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Abstract

This paper provides the first synthesized account of resumptive pronouns in two kinds of A-bar dependencies in Biblical Hebrew: dislocation constructions and relative clauses. First, with respect to dislocation, this paper argues that two distinct constructions can be empirically distinguished in Biblical Hebrew according to six, cross-linguistically supported tests which diagnose connectivity between the dislocate and host clause. These are referred to as Hanging Topics and Left Dislocates (see Anagnostopoulou et al. 1997; Alexiadou 2017). On the basis of these differences, it is claimed that Hanging Topics are externally Merged in the specifier of a functional projection in the left periphery, here taken to be Top(ic) (see Rizzi 1997). In line with recent proposals by Ott (2014), Left Dislocates are argued to be elliptical sentence remnants appearing linearly juxtaposed to their host clauses, superficially giving rise to a configuration similar to that of Hanging Topics. This paper argues that the clause hosting the dislocate and the clause hosting the correlate (= resumptive pronoun) are asyndetically coordinated by Koster's (2000) null operator colon "::P". Ellipsis of the clause hosting the dislocate is then licensed by an E feature on C (Merchant 2001, 2004a). This account predicts a mixed set of connectivity effects, such that certain mismatches will be permitted as long as they are not relevant for the identity calculation in licensing ellipsis. Crucially, it is shown that accounts which posit a movement relationship between the correlate and the dislocate fail to predict certain anti-connectivity effects present in Left Dislocation, most importantly \( \phi \)-feature mismatches (cf. Grohmann 2003).

The second part of the paper addresses the syntax of resumption in relative clauses. The first contribution of this section is to provide the most comprehensive catalogue of the distribution of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses, categorized according to their clausal position and the relative complementizer with which they occur. It is shown that Biblical Hebrew, like Modern Hebrew and Irish, productively employs resumptive pronouns in island and non-island contexts. This empirical survey forms the foundation for the following section, where it is argued that three functional proposals aimed at accounting for the distribution of resumptive pronouns in optional positions in Biblical Hebrew and in other languages fail to predict the full range of attested data. Finally, this paper puts forward a unified theoretical account of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses in Biblical Hebrew whereby resumptive pronouns are uniformly generated independently of their A-bar binders and are bound in-situ (see Merchant 2004b; McCloskey 1990; Safir 1986, 1996). Certain properties traditionally associated with movement which are found in resumption (e.g. reconstruction effects; see Bianchi 2004, Sichel 2014) can instead be accounted for by positing that the resumptive pronoun is a determiner which takes a copy of the relative head as its complement (see Elbourne 2001). This copy undergoes NP-ellipsis under
identity with its antecedent (Guilliot and Malkawi 2006, 2011).

Overall, this paper aims to provide a wealth of new empirical data for consideration in the typological and theoretical literature on resumption. Moreover, it provides at least some evidence for McCloskey’s (2002) observation that resumptive pronouns in all languages are regular pronouns and are not special in any way. The accounts proposed herein are compatible with this generalization: in Hanging Topics and relative clauses, resumptive pronouns are regular pronouns (possibly derived by NP-ellipsis) which are A-bar bound (possibly directly by their antecedents); in Left Dislocation, resumptive pronouns are regular, anaphoric pronouns.
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1 Introduction

The term "resumption" refers to the phenomenon in which a pronominal element occurs in the variable position of an unbounded A-bar dependency (Rouveret 2011; see also Sells 1984 and McCloskey 2017b). Resumptive pronouns are found throughout the world's languages in a variety A-bar dependencies, including relative clauses, wh-questions, dislocation constructions, comparative clauses, clefts, and "tough-movement" constructions. In Biblical Hebrew, two configurations in particular utilize resumptive pronouns: (i) dislocation constructions (alternatively referred to as casus pendens, extraposition, and left dislocation, inter alia), as in [1], and (ii) relative clauses, as in [2]. Resumptive pronouns are boxed throughout.

(1) kî ʔōt-ō1 kê-hayyôm timšʔûn ʔōt-ō1
because ACC-3MS as-today find.IPV.2MP ACC-3MS

'Because him1—even today you shall find him1.' (1 Sam 9.13)

(2) nêlḥâ ʔahārē ʔēlōhim ʔēḥērim1 ʔāser lōy ʔēdāyātā-m1
go,JUS.1P after gods.MP other.MP C NEG know.PFV.2MS-3MP.ACC

'Let us go after other gods who you don't know (lit. gods1 that you don't know them1)' (Deut 13.3)

Until recently, the subject of resumption in Biblical Hebrew remained restricted in large part to reference grammars which inevitably relied on representative examples (see Van der Merwe et al. 2017: 303-309, 510-518; Joüon and Muraoka 2016 551–554, 559–564; Waltke and O'Connor 1990: 76-80, 333-340). Research into dislocation constructions has largely been inspired by Groß (1987) and Khan (1988) and continues to develop insights into the syntax and pragmatics of these constructions (see Holmstedt 2014; Korchin 2015; Naude 1990; Westbury 2014, 2016; inter alia). Research into relative clause resumption, on the other hand, has been less prominent (see Joosten 1993; Parunak 1996; Tsujita 1991). The most comprehensive studies are Holmstedt (2002; 2016) which catalogue the range of relative complementizers co-occurring with resumptive pronouns and outline the clausal positions in which resumptive pronouns may appear. Yet even these studies overlook important empirical facts and therefore miss key generalizations about the data.

The present paper will build on these previous studies and provide the first systematic overview of resumptive pronouns in Biblical Hebrew, thereby contributing to our understanding of resumptive A-bar dependencies from both a language-specific and a general theoretical perspective. Initially, the syntax of dislocation constructions is taken up in detail, where "resumptive pronouns" are instead referred to as "correlates" following

I will not address the syntax of purpose infinitivals, as in [i], which are also attested employing resumptive pronouns.

(i) hâ-ʔāres1 ʔāser ʔattem bāšhûm ʔēriš-āh1 ʔērēš niddâ hî
the-land.FS C 2MP enter.PTCP.MP to-possess.INF-3FS.ACC land.FS impure.FS 3FS

'The land1 that you are entering to possess it1 is an impure land.' (Ezra 9.11)
Ott (2014; 2015). It is argued that two distinct sub-categories of dislocations can be identified in Biblical Hebrew which have, for the most part, received a uniform treatment in the specialist literature (though see Khan 1988; Naudé 1990; Westbury 2014; Cowper and DeCaen 2017 for a few exceptions). Following research on similar phenomena in other languages, these two constructions are referred to as **Hanging Topics** and **Left Dislocation** and are distinguished on the basis of six tests which diagnose connectivity between the dislocate and its host clause (e.g. case-matching, reconstruction, etc.). For instance, whereas Left Dislocates must case-match their correlates, Hanging Topics may bear default nominative case.

(3) **Left Dislocation**

\[
\text{gam ūōt-ō} \text{ hakkū-[hû]}
\]

\[
\text{also ACC-3MS strike.IMP-MP-3MS.ACC}
\]

'Even him\textsubscript{1}–strike him\textsubscript{1}!' (2 Kgs 9.27)

(4) **Hanging Topic**

\[
hî\text{ānân yâkassen-[nâ]}
\]

\[
\text{3FS.NOM cloud.MS cover.IPFV.3MS-3FS.ACC}
\]

(refering to the nation of Egypt) 'It\textsubscript{1}–a cloud covers it\textsubscript{1}.’ (Ezek 30.18)

While a few of these contrasts have been recognized previously in the Biblical Hebrew literature (see especially Khan 1988), this paper offers the first synthesis of all the examples for which the two sub-types can be adequately differentiated. All of the relevant occurrences are listed in Appendices 1–2. Moreover, by striving for exhaustiveness in its empirical scope, this paper has uncovered interesting trends in the dislocation data, such as the statistical preference for Hanging Topics in Biblical Hebrew.

After this overview, the discussion turns to the derivation of Hanging Topics and Left Dislocates. On the basis of their robust anti-connectivity effects, it is argued that Hanging Topics are externally Merged into the specifier of a functional projection in the left periphery, here taken to be Top(ic).

(5)

```
ForceP
   / \  \
  Force TopP
    /   \
  ...Hanging Topic\textsubscript{2}...
    /   \
  Top Top' \\
  /   \
  Top TP
  /   \\
...correlate\textsubscript{2}...
```

This follows a precedent in the syntactic literature in which Hanging Topics in other languages are base-generated independently of their correlates. Left Dislocates, by contrast, are argued to belong to a separate clause which

---

A representative sample of embedded object resumption in purpose infinitivals can be found in Appendix 6.
is elided under identity with the clause hosting the correlate (Ott 2014, 2015).

(6) \[ \text{dislocate}_3 \quad \text{correlate}_3 \quad \text{dislocate}_3 \quad \text{correlate}_3 \quad \text{dislocate}_3 \]

The second part of this paper addresses the syntax of resumption in relative clauses in Biblical Hebrew. On the empirical front, this section provides a nearly exhaustive survey of the distribution of resumptive pronouns and gaps in relative clauses, supported by both raw counts and frequency estimates for all clausal positions and for four distinct relative complementizers (i.e. ?ašer, šeC-, φ, and zeh/zô/zû, all \[CAT: C\]). All of the relevant examples are given in transcription and translation in Appendices 3–5. Several generalizations emerge as a result of this survey, most notably the following: (i) highest subject resumption in Biblical Hebrew is acceptable (i.e. attested), if dispreferred, in contrast with languages like Irish and Modern Hebrew which disallow resumptive pronouns in the highest subject position (McCloskey 1990; Shlonsky 1992); (ii) for optionally resumptive positions, resumptive pronouns occur at higher frequencies in embedded positions than in non-embedded ones; (iii) highest object resumptive pronouns are obligatory in Weak Crossover configurations; and (iv) resumption is island-insensitive.

With this empirical groundwork laid, the discussion turns to three functional proposals aimed at accounting for the use of resumptive pronouns in optional positions. It is argued that none of these proposals, whether taken individually or together, suffices to predict the full range of data. Finally, this paper offers a theoretically unified account of resumption in relative clauses in which resumptive pronouns are Determiners base-generated independently of their A-bar binders whose NP complements are elided under identity with their antecedents (Guilliot and Malkawi 2006, 2011; Rouveret 2008; Salzmann 2017; see Elbourne 2001).

(7) *Structure of a resumptive pronoun*

\[ \text{DP} \quad \text{RP} \quad \text{NP}_r \]

This accounts for the apparently conflicting set of movement (e.g. possibility for reconstruction) and non-movement (e.g. island-insensitivity) properties of resumptive pronouns and does not face the same issues of overgeneration encountered by hybrid approaches in which resumptive pronouns can be derived either by movement or by base-generation (see especially Sichel 2014). An important conclusion of this study is that resumptive pronouns in relative clauses are never a product of movement in Biblical Hebrew.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives a brief overview of the morphosyntactic and typological features of Biblical Hebrew which are relevant to the present study, and additionally defines the limits of the corpus. Section 3 distinguishes two types of dislocation constructions. Section 4 addresses the syntax of resumption in relative clauses. Section 5 concludes by summarizing these arguments and by discussing some
implications of the analysis for the Biblical Hebrew and syntactic literature.

2 Background on Biblical Hebrew

2.1 Typological and Morphosyntactic Basics

2.1.1 Basic Constituent Order

Biblical Hebrew is a pro-drop language (Cowper and DeCaen 2017; Holmstedt 2013b; Naudé 2013). Verbs carry rich agreement and overt subject pronouns are not obligatory in finite clauses:

(8) wat-tēbk
    and-wept.IPFV.3FS
'She wept.' (Gen 21.16)

In (8), the verb *wat-tēbk* is overtly marked for third feminine singular agreement, even in the absence of an overt pronominal subject. In line with the view prevalent since the Principles and Parameters framework of the 1980’s, I assume that a silent pronominal subject represented as *pro* is covertly present in such structures (Borer 1984a; Chomsky 1981). This null subject bears φ-features that end up exponed overtly on the verb via an agreement relation. Thus, I argue that all finite Biblical Hebrew sentences contain a subject, at least underlyingly.

This will prove important for our discussion of dislocations with islands in Section 3, and of subject resumption in relative clauses in Section 4.

Though scholars agree that Biblical Hebrew has unmarked VO order in discourse-neutral contexts, the relative position of (lexical, non-pronominal) subjects has recently come under scrutiny. This paper will adopt the consensus view that the discourse-neutral constituent order is VSO, though none of the conclusions presented here rely on this assumption.

I assume with Doron (2005) that the verb in Biblical Hebrew undergoes obligatory head movement to T (at least in finite clauses). This accounts for the fact that finite verbs precede certain adverbials, such as the manner adverbial *kākā* 'thus, in this way' and the sentential adverb *šōd* 'still, anymore'.

---

2 The astute reader will notice a discrepancy in (8) between the imperfective gloss for the verb and my perfective translation 'wept'. Finite Biblical Hebrew verbs are primarily marked for perfective or imperfective aspect (Pardee 2012; Van der Merwe et al. 2017). However, when the conjunction *w* - 'and' combines with a clause-initial verb, the temporal/aspectual interpretation flips: a morphologically perfective form carries an imperfective interpretation, and a morphologically imperfective form carries a perfective interpretation. Comparative historical work on Semitic has shown that Biblical Hebrew inherited two verb forms—an imperfective form and a preterite/perfective form—which became syncretic for most verbs in Biblical Hebrew. The old perfective form is preserved only in these examples with a cliticized or incorporated coordinating conjunction.

3 I disagree with Goldenberg (2013: 150-151) that pronominal subjects are always implicitly present—even in the presence of a nominal subject—and are expressed by the agreement features of finite verbs.

I abstract over the position of the subject in the following.

(9) a. kol hā-ʔezrāḥ yaʔašeh kākā ʔeṭ ʔelleh
every the-native do.IPfv.3MS this.way ACC these.MP
‘Every native (Israelite) will do these things this way.’ (Num 15.13)

b. 

(10) a. w^a-lōʔ yizb^hû yōd ʔeṭ zibhê-hem laš-s^îrim
and-NEG sacrifice.IPfv.3MP anymore ACC sacrifices-3MP,GEN to.the-goat.demons
‘They will no longer sacrifice their sacrifices to the goat demons.’ (Lev 17.7)

b. 

