההצואה עם הרוח ולאין שליה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.15</td>
<td>ואני תקנת פמשקית יוצר ביב כלת עולמי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.15-16</td>
<td>ודבקו ובו אלת תבירת חות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.16</td>
<td>ובנירא✏️ ולא ת⇑ו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.16-17</td>
<td>תגרת מחותי על באל או∼باب מנוהל או∼밥לד ומכ⫹Longrightarrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.17</td>
<td>ית נויהו בחוץ אורו עולמי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.18(a)</td>
<td>וּבְזַבְזָה יְתַהְרָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.18(b)</td>
<td>ואומרו אתיהים למך א铤</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.19</td>
<td>ככה ישש שקה בכול ימי ממשלת בולעל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.19-20</td>
<td>ההנשמים ייעשו בירעה ברשום לפי הרוחות והאזר זא ו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.20</td>
<td>עולם ייעבו אטריירס</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.21-23</td>
<td>ובל דיום עברה שלשלות בעלبه הזא והלאוים וטעםיו ומששיות לולעה וכל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.23(a)</td>
<td>ולא ששלו אשים הכתי [מ] תעמור</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.23(b)</td>
<td>ולא ינסו מקומם גורל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.15</td>
<td>להפיץ והזהו בככל מחשבות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.16</td>
<td>הווה להם אותםậnות הםושבי כבדו ימלאו פעולות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.17</td>
<td>והעוהו יכללו כלל תפרים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.17-18</td>
<td>והעוהוبار אנשי להםמשתות לול</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.18</td>
<td>וושת 례 שניה ויהודי לעהלל בפעם י 수도ו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.20</td>
<td>ดารา דיא והחלל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.21</td>
<td>והודרו והשכ חהלל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QS Clause Location</td>
<td>Hebrew Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| III.24-25           | ואול ישראל ומלאך אמרה עזר לכל בנ[יו] או[ר]ון הווא ננה ורוחות והוחב |}
| III.25(a)           | ונעלת[ה] יד לمنظף |}
| III.25(b)           | ואחת אחר לבנ[ל] [מ]ע[יד]עלמים |}
| III.26–IV.1*        | ובכמה עִלֵּלוֹתיה יצוה לעד |}
| IV.1(a)             | ואחת חנכ[ה] סדרה |}
| IV.1(b)             | ונע[ל]ך[ע] נצ[ח]ה |}
| IV.1(c)             | וב쵰נ[יו] יחלקל כל בבוא[וה]דרורות |}
| IV.15(a)            | וב희[יר] תשנים בכרו כות ככ[ל]ויעל[ה] |}
| IV.15(b)            | ואה[רו] יחלקל כל בבוא[וה]דרורות |}
| IV.16-17            | וא[יכ] אל שמו ברבד עד כי וח铊[ת] |}
| IV.17               | והמח[ש] עלול ב[ב]מלכות |}
| IV.18(a)            | ואיך[ל]ך יחלק[ו] |}
| IV.18-19            | ובמות[ה] פַּקְדָה י SizedBoxת לעד |}
| IV.19-20            | וא[יכ] התנ[ו] עלכל אמה חבל |}
| IV.20               | וא[יכ] ברר אל [א]מהו כו[m]מש[ג] |}
| IV.20-21            | והמח[ש] עלול ב[ב]מלכות |}
| IV.21-22            | וא[יכ] ברר אל[ל]ך עלכל |}
| IV.22               | וא[יכ] ברר אל[ל]ך עלכל |}
| IV.23               | והמח[ש] עלול ב[ב]מלכות |}
| IV.23(a)            | וא[יכ] ברר אל[ל]ך עלכל |}
| IV.23(b)            | ו[כ] ב[כ]רר אל[ל]ך עלכל |}
| IV.24(a)            | והמח[ש] עלול ב[ב]מלכות |}
| IV.24(b)            | ו[כ] ב[כ]רר אל[ל]ך עלכל |}
| IV.24(c)            | והמח[ש] עלול ב[ב]מלכות |}
| IV.24(d)            | והמח[ש] עלול ב[ב]מלכות |}
| IV.24-25            | וא[יכ] ברר אל[ל]ך עלכל |}
| IV.25               | וא[יכ] ברר אל[ל]ך עלכל |}
| IV.25-26*           | והמח[ש] עלול ב[ב]מלכות כל כי |}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1QS Clause Location</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV.26*</td>
<td>וכרוול ל דבר איש לשה בות וור לפלורות ב[מ] מוות [ה]מקודה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.1</td>
<td>איש צו לזרון</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V.3-5               | על פתיםッツ צו לכול דבר לוחצר כלוחצ להמשמש לועשה זאם זיר ועתה דחקה ומשמש אוורח והצלע לכול דברי איש ל[ל] ישב והש.start |}
| V.4-5               | איש צו לשל הספר לשה בות ז démarche עד[כ] מים |
| V.7-8               | כל זחא לשה בותHouston על תלע[ב] מכל המחבר[ב] |
| V.10                | זואר צו לביר על לעשה |
| V.11(a)             | זא לא החש והבריר |
| V.11(b)             | זא לא בוקש |
| V.11(c)             | זא לא דרש[ו] וחוק |
| V.11-12             | זואר צו לעשה ולאשמשה |
| V.12-13             | הגרלה לבלו על[ל] צו[ו] |
| V.13                | לא צא בحما לשה בור[ו] והת[ו] |
| V.13-14             | צא לא יתר[ו] ואין שב[ו] מחר[ו] |
| V.14                | צא לא ית[ו] ואין שב[ו] מחר[ו] |
| V.14-15(b)          | מ[ו] ישאה עון אשמה |
| V.15(a)             | צא רוחמק בקולד בר[ו] |
| V.15(b)             | בקולד בר[ו] שקר שחר |
| V.16                | זואר לא לבל[ו] בבריר |
| V.16-17             | כל זא ויד[ו] עמו חמסו א[ו] ש[ו] עדו בבריר |
| V.18                | זואר לא תוש[ו] בבריר |
| V.18-19             | כל זא יש[ו] עמו בבריר |
| V.19(a)             | זואר לא יד[ו] את בריר |

(413)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IQS Clause Location</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V.19(b)</td>
<td>תבל ישמיד דברו מנאצי וכולל Tiểu מַחַבְלָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.20</td>
<td>יהא בברית ועלושת כהל הוהית הלאה הודיח לעדית קודש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.20-22</td>
<td>יהא בברית ועלושת כהל הוהית הלאה הודיח לעדית קודש ודרשวา ותורן בו דן אדם על שכלו ועלושת בו בריית ולקודח והכל תחקו ואחרון המַחַבְלָה בְיָדָה ותקד חיו והכל תחקו ואחרון המַחַבְלָה בְיָדָה ולברית</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.22</td>
<td>ואשר בצו הלאה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.23</td>
<td>וזכז込み בברית אחיו עזרו לעליוiclass=&quot;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.25-26*</td>
<td>ולא יבר יאלתם באס או בַתָּלָה וָהוֹדוּ (קָשָׂה וּבְקָנאת) וָהוֹדוּ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.26(a)*</td>
<td>ואל ישנהו [בניורלה] לַבְּבֵי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.26(b)</td>
<td>ובאין יֹיכָהו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.26–VI.1</td>
<td>ולווא ישנה עלייון</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.1</td>
<td>ונהאם אם איש על ענה בברית וברית אשר לא באבכה לעניי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.1-2</td>
<td>באבל חותל בברית מנזרומים כל הנמצאים איש ואיש ענוי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.2(a)</td>
<td>וישמש חסק ושלד תמלכה לַפְּלָמָנִי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.2(b)</td>
<td>וזוד יָאֹכִל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.3(a)</td>
<td>וזוד יַרְבֵּן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.3(b)</td>
<td>וזוד יַעָשֵי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.3-4</td>
<td>בבל חסק אשר ידי שם עשה אנשיו מצעתו והחיי אל עשית את בְּרוּך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.4(a)</td>
<td>ואיש הכותני מבו לַפְּלָג</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.4(b)</td>
<td>ובן ישואל עלעמות כלול דבר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.4-5</td>
<td>בי הלוחם ושאלה לאבר ואלהッシה לשהות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.4-6</td>
<td>יבי הלוחם ושאלה לאבר ואלהッシה לשהות בֵּיתו בחוקיו והשננה לַברכֶד ברֵאשָׁה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.4-6</td>
<td>והנהיג לשהות בחוקיו והשננה לַברכֶד ברֵאשָׁה והחיתון</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.6-7</td>
<td>ולא אם חטב בבל אשר ידי שם עשה אנשיו בֶד בֶרוכו ויָס עֲלֵיהו וָלַיָה נֹמָה -ָ甲状 אֶל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.7-8</td>
<td>ובהбит שקורד בֵּיתו את שלְשָׁלוֹת כל לְיָלֶה תַּנְחָא לִכְּרֵא בֵּסֶפֶר וַלְדֵרוּ וַלַּמד וַלָּשׁוֹן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.8</td>
<td>המנהיגים יבָב לַשׁוֹנ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.8-9</td>
<td>נשאר כו דמח יבָב אִיש בְּטָחון</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.9-10</td>
<td>ובן ישואל لمמשפט כלול עַצָּר ודובראשר ידי לְיָבָב לַשׁוֹן איש ואת מדועו עלעשתו הוהי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQS Clause Location</td>
<td>Hebrew Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.10</td>
<td>ולא ידבר איש ב獅豹 דבר ירעהに入る כללה אחותו לבבדו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.10-11</td>
<td>נון ולא ידבר אדם מהכובד לפני</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.11</td>
<td>אחר איש הברמד ברמד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.11-12</td>
<td>בממשך הברמד אל ידבר אשת כל בכר אשר אשהifa הברמד widened והאיש המבמד עד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.12-13</td>
<td>אשה איש אשר ישים את הברמד אל ברמד אשר לא בטבע אריאש והושואל את עשו היהד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.13(a)</td>
<td>אם זוהי אישה לפני</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.13(b)</td>
<td>אם זוהי אל דבר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.13-14</td>
<td>לע הכתוב המושרוה לפני עשה היהד ידישתו והאישה המבמד והברמד לע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.14</td>
<td>זוהי המי מוסר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.14-15</td>
<td>זוהי מי מוסר יבשות בריש דש שלושرام אולם הושואל עד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.15</td>
<td>וה وبينו בברומ הזית</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.15-16</td>
<td>והברדובו תלמודו בכל הברמד ושאלו תוק עלו דברה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.16(a)</td>
<td>ובאשר ישנה הוגל על עשו הברמד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.16(b)</td>
<td>ובאשר ישנה הוגל על עשו הברמד קרב ואדך</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.16-17</td>
<td>בברומת ללעגתו היהד על אדם בטוחות הברמד עד אשר ידורשת היזו ממעש עד מלאתו ולא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.17(a)</td>
<td>אם ייזתה לזרה תמיש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.17(b)</td>
<td>אם יזתה לא שיער טוב הברמד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.18</td>
<td>ושאר הברמד לפני עשו הברמד על דברה יפיפ שלכל תמיש בו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.18-19</td>
<td>והברדובו ולא השנה בוחר יותר לפי הכובד והברד אחר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.18-20</td>
<td>והברדובו לא השנה ברוב לפני果然 והברד אנשי ברומת קרבו גם את ההנה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.20(a)</td>
<td>והברדובו ברימה עד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.20(b)</td>
<td>והברדובו לא וייקן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.20-21</td>
<td>על הבשר והברד בין לפני</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.21</td>
<td>והברדובו לא השנה השנויות תפודות על עשו הברמד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.21-22(a)</td>
<td>אם זוהי אל הגרוב לפני היהד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQS Clause Location</td>
<td>Hebrew Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| VI.21-22(b)         | אמר עם הל谔ו לקורב ליהודה וחוזו בווכרים מביכרו תכונת בכם المشكلים ושם הל谔ו לקורב ליהודה וחוזו בווכרים מביכרו תכונת בכם المشكلים ושם הל谔ו לקורב ליהודה וחוזו בווכרים מביכרו תכונת בכם المشكلים ושם הל谔ו לקורב ליהודה וחוזו בווכרים מביכרו תכונת בכם المشكلים ושם הל谔ו לקורב ליהודה וחוזו בווכרים מביכרו תכונת בכם المشكلים ושם הל谔ו לקורב ליהודה וחוזו בווכרים מביכרו תכונת בכם المشكلים ושם הל谔ו לקורב ליהודה וחוזו בווכרים מביכרו תכונת בכם المشكلים ושם הל谔ו לקורב Lüllehovאשך חצרה |}
| VI.24               | אמר ישפוט בכם ודיבר יהוה על פן הדיבר |}
| VI.24-25(a)         | אם נצאו בכם ואשך שיקר בכם חדשות ו.TextAlignment |}
| VI.24-25(c)         | אם נצאו בכם ואשך שיקר בכם חדשות ו.TextAlignment |}
| VI.25               | אשר שיקר נשים ואשר־ידי חמשה |}
| VI.25-26            | אשר ישמר את פלוג שלמה |}
| VI.25-27*           | אשר ישמר את פלוג שלמה |}
| VI.26*              | דבר בקורות פרש לפנים [יתן] או יוסיפו באמור את פלוג שלמה לפנים |}
| VI.27(a)*           | [יתן] או יוסיפו באמור את פלוג שלמה לפנים |}
| VI.27(b)*           | [יתן] או יוסיפו באמור את פלוג שלמה לפנים |}
| VI.27–VII.1*        | [יתן] או יוסיפו באמור את פלוג שלמה לפנים |}
| VII.2(a)            | aloud ישוב עד רעה ובדעה |}
| VII.2(b)            | אאם באחד [מן] הכהנים בספר בד רבים |}
| VII.2-3             | אאם באחד [מן] הכהנים בספר בד רבים |}
| VII.3(a)            | אאם בשנגת בד |}
| VII.3(b)            | אאם בשנגת בד |}
| VII.3(c)            | אאם בשנגת בד |}
| VII.3-4             | אאם בשנגת בד |}
| VII.4(a)            | התייש אלי יציאת בלא המספים ואלה רעה בד להעיד נוגע שלמה |}
| VII.4(b)            | התייש אלי יציאת בלא המספים ואלה רעה בד להעיד נוגע שלמה |}
| VII.5(a)            | התייש אלי יציאת בלא המספים ואלה רעה בד להעיד נוגע שלמה |}
| VII.5(b)            | התייש אלי יציאת בלא המספים ואלה רעה בד להעיד נוגע שלמה |}
| VII.5(c)            | התייש אלי יציאת בלא המספים ואלה רעה בד להעיד נוגע שלמה |}
| VII.5-6(a)          | התייש אלי יציאת בלא המספים ואלה רעה בד להעיד נוגע שלמה |}
| VII.5-6(b)          | התייש אלי יציאת בלא המספים ואלה רעה בד להעיד נוגע שלמה |}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IQS Clause Location</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII.6</td>
<td>ואם בختו ויחד תרבו לאלבדי 569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.6-7</td>
<td>ואם בחרו והיחד תרבו לשלמו בחרוש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.8(a)</td>
<td>ואם לא נשיג יד לשלמו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.8(b)</td>
<td>ואם לא נשיג יד לשלמו ונענש ש干部队伍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.8(c)</td>
<td>ואשר יאור והיחד יאש לא במשה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.8(d)</td>
<td>ואשר יאור והיחד יאש לא במשה ונענש ש干部队伍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.9</td>
<td>ואשר יברconi דבר נבל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.10</td>
<td>ואשר ישיב כים במשב הריב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.11</td>
<td>ודע שלום וقياس על מושג אחדר ונענש עשרת ימים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.11-12*</td>
<td>ואש יָקְר (ופאר) ונענש ש干部队伍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.12(a)</td>
<td>ואשר יהל כיון ערב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.12(b)</td>
<td>ואשר יהל כיון ערב וורה או ה יאנש ונענש שב.SelectedValue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.12(c)</td>
<td>ואשר יאור כיון והוך קומס חיב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.13</td>
<td>ואשר ירא כיון ויד מהותת בגד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.13-14</td>
<td>ואשר ירא כיון והוך מהותת בגד ונענש ש干部队伍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.14(a)</td>
<td>וכרה עד ערות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.14(b)</td>
<td>ואשר ישח בכשלות לשמיят קול</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.14-15</td>
<td>ואשר ישח בכשלות לשמייא קול ונענש ש干部队伍</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.15(a)</td>
<td>ותומ겼ו יאמו יאמו לשוחב בגד ונענש עשרת ימים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.15(b)</td>
<td>ואשר ילכל אבר 하나</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.15-16</td>
<td>והאותי יאמו ילכל ברעה והבודלו שנות אחדר מגורית לריב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.16</td>
<td>ברם ילכל ריב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.17(a)</td>
<td>והוא שם עד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.17(b)</td>
<td>והאותי יאמו ילכל על יאס חזרה ישלווה</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