Moreover, V-to-T movement (in conjunction with subject movement to Spec, TP) correctly predicts the fact that quantifiers may be stranded in a post-verbal position. In (11), the verb first undergoes head movement to T over the subject in [Spec, vP]. The subject DP "Mt. Sinai" then moves successive cyclically through the specifier of QP and lands ultimately in Spec TP (presumably to satisfy the strong [*D] feature on T), thereby stranding the quantifier "all" in its base position. I follow Shlonsky's (1991) analysis for Modern Hebrew quantifier stranding and assume that the φ-feature morphology manifested on the stranded quantifier kol 'all' is the realization of an agreement relation between the quantifier kol and the quantified DP which is obligatorily pronounced when DP strands Q. Compare (11) with the Modern Hebrew parallel in (12).
I will not take a stance here on whether or not Biblical Hebrew has "triggered inversion", a process of V-to-C movement that has been proposed both for Modern Hebrew (see Shlonsky 1997; Shlonsky and Doron 1992) and for Biblical Hebrew (see Holmstedt 2002, 2009, 2016; Jones 2015; see Cowper and DeCaen 2017 for a related proposal). Nothing in the analysis rests on the assumption that either V-to-T or V-to-C movement takes place in Biblical Hebrew. Declarative VO order without overt focus or topic-marking is illustrated in (13).

I will not take a stance here on whether or not Biblical Hebrew has "triggered inversion", a process of V-to-C movement that has been proposed both for Modern Hebrew (see Shlonsky 1997; Shlonsky and Doron 1992) and for Biblical Hebrew (see Holmstedt 2002, 2009, 2016; Jones 2015; see Cowper and DeCaen 2017 for a related proposal). Nothing in the analysis rests on the assumption that either V-to-T or V-to-C movement takes place in Biblical Hebrew. Declarative VO order without overt focus or topic-marking is illustrated in (13).

Traditional analyses of Biblical Hebrew assume that many preverbal constituents (e.g. internal arguments) bear a (contrastive) topic or focus interpretation (see Holmstedt 2014; Moshavi 2010). For instance in (14), the PP 'to the darkness' is a contrast alternative to the previous PP 'to the light' and is in a marked, pre-verbal position in the second clause.

(11) a. ַּיָּשָׁן kull-ô
     and-mountain.MS Sinai smoke.PFV.3MS all-3MS
     'All of Mt. Sinai was smoking (lit. 'Mt. Sinai was smoking all of it.').' (Ex 19.18)

b.  

(12) ha-yeladim yašnu kul-am
     the-children slept all-3MP
     'The children all slept.' (slightly adapted from Shlonsky 1991:167)

(13) Basic V(S)O Word Order
     qābar  ?abrahām ?et šārā  ?išt-ô
     bury..PFV.3MS Abraham ACC Sarah wife-3MS.GEN
     'Abraham buried Sarah, his wife.' (Gen 23.19)

     and-call..PFV.3MS God to.the-light day and to.the-darkness call.PFV.3MS night
     'God called the light 'day', and THE DARKNESS1 he called 1 night.' (Gen 1.5)
Although very sketchy in its details, this basic overview of Biblical Hebrew word order is sufficient for the present analysis.

2.1.2 Oblique Pronouns and Differential Object Marking

Biblical Hebrew exhibits differential object marking, which is to say that (non-pronominal) direct objects can be split into two classes: those that receive overt morphological marking and those that do not. The differential object marker is exponed by the clitic adposition ?et (glossed as ACC throughout, and traditionally referred to as the definite direct object marker) which immediately precedes the direct object (see Dresher 2009). Definiteness is one among many parameters which regulate the distribution of differential object marking in Biblical Hebrew. In his corpus of Standard Biblical Hebrew, Bekins (2012: 113) reports that 70% (537/766) of definite direct objects are overtly marked, compared to only 1% (3/229) of marked indefinite direct objects. Representative examples of definite and indefinite direct objects, with and without ?et respectively, are given in (15a)–(15b).

(15) Lexical/non-pronominal direct objects

a. *Definite, animate object —> ?et*
   
   way-yāšem šām ?et hā-?ādām
   and-set.PFV.3MS there ACC the-man
   'He set the man there.' (Gen 2.8)

b. *Indefinite, animate object —> no ?et*
   
   ?āšīmā ūāl-ay melek
   set.JUSS.1S over-1S king
   'Let me set a king over myself.' (Deut 17.14)

Pronominal objects, by contrast, are either cliticized to the verb as in (16a), or to ?et as in (16b).

(16) Pronominal direct object

a. *Pronoun cliticized to verb*
   
   hī pīṣ-ām YHWH
   scatter.PFV.3MS-3MP.ACC YHWH
   'YHWH scattered them.' (Gen 11.9)

b. *Pronoun cliticized to ?et*
   
   way-yittēn ?ōt-ām ?êtōhām bi-rqî haš-šāmāyim
   and-set.IPFV.3MS ACC-3MP god in-expanse the-heavens
   'And God set them in the expanse of the heavens' (Gen 1.17)

The fact that the differential object marker in (16b) surfaces as ?ōt is a result of regular allomorphy in the context.

---


of pronominal clitics: the differential object marker surfaces as ?et before second person plural clitic pronouns, and as ?êt before all other clitic pronouns, as illustrated in Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person/Gender</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ût-î</td>
<td>ût-ânû</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2M</td>
<td>ût-ôkâ</td>
<td>ût-ôkem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F</td>
<td>ût-ôk</td>
<td>ût-ôkem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>ût-ôk</td>
<td>ût-ôkem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>ût-ôk</td>
<td>ût-ôkem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Differential object marker ?et with pronominal clitics [Van der Merwe et al. 2017: 282]

Pronominal complements of prepositions (17a) and pronominal possessors (17b) always appear as clitics, never as independent pronouns, and do not participate in differential object marking.

(17) a. **Cliticized pronominal complement of preposition**

\[
\text{way-yō?mer lā-hem ûlôhîm} \\
\text{AND-say.IP.FV.3S MS to-3MP god} \\
\text{'And God said to them...'} \quad \text{(Gen 1.28)}
\]

b. **Cliticized pronominal possessor**

\[
\text{sûpôt-ëm} \\
\text{language-3MP.GEN} \\
\text{'their language'} \quad \text{(Gen 11.7)}
\]

2.1.3 Relative clauses

A prototypical Biblical Hebrew relative clause is given in (18):

(18) way-yar? ûet hâ-ûgâlõtî ûsêr šâlah yôsëp lâ-šët ût-ô \\
and-see.PFV.3S ACC the-wagons.FP C send.PFV.3S ACC Joseph to-take.INF ACC-3S

The traditional Biblical Hebrew and Comparative Semitics literature refers to pronominal objects, complements of prepositions, and possessors as **pronominal suffixes**, though according to at least one test they are more accurately defined as (morphophonological) **clitics**. Zwicky & Pullum argue that clitics can attach to a wider range of hosts than can affixes (1983: 503). In Biblical Hebrew, the same paradigm of pronominal elements is manifested with nouns, prepositions, and verbs (**modulo** regular allomorphic variation).

(i) lô-kâ \\
to-2MS
(ii) ûahi-kâ \\
brother-2MS.GEN
(iii) wi-šêl-ô-kâ \\
and-ask.PFV.3S ACC-2MS.ACC

'to you' (Gen 3.11) 'your brother' (Gen 4.9) 'and he asks you' (Gen 32.18)

Thus, I will refer to these reduced pronominals as clitics throughout. See Shlonsky [1992] for a similar argument with respect to Modern Hebrew, and Weninger [2011: 168] for the classification of oblique pronouns in Semitic in general as clitics.

8 This section relies heavily on Holmstedt [2016], especially pp. 1-9.
'And he saw the wagons that Joseph sent to take him.' (Gen 45.27)

Relative clauses in Biblical Hebrew are formed either with a relative complementizer or relative pronoun, but never with both. In point of fact, the relative complementizer strategy is used in the lion's share of attested examples. Holmstedt (2016: 1 n.4) estimates a total of 9,599 relative clauses in the Hebrew Bible, out of which at most 37 contain the relative pronouns mî 'who' and m¯ah 'what'—that is, roughly 0.4% of the entire corpus (see Holmstedt 2016: 300-303). I will not consider relative pronouns in this paper in any detail.

Five distinct relative complementizers are attested in Biblical Hebrew, illustrated in (19)–(23).

(19) ʔašer
kì tôr-ēm ʔet had-erek tōhā ʔašer yēl'kū b-āhî
because teach.IPV.2MS-3MP.ACC ACC the-way FS the-good FS C walk.IPV.3MP on-3FS
'Because you will teach them the good way on which they should walk. (lit. the good way that they should walk on it)’ (1 Kgs 8.36)

(20) šeC-
ʔašrē hā-Ŷâm1 šek-kākâ ll-ðî1
Blessed the-people MS C-thus to-3MS
'Blessed is the people to whom such (blessings) belong. (lit. the people that thus belongs to it)’ (Ps 144.15)

(21) 9
Note that the other potential example of an in-situ, headless mî/m¯ah relative is Jer 5.15, which I analyze instead as an embedded interrogative. The rest of the relative clauses alleged to contain relative pronouns occupy a clause-initial position, and all but one (Num 23.3) are headless, giving them the appearance of regular wh-questions, as in (iii).

(i) lî? yēdaʕî hā-Ŷādām mah šey-yihyeh
NEG know.IPV.3MS the-man what C-happen.IPV.3MS
'Man does not know what will happen.' (Qoh 10.14)

(ii) bahʔrû lâ-κêm hayyôt [DP ʔet mî1 [CP lāʔbōdûn __1]]
choose.IMP MP for-2MP today ACC who1 serve.IPV.2MP __1
'Choose for yourselves today [DP who1 [CP you will serve __1]].' (Josh 24.15)

Note that the other potential example of an in-situ, headless mî/m¯ah relative is Jer 5.15, which I analyze instead as an embedded interrogative. The rest of the relative clauses alleged to contain relative pronouns occupy a clause-initial position, and all but one (Num 23.3) are headless, giving them the appearance of regular wh-questions, as in (iii).

(iii) māh rʔıtêm ʔâšīti mahʔrû kāmô-nî
what see.IPV.2MP do.IPV.1S do.IMP MP like-1S
Relative parse: 'What you have seen me do, do __1 like me.' (Judg 9.48)
Non-relative/Biclausal parse: 'What have you seen me do? Act like me.' (Judg 9.48)

We must proceed with caution, then, in discussing this extremely marginal relativization strategy.
You will show them the path on which they will walk. (lit. 'the path (that) they will walk on it') (Exod 18.20)

(22) zeh (masc.) / zô (fem.) / zû (indecl.) (henceforth the z-series)\(^{12}\)

\[\text{h}^3\text{-lô} \text{?el [q'?šînê ?anšê ham-milhîmâ]_1} \text{he-hâl}^3\text{kû} \text{itt-ô} \text{go.} \text{PFV.3P} \text{with-3MS} \]

'He said to [the chiefs of the men of war]_1 that \_1 had gone with him...' (Jos 10.24)

These five constituents are to be glossed as relative complementizers and not as relative pronouns for three reasons. The first reason is formal: with the exception of z-series, which is optionally marked for gender, none of the Biblical Hebrew relative words exhibit features associated with the category D(eterminer) (e.g. \(\phi\)-features or case). If the Biblical Hebrew relative words are of the category C, then this fact is not at all surprising. The second is distributional: relative pronouns and resumptive pronouns in many languages have mutually exclusive distributions and cannot be employed simultaneously (de Vries 2002: 177). Resumptive pronouns are attested with all of the aforementioned relative words, a fact which would be typologically unexpected if they were in fact relative pronouns. Finally, none of these relative words permit pied piping of prepositions or of possessors, as illustrated in (24) and (25).

(24) Unattested preposition pied-piping in relative clauses

\[*[\text{CP} [\text{PP} \{ ?^a\text{šer} / \text{še} / \text{∅} / \text{z-series} / h^3\text{C-} \}] \_1 \ldots \_1 \ldots \] \]

(25) Unattested possessor pied-piping in relative clauses

\[*[\text{CP} [\text{DP} \{ ?^a\text{šer} / \text{še} / \text{∅} / \text{z-series} / h^3\text{C-} \} \text{Poss} \_1 \ldots \_1 \ldots \] \]

On the basis of these three tests, I conclude that the Biblical Hebrew relative words in (19)–(23) are relative

\(^{12}\)Comparative-historical work on Semitic has demonstrated that the Biblical Hebrew z-series of complementizers are cognate with relative pronouns in other West Semitic languages, including Goššîz, Ugaritic, and Aramaic (cf. Hasselbach 2007; Huehnergard 2006; Huehnergard and Pat-El 2018; and Huehnergard 2019). See also Holmstedt 2016: 111-112, fn. 8) for the claim that relative clauses with construct-state heads and overt complementizers always carry a restrictive interpretation.

For relative clauses with null complementizers and construct-state heads in Akkadian, see Henry 2013, and on the same in Semitic more generally, see Lipinski 2001 §57.3, Pat-El 2014, Huehnergard and Pat-El 2018, and Huehnergard 2019. See also Holmstedt 2016: 111-112, fn. 8) for more examples. Interestingly, none of these examples involves resumption.

See Holmstedt 2016: 112, fn. 9) for more examples. Interestingly, none of these examples involves resumption.
complementizers and not relative pronouns (contra Kautzsch 1910 §138, Bauer and Leander 1922 §32, Waltke and O’Connor 1990 §19; Huehnergard 2006; Joüon and Muraoka 2016 §38).

This paper does not consider the complementizer $\text{h}^a\text{C}$- in any detail, as it is homophonous with the definite article in Biblical Hebrew, generating numerous ambiguous examples. I leave it to future research to provide a more thorough analysis of the distribution of resumptive pronouns with $\text{h}^a\text{C}$- relatives. Summary counts for the former four complementizers are given in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Complementizer</th>
<th># of attested examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{ḥ}^a\text{šer}$</td>
<td>5500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\emptyset$</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{šeC}$-</td>
<td>139$^{15}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{zeh/žî/zû}$</td>
<td>25$^{16}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Biblical Hebrew complementizer counts adapted from Holmstedt (2016)

A host of factors constrain the distribution of the Biblical Hebrew relative complementizers, including:

(a) **Diachrony**: The z-series complementizers are restricted primarily to Archaic Biblical Hebrew (ca. 1100(?)-1000 B.C.E.) (Gianto 2016: 27).

**Note**: See Holmstedt (2016 57–85), Joüon & Muraoka (2016 503), and Steiner (1997 171) for similar arguments.

$\text{h}^a\text{C}$- is unambiguously a complementizer when it is prefixed to finite verbs, as in (i).