570. See note 569 above.
IQS Clause Location | Hebrew Text
---|---
VII.17(c) | אשר ילב על ים היה
VII.17-18(a) | לא זכרו היל ילב אלא במשפץ
VII.17-18(b) | לא זכרו היל ילב אלא במשפץ וענשו שרשור ויהי
VII.18-19(a) | והאיש ראש תמר רמז היה לדַּנֵי בכל שרשור ויהי לא ישב ונענש
VII.18-19(b) | וה∉י ויאמר ראש תמר רמז היה לדַּנֵי בכל שרשור ויהי לא ישב ונענש
VII.18-19(c) | ראש תמר רמז היה לדַּנֵי בכל שרשור ויהי לא ישב ונענש
VII.19-20 | ברשונה לא ישבו מצודת הריבים
VII.20(a) | ובשנתו לא ישבו מצודת הריבים
VII.20(b) | וה∉י_allowed vì כי רוק ח跶
VII.20-21 | והписать על שמו ישבו הריבים [ל]דברי
VII.21(a) | וה∉י_allowed vì כי רוק ח跶
VII.21(b) | וה∉י_allowed vì כי רוק חวัฒו
VII.21(c) | וה∉י_allowed vì כי רוק ח yPosו
VII.22-24 | וה∼ל אל氡 במשפץ קדש והיב קדש והיב קדש
VII.23 | ישיבת קדש במשפץ קדש והיב קדש והיב קדש
VII.23-24 | ישיבת קדש במשפץ קדש והיב קדש והיב קדש
VII.24-25* | [איש] ישב במשפץ קדש והיב קדש והיב קדש והיב קדש
VIII.7-8 | בהל ידעון סדורותיה
VIII.8 | מעל שימש מקומם
VIII.10-11 | בהון אלד ב deported הרוח של רוח ויהי בם קדש בם עיסי והיה
VIII.11-12(a) | ה∼ל דבר המפרש וה∼ל אחר אלד אדוה ו∼ל אחר דרך מועד ו∼ל אחר דר ב…and י∼ל part part
VIII.11-12(b) | המתחא לא∼ל הדוהים
VIII.12-14 | הביאו אלד ב∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼ד∼d...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IQS Clause Location</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIII.16-17</td>
<td>בטלת יגעו אל רמה ביד דבר המצווה מכול יסור אשר היחד ברית היחד מstructors את אנשי איש וכול ה הקודש אנשי איש</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IQS Clause Location | Hebrew Text
--- | ---
IX.10-11(a) | ואפרנס במשפע חוטף והשלים את חתולה והשלים ללותו ובו עד בו נביא ומושת אוחרי
IX.10-11(b) | ואת חתולה והשלים ללותו ובו עד בו נביא ומושת אוחרי ישראל
IX.24(a) | נ歩לה הנפש והיה הזדהב
IX.24(b) | והנה רצון הוא וליהח.Provider[בברא"ל אייר่ פיהו רצע] [בברא"ל אייר่ פיהו רצע]
IX.25(a)* | והנה הגוה בוכנו אשר לא שוה [ח] [בברא"ל אייר่ פיהו רצע] [בברא"ל אייר่ פיהו רצע]
IX.25(b)* | [...] [אני] [אני] [אני]
IX.25(c)* | [...] [אני] [אני] [אני]
Table A2: *Finite Verb Clauses Removed from the 1QS Prose Corpus*

Finite non-copular verb clauses from 1QS II.25(b)–III.12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Location</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II.25-26*</td>
<td>נבילה נמואס בלוא [בברית א] לְלָלוֹת בְּשַׁרְיוֹת לָבָלָו [יתצבש ב] ה רָמה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.26–III.1</td>
<td>לאו חוזי למְשׁוֹב חַי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1(a)</td>
<td>腔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1(b)</td>
<td>腔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2</td>
<td>ד ה ווין לוא בוּוּוּ בֵּה חַז</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.3(a)</td>
<td>לאו יָדְק בַּמְחֵר חַש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.3(b)</td>
<td>וֹתֵשׁ בֵּי לָדוֹר אֵוׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.3-4</td>
<td>בֵי נַחֲמִים לְאָדוֹתשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.4(a)</td>
<td>לוא חָזְבָב בַּפּוֹני</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.4(b)</td>
<td>לוא יוֹתְר בַּמְנֵה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.4-5</td>
<td>לוא אָחָזְק בֵּי נַחֲמִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.5</td>
<td>לוא יוֹתְר בַּבל מֵר וָז</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.6-7</td>
<td>בָּא הָרוּחׁ עַשׁ זָמַת אָלְדָּרְפִּי אֵי חַפּוֹר בּוֹל עַשׁנִים לֵחוֹטֶה בֶּאֹר הָדוֹר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.7-8</td>
<td>בָּזְוַחֲזְק לָדוֹר בַּמְחֵר חַש בֵּי נַחֲמִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.8</td>
<td>בָּזְוַחֲזְק חַשִּׁב בַּמְנֵה חַש בֵּי נַחֲמִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.8-9</td>
<td>בָּעֵמָה נַשׁ לֵחוֹט חַזִי אֵי חַפּוֹר בּוֹל עַשׁנִים לֵחוֹטֶה בֶּאֹר הָדוֹר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.9-11</td>
<td>יָבִיבְךָ פַּעַמְיָה הַלֹּטַחְוָה חָמִש בּוֹל דְּרִי אֵי בָּאָשׁוּר גֶּזַע לֵחוֹטֶהּ חַש בֵּי נַחֲמִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.10</td>
<td>בָּאָשׁוּר גֶּזַע לֵחוֹטֶהּ חַש בֵּי נַחֲמִים</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| III.11          |אֵי רָצוּ הַבַּפּוֹנִי נִחֲזָה לֵפִי אֵל
Table A3: 1QM Prose Corpus, Finite Verb Clauses

Finite non-copular verb clauses in the 1QM prose corpus: 1QM I.1–X.1a; X.2b, 5b-6a, 8b-9a; XI.7b-10; XI.13–XII.6; XII.19–XIII.6; XIV.1-12a; XIV.16–XV.6; XV.9–XVIII.6a; XVIII.17–XIX.2; XIX.9-14. Clauses that depend upon biblical syntax are included in small font. Text is taken from Qimron 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1QM Clause Location</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.2-3*</td>
<td>בֵּנֵי בֵּית יוֹהֵדָה בָּנֹי בְּנֵי גּוֹלֶת כָּפָלְתָה הָמוֹן בֶּן [לֹא בְּבֵאָמָהוֹן] כָּפָלְתָה בָּשָׂם בֶּן יָוֶל הָדוּרְדָה בָּשָׂם בֶּן יָוֶל הָדוּרְדָה בָּשָׂם בֶּן יָוֶל הָדוּרְדָה בָּשָׂם בֶּן יָוֶל הָדוּרְדָה בָּשָׂם בֶּן יָוֶל הָדוּרְדָה בָּשָׂם בֶּן יָוֶל הָדוּרְדָה בָּשָׂם בֶּן יָוֶל הָדוּרְדָה בָּשָׂם בֶּן יָוֶל הָדוּרְדָה בָּשָׂם בֶּן יָוֶל הָדוּרְדָה בָּשָׂם בֶּן יָוֶל הָדוּרְדָה בָּשָׂם בֶּן יָוֶל הָדוּרְדָה בָּשָׂם בֶּן יָוֶל H.7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3</td>
<td>וַאֲחֹר הַמִּלְחָמָה יַעֲבוֹן מְשָׁא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.4</td>
<td>וַנָּצַק צֵא בַּת הַמִּלְחָמָה בְּלֵבֶל הָמוֹן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.6(a)</td>
<td>וֹסְרֵה מִמֵּשְׁלַחֲתָה חָטָאֵל [ךְַי] [רָצַעְתָּא סֵאתָא]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.6(b)*</td>
<td>וֹסְרֵה מִמֵּשְׁלַחֲתָה חָטָאֵל [ךְַי] [רָצַעְתָּא سֵאתָא]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.8-9*</td>
<td>בְּבֵלְוָדָה בָּלָא אֲרִי רוֹמֵן גּוֹלֶת [וּלְוַלָּא] [לְוַלָּא] בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָא בָּלָa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.10-11</td>
<td>וֹבֵנֶהוּ הַנִּלְכָּר הַנִּלְכָּר הַנִּלְכָּר הַנִּלְכָּר הַנִּלְכָּר הַנִּלְכָּר הַנִּלְכָּר H.7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.12</td>
<td>הַבּוֹכֵל הַחָוָתָה לָא הַכֹּתָה מַחְוָתָה דָּעַת הָמוֹןUSED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.13</td>
<td>שׁלַחֲשׁוּ הָנָרְלָת הָיוֹתָכָא בָּיָא לָנְנָגָת רוּשָּׁא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.13-14*</td>
<td>שׁלַחֲשׁוּ הָנָרְלָת הָיוֹתָכָא בָּיָא לָנְנָגָת רוּשָּׁא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1-2</td>
<td>וְאָזָא וְאָזָא וְאָזָא וְאָזָא וְאָזָא וְאָזָא וְאָזָא וְאָזָא V.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2</td>
<td>וְאָזָא וְאָזָא וְאָזָא V.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.3</td>
<td>וְאָזָא וְאָזָא V.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4</td>
<td>וְאָזָא וְאָזָא V.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.4-6</td>
<td>וְאָזָא וְאָזָא V.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.6</td>
<td>וְאָזָא V.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.7-8</td>
<td>וְאָזָא וְאָזָא V.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.8-9</td>
<td>וְאָזָא V.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.9(a)</td>
<td>וְאָזָא V.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.9(b)</td>
<td>וְאָזָא V.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.10</td>
<td>וְאָזָא V.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.10-11</td>
<td>וְאָזָא V.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM Clause Location</td>
<td>Hebrew Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.11</td>
<td>בברית זבח התמימים להלן בכנן אופטשד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.12</td>
<td>ובששה יבשביות להלן בכל בנו אשר ופרס וקדמומי על המדבר יהודה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.12-13</td>
<td>ובשנה השמינית להלן בכל עילו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.13</td>
<td>בתשעית להלן בפשעיאו הקדחים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.13-14*</td>
<td>ובשנה השמינית להלן מכל בנו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.14**</td>
<td>ובשנה השמינית להלן כל בנו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2</td>
<td>על الشرقם מכתב יתנוהי קראי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.3(a)</td>
<td>על الشرقם מכתב יתנוהי קראי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.3(b)</td>
<td>על الشرقם מכתב יתנוהי קראי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.3-4</td>
<td>על الشرقם מכתב יתנוהי קראי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.4-5</td>
<td>על الشرقם מכתב יתנוהי קראי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.5-6</td>
<td>על الشرقם מכתב יתנוהי קראי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.6</td>
<td>על الشرقם מכתב יתנוהי קראי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.7-8</td>
<td>על الشرقם מכתב יתנוהי קראי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.8</td>
<td>על الشرقם מכתב יתנוהי קראי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.8-9</td>
<td>על الشرقם מכתב יתנוהי קראי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.9(a)</td>
<td>על الشرقם מכתב יתנוהי קראי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.9(b)</td>
<td>על الشرقם מכתב יתנוהי קראי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.9(c)</td>
<td>על الشرقם מכתב יתנוהי קראי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.10(a)</td>
<td>על الشرقם מכתב יתנוהי קראי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.10(b)</td>
<td>על الشرقם מכתב יתנוהי קראי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.10-11</td>
<td>על الشرقם מכתב יתנוהי קראי</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| III.13-14           | על השם נהקדול ארבעה לכל הקודם ופרס שאancelושי ואלושי נ.RadioButton
| III.14-15*          | על השם נהקדול ארבעה לכל הקודם ופרס שאancelושי נRadioButton
| IV.1                | על שם נהקדול תום כל השם ופרס שאancelושי נRadioButton
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IV.1-2
שם ואת שארית לאין גורלוうち אנשי ובכול עלבעברה אל אף יכתבו