(i) $\text{t̂rûmat bêt }\text{ḥ}^a\text{lōhē-nû }\text{ha-hērimū }\text{ham-melek w}^3\text{-yō\\̣}^3\text{šay-w w}^3\text{-sārāy-w w}^3\text{-kōl yîšrā’êl}$

offering house god-1psgen C-offer,pfv,3p the-king and-counselors-3ms,gen and-princes-3ms,gen and-all Israel

han-nimsâ?im ____1

the-remaining

'(I weighed out...) the offering of the house of our God that the king, his counselors, his princes, and all of Israel that remained had offered ____1.' (Ezra 8.25)

This example nonetheless presents other difficulties, including the apparent lack of agreement between the relative internal subject $\text{ḥ}^a\text{nimsâ}{'im}$ ‘stones (fp)’ and predicative participle $\text{nimsâ}{'im}$ ‘is found (ms)’.

(ii) $\text{w}^3\text{-ha-hērimū}$ $\text{bêt }\text{ḥ}^a\text{bānîm nāt^nû}$ $\text{P-ḥôsar bêt }\text{YHWH}$

and-C-be.found,ptcp,ms with-3ms stones,fp give,pfv,3p to-treasury house YHWH

'And the (one) that stones (fp) are found (ms) with him gave (an offering) to the treasury of the house of YHWH.' (1 Chr 29.8)

This example nonetheless presents other difficulties, including the apparent lack of agreement between the relative internal subject $\text{ḥ}^a\text{bānîm }\text{stones (fp)}$ and predicative participle $\text{nimsâ}{'im}$ ‘is found (ms)’.

Note that also Holmstedt’s contention that “Hebrew disallows overt resumption in [h$^a$C]- relatives” appears to be undermined by the following example, with a PP-internal resumptive pronoun (2016 170).

13 See Holmstedt (2016 57–85), Joüon & Muraoka (2016 503), and Steiner (1997 171) for similar arguments.

14 $\text{h}^a\text{C}$- is unambiguously a complementizer when it is prefixed to finite verbs, as in (i).

15 Holmstedt (2012 113) cites 139 examples of šeC- in relative and non-relative contexts, and he lists 139 examples in Holmstedt (2016 286-298), but he cites the figure 136 in (2016 97). Waltke & O’Connor claim that there are 138 instances of šeC- (1990 331 n.1).

16 I add Isa 25.9 to the 24 examples cited in Holmstedt (2016 298-300).
(b) **Geography and dialect**: šeC- may be representative of a Northern dialect influenced by Phoenician (Holmstedt and Kirk 2016; see also Rendsburg 2003).

(c) **Syntax**: $h^dC-$ is nearly always used with subject relatives, while $?^4\text{šer}$ is used with all possible relativized positions, including subject, object, complement of a preposition, time/place/manner adjuncts, etc.

Every relative complementizer can modify both overt and null external heads, and the corresponding relative clause can have either a restrictive or a non-restrictive/appositive interpretation. For a thorough treatment of the Biblical Hebrew relative clause and an overview thereof, see Holmstedt (2016) and (2013c), respectively.

### 2.2 Corpus of Biblical Hebrew

Broadly speaking, I take as my object of study relevant examples from the entire Biblical Hebrew corpus of the Masoretic Text, using the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* as my text (see Khan 2013). I do not consider dialectal or diachronic splits therein. I also exclude Biblical Aramaic from my discussion (see Rosenthal 1961:5-6 for the extent of that corpus). I have culled relative clause and dislocation examples largely from the tagged Holmstedt-Abegg Syntactic Database of Ancient Hebrew using Accordance Bible Software. These searches were checked against examples cited in the standard reference grammars (e.g. Joüon and Muraoka 2016; Van der Merwe et al. 2017; Waltke and O’Connor 1990) and in specialized monographic and article-length works (for relative clauses, Holmstedt 2016; Joosten 1993; Parunak 1996; Tsujita 1991; for dislocation, Groß 1987; Holmstedt 2014; Naudé 1990; Westbury 2014). I am also greatly indebted to Robert Holmstedt for sharing his data on resumption in Biblical Hebrew relative clauses with me (in addition to the extensive appendices he provides in Holmstedt 2016), against which I have checked my data. In the end, however, our corpora do not entirely overlap.

### 3 Dislocations in Biblical Hebrew

#### 3.1 Introduction and Literature Review

A well-spring of research in recent years has been devoted to understanding the syntax and pragmatics of Biblical Hebrew sentences like the following:

(26) a. lâken [ham-mittâi, ?$^4\text{šer}$ ţâlitâ ššâmî lô têrêd mimmen-nâî]

Therefore the-bed.FS C go.up.PFV.2MS there NEG go.down.1PFV.2MS from-3FS

‘Therefore the bed$_1$ that you have gone up on–you will not come down from it$_1$.’ (2 Kgs 1.16)

b. ?et YHWH$_1$ s$^b$bâ?)ôtî $?^4\text{šot-ôî}$ taqdišû

ACC YHWH hosts ACC-3MS honor.1PFV.2MP
Such examples have faced an identity crisis within Biblical Hebrew studies, with most scholars coining new labels for them in each dedicated treatment. The most commonly used labels are *casus pendens* (Davidson 1901; Groß 1987; Jouon and Muraoka 2016; Kautzsch 1910; see Kogan 2008 on Akkadian), *extraposition* (Goldenberg 2013; Groß 2013; Khan 1988; Zewi 1999), and *(left) dislocation* (Holmstedt 2014; Holmstedt and Jones 2014; Jones 2015; Naudé 1990; Naudé and Miller-Naudé 2017; Van der Merwe et al. 2017; Westbury 2014, 2016). In this paper, I elect to refer to the super-set category containing (26a)–(26b) as *dislocation*, the basic structure of which can be schematized as in (27): a clause-peripheral constituent (the *dislocate*) is linked to its host clause via a (typically pronominal) coreferential constituent, referred to here as the *correlate* (Alexiadou 2017).

(27) **Dislocation schematized**

\[
\text{dislocate}_1 \ [\text{Host Clause} \ldots \text{correlate}_1 \ldots]
\]

Pretheoretically, I follow Ott (2014; 2015) and use the purely descriptive label ’correlate’ rather than ’resumptive element’, as it is not clear *a priori* whether the resumption that we find in Biblical Hebrew dislocations is indeed comparable to resumption in relative clauses.

It has frequently been assumed that Biblical Hebrew attests only a single type of dislocation, defined either structurally or discourse-pragmatically. The majority of scholars who adopt a structural definition of dislocation converge on some variant of the following: a (pro-)nominal constituent, *optionally* marked by the differential object marker *ет* or a preposition, stands syntactically outside of the clause, separated by an intonational boundary, and is obligatorily related to a coreferential (pro-)nominal element in the clause (Groß 1987: 1, 2, Jouon and Muraoka 2016 §156, Moshavi 2010: 81-84, Holmstedt 2014: 118-124, Van der Merwe et al. 2017: 510). Under this view, (26a) and (26b) are unified by the presence of a clause-internal correlate, and should be contrasted with examples of *fronting* or *topicalization*, as in (28), which contains a clause-internal gap.

(28) û-mal?âk-îm šâlah gidîôn bâ-kol har ʔęprayim and-messengers send.PFV.3MS Gideon in-all mountain Ephraim

’And messengers₁, Gideon sent through all Mt. Ephraim.’ (Jdg 7.24)

In other words, the clause following a dislocate is syntactically complete by virtue of the presence of the correlate, whereas the clause following a topicalized constituent is incomplete.

---

17 Other labels include *front dislocation* (Korchin 2015), *hanging topic* (Cowper and DeCaen 2017), *preposing* (Moshavi 2010), and *pronominal agreement* (Khan 1988).

18 Other diagnostics have also been proposed to distinguish dislocation from topicalization, though none prove criterial. For instance, Groß (1987: 31-32, 186), Naudé (1990: 127), Cowper & DeCaen (2017: 13-14, 27), and van der Merwe et al. (2017: 513) argue that only dislocates can occur before *wh*-words, as in (26).

---

13
Another school of thought, working within the framework of constructional grammar, has argued for a gradient, cognitively-motivated definition for dislocations, wherein a set of non-identical syntactic constructions orbit a central type or pattern (Westbury 2014, 2016: 66). Under this analysis, the only feature which is critical for dislocation is "the presence of a constituent(s) located outside, and in front of, the boundary of the clause with which it is semantically or pragmatically associated" (Westbury 2014: 23). In addition to prototypical examples like (26a)–(26b), these scholars argue that temporal phrases or clauses preceding a main clause should also be categorized as dislocations, albeit more marginal cases, even though they lack an overt correlate. For instance, Westbury (2014: 270) claims that the clause "Joab was seizing the city" in (29) is one of these non-prototypical dislocates:

(29) [wa-y^ hurried -bi-šmôr yôABB ́el hâ-`îr] way-yittên ?et ́?ûriyyâ ?el ham-mâqôm and-be.IPV.3MS in-watch.INF Joab to the-city and-assign.IPV.3MS ACC Uriah to the-place 'Joab was seizing the city, and he assigned Uriah to the place...' (2 Sam 11.16)

In Westbury's analysis, (26a), (26b), and (29) are functionally unified. Following Lambrecht (1994: 185), Westbury claims that the clause "Joab was seizing the city" in (29) is one of these non-prototypical dislocates:

Yet topicalized constituents, which correspond to gaps inside the host clause, can also appear before wh-words (cf. Holmstedt's so-called "extreme Topic fronting" (2014: 148-149)):

(ii) [bi-šAR m^kînôt ham-melek] meh `âsû in-rest provinces the-king what do.PFV.3P

'In the rest of the king's provinces, what have they done ___1?' (Est 9.12; see also Gen 27.37; Ps 139.17, 147.17; Qoh 4.11, 8.7)

Cowper & DeCaen assimilate examples like (ii) to dislocation constructions by assuming that there is a null resumptive prepositional phrase inside the main clause (2017: 27). An essential problem with this analysis is that Biblical Hebrew does not otherwise seem to permit null prepositional phrases. This issue is also addressed in Section 4 below with respect to resumptive-gap alternations in relative clauses with predicates like bhr 'to choose'. I conclude, then, that the position of constituents before interrogative pronouns cannot distinguish between dislocations and topicalization/fronting. Note in connection with this that Modern Hebrew topical elements must precede wh-words.

(iii) a. et ha ma'amar ha ze eize student hiclaxta lešaxne'a likro?
   ACC the this which student you.managed to.convince to.read

   'This article, which student did you manage to convince to read?' (Slonsky 2014: 336)

b. ??eize which student et ha ma'amar ha ze hiclaxta lešaxne'a likro?
   which student ACC the this which you.managed to.convince to.read

   (int.) 'Which student did you manage to convince to read this article?' (Slonsky 2014: 336)

On the basis of these and other data, Slonsky (2014) proposes the cartography of functional projections given in (iv) for Modern Hebrew (where ">" indicates both linear precedence and hierarchical dominance).

(iv) Modern Hebrew Left Periphery
   Top > Foc > Top > Wh > Foc
   Slonsky 2014: 339

Cowper & DeCaen also group prototypical dislocations (i.e. with a nominal dislocate) together with purportedly dislocated temporal phrases and adjunct clauses, arguing that these constructions are abstractly syntactically parallel (2017: 24-29).
bury assumes that a cognitive cost is associated with both introducing and talking about a referent in the same clause, and he argues that both prototypical and non-prototypical 'dislocations' relieve this burden. A series of recent works inspired by Westbury's approach have either adopted the cognitive-functional definition of dislocations for Biblical Hebrew (see Van der Merwe et al. 2017) or extended it to other languages (see Andrason 2016a,b). In summary, then, the consensus view among Biblical Hebrew scholars has been to recognize only a single category of dislocation, variably defined in terms of the presence vs. absence of a correlate, or in terms of the cognitive motivations for such constructions.

To my knowledge, only four studies have discriminated between types of dislocations in Biblical Hebrew: Khan (1988), Naudé (1990), Westbury (2014), and Cowper & DeCaen (2017). All recognize a difference between dislocates which case-match their correlates and dislocates which do not, at least in passing, though none brings this distinction to bear on their analysis of the Biblical Hebrew data. Naudé at first suggests that case-marked dislocates are more connected to the host clause than are non-case-marked dislocates: "[T]he use of the nota accusativi...to mark a preposed object means that it is not indeterminate or neutral, but the marked object of the following verb. By that token, it forms an integral part of the following clause" (1990: 119-120). However, Naudé later abandons the case-matching distinction and opts for a uniform analysis of dislocations, stating that "a dislocated NP does not always assume the case of the resumptive pronoun within [the host clause]... On the contrary, dislocated constituents...seem to be assigned nominative case, irrespective of the case assigned to the resumptive NP" (1990: 126). This is surprising, since he cites the example in (30) which contains an accusative-marked dislocate (1990: 125):

(30) gam ʔōt-ō1 hakkū-hū1
      even ACC-3MS strike.IMP.MP-3MS.ACC 'Even him1, strike him1.' (2 Kgs 9.27)

Therefore, while Naudé raises the issue of case-matching, he does not maintain this distinction in his analysis of the Biblical Hebrew data.

Westbury only brings up case-connectivity as a possible diagnostic for differentiating types of dislocations in other languages. Westbury's discussion of "Clitic Left Dislocation", a species of dislocation known from Greek, Spanish, and Italian in which the dislocate and correlate must case-match, plays no role in his taxonomy of the Biblical Hebrew data. In the end, he abstracts over the syntactic differences between dislocates and opts for a cognitively motivated definition.

---

20 Jones (2015: 140, fn. 163) suggests that all of the dislocates in his corpus of Hellenistic Period Hebrew should be analyzed as Hanging Topics on the basis of three diagnostics: (i) epithets (i.e. non-pronominal DPs) may serve as correlates; (ii) Hanging Topics are primarily used as a topic-shifting strategy; (iii) correlates may be 'null', for instance in the subject position.
Cowper & DeCaen likewise recognize a contrast between types of dislocates in other languages but fall short of bringing this intuition to bear on Biblical Hebrew. They observe that German and Dutch employ two distinct dislocation strategies differentiated by the presence vs. absence of (i) case-matching and (ii) contrastive interpretations, referring to both constructions as "Hanging Topics". Dislocates of the first type may be marked for default nominative case and are interpreted as non-contrastive, while dislocates of the second type must case-match their correlates and are interpreted as contrastive. Yet they never assess the Biblical Hebrew data in light of this contrast. Rather, they wrap up their discussion with a nod to future research: "Given that in [Biblical Hebrew], the [Hanging Topic] only optionally agrees in case with the resumptive pronoun, the question is to what extent [Hanging Topic] constructions are similarly contrastive syntactically" (2017: 13).