IV.2-3
שמות ואות המאה שאש שארית בשר ובכולמלחמה יד אלה מתוכנו היין אבותיו שר

IV.3-4(a)
ואות החמשים שאש שבשרי עשרהיו שר

IV.3-4(b)
לאנเทพיות ברשעים מעמד בחéconom מתוכנו שר

IV.4-5
ואות העשרה שאש בעשה בנבל אלה רנות מתוכנו שר

IV.6
אל משפט אל כבוד אל צדק אלאמת אותותם עלכתיבו מהלח למלכת

IV.7
אל חללי אל מהומת אלמועד אלימין אותותם עלכתיבו למלחמה ובגשתם אלשלום

IV.8
כשתהלת את אחריםודת אל הנשפים מתוכנו שר

IV.9
בצאתו הלוחמה יכהנה על ראשונה מתוכנו שר

IV.11
שלומי אל כוח אלא ת.CopyTo אל גמול אלא ריב אלא נקמת אלאמלחמה מתוכנו שר

IV.11-12
בצאתו הלוחמה יכהנה על ראשי מתוכנו שר

IV.12-13
בצאתו הלוחמה יכהנה על ראשי מתוכנו שר

V.1
ושב הלוחמה

V.1(a)
וזאכרו את השם הקדוש פעמים ששה

V.1(b)
וכמה בראש ובדמות

V.1(c)
והכוהו בם הנערתчёт

V.1-2
הזה באירה ישיל[א] על מצרים דאוב שבעה וחודש מחומת

V.2
את חבר התקים בתק הים לבר بتاريخ

V.2-3
את חבר התקים בתק הים לבר altro التاريخ

V.3
לשלום אל תהלת אל תודה

V.4(a)
ושב הלוחמה

V.4(b)
ואזהה את שמי עד לי BIN
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IQM Clause Location</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI.4(d)</td>
<td>הנוהך בים סיני המערה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.6</td>
<td>ובקורות עמנ אשת חל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.8(a)</td>
<td>ושבת סדר פרשים עםsten שמם הלא המערה ושלום</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.8(b)</td>
<td>המערת יושב строки</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.9</td>
<td>מחאת פרשים יא יאohen מערכה ראשיתubi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.9-10*</td>
<td>בני מענה לכס [עכבר] המערה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.3-4</td>
<td>וכל י.setBounds ושאר לא יאמענה בצאתה מרשים לכס מלחה עד שועב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.4-5</td>
<td>וכל מנהל או יא או יא איש ושאר יא על מענה בשאראי איו מענה בשאראי בכר כל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.5-6</td>
<td>וכל איש יאש איו היש שארון מדמה בים המערה לא יד אמו יא מלאכי קודותعتمد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.7</td>
<td>וכל יאוד בור איו יארא מענה כול מענה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.9-11</td>
<td>וב써 סדר הפרשים המערה לקראמענה ויאי מענה ומיאי מורה ויאי יאשה החינים לא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>בין המערת ששנה כרמים מני איורים לובישים ביניים שלן כמות בכם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ביודר יאשנים בד שיש מענה תוכן ויאי תוכן שימוש המשי ו liable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>יהבון בראתיהם בני מענה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.11-12</td>
<td>ואיל המערה לא יארא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.13-14</td>
<td>ובעשת הכוהנים אני יא מענה שעשת ליה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.15*</td>
<td>ותקוע הכוהנים בשיתו הצהיח [מקרא והביאים קול תורנה] [מל] המעה על המשי מנ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.16</td>
<td>והמשי אשני בני יא יא ומאי אתאד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.16-17*</td>
<td>וכא צו מענה מענה יא כלל חס [ך חוז]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.2</td>
<td>אוור תקוע לכס הכוהנים יבאו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.3</td>
<td>ובאו לכס המענה הראות נון ר��י על מענה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.3-4</td>
<td>ותקוע הכוהנים בראתיהם המקרא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.4</td>
<td>וייאו שלשת זהני בני יא תמורים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.5</td>
<td>ותקוע הכוהנים בראוות hill תמאבי יא פרד מענה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.6-8</td>
<td>וביהם שלשת סדרים יתקוע לכס הכוהנים יוטה שים קול ואותו יא סמד כי מפשו על</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>קורבט לענה אתאר יוטו יא כלל מענה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.8</td>
<td>ונסו יאכל מענה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.8-9</td>
<td>ותקוע הכוהנים יושב שער התהלים כלל יא פרד לענה מענה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM Clause Location</td>
<td>Hebrew Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.9-10</td>
<td>אויב לבו להמס גדולה מלחמה תרועת אחד קול יריעו השופרות עם וכל והלויים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.10-11</td>
<td>חללים להפיל המלחמה זרקות יצאו [תרו] הקול עם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM Clause Location</td>
<td>Hebrew Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| XIII.2              | עון
| XIII.2-3            | אוומר בורך אל ישראל בבול מוכתב קדוש והושא ומשי אומת
| XIV.2(a)            | והותר הארעהמועל התהלים לבעה התמחה ינוג כלש זה התהל המושב
| XIV.2(b)            | ובכוקר יבוש בנורם
| XIV.2-3             | ורתוות ממס פגרי האשמת
| XIV.3(a)            | ושבע אלו מוקד דומע או ארセル שמס המשרבה לפנים חולל האוהב
| XIV.3(b)            | אוושרי שמס המשרבה לפנים חולל האוהב
| XIV.3-4             | אווכי שמס בולות אול ישראל
| XIV.4(a)            | והורמת שם ב臟 שמחת
| XIV.4(b)            | עון
| XIV.4-5             | אוומר בורך אל ישראל השמד ש khỏ ינוגعدل ועשתה לעון פדוה
| XIV.5**             | ויודא משלי (לדב) [ח] [לא
| XIV.5-6*            | וחוקה גזים אווכי להלד אוי שאריה וותריר במשפתי על נמס הלפתות פה להHexStringה לזר
| XIV.7               | ונהבバリ ידuble ישון גול ידוע ושע
| XV.2*               | ווכל [חדרי] המהלמה לבל
| XV.2-3              | וחונג נמל הביתימ ננד גול חיל בהלילה והנעריהם עם לום [נקם] [ברחב] [לא
| XV.4*               | ועופ אום הרשה אוחיו [כוהנים] והلينם גול אשיש הסדר עמו
| XV.6-7              | והוכל הלעון הזוהר למה<[פ] יפל גאל אוה
| XV.7(a)             | עון
| XV.7(b)             | אוומרחוך ואומך והיו לבן חיל
| XV.7(c)             | חיתו
| XV.7(d)             | ואאמרו
| XV.8(a)             | ולא חיה
| XV.8(b)             | ולא חיהו
| XV.8(c)             | ולא תועדו תמימים
| XV.8-9              | אוול שומן אוחור
| XV.11-12*           |ウォל קיס וחיים המר יולים [בל] [חק] [חי]
| XVI.1(a)*           | ואל ישארו קר אום על כל הנגאים
| XVI.1(b)            | ובכוקר יבוש וגון בברור
| XVI.3*              | או צל המפר המועש [ויוש] [ביס] [הוא] אוצל הנועם נגר מה职业技术
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1QM Clause Location</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XVI.3-4</td>
<td>ואחר יקוט ליום המבות בượngות הכהנים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.4(a)**</td>
<td>ומכחו מכיר [לחם] [ייז] או אונס הבנים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.4(b)**</td>
<td>ועומד ראתש בtexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.4-5</td>
<td>ומתקע להם המבות מענה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.5-6*</td>
<td>ומתקע להם המבות חורך [ש] נדמ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.6-7</td>
<td>ובוגרדם עד מעברת בחיתו כרי כתיו אמר והם ידכון מתחמם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.8</td>
<td>בגועצם כי חוכל ידכון חפילי כתיב</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.8-9*</td>
<td>נוכל גועצם לקול [תרועא]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.11</td>
<td>וחלול היבים ידכון לברוי ולא לבתיו ולחלולו חפילי המלתמה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.12</td>
<td>ומתקע בtexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.13(a)</td>
<td>ונס מהרורש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.13(b)</td>
<td>ומתקע לפני המשתר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.15</td>
<td>ומתקע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.15-16**</td>
<td>כי מאו שמועתה [ס בר] ואל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.1</td>
<td>ומתקע בצパーナו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.2*</td>
<td>ואסתם חורי שמועה [ס נדב ואביה] ואג ארוה פאר לתוךו Ale במשפות עטני</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.4</td>
<td>אסאט התוחוק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.6*</td>
<td>והשלת עזר עלימ [ס גוורל] [בר] והגבורה מלעידי השמידי מבלונל יאור עולים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.8(a)*</td>
<td>ושנת תונון [ב] מרומס</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.8(b)</td>
<td>ומתקע בצパーナו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.8-9*</td>
<td>ואסאט בנ לתוחוק במשאת [ס] זה י钇 [ס] [ומ] לא מערחל יי למשמות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.9(a)*</td>
<td>עד יניע [ס] [ומ] לא מערחל יי למשמות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.9(b)*</td>
<td>عدم יכונ [ס] [ומ] לא מערחל יי למשמות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.10</td>
<td>ואסאט בנ לתוחוק בצパーナו [ס] זה י钇 [ס] [ומ] לא מערחל יי למשמות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.11*</td>
<td>liken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.12-13*</td>
<td>והחכים ייעו במשיור עוז [ס]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.13*</td>
<td>לעולמים ושות [ס] וית ייעו תורעה מלתמה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQM Clause Location</td>
<td>Hebrew Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.13-14</td>
<td>אוסף הביתם שלשה יהו בחיל הכחizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.14(a)*</td>
<td>[טפש צאת קוק התמר] יהו חולם בחלילם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.14(b)*</td>
<td>בהל הער[מ] [יח] ק[ל] הלירה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.2</td>
<td>ונפל בני יפת לאין קום</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.2-3*</td>
<td>הביתים כות לאין [שלום פלישה]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.3-4*</td>
<td>בתות התחלאה יריעה היותה [תורעה גודלה בחゾר] [יח] [ב] [ף]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.4</td>
<td>והשמיד איליהם מכלוך המלכים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.6(a)</td>
<td>ונכר מש אול יהושע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.6(b)</td>
<td>ונן</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.6-7*</td>
<td>אמרו בורך שמך אלהי [אלים] כי הנחלת [ה] משמה על [ה]פליא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.8(b)*</td>
<td>אהנה את [זוכא] עשתה [ práctica] שמבה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>בגוים [ה] נ잪םלי [מ] מקלו [ור] [ה] [לכין] [לאין מקבר] אשר [נפ] ומ בגר</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table A4: 1QM Poetic Corpus, Finite Verb Clauses