Khan, on the other hand, consistently distinguishes between dislocates with, and dislocates without, overt case-matching in his survey of several ancient Semitic languages, referring to the former as "pronominal agreement", and to the latter as "extraposition" (1988: xxvi-xxviii). It is remarkable that this discovery has received little recognition in all subsequent work on dislocations in Biblical Hebrew. In Khan's view, "extraposition" involves a clause-initial nominal that "is not adjoined to any relational particle such as a preposition or an object marker and in those languages which have case inflection it is generally in the nominative" (1988: xvi). "Pronominal agreement", on the other hand, "is a construction where a noun or nominal phrase whose grammatical relation is indicated by its case inflection or by an adjoining relational particle is accompanied in the same clause by a coreferential pronoun agreeing with it in number, gender, person, and grammatical relation" (1988: xxvi-xxvii). Thus, Khan's bipartite classification relies on the presence vs. absence of case-matching on, or of prepositions with, the dislocate (Khan 1988: 71-77).21

In summary, a handful of scholars have noted—to a greater or lesser degree—that there exists a basic contrast between two kinds of dislocates in Biblical Hebrew: those that case-match, or occur with the same preposition as, their correlates, and those that do not. Yet none have explored other empirical differences between the two constructions or documented the full range of attested examples to substantiate such claims. I believe that the variation in Biblical Hebrew dislocations has not been sufficiently investigated because this research

21Khan's analysis differs from the one presented here, however, insofar as he assimilates dislocations with case-matching as in (30) to constructions in Syriac in which the lexical direct object is proleptically marked by a pronominal clitic on the verb, as in (i) (which Khan refers to as "anticipatory pronominal agreement" (1988: 128)).

(i) we-škāh-eh  la-mšiḥā
   and-he.found-3MS.ACC ACC-Messiah
   'He found the Messiah' (Syriac; Khan 1988: 128, citing Brockelmann 1908: 14)

Whereas accusative-marked dislocates occur clause-initially, the direct object in the Syriac example in (i) occurs in its usual, clause-internal position. I submit that these phenomena ought to receive independent analyses.
has operated in near isolation: no attempts have been made to systematically compare the Biblical Hebrew data with that of other languages, even though many of these scholars appear to be aware of such data (cf. the discussions in Westbury 2014: ch. 3, Cowper and DeCaen 2017: 11-14). In this section, I will show that such comparisons compel us towards the conclusion already hinted at by Khan, Naudé, Westbury, and Cowper & DeCaen—namely, that we can tease apart two empirically distinct phenomena in what the Biblical Hebrew scholarship (and indeed the scholarship on Semitic languages in general) has treated as a unitary category of dislocation, corresponding to [27].

The broader literature on such constructions in other languages has identified two sub-categories of dislocation: (i) Hanging Topics, and (ii) clitic or contrastive left dislocation—here referred to as Left Dislocation (see Cinque 1983; Anagnostopoulou et al. 1997; Grohmann 2000; López 2009; Alexiadou 2017; among many others). Hanging Topics and Left Dislocates are unified by the presence of an (overt) correlate (often referred to as a resumptive pronoun), but they differ in the extent to which they exhibit connectivity effects (Cinque 1983; Alexiadou 2017). On the one hand, Hanging Topics fail to show any connectivity with their correlates. For instance, they do not (or need not) case-match their correlates, as shown by the Czech Hanging Topic in (31).

(31) **Hanging Topic**

                                 Honza, viděla jsem chlapa, který ho zná
Honza.NOM saw AUX.1S guy REL him.ACC.CL knows

'Honza, I saw a guy who knows him.' (Czech; Sturgeon 2008: 59)

Such connectivity effects are present, however, in Left Dislocation: Left Dislocates obligatorily case-match their correlates, as illustrated by the German example in (32).

(32) **Left Dislocation**

                                        Dem Peter, dem hat Maria schon oft geholfen.
the.DAT Peter him.DAT has Maria already often helped

'Maria has often helped Peter.' (German; Ott 2015: 226)

The remainder of this section aims to substantiate the claim that Biblical Hebrew attests both Hanging Topics and Left Dislocates, and to formally account for the distinct syntactic properties of each. First, it is

For simplicity, I adopt the proposal in Anagnostopoulou (1997) to treat Clitic and Contrastive dislocation as variants of a single phenomenon, distinguished only by the shape of the correlate. The former are known from Italian, Modern Hebrew, and Greek, and involve a clitic correlate, while the latter are known primarily from Germanic languages, and contain a demonstrative correlate (Alexiadou 2017: 2138). The label "clitic left dislocation" is particularly inappropriate for Biblical Hebrew since both clitic and free, differential object marked correlates are employed in Left Dislocation. Such a label would miss an obvious broader generalization about these constructions which goes beyond phonological properties of the correlate. The label "contrastive dislocation" presupposes a particular view of how these Biblical Hebrew constructions function in discourse for which we lack concrete evidence. I therefore follow the precedent set by Ott and refer to the umbrella category containing Clitic and Contrastive dislocation as Left Dislocation (2015: 226 n.1).
shown that these two dislocation constructions can be empirically teased apart according to the diagnostics in (33).

(33) **Diagnostics for distinguishing Hanging Topics from Left Dislocation**

- a. Phrasal category of the dislocate
- b. Presence vs. absence of case-mismatches between dislocate and correlate
- c. Presence vs. absence of correlates inside syntactic islands
- d. Presence vs. absence of anti-reconstruction effects
- e. 'As for' phrases
- f. Use of epithets as correlates

Discriminating between these two constructions also reveals a potential diachronic trend towards the exclusive use of Hanging Topics in the history of the Hebrew language: Left Dislocates are outnumbered by Hanging Topics in Biblical Hebrew, are either rare or unattested in later varieties such as Qumranic and Mishnaic Hebrew, and are ungrammatical in Modern Hebrew.

Second, it is argued that Hanging Topics are base generated in the left periphery and do not relate to their correlates via movement. This accurately predicts that Hanging Topics consistently lack connectivity effects. Whereas some previous literature has argued that Hanging Topics in other languages are CP adjuncts (see Cinque 1983; Grohmann 2000; Sturgeon 2008), it is argued here that Biblical Hebrew Hanging Topics are Merged in the specifier of a dedicated functional projection in the left periphery—here taken to be Top(ic). A Merge analysis predicts the fixed position of Hanging Topics in the left periphery viz a viz other left peripheral constituents, and correctly predicts that Hanging Topics cannot be iterated—two facts which the Adjunction analysis does not straightforwardly account for. The basic proposal is sketched in (34).

23 I have also discovered that several diagnostics proposed for other languages are unreliable in Biblical Hebrew (see Alexiadou 2017 for an overview of these diagnostics). These include the following:

- i. Prosody (as indicated by disjunctive Masoretic accents): Both Hanging Topics and Left Dislocates are attested with prosodic breaks, and I have found no significant patterns regarding which disjunctive accents are used in each.

- ii. Form of the correlate: Both Hanging Topics and Left Dislocates are attested with clitic and ?et-marked correlates.

- iii. Occurrence in embedded contexts: Both Hanging Topics and Left Dislocates are attested in embedded clauses.
Finally, following recent proposals by Ott (2014, 2015), Left Dislocates in Biblical Hebrew are argued to be remnants of clausal ellipsis in asyndetic coordination. Under this view, Left Dislocation is underlyingly biclausal; the dislocate and correlate are generated in separate, but nearly identical clauses. This account derives the fact that the dislocate appears linearly juxtaposed to the second clause (i.e. the host clause). Thus, Left Dislocation is assimilated to other clausal ellipsis phenomena, such as sluicing (Ross 1969, Merchant 2001), fragment answers (Merchant 2004a), and split questions (Arregi 2010). The basics of this proposal are illustrated in (35), where I adopt Koster’s (2000) Colon Phrase ":P", an obligatorily null asyndetic coordinator, as the formal linkage between the two clauses—schematically, [ :P [ : YP ]] (see also Ott and De Vries 2016). This claim is sketched for a Biblical Hebrew example in (36).

This analysis relies on two assumptions which jointly derive the surface pattern of Left Dislocation: (i) ellipsis
is implemented as PF-deletion triggered by an ellipsis feature (E feature, for short; Merchant 2001) and (ii) the
dislocate is assumed to undergo A-bar movement to [Spec, CP] prior to TP-ellipsis, triggered by a strong feature
(call it [F*]) on C. The finer mechanics will be explained in detail in subsequent sections.

The ellipsis account of Left Dislocation is to be contrasted with movement-based accounts, in which the
left dislocate moves from a position internal to the host clause (see Cinque 1977; Aoun and Benmamoun 1998;
Grohmann 2000; Boeckx 2003; Zeller 2009). While the latter capture a host of connectivity effects evident in
Left Dislocation (e.g. case-matching), they fail to predict attested anti-connectivity effects, such as φ-feature mismatches between the dislocate and correlate. These facts are entirely consistent with the ellipsis approach,
since Left Dislocates move from a position internal to the first clause, but relate only anaphorically to the cor-
relate in the second clause. Ultimately, my proposal serves as a vindication of Ott’s analysis of Left Dislocation
in the wake of recent counter-arguments (see especially den Dikken and Surányi 2017).

3.2 Biblical Hebrew has both Hanging Topics and Left Dislocates

This section is based on my survey of all the examples of third person dislocates in Biblical Hebrew which
could be identified as either Hanging Topics or as Left Dislocates according to cross-linguistically supported
diagnostics. All of the relevant data are given in transcription with translations in Appendices 1-2.

3.2.1 Diagnostic 1: Phrasal category of the dislocate

In many languages, it has been recognized that Hanging Topics are restricted to the category NP/DP. Example (37) illustrates that in English two copies of the preposition ‘to’—one with the dislocate, and one with the correlate—are not allowed. Dislocates must be nominal in English-style Hanging Topics.

(37) (*To) John, I have already spoken [to him]1. (Alexiadou 2017: 2141)

Left Dislocates, on the other hand, can be of any phrasal category (e.g. PP, VP, etc.).

(38) a. [PP in Spanien]1, [da1] trinken sie Wein zum Frühstück.

in Spain there drink they wine to the breakfast

‘In Spain1, there1 they drink wine at breakfast.’ (German; Ott 2015: 229)

24 I do not take up non-third person dislocates here. (i) below is one example of a non-case-matching second person Hanging Topic. See Khan (1988: 67) for more examples.

(i) ŷhûdã ?attâ1 yôḏû-ḵâ ?ahē-ḵâ1

Judah 2MS praise.IPV.3MP-2MS.ACC brothers-2MS.GEN

‘Judah, you1–your1 brothers will praise you1.’ (Gen 49.8)
b. [AP Bella], non [lo] é mai stata beautiful not it is never she been 'She has never been beautiful.' (Italian; Cinque 1990 cited in Ott 2015: 230)

Biblical Hebrew, in turn, attests both DP and PP dislocates.

(39) [DP ?ereš1 ] mimmen- [nā] yēšē? lāhem land.FS from-3FS come.IPFV.3MS bread 'As for) the land1, from it comes bread.' (Job 28.5)

(40) ū- [PP mē- ?ēš had-da[y]t tōb wā- rāf ]1 lō? tō?kal and- from-tree the-knowledge good and-evil NEG eat.IPFV.2MS from-3MS 'But [PP from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil]1, you shall not eat [PP from it]1' (Gen 2.17)

The presence of a PP dislocate in (40) constitutes positive evidence for Left Dislocation in Biblical Hebrew, parallel to the examples in (38). If Biblical Hebrew only had recourse to the Hanging Topic strategy, like English, we would predict PP dislocates as in (40) to be impossible, contrary to fact.

3.2.2 Diagnostic 2: Case-mismatches between the dislocate and correlate

In languages with overt case marking, Hanging Topics may bear default case rather than match their correlates, as shown in (41) for German.

(41) a. {Diesem Doktoranden1 } / Dieser Doktorand1, [ihm1] wird jeder Linguist {this.DAT doctoral.student.DAT / this.NOM doctoral.student.NOM} he.DAT will every linguist helfen. help

b. {Diesem Doktoranden1 } / Dieser Doktorand1, jeder Linguist wird [ihm1] {this.DAT doctoral.student.DAT / this.NOM doctoral.student.NOM} every linguist will he.DAT helfen. help

Both: 'This doctoral student1, every linguist will help him1.' (German; den Dikken and Surányi 2017: 545)

Left Dislocates do not exhibit this optionality: they must case-match their correlates. This is illustrated for Italian in (42).

(42) {Me1 / *Io1}, ha detto che [mi1] vede domani. {me.ACC / l.NOM} she.has said that me.CL.ACC she.will see tomorrow 'Me1, she said that she will see me1 tomorrow.' (Italian; Cinque 1990)

It is important to note here that the case-matching effects present in (41) and (42) are evidently distinct

---

25 See Ross (1973: 133–134, n.7) for the first allusion to this fact, and Cinque (1977) for further elaboration.
insofar as they track reconstruction effects differently. In German, only Left Dislocates with obligatory case-matching and $d$-pronoun correlates as in (43) exhibit reconstruction for variable binding. Hanging Topics with optional case-matching and regular, personal pronoun correlates do not permit reconstruction.

(43) **Left Dislocate with case-matching can reconstruct for variable binding**

Seinem$_1$ ersten Doktoranden, jeder Linguist$_1$ wird [dem] helfen
his first doctoral.student.DAT every linguist will $d$-PRON.DAT help

'His first doctoral student, every linguist will help him.' (den Dikken and Surányi 2017: 546)

(44) **Hanging Topic with case-matching cannot reconstruct for variable binding**

a. *Seinem$_1$ ersten Doktoranden, [ihm] wird jeder Linguist$_1$ helfen
his first doctoral.student.DAT he.DAT will every linguist help

b. *Seinem$_1$ ersten Doktoranden, jeder Linguist$_1$ wird [ihm] helfen
his first doctoral.student.DAT he.DAT will he.DAT help

'*His first doctoral student, every linguist will help him.' (den Dikken and Surányi 2017: 546)

This poses a problem for identifying the source of the optional case assigned to Hanging Topics. There is no clear way to restrict Hanging Topics from bearing an arbitrary case distinct from that of the correlate. Hanging Topics are not clearly c-commanded by a case-assigning head (e.g. $v$ or T). Neither is case the kind of feature that we expect to be 'passed' along via agreement or another operation which could conceivably link the Hanging Topic and its correlate (contra the proposals in Rodman 1997 and Vat 1997). The ellipsis solution proposed below for Left Dislocation will likewise not easily carry over to optional case-matching with Hanging Topics: whatever configuration licenses ellipsis in Left Dislocation must permit both case-connectivity and reconstruction, whereas the configuration that licenses Hanging Topics must license only case-connectivity and not reconstruction. I leave this issue to future research. I will simply note throughout where it is possible that a given example in Biblical Hebrew could be parsed as a Hanging Topic with optional case-matching.

Biblical Hebrew dislocates are attested both with and without case-matching. In (45), the pronominal dislocate ?ōt-$d$ 'him' matches the clitic correlate -hû 'him' for accusative case. In (46), the dislocate hî? 'it' bears nominative case and relates to the accusative clitic correlate -nâ 'it'.

(45) gam ?ōt-$d$, hakkû-[hû$_1$]

even ACC-3MS strike.IMP.MP-3MS.ACC

'Even him$_1$, strike him$_1$.' (2 Kgs 9.27)

(46) hî$_1$ ?ânân y“kassen-[nâ$_1$]$

3FS.NOM cloud covers-3FS.ACC

(refering to the nation of Egypt) 'It$_1$, a cloud covers it$_1$.' (Ezek 30.18)

Example (45) and others like it are ambiguous between a Hanging Topic parse with optional case-matching and a Left Dislocate parse. Example (46), with a case-mismatch (NOM/unmarked dislocate, ACC correlate), must be
a Hanging Topic, parallel to the German dislocates *Dieser Doktorand in (41)*, because only Hanging Topics may mismatch their correlates.

**3.2.3 Diagnostic 3: Island-sensitivity**

Dislocates also diverge with respect to their sensitivity to locality constraints (see Cinque [1977]). It has been recognized since Ross (1967) that Hanging Topics can be coreferential with correlates embedded in a variety of islands.

(47) **Hanging Topic with correlate in adjunct island**

Peter₁, Hans geht immer in die Kneipe, [island bevor er ihn₁ trifft].

Peter goes always to the pub before he him meets

'Peter₁, John always goes to the pub [island before he meets him₁].' (German; Shaer and Frey 2004: 472)

Left Dislocates, on the other hand, may not relate to correlates inside islands. Compare (47) with the minimally different, yet ungrammatical example in (48) with a case-matching dislocate (and d-pronoun correlate).

(48) **Left Dislocate relating to correlate in adjunct island is ungrammatical**

*Den Peter₁, Hans geht in die Kneipe, [island bevor er den₁ trifft].

the.ACC Peter goes to the pub before he him meets

(int.) 'Peter₁, John goes to the pub [island before he meets him₁].' (German; Shaer and Frey 2004: 472)

In Biblical Hebrew, nominative dislocates are attested relating to correlates in wh-islands and in relative clause islands, as seen in (49) and (50), respectively. These constitute positive evidence for the Hanging Topic strategy in Biblical Hebrew.

(49) **Correlate in wh-island**

a. kî [zeh mošeh hā-ʔiš ?ašer heʔešlā-nū mēʔereš misrayim]₁ lō?

because this.MS Moses the-man that bring.up.PFV.3MS-1P.ACC from-land Egypt NEG

yādaʔnū [Wh-Island meh hayā 1-ð₁]

know.PFV.1 what be.PFV.3MS to-3MS

'...because [this (guy), Moses, the man that brought us up from Egypt]₁, we don’t know [Wh-Island what happened to him]₁.' (Exod 32.1)

b. hā-riʔšônōṯ₁ [Wh-Island mā hēnnā hàgīdū ]

the-former.things.FP what 3FP say.IMP.MP

'The former things₁–say [Wh-Island what they₁ are].’ (Isa 41.22)

(50) **Correlate in relative clause island**

w̄̕-[kōl kī lī̕ hēreš ... ]₁ kōl [RC Island ?ašer b̄̕-tōk-ð₁] yitmā?

and-every jar earthenware all C in-middle-3MS.GEN be.unclean.PFV.3MS

'And [every earthen jar ...]₁, all [RC Island that is inside it₁] is unclean.’ (Lev 11.33)
Interestingly, there are several attested examples in which a generic indefinite nominal dislocate appears to connect to a silent subject correlate contained within an adjunct island, as in (51).26

(51) *?ādām [island kī yāmūt __ bā?-ʔōhel] kol hab-bā? ?el hā-ʔōhel wē-kol
man if die.IPfv.3MS in-tent every C-enter.ptcp.MS to the-tent
?āser bā-ʔōhel yītmā? šibṭaḥ yāmām
and-every C in-the-tent be.unclean.ipfv.3MS seven days

'As for a man, [island if __ dies in a tent], then everyone who comes into the tent and everyone who is in the tent will be unclean for seven days.' (Num 19.14) 27

Yet parsing this structure with a gap in the embedded subject position is tantamount to admitting A-bar movement (e.g. topicalization) out of an adjunct island. The solution, I submit, is to posit a null pro correlate in such examples. According to this hypothesis, (51) and (49)–(50) are structurally parallel: a dislocate relates to a (silent or overt) correlate contained within an island. The proposed underlying form of (51) is sketched in (52).

(52) *Hanging Topic with silent pronominal subject as correlate

?ādām1 [island kī yāmūt pro1 bā?-ʔōhel]
man if die.IPfv.3MS in-tent

'A man1, [island if he1 dies in a tent]...’ (Num 19.14)

Admittedly, in permitting null subject correlates, we run the risk of generating systematic ambiguities in simpler examples like (53) which do not contain islands. This example could either involve (i) A-bar movement that creates a filler-gap dependency, or (ii) a Hanging Topic relating to a null pro correlate.

(53) wē-[?attā wa-tū bādē-kā] yādaʾīti kī šer tūrūʔūn { ____ (?) / pro1 (?) } mip-pēnē
and-2MS and-servants-2-MS.GEN know.pfv.1S C not yet fear.pfv.2MP { ____ / pro } from-before

26 Khan observes that these sentences occur mostly in casuistic formulations (1988: 102–104).
27 See Groß 1987: 116 for more examples.
28 Cowper & DeCaen also posit that silent subject pronouns can function as correlates in Biblical Hebrew dislocation constructions (2017: 26). Null resumption is not at all uncommon in descriptions of A-bar dependencies in other languages. For instance, Georgopoulos (1991) argues Palauan lacks a movement strategy for forming long distance A-bar dependencies and that apparent gaps are actually null resumptive pronouns. Thus, the dislocate in [1] connects to a null pronoun contained within a relative clause island inside the host clause. I follow the source and do not gloss the prenominal marker a, which Georgopoulos claims "is a marker of full NPs (in complementary distribution with demonstratives), though it is not a marker of definiteness" (1991: 32).

(i) a buk1 a ku-dengel-li a redil [RC-island el uldurukl-li pro1 el mo er a delak ]
book irr-1S-pf-know-3S woman C r-pf-send-3S C go P mother-1S

'The book1, I know the woman who sent pro1 to my mother.' (Palauan; Georgopoulos 1991: 80)

Norcliffe (2009; 2009) argues that Yucatec employs null resumptive pronouns in A-bar dependencies with fully inflected verb forms. Evidence for this proposal comes from the island-insensitivity of such A-bar dependencies, as shown in [i] where the null subject of the embedded clause triggers third person ergative agreement (or clitic doubling) on the verb.

(i) lela’leli te artista1 hach uts ti’ inw ich bāax k-u1=pintart-ik-∅
this it DEF artist very good in 1erg eye what 3MP-3ERG=paint-ING-3ABS

'This is the painter1 that I like what (he1) paints' (Yucatec; Elisabeth Norcliffe 2009: 147)
YHWH ʾlōhîm
YHWH God

'But [you and your servants], I know that { ___1(?) / (you1(?)) } don't yet fear YHWH God.' (Exod 9.30)

These examples could theoretically be disambiguated on the basis of reconstruction and Weak and Strong Crossover effects, all of which are characteristic of A-bar movement. Without the presence of such illuminating features, however, the ambiguity persists. I have no easy solution to this question and must leave a fuller exposition of the issue to future work.

In summary, examples [(49)–(51)] constitute positive evidence for the Hanging Topic strategy in Biblical Hebrew: all contain non-case-matching dislocates relating to island-internal correlates. Crucially, there are no attested examples of PP dislocates or of case-matching dislocates relating to correlates inside islands.

(54) a. Unattested: *PP₁[HostClause ... [Island ... correlate₁ ... ] ... ]

29 The example in (i) appears at first blush to involve a Left Dislocate violating the Coordinate Structure Constraint: the accusative dislocate 'the living bird' relates to the third feminine singular correlate ʾāt-āh which seems to be the first conjunct in a series of accusative DP conjuncts.

(i) [ʾet had-šippōr ha-ha-yāyā] yiqqah ʾāt-āh[ACC-3FS] w⁴-[ʾet ʾēṣ hā-ṣerez] w⁴-[ʾet s³ni hat-tōlaʾat] w⁴-[ʾet] ha-ʾēzōh
the-bird.COLL the-living,FS take,PFV.3MS and-ACC wood the-cedar and-ACC scarlet the-worm and-ACC

'[The living bird], he shall take [it] and [the cedarwood] and [the scarlet yarn] and [the hyssop].' (Lev 14.6)

However, Jason Merchant (pers. comm.) has suggested to me that the series of conjuncts after the correlate ʾāt-āh 'it' could be remnants of stripping (a kind of clausal ellipsis with clausal conjunction), illustrated for English in (ii).


Under this analysis, the conjunction after the correlate ʾāt-āh 'it' would actually signal clausal coordination where the second clause has undergone some elision. I assume with Merchant (2003) that stripping involves clausal ellipsis, triggered by a stripping variant of an ellipsis feature E (dubbed "Estripping" in Wurmbrand 2017), added to the relevant functional head (in this case possibly Foc). Estripping bears two features: [uF*], which ensures that it is added to a head bearing a matching [F*] feature, and [uConj], which must be checked by a c-commanding conjunction. The remnant in stripping is attracted to [Spec, FocP] by the strong [F*] feature on Foc. My analysis for the stripping component of (i) is given below.

(iii) and...

Consequently, the Left Dislocate "the living bird" in (i) does not relate to a correlate inside an island.

25
3.2.4 Diagnostic 4: Anti-reconstruction effects

Next, I will discuss the presence of anti-reconstruction effects in Biblical Hebrew Hanging Topics. Reconstruction is defined as interpreting an overtly displaced constituent, in part or in whole, in a position through which it has moved (Heycock 1995, Fox 1999). Anti-reconstruction, therefore, involves obligatorily interpreting a displaced constituent in its surface position (see Lechner 2013). Now it has been observed that Hanging Topics in many languages do not permit reconstruction for binding, scope, or idiom interpretation (see Cinque 1983, Ott 2015: 228). For example, the Dutch Hanging Topic Anneke d'r broer 'Ann's brother' in (55) relates to the embedded object correlate hem 'him'. The dislocate also contains the referential expression Anneke which is coreferential with the embedded subject ze 'she'. If the dislocate were to be interpreted at the position of the correlate, the subject ze would c-command the object containing Anneke and the sentence would violate Condition C of the Binding Theory under the coreferential interpretation.

(55) Hanging Topics do not reconstruct, no Condition C violation
[Anneke₁ d'r broer₁₂, ik gelooft dat ze₁ hem₂ wel aardig vindt
Ann her brother I think that she him well friendly finds
'(As for) [Ann₁'s brother]₁₂, I think that she₁ likes him₂.' (Dutch; Vat 1997: 74)

Conversely, we find that similar constructions in Dutch Left Dislocation are ungrammatical. In (56), the dislocate Anneke d'r broer must be interpreted at the position of the correlate die 'that one', which leads to ungrammaticality on the reading where Anneke and ze are intended to be coreferential.

(56) LD reconstructs, forcing a Condition C violation
*[Anneke₁ d'r broer₁₂, die₂ vindt ze₁ wel aardig
Ann her brother that one finds she well friendly
(int.) ' [Ann₁’s brother]₁₂, she₁ likes him₂.' (Dutch; Vat 1997: 73)

Parallel to the Dutch example in (55), we find the Biblical Hebrew example in (57).

(57) Non-case-matching dislocate, reconstruction unavailable
wə-gəm [ maš'аšā kâ ?ēm ?asā? ham-melek ]₁ hēšūr-ḥā₁ pro₂ mig-gēḥirā and-even Maacah mother Asa the-king turn.PFV.3MS-3FS.ACC₁ from-queenship
'And even [Maacah, mother of king Asa₁₂], he₂ turned her₁ aside from queenship.' (2 Chr 15.16)

Were the dislocate maš'аšā kâ ?ēm ?asā? ham-melek 'Maacah, mother of king Asa' to reconstruct, this would yield the following string, represented in English:

(58) *He₂ turned [Maacah, mother of king Asa₁₂] aside from queenship.
I predict that (58) would be ungrammatical in Biblical Hebrew. Anti-reconstruction seems to proffer positive evidence for Hanging Topics in Biblical Hebrew.

3.2.5 Diagnostic 5: 'As for' phrases

'As for' phrases are only (optionally) permitted with Hanging Topics cross-linguistically. Rodman (1997: 36) observes that a wide variety of such expressions may linearly precede dislocates in English, as in (59).

(59) [As for/Speaking of/On the subject of/You know] sugar₁, I can't have too much of it₁ on this new diet.

In Biblical Hebrew, the clitic dative preposition P- 'to' optionally marks Hanging Topics, as in (60) (Kautzsch 1910 §143e; Meek 1945: 13; Khan 1988: 68; see Jones 2015: 149-151 for similar constructions in Hellenistic Period Hebrew).

(60) P- [kol hab-b³hêmâ ṭ²šêr hî?] mašpresê parsâ w³-šesa³ ṭ³nên-nâ šôšâ³at
to- all the-beast.FS C 3FS divide.PTCP.FS hoof and-cloven.hoof NEG.EXIST-3FS split.PTCP.FS
w³-ġerâ ṭ³nên-nâ ma³lâmê lî ³me³im hêmî lâ-kem
and-cud NEG.EXIST-3FS chew.PTCP.FS unclean.PTCP.MP 3MP for-you.MP
'As for [every beast that (it) parts (its) hoof but isn't cloven-hoofed and chews cud]₁ they₁ are unclean for you.' (Lev 11.26)

This makes the prediction that there should exist examples of Hanging Topics with apparent preposition mismatches, where the dislocate is marked by P- and the correlate is marked by another preposition. Although such examples have not surfaced in my search, they are predicted to be possible under a Hanging Topic parse.