Finite non-copular verb clauses in the 1QM Poetic Corpus: 1QM X.8–XII.18; XIII.7–18; XIV.8–19; XVIII.6–15; XIX.2–8. Clauses that depend upon biblical syntax are included in small font. Text is taken from Qimron 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1QM Clause Location</th>
<th>Hebrew Text (poetic corpus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X.8-9</td>
<td>האפור בשמשת ההודל בזמנת התוכחה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.9</td>
<td>האפור בשמשת ההודל בזמנת התוכחה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.1</td>
<td>ובכורות יזכרו רכישת פרגים לאין כоборот</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.1-2</td>
<td>ואה שם הגור også גבר ואחר גגנור</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.2-3*</td>
<td>ואה לכלת הגור også גבר ואחר גגנור</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.3-4</td>
<td>גם בר מלקין ושעשנת ולבר על ברוור וברמיה ואלה במשננה אשר הורונה עליללה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.5</td>
<td>או הרח ענושה יין עשה והי איא ב GOODMAN בחלה נחוכל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.5-7*</td>
<td>בא[מש] הנגדה לו אמרו דריך מובד מערוק מש ש.VisualStudio המשרלב והוחם פאתי מכוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.6(a)</td>
<td>נורכדר ביב מערוד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.6(b)</td>
<td>וטב שמת מושכר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.6(c)</td>
<td>וה師ף פטרה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.6(d)</td>
<td>נורכדר ביב מערוד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.7(a)</td>
<td>ואבידא [מש] מערוד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.7(b)*</td>
<td>ואבידא [מש] מערוד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.7(c)</td>
<td>ואבידא [מש] מערוד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.7-9*</td>
<td>ובכדר משיח הוהי מועדה חלה[מש] מלומה דיריה חלכה במקבר簡単 להפלי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.9-10</td>
<td>ותעש להמה הפרעה והשליח Harden מקרביה ביב [שמ] [_spacing] [_spacing]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.10</td>
<td>[בניא בחר] יער כלפיי אשת עמדיר אנקלה רשעה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.10-11</td>
<td>לא תש双创 עמי כלתו אשמה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.11-12</td>
<td>אם אספק הלבר להא עומ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.13*</td>
<td>אם אספק הלבר להא עומ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.1-2*</td>
<td>בוחריו עפ קרוח שמחה الملك ב[דה]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.10(a)</td>
<td>קומת בגור</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.10(b)</td>
<td>שלב שטיבת אש בגד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.10-11</td>
<td>רוחו שלטהלת עמי חיל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1QM Clause Location</td>
<td>Hebrew Text (poetic corpus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| XII.11(a)           | חַלָּלְךָ בֵּמוֹתִי עַל וּרְגֵלָךְ אוּבְרִיךְ בְּעֹרֶף יְדָךְ תָּן | 11(a) ansk.
| XII.11-12           | וּרְגֵלָךְ אוּבְרִיךְ בְּעֹרֶף יְדָךְ תָּן | 11(a) ansk.
| XII.12-13           | מֵפַחְתּוֹת בִּצְעוֹדַבֵּת בֹּדֶר הַשַּׁבֵּעַ עַל הַשָּׁבֵעַ בֹּדֶר הַשַּׁבֵּעַ | 12-13 ansk.
| XII.13(a)           | צַעְתָּן שְׁמַעְתּוֹ | 13(a) ansk.
| XII.13(b)           | וּנַחֲוָיָה מַרְבּוֹת לְאֻשָּׁר | 13(b) ansk.
| XII.13(c)           | וּנַחֲוָיָה מַרְבּוֹת לְאֻשָּׁר | 13(c) ansk.
| XII.13-14*          | מַחֲשָׂה נְכָרָה עַל יָד נַעֲשָׂה | 13-14* ansk.
| XII.14(a)           | מַלְפָּקִים שַׁחְצִים | 14(a) ansk.
| XII.14(b)           | וּנֵשָׁתָהּ לְנַעֲשָׂה | 14(b) ansk.
| XII.15              | עַדְיָן עַד בְּכֵד | 15 ansk.
| XIII.7(a)           | שָׁמַכָּה גְבַרְתָּךְ עָלָּמִים | 7(a) ansk.
| XIII.7(b)*          | נֶבֶרָתֵי [בֵּ] רְחֵת לְאָבוֹתֵנִי | 7(b) ansk.
| XIII.7-8            | וַחֲקַקֵם לְרִכְבֶּהָ [זָ] עָלָּמִים | 7-8 ansk.
| XIII.9**            | שָׁמַכָּה גְבַרְתָּךְ עָלָּמִים | 9** ansk.
| XIII.9-10           | נֶבֶרָתֵי [בֵּ] רְחֵת לְאָבוֹתֵנִי | 9-10 ansk.
| XIII.10             | וֹשֶׁר מְאֹר מֵאִזְפָּדֵת לְעֹדְוִנֵנִי | 10 ansk.
| XIII.10-11          | אוֹתָהּ עֲשִׂיתָה בִּילָעֲל לְשָׂחַת מֶסְטִימָה | 10-11 ansk.
| XIII.12             | בַּחֲקַקֵּו נְשָׁהָּ | 12 ansk.
| XIII.12-13*         | וֹגַּנְג [בֵּ] גָּרְמֵךְ נְשָׁהָּּ נְשָׁהָּ בְּדִי נְגָרְמֵךְ | 12-13* ansk.
| XIII.13             | וּנֵשֶׁבְּשֶׁבֵת נְשָׁהָּ | 13 ansk.
| XIII.18*            | [בֵּ] אֲשֶׁר הָיָה יְזָהֲהֵה לְ[וֹדֶי] נָקֵמָה | 18* ansk.
| XIV.9-10**          | בְּבוֹלֵךְ רִי שֵׁמָתָו לְאָוֹד הִזָּה [בֵּ] מְבִירָתָה | 9-10** ansk.
| XIV.10(a)**         | רְוִיחַ [יִבְּ] הָעַרְכָּתָה מְמָנְשָׁה | 10(a)** ansk.
| XIV.10(b)**         | בַּבַּחֲשֵׁרֵן אָשֶׁר מְשַׁמְּשָׁה שֵׂמָתָה נְשָׁהָּ נְשָׁהָּ | 10(b)** ankan.
| XIV.11-12           | לֹשֶׁבֵדֶם שֶׁבֶת לְבֵת | 11-12 ansk.
| XIV.12              | בְּמַעַשְׁתָּה נְפַלָּתָה נְפַלָּתָה | 12 ansk.
| XIV.16              | רֹבֶם רֹבֶם אֲלֵי אֲלֵי | 16 ansk.
| XVIII.7             | בְּרִיתָךְ שְׁמָרָהּ לְנוֹ אוֹיֵא | 7 ansk.
1QM Clause Location | Hebrew Text (poetic corpus)
--- | ---
XVIII.8(a)* | [ית]ה [ית]ה [ית]ה
XVIII.10 | [ית]ה [ית]ה [ית]ה
XVIII.12-13* | [ית]ה [ית]ה
XVIII.13* | [ית]ה [ית]ה
XIX.3 | [ית]ה [ית]ה
XIX.4(a) | [ית]ה [ית]ה
XIX.4(b) | [ית]ה [ית]ה
XIX.5(a) | [ית]ה [ית]ה
XIX.5(b)* | [ית]ה [ית]ה
XIX.6 | [ית]ה [ית]ה
XIX.7(a)** | [ית]ה [ית]ה
XIX.7(b)* | [ית]ה [ית]ה
Table A5: 1QpHab Finite Verb Clauses