(61) Predicted:
P- dislocate [Host.Clause ... [PP P correlate] ... ], where P ≠ P

3.2.6 Diagnostic 6: Epithet correlates

The final diagnostic is somewhat contested and pertains to the use of epithets as correlates in dislocation constructions. I adopt Aoun and Choueiri’s (2000) definition of epithets as DPs composed of either a definite article or demonstrative and an NP:\footnote{Aoun and Choueiri adduce two other diagnostics which distinguish epithets from R-expressions cross-linguistically (with language specific diagnostics proffering further differences between the two): (i) the NP component of epithets typically expresses an affective meaning, including contempt, irony, endearment, etc., illustrated in (i) (an observation attributed to Joan Maling and Jim McCloskey); (ii) epithets can express temporary qualification which is not always true of the referent.}

(i) ha-l-habîle / masTuul / maḍduub / fîmaa Saami
this-the-idiot / idiot / idiot / ass Sami

'This idiot/ass Sami’ (Lebanese Arabic: Aoun and Choueiri 2000: 2)
numerous times that epithet correlates are only permissible in Hanging Topic-type dislocations (see Anagnostopoulou 1997: 153, Cinque 1997: 96, López 2009: 4, Alexiadou 2017: 2141). These claims are arguably supported by data like the following:

(62) a. **Hanging Topics may relate to epithet correlates**

María₁, hace tiempo que no veo a esa sinvergüenza₁.
Maria, does time that NEG see.1ST A that shameless

'María₁, I haven't seen that shameless woman₁ in a long time.' (Spanish; López 2009: 4)

b. **Left Dislocates may not relate to epithet correlates**

* A María₁, hace tiempo que no veo a esa sinvergüenza₁.
A María does time that NEG see.1ST A that shameless

(int.) 'Maria₁, I haven't seen that shameless woman₁ in a long time.' (Spanish; López 2009: 4)

Yet this generalization appears to be contradicted by the facts in (63)–(68), where Left Dislocates in several languages relate to epithet correlates. Case-connectivity in examples (63)–(66) ensures that each construction involves Left Dislocation. While neither the Dutch nor the Lebanese Arabic dislocates display overt case, we can nevertheless be sure that (67) and (68) involve Left Dislocation because both permit reconstruction of the dislocate to a position c-commanded by a negative quantifier (see Sportiche 2017).

(63) Ale Karla₁, but Karel.ACC that idiot.ACC no one NEG saw

'that idiot.1' (Czech; Sturgeon 2008: 117, fn. 17)

(64) Ton Petro₁, the.ACC Peter.ACC him miss.1SG the.ACC sweet.ACC my

'Peter₁, I miss my sweety₁.' (Greek; Mina Giannoula, pers. comm.)

(65) Den Peter₁, den Idioten₁ habe ich gestern noch gesehen
the.ACC Peter the.ACC idiot have I yesterday still seen

'Peter₁, I saw that idiot₁ yesterday.' (German; den Dikken and Surányi 2017: 548)

(66) Jánost₁, János.ACC that the unfortunate.1ONE.ACC sacked.3PL

'that the unfortunate.1' (Hungarian; den Dikken and Surányi 2017: 548)

(67) Zijn zijn eerstjaarsstudenten₁, Barriers uitleggen
his first.year.students those nitwits wants no single linguist Barriers explain

'His second year students, no linguist wants to explain Barriers to those nitwits₁.' (Dutch; den Dikken and Surányi 2017: 548)

(68) tɑ’miizistå-ɑ₁ – k-l-kseen ma baddna xɔ‘bbrir wala m’allahmеш.1P want.1P tell.1P no teacher that 3-the-idiot.LSM cheated.3SM

in-the-exam

'Her bad student₁, we don't want to tell any teacher₁ that this idiot₁ cheated on the exam.' (Lebanese Arabic; Aoun et al. 2001: 380)
The facts seem to demand that we parameterize the epithet diagnostic for a given language. In some languages, epithets will be compatible with both Hanging Topics and Left Dislocates, but not in others. We seem to find a situation in Biblical Hebrew similar to that in Spanish: epithets are only attested as correlates in Hanging Topic constructions, as illustrated in (69).31

(69) a. [kol makkê nepeš]1 1p-ûti ɣêdîm yiršah ɣet hâ-ròsè̱1hî1 every strike. PTC.P.MS soul to-mouth witnesses kill.IPFV.3MS ACC the-murder. PTC.P.MS

'[Everyone who kills someone]1– before witnesses (one) shall kill the murderer]1.' (Num 35.30)32

b. wû-han-nepeš1 ?âser tîpneh ?el hâ-?ôbôt wû-?el hay-yiddîyônîm li-znôt and-the-soul.FS C turn.IPFV.3FS to the mediums and-to the necromancers to-be harlot ?ahâ-rê-hem wû-nâ-tattêtî ?êt pâna-y ban-nepeš ha-hi1 ACC face-1S GEN on-the-soul.FS the-that.FS

'The person1 (lit. ‘soul”) that turns to mediums and to necromancers to be a harlot after them—I will set my face against that person1.’ (Lev 20.6)

I have found no examples of accusative-marked dislocates, nor of PP dislocates, related to epithet correlates.

(70) a. Unattested: *DP[ACC]1 [Host Clause ... epithet[ACC]1 ... ]

b. Unattested: *PP1 [Host Clause ... [PP P epithet]1 ... ]

If this distribution is not merely coincidental, then the use of epithet correlates uniquely characterizes Hanging Topics in Biblical Hebrew.33

3.2.7 Summary of the diagnostics

This section has argued that two distinct classes of dislocation constructions can be teased apart empirically in Biblical Hebrew. Relying on six diagnostic tests supported by comparisons with several other languages, I have shown that there is positive evidence for both Hanging Topics and Left Dislocates in the Biblical Hebrew corpus. These findings are summarized below.

31 There are also several examples of nominative epithet correlates cited in Khan (1988: 73–74), Groß (1987: 119–120), and Holmstedt (2014: 120).
32 See also Lev 7.19, 20.16, and 23.30.
33 See Jones (2015: 140, fn. 163) for the claim that Hellenistic Period Hebrew dislocations are Hanging Topics on the basis of epithet correlates. Crucially, Jones does not link this property with any other diagnostics for distinguishing Hanging Topics from Left Dislocates, such as case-matching or phrasal category of the dislocate. Rather, the only example he gives involves an anaphoric epithet correlate with nominative case in the subject position. It is hoped that future research on Hellenistic Period Hebrew will uncover examples with epithet correlates such as those cited for Biblical Hebrew which must unambiguously be parsed as Hanging Topics.
### 3.2.8 Excursus on the Diachrony of Dislocates in Biblical Hebrew

At this point, one might wonder why the contrast between Hanging Topics and Left Dislocates has escaped the attention of most scholars in a language as frequently studied as Biblical Hebrew. I believe that this oversight is due to the statistical predominance of the former in the Biblical Hebrew corpus. If we consider just those cases where the two can be adequately distinguished (i.e. with correlates that are (i) direct objects, (ii) locative adverbs, or (iii) contained inside prepositional phrases), Hanging Topics outnumber Left Dislocates at a rate of 4.5 : 1. The raw counts are summarized Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dislocate Type</th>
<th>Correlate Type</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D(P)</td>
<td>D(P)</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc Adv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked DP</td>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Hanging Topic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative DP</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Left Dislocate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP (Left</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislocate)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Biblical Hebrew Dislocation Statistics

The preference for Hanging Topics seems to be amplified in later stages of Hebrew. A brief survey of dislocations in Qumran Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew suggests that Left Dislocation is extremely rare in these later periods. Non-case-matching dislocates, as in (71), and DP dislocates related to resumptive pronouns inside...
PPs, as in (72), seem to be the norm according to the descriptions in standard reference grammars (Fernández 1999; Segal 1927).

(71) **Qumran Hebrew non-case-matching dislocate (=Hanging Topic)**

```
w-h-?yš1    ?šr ylwn    yl yswd h-yhād yšlh- hw1
and-the-man. MS C grumble.IPFV.3MS against foundation the-Yahad banish.IPFV.3MP-3MS.ACC

'And the man1 that grumbles against the foundation of the Yahad–they shall banish him1.' (1QS VII.17(b); Jones 2015: 141)
```

(72) **Mishnaic Hebrew DP dislocate with resumptive inside PP (=Hanging Topic)**

```
hat-t'rûmâ1 meh háyû yōšīn b-āh1
the-oblation.FS what do.PFV.3P do.PTCP.MP with-3FS

'The oblation–what is to be done with it?' (Sheq 4.1; Fernández 1999: 186)
```

Although I did not find any clear cases of Left Dislocation in my informal survey, Alexopoulou, Doron, and Heycock (2004) cite the following example of a PP dislocate.

(73) **al kol cara fe tavò al ha-cibur matri'în ʿaley-ha about any calamity that will.come on the-community they.warn about-it**

'O one should warn against any calamity that may befall the community.' (Taʿanit 3:8, slightly adapted from Alexopoulou et al. 2004: 352, fn. 10, who cite Azar 1995: 104)

With respect to Modern Hebrew, Doron (2011: 297-298) claims that only nominative DP dislocates are grammatical. PP dislocates and accusative (case-matching) dislocates are ungrammatical.

(74) **kol gever, rina xošvet al-av every man Rina thinks about-him**

'Rina thinks about every man'

(75) **al kol gever rina xošvet al-av about every man Rina thinks about-him (int.) 'Rina thinks about every man.'**

(76) **et dani rina ohevot oto ACC Dani Rina loves him (int.) 'Rina loves Dani.'**

This relatively brief overview suggests a diachronic trend towards the exclusive use of Hanging Topics in the history of the Hebrew language which has its roots in the marked preference for Hanging Topics we see in Biblical Hebrew. Further exposition of this issue is left to future research.

---

35 Vowels are not indicated in the Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran, so no vowels are represented in the transcription here.

36 López (2016: 419, fn. 4) reports that Hanging Topics have supplanted Left Dislocates in colloquial registers of French. The history of English may also prove enlightening in this regard, since Old English seems to have employed both Left Dislocation and Hanging Topics in contrast to current vernaculars which only use Hanging Topics (see Traugott 2007).
3.3 Biblical Hebrew Hanging Topics are clause-externally base generated

In this section, I argue that Hanging Topics must be base-generated outside of the clausal core. Based on their distribution with respect to other left-peripheral constituents, I argue that they are consistently introduced into a functional projection in an articulated left periphery. Specifically, I take Hanging Topics to be Merged into the specifier of Top(ic)P.

Let us recall one of the basic empirical generalizations we established in the preceding sections. Hanging Topics fail to exhibit connectivity effects with their correlates, in that they permit case-mismatches, they may relate to correlates over island boundaries, and they do not reconstruct. The scholarly consensus since Ross (1967) has argued on the basis of these and similar facts for other languages that Hanging Topics must not be derived by movement from a position internal to the host clause. Rather, they are base-generated in the left periphery. The impossibility of a movement-style derivation for Hanging Topics is sketched for the representative examples in (77)–(79).

(77) Hanging Topics mismatch in case with their correlates
a. hî P 3FS.NOM yānān y̱ašحسن nā1 cloud.MS cover.IPFW.3MS-3FS.ACC
   (referring to the nation of Egypt) ‘It1—a cloud covers it1.’ (Ezek 30.18)

(78) Hanging Topics relate to correlates inside islands
a. w̱a-[köl k‘li hereš ... ]1 köl ʔašer ḇa-tôk-[¿ò1] y̱išmā? and-every jar earthenware all that in-middle-3MS,GEN be.unclean.IPFW.3MS
   ‘And [every earthen jar ...], all that is inside it1 is unclean.’ (Lev 11.33)
(79) **Hanging Topics do not reconstruct**

a. wº-ºgam [ maºká ßém ?ásâº2 ham-melek]₁ hº-sîr-áh₁ pro₁₂ mig-gºbirå
   and-even Maacah mother Asa the-king turn.PFV.3MS-3FS.ACC₁ from-queenship
   'And even [Maacah, mother of King Asa]₁, he₁₂ turned her₁ aside from queenship.' (2 Chr 15.16)

b. 

Mismatches in $\phi$-features also militate against a movement analysis of Hanging Topics. Under any theory of movement (e.g. the Copy Theory of movement, see Chomsky 1995), displacement ought to preserve $\phi$-features, *ceteris paribus*[^37]. Yet we see that Biblical Hebrew Hanging Topics can mismatch in both gender and number

[^37]: One might object that these mismatches—and those in the Left Dislocation cases discussed below—are directional, always proceeding from the more marked to the less-marked featural value, i.e. plural ⇒ singular, feminine ⇒ masculine. In a system like Dis-
with their correlates.

(80) **Hanging Topic number mismatch**

\[ \text{w}^0\text{-} \text{h}uqq\text{o}t\text{-}\text{àyw} \quad \text{l}ō? \quad ?\text{à}sûr \quad \text{mimmen-nâ}_1 \]

and- statutes.\text{FP}-\text{MS}.\text{GEN} \quad \text{NEG} \ \text{turn.aside.IPV.1S} \ \text{from-3FS}

'And (as for) his statutes\(_1\) (fp), I will not turn aside from it\(_1\) (fs).' (2 Sam 22.33)

(81) **Hanging Topic gender mismatch**

\[ \text{k}\text{o}l \ \text{he-}\text{ʕàrîm} \quad \text{hâ-\text{ʕòm}d\text{òt}} \quad \text{ʕal till-\text{âm}} \quad \text{l}ō? \quad \text{s\text{ò}râp-\text{âm}_1} \quad \text{yi\text{ʃrâ\text{ʔel}}} \]

all the-cities.\text{FP} \ \text{the-stand.PTCP}\text{.FP} \ \text{on mound-their.MP} \ \text{NEG burn.PFV.3MS-3MP.ACC} \ \text{Israel}

'All the cities (fp) standing on their mound, Israel didn't burn them (mp).' (Josh 11.13)

On the basis of case-mismatches, island-insensitivity, anti-reconstruction effects, and \text{φ}-feature mismatches, I conclude that Biblical Hebrew Hanging Topics cannot relate to their correlates via movement, and must be base-generated in their left-peripheral position.

The precise locus of this position in Biblical Hebrew, however, is somewhat contested. Cowper & DeCaen (2017) argue that Hanging Topics in Biblical Hebrew are merged into the specifier of the highest projection in the clause, a phrase they call "&P".

tributed Morphology where feature bundles are manipulated in a post-syntactic component, such mismatches could be accounted for by *impoveryment* (Bonet 1991; Halle and Marantz 1994). Impoverishment is an operation that deletes (marked) features prior to phonological exponence via rule application (i.e. Vocabulary Insertion), giving rise to a proliferation of syncretisms. It is at least conceivable that, assuming movement from the position of the correlate to the dislocate, impoverishment could precede copy-deletion with the result that the dislocate and correlate bear different \text{φ}-features. See van Urk (2018) for a similar approach to \text{φ}-mismatches in pronoun copying in Dinka Bor.