Finite non-copular verb clauses in 1QpHab I.1–XIII.4. Clauses that depend upon biblical syntax are included in small font. M/S stands for Main Clause/Subordinate Clause. Text is taken from Qimron 2010.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1QpHab Clause Location</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III.5-6*</td>
<td>וא[ב]כלה ומרות להלך עם כל העמים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.9-10*</td>
<td>אשר ידרשו את הארוף בתוס[ע] הבכורה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.10-11*</td>
<td>אמרוותרו יבואמקי ירה Thời[ל] ואת כת[ל] העמים בנשר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.1-2</td>
<td>אשר ילענו על רבי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.2</td>
<td>נبصر על נבטים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.2-3</td>
<td>וכללו יהר ושירה יה=-=-=-=-ש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.3</td>
<td>כלכלו דם רבי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.5-6</td>
<td>אשר יברו על מצריר העמים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.6</td>
<td>יכלוו יישחקו עליה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.7</td>
<td>יבעו רבי יהирו לתחמוש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.7-8</td>
<td>זבאה מהפתח לנדיס</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.8-9</td>
<td>הורשים בְּנוֹוּ יהישוּ בוּשׁ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.11</td>
<td>אשר בּנעָת בְּתִיכן [חֶפֶל] י นอกจาก</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.12-13*</td>
<td>[ז] והאר או יראו ולו את חָלַשׁ את ח[אֲרָמִי]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.3</td>
<td>אשר לא יכלו alternating ואת דוע בֶּד הַנָּוִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.4</td>
<td>ירכו בחסי וּֽוֹא alternating ואת מָשְפִּים כּל הָנָוִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.4-5</td>
<td>הַנְּכוֹתָם את שֵׁם כל רְשֵׁי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.5-6</td>
<td>אשר שמרו את מנומרו בּרְנָוִים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.7-8</td>
<td>אשר לאו זֹנו את חְֽוָתָם בּקִים החששה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.10</td>
<td>אשר זֹנו חוּתָם חָלֵֽעָתָם</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.11-12(a)</td>
<td>לֹא alternating על אֶשֶּה תַכְּנֶה alternating את התורה וּניַּכְּלֵֽו alternating כת[ל]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.11-12(b)</td>
<td>אשר זֹנו את התורה וּניַּכְּלֵֽו alternating כת[ל]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.1-2</td>
<td>ויוספ את התAmericans alternating עִם כל שִׁלֹאָה וּניַּרְבְּוָה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.10-11</td>
<td>אשר יאדו רכיב בָּחָר alternating נִכיָשׁוּים וּניַּכְּלֵֽו alternating כת[ל]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.1-2</td>
<td>יְדוּרָב alternating אל תבוקל alternating את הת-Americans alternating על הדר alternating והatório</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I QpHab Clause Location</td>
<td>Hebrew Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.2</td>
<td>הודעו לוא הקץ גמר ואת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.4-5</td>
<td>הנביאים עבדיו דברי רזי כל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.7</td>
<td>אשר יארוך תוק האריה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.8</td>
<td>אשר דברי הנביאים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.11-14</td>
<td>אשר לא יפו ידות מעבידת האמת בנをしている עליון התוק האריה כי כל קץ אל יבוא</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.12-14</td>
<td>ביא כולם אל בואו החלכותЈאשת התוק [ל[ה[ג]] בר י_REPOV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.13-14*</td>
<td>כי אשר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.1-3</td>
<td>אשר ייצלו לא מבית המופשים ובכר עמל וזנחנו בנו מעדה הצדק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.9-10(a)</td>
<td>נבואו משלי ישראל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.9-10(b)</td>
<td>נבואו משלי ישראל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.10</td>
<td>והנהו את אלה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.10-11*</td>
<td>[ז] בנדו בחלוקים ובכר ויה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.11(a)</td>
<td>וחול</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.11(b)</td>
<td>ויקובנ ומותי [ח] מס אשר מרד באל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.11(c)</td>
<td>אשר מרדו באל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.12</td>
<td>ונהו עלים לכתף עליל [ו] אשמה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.12-13*</td>
<td>והרי [תלע[ב] על כל אדêt נדור ננשו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.6-7</td>
<td>ולהאחתים והמים גון גון עם עליל ההנהאיים כי כל הרה הנשים</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.9-12*</td>
<td>[ב[ע]ו[ז]ו[ז]] מחרי הזרז ואשمشו נתנה אל [ד] [ז] וייחו לנה תמך כלבלב [יר] נפש</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.11-12</td>
<td>[א] שחר החשש על ביתו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.3-4</td>
<td>אשר ייחו את השמות בית עופט ראמ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.4</td>
<td>ומשת עלים כלשפות</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.5(a)</td>
<td>בוחוכים יישוע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.5(b)</td>
<td>ובאש נפטרה צффנת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.9-13</td>
<td>אשר התуча ברנים עלי שיביהו כלים עדיה بشקר בציבור בנייה לונ뇽 רבוד</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.12-13</td>
<td>בזערת משלי להורות נב [מש] שחר להזח עמכל ל niezbędn בציבור ויושב משפר ויאס אשר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause Location</td>
<td>Hebrew Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.1-2</td>
<td>לאחר תנהלה להם הדבר כמי היה לבר</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.4-6</td>
<td>אשר דרכו אחר מורד התבזק לביע הספקות אביו נלוה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.6-8</td>
<td>בוקן מעד נוגת תפי ההכמוס מעיתו אליות בלעזו הלכשלה בים זומכ שבח מונחה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.12-14</td>
<td>אשר נבר클וע מכבד יא לא מנע הוא על חית לבכוב והוריו לפי ספת הتظמה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.13</td>
<td>כי לאו משלに関して ח ת</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.13-14</td>
<td>ויולך בדרוג ההגורתי לפי ספת הتظמה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.3</td>
<td>אשר גמל על 아בוע</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.5-6</td>
<td>אשר יושפטו עלכל살 הכבר הוא סרבל אביו</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.8</td>
<td>אשר פעל בה הכרחי מועש חטובה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.8-9</td>
<td>וישמה את מקדש את</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.9-10</td>
<td>אשר גמל את אבי</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.13</td>
<td>אשר צירום לbruarת להשתת בתפלה והמה לוה יצילם בו המקמט</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.14</td>
<td>הוהו לוה יצילם בו המקמט</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.2</td>
<td>אשר עבד את האב ואה חני</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.2-4</td>
<td>בזים הממשים לכלא את כל עבדי העצבים ואת הרשעים עם האורין</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause Location</td>
<td>Hebrew Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.18-19</td>
<td>b’wbrm bbryt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.12-13</td>
<td>whyh b’swm’w ’t dbry hbrew hzwtybrk bbbw l’mwr . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.15</td>
<td>wlpny hywtm hkyn kw1 mhšbtm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.16</td>
<td>wbhywtm l’wddwtn kmhšbt kbdwylm’t p’wltn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.18-19</td>
<td>wbrw’d pqwdh yšynydh h’d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.23c</td>
<td>’d hnh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.20-22</td>
<td>ky’ yhw bbryt l’swt kw1 hhwqym h’t bhwhd l’d qwdš wršw ’t rwhwm byhd bynh yš l’hw škw l’py bny qhrwn hmtndbym bynd lhqm’t brytw wlpqwd ’t kw1 hhwqym šr swh l’swt w’l py r( ).b yš’l hmtndbym lšwb byhd lbrwyw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.26b*</td>
<td>ky’ bywm [] ywkyhnhw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.4-7</td>
<td>whyh ky’ y’rwkw h’swlh1 l’kw1 ’w htyrwš l’swt hkw1n yššl ydw lršwn hbrk br’šyt hšlm [dittography] wghtyrwš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.15-16</td>
<td>w’hr bbw’w l’mrd lpny hrbym wnš’l lw hkw1 ’l dbryw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.16-17</td>
<td>wbrqwrw l’st hyhd lw’ yq’ bhtrt hrbym ’d šr ydršwš lw’hw wniš’w ’d nwl’t lw šnh tynymh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.18</td>
<td>wbrw’l lw šnh btwk hyhd yš’l lw hrbym ’l dbryw lpy škw wnš’ydw btrwrh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.11-12</td>
<td>bmwsb hrbym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.21</td>
<td>wbrw’l lw hšnh hšnyt ypqwdhw’l py hrbym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.19-20*</td>
<td>bšwnh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.20a</td>
<td>bšnyt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.20-21</td>
<td>wbrw’l lw štnym ynym yš’l lw hrbym ’l dbryw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause Location</td>
<td>Hebrew Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.21b</td>
<td>w’hr yš‘l ḥmšpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.10-11</td>
<td>bhkyn ūlh byswd hyhd šntym ymym bmynm drk ybdlw qwdš btwk šš ‘nšy hyhd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.12-14</td>
<td>wbhywt ūlh lyhd byšr’l btkwnym h’hly ybdlw mtwk mwšš hnsy h’wl llkt bmdb brpnw šm ‘t drk hw’h’ k’šr ktwb bmdb pr dw drk yyyy yšw b’rbb msłh l’lwhynw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.19a</td>
<td>w’hr ykt[l]b btkwnw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.2</td>
<td>w’hr yktwb btkwnw lyhd qwdš</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.3-577</td>
<td>bhywt ūlh hyšr’l kkkwl htkmynm h’hly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.5-6</td>
<td>b’t ḥhyh ybdlyw ṛnsy hyhd byt qwdš l’hwrn hwhd qwdš qwdšym wbym yhd lyšr’l hhwlkm bmynm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