This analysis faces at least one non-trivial issue when extended to Biblical Hebrew—namely, the matter of enforcing multiple copy spell-out. Arguably the most fleshed-out proposal regarding multiple copy spell-out in Left Dislocation is Grohmann (2003). Grohmann argues that movement that is 'too short' (in his terms, within a single domain, such as movement from [Spec, TopP] to [Spec, CP] in Contrastive Left Dislocation) forces multiple copy spell-out, where the lower copy is spelled out as a minimal pronoun. This analysis requires that both dislocate and correlate be in a highly local structural configuration. Yet we find demonstrably non-local dislocate-correlate configurations in Biblical Hebrew, as in (i). In this example, the correlate is in a post-verbal position, which I take to be at least below C (i.e. not in [Spec, TopP] as per Grohmann's analysis).

(i) \[ \text{k}i \quad \text{ʔòt-}\text{ð}_1 \quad \text{்஗-\text{hayyôm} tims\text{ù}n} \quad \text{ûn} \quad \text{ʔòt-}\text{ð}_1 \]

because ACC-3MS as-today find.IPV.2MP ACC-3MS

'Because him\(_1\)—even today you shall find him\(_1\).’ (1 Sam 9.13)

Admittedly, Grohmann *does* allow for 'low' spelled-out copies in Clitic Left Dislocation, but this will not work either since the correlate in (i) bears differential object marking and is not cliticized to the verb. Without a clear way to enforce multiple copy spell-out in the first place, I set aside the movement-\text{cum}-impoveryment approach.
In Cowper & DeCaen’s system, Hanging Topics are treated as a kind of asymmetric coordination, where the Hanging Topic occurs in [Spec, &P] and the host clause as the complement of & in $\Sigma$.

According to their articulated clause structure, this predicts that Hanging Topics will consistently appear above Force, a head which marks illocutionary force and clause type and which can be exponed by declarative and relative complementizers, polar interrogative operators, and various particles marking illocutionary force, inter alia (see Rizzi 1997; Rizzi and Cinque 2016).

Contrary to Cowper & DeCaen’s predictions, the data clearly show that Hanging Topics follow, and do not precede, Force. Hanging Topics follow the polar interrogative operator $h^a$- in root contexts, as shown in (83), and they follow relative complementizers such as $?^a$-$\tilde{c}ar$ in embedded contexts, as shown in (84). The projection hosting the Hanging Topic is agnostically labeled "?(P)" for now.

(83) Root Hanging Topics follow the polar interrogative operator $h^a$-

a. he-?anôkî lî-?âdâm šîh-11
 Q-1S to-man complaint-1S.GEN

38 A core issue for their analysis which they do not address is why the coordinating conjunction is so frequently null in Hanging Topic constructions.

39 I should note that these facts must be assessed on a language by language basis. For instance, in Italian, Hanging Topics cannot occur in embedded contexts, regardless of the position of the relative pronoun with respect to the Hanging Topic.

(i) a. *Una persona che questo libro non ne parlerà mai
 a person that this book not of.it will.talk never
 (int.) ‘a person who will never talk about this book’ [Benincà and Poletto 2004: 65]

b. *Una persona questo libro che non ne parlerà mai
 a person this book that not of.it will.talk never
 (int.) ‘a person who will never talk about this book’ [Benincà and Poletto 2004: 65]
'As for me— is my complaint against man?' (Job 21.4)

b. ForceP
   Force
   he [+Q]
   DP
   ?ānōkî
   I

   b-?ādâm šîh-i
   my complaint is against man

(84) Embedded Hanging Topics follow relative complementizers
a. ?ānōkî 'ōseh dābār1 b3-yišrā?ēl ?ašer [kol šōm2n?i-ō1]1 tō sillēnā štē
   1S do.PTCP:MS thing:MS in-Israel C every hear.PTCP:MS-3MS.GEN tingle.IPfv.3FP two
   ?ōznāy-w2
ears.FD-3MS.GEN
   'I am doing a thing1 in Israel that [everyone who hears it1]2 his2 two ears will tingle.' (1 Sam 3.11)

b. NP
   dābār
   thing

   NP
   ForceP
   Force
   ?ašer
   that

   ?
   DP2
   kol šōm2n?i-ō
   everyone who hears it

   TP
   vP
   T
   v
   V
   štē ?ōznāy-w2
   his2 two ears
   rō sillēnā
   tingle

We can schematize these ordering constraints as in (85)40

(85) a. Force > Hanging Topic
    b. *Hanging Topic > Force

We can account for this fact by supposing that Hanging Topics are introduced by a functional head dominated by Force. Call this functional head Top(ic).41

40Given that Hanging Topics show some ordering constraints with respect to constituents in Force (e.g. relative complementizers and polar question operators), I disagree with Ott that Hanging Topics "merely bear a loose 'aboutness' relation to their hosts" (emphasis added; 2013: 272, fn. 52). The same applies to Cinque's (1997: 100) contention that Hanging Topics should be relegated to "dis- course grammar": if Hanging Topics are not incorporated into the clausal spine in a meaningful way, there is no reason why the generalizations in (85) should hold.

41Note that my use of the label "Topic" simply follows the precedent for locating a TopP below ForceP (and above Int(errogative))P
Now, the structure in (86) can be accounted for in one of two ways: either the Hanging Topic is adjoined to TopP, or it is Merged into [Spec, Top]. If Hanging Topics are adjoined to TopP and if adjunction is a freely iterable operation, then we predict that several Hanging Topics can, in principle, appear in a given clause. Yet this is not the case for English, Czech, or Italian Hanging Topics.

If, however, Hanging Topics are uniquely selected by a head in the left periphery, then we predict that the number of Hanging Topics will match the number of selectional features to be satisfied on the selecting head. If we assume that Top selects for a single DP, then we can derive the facts in (87)–(89).

Returning to Biblical Hebrew, it is overwhelmingly the case that clauses may only host a single Hanging Topic. The sole exception to this generalization that I have found is (90), which appears to contain two Hanging Topics; these are "all the people..." and "their children...".

---

(i) Der Alex1, der Wagen2, seine Mutter3, gestern hat sie3 ihm1 den2 geschenkt.

the.NOM Alex the.NOM car his.NOM mother yesterday has she.NOM him.DAT it.ACC given

'Alex1, his mother2, the car3, yesterday she3 gave it2 to him1.' (slightly adapted from Grohmann [2000]: 187)

If correct, then the adjunction analysis is arguably most convincing for German. Still, this argument does not extend to English, Czech, Italian, or, as I argue in the main text, Biblical Hebrew.

See Naudé [1990] and Holmstedt [2014] for the alternative view that Biblical Hebrew dislocates are uniformly adjoined to CP.
(90) [ kol hâ-ŷâm han-nôtâr min hâ-ʔaʔmôrî ha-ḥittî hap-p’rizzî ha-ḥîwwî all the-people.MS the-remaining.s from-the-Amorite the-Hittite the-Perizzite the-Hivite wâ-ha-ybûṣî ʔaʔser lô? mim-b’nê yîšrāʔêl hêmmâ ]1 [ b’nê-hem1 ʔaʔser nôt’rû and-the-Jebusite C NEG from-children Israel 3MP children-3MP.GEN C remain.PFV.3P ]1 hê[r4-hem bâ-ʔârēs ʔaʔser lô? yâklû b’nê yîšrâʔêl lî-pî-hah4rim-ām ]2 after-3MP in.the-land C NEG be.able.PFV.3P children Israel to-dispossess-3MP.ACC way-ya[l2-em2] Șlômôh lî-mas Yôbêd Yâd hay-yôm haz-zeh and-bring.IPFV.3MS Solomon to-labor serving until the-day the-this ’[All the people remaining from the Amorites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites who are not of the people of Israel], [their1 children who remained after them in the land, who the children of Israel were not able to dispossess|2–Solomon drafted them2 into slave labor to this day.’ (1 Kgs 9.20-21)

However, this example is exceptional insofar as the initial dislocate ("all the people...") relates to a correlate contained inside the second dislocate, and not to a constituent inside the host clause proper. The second dislocate ("their children..."), by contrast, relates to a correlate inside the host clause and thus bears the normal trappings of a Hanging Topic. Rather than viewing this as the sole example of multiple Hanging Topics in Biblical Hebrew, I claim that (90) involves anacoluthon—a kind of grammatical discontinuity, potentially arising from production errors. Under this analysis, the first dislocate belongs to an abandoned utterance, while the second dislocate is a true Hanging Topic, and the break between the two marks a restart. If correct, then the Biblical Hebrew data would conform to the generalization from (87)–(89) that clauses may bear at most a single Hanging Topic. I argue that this generalization can only be adequately accounted for if Hanging Topics are selected by a functional head (e.g. Top) and are Merged in their base-generated positions.

3.4 Biblical Hebrew Left Dislocation involves clausal juxtaposition plus ellipsis

Having argued that Hanging Topics are externally Merged in the specifier of a functional projection, this section aims to account for the syntax of Left Dislocation in Biblical Hebrew. Two main alternatives have been proposed for Left Dislocation in other languages. Cinque (1977), Grohmann (2000), Boeckx & Grohmann (2005), and Zeller (2009), among others, argue that Left Dislocates move from a clause-internal to a clause-peripheral position. On the other hand, Ott (2014; 2015) has argued that Left Dislocates are ellipsis remnants which appear linearly juxtaposed to their host clauses.

(91) [CP1 dislocate3 ... correlate3 ... ] [CP2 ... correlate3 ... ], (see Ott2015 239)

I will consider each proposal in turn. In the end, I argue that only the ellipsis analysis of Left Dislocation can adequately square with the Biblical Hebrew data.
3.4.1 Movement analysis of Left Dislocation

The movement analysis of Left Dislocation goes back to a suggestion by Ross (1973: 133–134, n.7), and was first explored in detail by Cinque (1977). Cinque claimed that connectivity between the dislocate and host clause (e.g. in terms of case and reconstruction for binding, scope, and idiom interpretation) could be captured by positing that Left Dislocates are actually base-generated inside the host clause, and only arrive at their left-peripheral surface position via a copying rule. More recent analyses have updated the language and propose that left dislocates move to the specifier of CP (see Grohmann 2003) or to the specifier of a functional projection in the left periphery (see Rizzi 1997 et seq.). Under these accounts, correlates are copies in a movement chain that are exceptionally pronounced, perhaps due to movement that is too short in some relevant sense (see Grohmann 2003).

I am not concerned here with the precise mechanics of the alleged movement in Left Dislocation, but rather with a general prediction that movement analyses make: if correlates are lower copies in a movement chain, then we expect that all copies will bear the same φ-features, ceteris paribus.

It turns out that this prediction is not borne out. Although Left Dislocates do exhibit some clause-internal features, such as case- and θ-role connectivity with the host clause's predicate, they permit φ-feature mismatches with their correlates. Ott (2015) provides evidence for mismatches in Left Dislocation for several languages, including German.

(92) Dem Mädchen da vorne, [dem the.DAT girl].NEUT over there haben sie neulich die Handtasche geklaut 
the.Neut.Dat fem.dat have they recently the purse stolen 
'That girl over there recently had her purse stolen.' (German; Ott 2015: 247)

Similar observations can be made for Biblical Hebrew. In (93), the dislocate contains the feminine plural noun 'the handmaids' which relates to a correlate which contains a masculine plural pronominal clitic.

(93) Left Dislocation gender mismatch
w-\{ ūm hâ-ʔa\mähö \ʔəšər ?āmart \}1 simm-ām\m1 ḫkkāb\m1 dā 
and- with the-handmaids.fp that speak.pfv.2fs with-3mp be.honored.ipfv.1s

'And [with the handmaids (fp) that you speak to]1, with them1 (mp) I shall be honored.' (2 Sam 6.22)

Even more challenging for the movement analysis is (94), which exhibits both a gender mismatch and an apparent mismatch in phrasal category: the dislocate is a DP overtly marked for accusative case, while the

\footnote{For a recent revision to Grohmann's analysis of Left Dislocation, and for a rejection of Ott's analysis, see den Dikken and Surányi 2017.}
\footnote{The same applies to the "big DP" analyses adopted in Boeckx 2003, Boeckx & Grohmann 2005, and Zeller 2009. In these studies, it is argued that Left Dislocates (and antecedents in A-bar dependencies terminating in resumptive pronouns in general) are base-generated in the host clause together with their correlates inside a single DP. Movement of the dislocate to the left periphery strands the (pronounced) correlate in-situ. All of these analyses stipulate an Agree (or Match) relationship between the dislocate and correlate prior to movement, so we would still expect φ-feature matching in Left Dislocation.}
correlate is a PP.

(94) Category and gender mismatch

\[ \text{w}^{\text{DP}} \text{?et muşq ('-ay)} \quad \text{lô? hâl}^{\text{PP}} \text{kû} \quad \text{[PP bâ-hem]} \]

\[ \text{and- ACC statutes.FP-1S.GEN NEG walk.PFV.3P in-3MP} \]

'And [DP my statutes] (fp), they didn't walk [PP in them (mp)].' (Ezek 20.16)

There appears to be no good way to salvage the movement analysis such that it would predict (94), since Biblical Hebrew lacks preposition stranding.\(^{45}\)

Crucially, there is no constituent in the host clause available to assign accusative case to the dislocate, ruling out any analysis in which the dislocate originated as an argument of the overt lower predicate. We must turn elsewhere for an adequate explanation.

### 3.4.2 Ellipsis analysis of Left Dislocation

In a recent series of studies, Ott has painted a different derivational picture of Left Dislocation \(^{2014, 2015}\). The launching point of his analysis is dubbed "Cinque's Paradox" \(^{\text{Cinque 1983}}\): Left Dislocates appear to exhibit movement properties and non-movement properties simultaneously \(^{2015, 231}\). Ott hypothesizes that we can capture this apparent contradiction by assuming that the dislocate and correlate belong to two separate, but identical clauses. The clause containing the dislocate is elided under parallelism with its postcedent, the host clause, where ellipsis is taken to be PF-deletion. Ott's proposal can be distilled into the three steps in (95), schematized in (96).