571. This temporal phrase is clause-initial, but the main verb of the clause is an infinitive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause Location</th>
<th>Temporal Phrase</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Clause Type</th>
<th>Clause Initial?</th>
<th>Prep/Word</th>
<th>Sense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.6</td>
<td>ʿwd</td>
<td>again</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʿwd</td>
<td>again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.16-18</td>
<td>bmmšlt blyʾl</td>
<td>during the dominion of Belial</td>
<td>subord</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʾb</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.18-19</td>
<td>bʿwrbr bbrt</td>
<td>after they are entering into the covenant</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ʾb</td>
<td>during or after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.8(a)</td>
<td>bqwrʾkh</td>
<td>when you cry out / during your crying out</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʾb</td>
<td>during or after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.12-13</td>
<td>whyh bšwm ʾ t dbry hbrt hzw</td>
<td>when he hears the words of this covenant</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>whyh</td>
<td>after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.19</td>
<td>šnh bšnh kwl ywmy mmšlt blyʾl</td>
<td>year after year all the days of the dominion of Belial</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>repetitive, during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.15</td>
<td>lpyn hywtm</td>
<td>before they come to be</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>lpyn</td>
<td>before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.16</td>
<td>bhywtm lʾwrdwtn kmḥšbt kbdw</td>
<td>when they come to be at their ordained times according to his glorious plan</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ʾd</td>
<td>after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.22-23</td>
<td>ʿd qsw</td>
<td>until his era</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʾd</td>
<td>until</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.26–IV.1*</td>
<td>ʿdy ʿwlnym</td>
<td>forever</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʾd</td>
<td>forever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.1(a)</td>
<td>lʾd</td>
<td>forever</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>lʾd</td>
<td>forever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.1(c)</td>
<td>lnʾsh</td>
<td>forever</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>lnʾsh</td>
<td>forever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.13-14</td>
<td>ʾd kltm ʾynt ʾsrty wpʾyṯ lmnw</td>
<td>until their destruction without remnant or escape for them</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʾd</td>
<td>until</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.18-19</td>
<td>bmwʾd pqwdh</td>
<td>at the appointed time of visitation</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ʾb</td>
<td>at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.23</td>
<td>ʾd hnh</td>
<td>forever</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʾd</td>
<td>forever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.25</td>
<td>ʾd qš nhʾrš Ῥʾsw ʾhdš</td>
<td>until the time of decree and renewal</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʾd</td>
<td>until</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.20-22</td>
<td>kyʾ ybwʾ bbrt lʾšry Ῥʾkwlt Ῥʾhwym Ῥʾḥl Ῥʾhwṛ Ῥʾdt qwsy</td>
<td>when he enters into the covenant to do according to all of these statutes to be united to a holy congregation</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>kyʾ</td>
<td>after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.26(b)</td>
<td>bywm</td>
<td>on the day</td>
<td>subord</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ʾb</td>
<td>unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.4-6</td>
<td>whyh kyʾ yʾrwkw hšwlnn lʾkwlt Ῥʾhwš Ῥʾštw</td>
<td>when they arrange the table for eating or the wine to drink</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>whyh</td>
<td>after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.10</td>
<td>trm yklh ʾhyhw ldbr</td>
<td>before his brother finishes speaking</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>trm</td>
<td>before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause Location</td>
<td>Temporal Phrase</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Clause Type</td>
<td>Clause Initial?</td>
<td>Prep/Word</td>
<td>Sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.11</td>
<td>btrw</td>
<td>during his turn</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.11-12</td>
<td>bmwšb hrbym</td>
<td>during the session of the general membership</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.15-16</td>
<td>ʿhr bbwʾ lʾmwd lpsychy hrbym</td>
<td>afterwards, when he enters to stand before the general membership</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ʿhr</td>
<td>afterwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.16-17</td>
<td>bqwr bwʾṣt hyḥd</td>
<td>when he draws near to the congregation of the Yahad</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.18</td>
<td>bmwlʾ lw šnh bṭwkh hyḥd</td>
<td>when he has spent a year in the Yahad</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.21</td>
<td>bmwlʾ lw hšnh hšnyt</td>
<td>when his second year has been finished</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.24-25(b)</td>
<td>šnh ʿḥt</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.25-27*</td>
<td>šnh ʿḥt</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.2(a)</td>
<td>ʿwd</td>
<td>again</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʿwd</td>
<td>again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.2-3</td>
<td>šnh ʿḥt</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.3(b)</td>
<td>ššḥ hwdšym</td>
<td>six months</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.3-4</td>
<td>ššḥ hwdšym</td>
<td>six months</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.4(a)</td>
<td>šnh ʿḥt</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.5(b)</td>
<td>ššḥ hwdšym</td>
<td>six months</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.5-6(b)</td>
<td>šlwšḥ hwdšym</td>
<td>three months</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.8(d)</td>
<td>šnh ʿḥt</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.9</td>
<td>šlwšḥ hwdšym</td>
<td>three months</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.9-10</td>
<td>ʿṣrt ymym</td>
<td>ten days</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.10</td>
<td>šlwšym ymym</td>
<td>thirty days</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.11</td>
<td>ʿṣrt ymym</td>
<td>ten days</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.11-12</td>
<td>šlwšym ym</td>
<td>thirty days</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.12(b)</td>
<td>ššḥ hwdšym</td>
<td>six months</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.13(a)</td>
<td>šlwšym ym</td>
<td>thirty days</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.13-14</td>
<td>šlwšym ym</td>
<td>thirty days</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.14-15</td>
<td>šlwšym ym</td>
<td>thirty days</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.15(a)</td>
<td>ʿṣrt ymym</td>
<td>ten days</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.15-16</td>
<td>šnh ʿḥt</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.17(a)</td>
<td>ʿwd</td>
<td>again</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʿwd</td>
<td>again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clause Location</td>
<td>Temporal Phrase</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>Clause Type</td>
<td>Clause Initial?</td>
<td>Prep/Word</td>
<td>Sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.17-18(b)</td>
<td>šš ḥwdšym</td>
<td>six months</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.18-19(b)</td>
<td>šty šnym</td>
<td>two years</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.19-20</td>
<td>bršwnh</td>
<td>during the first (year)</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.20(a)</td>
<td>bšnyt</td>
<td>during the second (year)</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.20-21</td>
<td>bmlw’t lw šntym ynym</td>
<td>when his two years have been finished</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.21(c)</td>
<td>ʾḥr</td>
<td>afterwards</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ʾḥr</td>
<td>afterwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.22-24</td>
<td>ʾmlw’t ʾsr šnym</td>
<td>at the fulfillment of ten years</td>
<td>subord</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʾl</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.22-24</td>
<td>ʾwd</td>
<td>again</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʾwd</td>
<td>again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.10-11</td>
<td>bhkyn ʾlḥ byswd hyhd šntym ynym bmym drk</td>
<td>when these have been established in the instruction of the Yahad for two years blamelessly</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.12-14</td>
<td>bhywt ʾlḥ lyḥd bysrʾl bt-kwnym h/lḥ</td>
<td>when these come to be a Yahad in Israel in these doctrines</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.18(a)</td>
<td>ʾd ʾṣr yzkw mʾṣyw mkwl ʾwl</td>
<td>until his works have been cleansed from all evil</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʾd</td>
<td>until</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.19</td>
<td>ʾḥr</td>
<td>afterwards</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ʾḥr</td>
<td>afterwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.23</td>
<td>ʾwd</td>
<td>again</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʾwd</td>
<td>again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.25(a)</td>
<td>šntym ynym</td>
<td>two years</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.26-27</td>
<td>ʾwd</td>
<td>again</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʾwd</td>
<td>again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.26-27</td>
<td>ʾd mwl’t lw šntym ynym</td>
<td>until his two years are fulfilled</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʾd</td>
<td>until</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.1(b)</td>
<td>ʾwd</td>
<td>again</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʾwd</td>
<td>again</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.1-2</td>
<td>šntym ynym</td>
<td>for two years</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.2</td>
<td>ʾḥr</td>
<td>afterwards</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ʾḥr</td>
<td>afterwards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.3-572</td>
<td>bhywt ʾlḥ byṣrʾl kkwł ḥtkwnym h/lḥ</td>
<td>when these are in Israel according to all these precepts</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.5-6</td>
<td>ʾb’t ḥḥyʾh</td>
<td>at that time</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ʾb</td>
<td>at that time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.10-11(b)</td>
<td>ʾd bwʾ nbyʾ wmṣḥyḥ ʾhrwn wṣṣrʾl</td>
<td>until the coming of the prophet and the messiahs of Aaron and Israel</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ʾd</td>
<td>until</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.21</td>
<td>ʾbʾṭym h/lḥ</td>
<td>during these times</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>during</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

572. This temporal phrase is clause-initial, but the main verb of the clause is an infinitive.
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