(95) **Ellipsis analysis of Left Dislocation**

a. Juxtapose identical clauses in the discourse.
b. Link those clauses endophorically via the dislocate and correlate.
c. Elide the former clause under identity with the latter.

\[(96) \ [\text{CP}_1 \text{ dislocate}_1 \ddots \text{correlate}_1 \ddots ] \ [\text{CP}_2 \ddots \text{correlate}_2 \ddots ] \quad \text{ where } \text{CP}_1 \leftrightarrow \text{CP}_2 \quad \text{(see Ott 2015, 239)}\]

As Ott discusses, this analysis correctly predicts that non-ellipsis variants of Left Dislocation in which both

\(^{45}\)One might also object to the movement analysis because prepositions in Biblical Hebrew do not assign accusative case. This can be seen by the contrast between first person clitic direct objects and complements of prepositions. In the former, the first person clitic bears accusative case and surfaces as -\(nî\) (the /a/ vowel in (ia) is epenthetic), whereas in the latter, it bears genitive case and surfaces as -\(î\).

(i) a. han-nāḥāš hiššît-anî
   the-serpent deceive.PFV.3MS-1S.ACC
   'The serpent deceived me.' (Gen 3.13)
b. hî nātî l-i
   3FS gave.PFV.3FS to-1S.GEN
   'She gave to me... ' (Gen 3.12)

There is no possible source then for the accusative case in (94) under standard movement analyses.
CPs are fully spelled-out should be grammatical (if highly redundant). Thus, the Left Dislocate in (97) has as its parallel the non-elliptical example in (98).

(97) a. Den Peter, den habe ich gestern gesehen.
   the Peter him have I yesterday seen
   'I saw Peter yesterday.'

   b. [CP1 den Peter, habe ich gestern gesehen] [CP2 den habe ich gestern gesehen]
   (German; Ott 2014: 278)

(98) (#) Den Peter habe ich gestern gesehen. Den habe ich gestern gesehen
   the Peter have I yesterday seen him have I yesterday seen
   'I saw Peter yesterday. I saw him yesterday.' (German; Ott 2014: 278)

Although I largely adopt the spirit of Ott’s analysis for the Biblical Hebrew data, I must clarify four important assumptions which alter the specifics of my implementation. First, I follow recent hybrid theories of ellipsis identity in assuming that the parallelism requirement in ellipsis is subject to both syntactic and semantic constraints (Merchant 2016: 24). With respect to semantic identity, I adopt Merchant’s (2001) Focus Condition on IP-ellipsis as defined in (99) and the notion of e-Givenness on which it is based. Simplifying slightly, this condition will require that an ellipsis site and its antecedent be mutually entailing. For syntactic identity, I minimally adopt Chung’s (2013) argument structure condition given in (101). This condition rules out derivations with mutually entailing predicates which are not syntactically identical, in the relevant sense. Finally, I assume that both of these constraints extend beyond sluicing to other kinds of clausal ellipsis, including Left Dislocation, by hypothesis.

(99) Focus condition on IP-ellipsis
An IP α can be deleted only if α is e-GIVEN.

(100) e-Givenness:
An expression E counts as e-GIVEN iff E has a salient antecedent A and, modulo ∃-type shifting,
   a. A entails F-clo(E), and
   b. E entails F-clo(A)
   (Merchant 2001: 26)

(101) Argument structure condition:
If the extracted phrase is the argument of a predicate in the ellipsis site, that predicate must have an argument structure identical to that of the corresponding predicate in the antecedent clause.
(slightly adapted from Chung 2013: 30)

Next, I assume with Merchant (2001; 2004a; 2013; 2016) that the Biblical Hebrew lexicon contains an "E" feature which houses all of the idiosyncratic properties of the ellipsis site which distinguish it from its antecedent/postcedent. There are several varieties of the E feature, each of which is added to a specific functional

---

46 See Wood, Barros, and Sigurðsson (2016) for evidence in support of this point from (im)possible case-mismatches in Icelandic clausal ellipsis.
head in the derivation (e.g. certain lexical entries for C in sluicing and fragment answers, certain lexical entries for T in VP-ellipsis, etc). Once added, the E feature imposes the aforementioned syntactic and semantic identity conditions and ensures that the complement of the head to which it has been added is not pronounced.

Third, I assume that the dislocate undergoes A-bar movement to the specifier of CP to escape deletion. This approach was first proposed by Ott and is inspired by Merchant’s analysis of sluicing and fragment answers, as sketched in (102) and (103), respectively. Note, however, that different features are implicated in each elliptical construction: A-bar movement in sluicing is driven by a strong \([wh^*]\) feature on C\(_Q\), whereas A-bar movement in fragment answers is driven by a strong \([F^*]\) feature on a functional head F in the left periphery.

(102) a. **Sluicing**
Suzy mentioned someone the other day, but I don’t know who [Suzy mentioned t].

(103) **Fragment Answer**
  a. Who did Sean see?
  b. Amy [Sean saw t].
  c. I will refer to the feature that drives A-bar movement in Left Dislocation as \([F]\), following Merchant, and stipulate that there exists a C bearing a strong \([F^*]\) in the Biblical Hebrew lexicon. C\([F^*]\) is Merged in CP.

---

47 Whether this is cached out as PF-deletion or as non-insertion of Vocabulary Items in a system like Distributed Morphology will not affect the analysis. See Merchant for some discussion of this issue.

48 The details could be reformulated under an articulated approach to the left periphery, in which case Rizzi’s FocusP might constitute a good candidate for hosting the relevant E feature.

49 Merchant (2004a: 675) suggests that FP may well correspond to Rizzi’s FocusP.
in Left Dislocation constructions and attracts the Left Dislocate, which bears a [F] feature, to its specifier. Furthermore, it is to this C[F*] that the E-feature is added, triggering TP-ellipsis. I refrain from assigning a single discourse-pragmatic function to the [F] feature, given that no consistent information-structural properties have yet been identified for Biblical Hebrew Left Dislocates (though see Holmstedt 2014 and Westbury 2014, 2016 for some attempts).

Finally, something must be said about why the two clauses in Left Dislocation are obligatorily juxtaposed with no intervening material. I assume that they are linked by an obligatorily null asyndetic coordinator, for which I adopt Koster’s (2000) Colon Phrase ":P". Coordination with Colon Phrase is asymmetric, with CP1 in [Spec, :P] and CP2 as the complement of colon :, and forces adjacency of the two clauses. With these four assumptions in tow, we can illustrate the modified ellipsis account of Left Dislocation in (104), repeated here from (35). Crucially, and contra many previous accounts, there is no movement relationship between CP1 and CP2 or the constituents therein.

(104) a. [:P [CP1 dislocate3 [... t3 ...]] [ : [CP2 ... correlate3 ... ]]] b. 

Let us now consider some basic Biblical Hebrew examples in light of the ellipsis hypothesis for Left Dislocation. In (105), the dislocate and correlate belong to separate clauses, by hypothesis. The dislocate is attracted to [Spec, CP] in the first clause by the strong [F*] feature on C. The [E] feature which has been added to the same C licenses TP ellipsis since the ellipsis site and postcedent are mutually entailing.

(105) a. û-PP mē-šēs had-da’at tōh wā-rāi lō? tō?kal mimmen-nû1 and- from-tree the-knowledge good and-evil NEG eat.IPFV.2MS from-3MS

’But [PP from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil], you shall not eat [PP from it]’ (Gen 2.17)

50 Lopéz (2016) has argued that the syntactic structure of dislocations maps isomorphically onto information structure in those languages which productively use both Hanging Topics and Left Dislocates: Left Dislocates have discourse-given referents and are contrastive (in the Roothian 1985 sense), whereas Hanging Topics involve the promotion of discourse-new topics. See Ott (2015), however, for evidence that the discourse functions of Left Dislocates vary by language.

51 The difference between the two instances of the preposition ‘from’—mē- and mimmen- is due to contextual allomorphy. The latter surfaces with pronominal clitics, whereas the former surfaces elsewhere before the [+back] consonants /t/, /š/, /h/ and /r/.
Likewise for the accusative DP dislocate in (106).

(106) a. gam ?ōt-ō₁ hakkû-hû₁
    also ACC-3MS strike.IMP,MP-3MS,ACC
    'Even him₁–strike him₁!' (2 Kgs 9.27)

b.

Now, recall the set of facts we set out to capture in this section: Left Dislocates exhibit case and θ-role connectivity with the host clause, but permit gender mismatches and apparent phrasal category mismatches. Case and θ-role connectivity are predicted by the ellipsis analysis since CP₁ and CP₂ must be identical according to Chung’s argument structure condition in (101). Moreover, gender mismatches are predicted to be tolerated in ellipsis as long as they are semantically vacuous, since such variation will not affect the relevant entailment relations. We can show that the gender mismatch in (93), repeated here as (107), is indeed truth-functionally vacuous, because the feminine noun ‘handmaids’ can relate to masculine anaphora cross-sententially, as shown
In (108).

(107) w^a-\{ ṭîm hâ-ʔa m̄ahôt ʔaṣer ṭâmart \} 1ʔimm-ām 1ikkâb^a dā
and- with the-handmaids.FP that speak.PFV.2FS with-3MP be.honored.IPFV.1S

'And [with the handmaids (fp) that you speak to], with them (mp) I shall be honored.' (2 Sam 6.22)

(108) way-yîrpâ\? ʔelōhim ... w^a-ʔet ʔištî-ō w^a-ʔamhôt-āyw\_w\_2
and-heal.PFV.3MS god and-ACC wife-3MS.Gen and-handmaids.FP-3MS.Gen

way-yēlêdû pro\_1\_2
and-give.birth.PFV.3MP

'God healed ... his wife\_1 and his handmaids\_2 (fp), and they\_1\_2 (mp) gave birth.' (Gen 20.17)

In (108), 'handmaids' and 'his wife' constitute the conjoined antecedent to the null pro subject of the verb way-yēlêdû 'they gave birth', which is inflected for masculine agreement. This gender mismatch has no apparent effect on the intended meaning of the proposition—it is clearly women who are giving birth, not men. The same can be said, then, for the parallel variation in (107), which can be safely ignored by the identity-calculating mechanism in ellipsis. I sketch the hypothesized elliptical structure for (107) in (109).\footnote{I abstract over the movement inside CP\_2 of the correlate, presumably a kind of focus or topicalization A-bar movement.}

The final desideratum for our analysis is an account of the apparent phrasal category mismatch in (94), repeated here as (110).
I would like to suggest that this example is only superficially problematic, and that the dislocate is indeed a PP, albeit one where the preposition is, for some reason, unpronounced. Without an overt preposition, the dislocate exceptionally surfaces with accusative case.

(111) \[ CP_1 [PP (in) my statutes ] \ \text{they didn’t walk (in) them } ] \ \Rightarrow [ACC] \]

This argument is inspired by Landau’s (2009) account of direct object experiencers in Modern Hebrew. Landau argues that, despite their surface accusative case, object experiencers (and indeed all experiencers) are underlyingly oblique. He marshalls evidence in favor of this view from relative clause extraction, where object experiencers pattern like complements of prepositions and must be resumed, unlike non-experiencer objects which host an alternation between gaps and resumptive pronouns.

(112) a. Relativized non-experiencer object $\rightarrow$ gap or resumptive

ze ha-iš₁ še-ha-ma’amar te’er *(oto₁).
this the-man that-the-article described *(him).
'This is the man that the article described.' (Landau 2009: 5)

b. Relativized object experiencer $\rightarrow$ resumptive only

ze ha-iš₁ še-ha-ma’amar hid’ig *(oto₁).
this the-man that-the-article worried *(him)
'This is the man that the article worried.' (Landau 2009: 5)

c. Relativized complement of a preposition $\rightarrow$ resumptive only

ha-iš₁ še-Rina xašva al-*(av₁)) higia.
the-man that-Rina thought of-*(him) arrived
'The man that Rina thought of arrived.' (Landau 2009: 31)

In other words, experiencers behave as though they are inside PPs, but surface with accusative case.

I propose that the dislocate "my statutes" in (110) is a PP, in which the preposition $b^p$- has no segmental realization. This null allomorph can be modeled in a realizational theory of morphology like Distributed Morphology (DM) which assumes Late Insertion of phonological representations into syntactic terminal nodes (see Halle and Marantz 1993, 1994; Harley and Noyer 1999; Noyer 1997). The fact that the preposition is exceptionally realized as $∅$- in the Left Dislocation example in (110) is argued to follow from the specific rule in (113a), applying only when the preposition is an ellipsis remnant. The abstract feature bundle normally realized as $b^p$-
'in' is realized as $\varnothing$- when it precedes a DP and a C bearing the E feature.\[^{53,54}\]

(113) a. $[p \, b^0] \rightarrow \varnothing / [\__ [\_ D] ] [c \, E]$

b. $[p \, b^0] \rightarrow b^0 / $ elsewhere

(114) illustrates the proposed structure for (110), where the I illustrate the phonological realizations of both prepositions in accordance with the rules in (113).\[^{55}\]

I assume that whatever mechanism licenses differential object marking of experiencers when the preposition is silent in Modern Hebrew (cf. (112b)) carries over to explain the differential object marking on the dislocate "my statutes" in (110).

All of the Left Dislocation data which I have identified in Biblical Hebrew can thus be accounted for under I assume that whatever mechanism licenses differential object marking of experiencers when the preposition is silent in Modern Hebrew (cf. (112b)) carries over to explain the differential object marking on the dislocate "my statutes" in (110).

53 Jason Merchant (pers. comm.) has pointed out to me that this parallels another phenomenon exceptionally permitted in ellipsis— namely, *swiping*. Swiping (sluiced wh-phrase inversion with prepositions in Northern Germanic) involves the inversion of some wh-words with a selecting preposition when stranded in sluicing, a possibility which is not available for the non-elliptical variants [Ross 1969; Merchant 2001].

(i) Joni’s traveling next weekend, but I don’t know who with.

54 As it stands, this rule would predict that the preposition $b^0$- ‘in’ would not occur overtly in dislocation constructions. Yet example (i) shows this prediction to be false.

(i) û-[b$^0$-?aw1-ô] [?et ḥuqqôt-ay

and-in-injustice-3MS.GEN C do.PFV.3MS yâmût in-3MS die.PFV.3MS

"But [in his injustice] that he has done|in it| he shall die." (Ezek 33.13)

A more complete analysis would call for an account of optional rule application in DM—a task which is beyond the scope of this paper.

55 The preposition $b^0$ is predictably pronounced $bâ$ before a pronominal suffix.
the ellipsis hypothesis. Moreover, the ellipsis analysis makes several strong predictions, two of which I shall mention briefly in the hope that future work may locate relevant examples. First, assuming that ellipsis in Left Dislocation is not obligatory, it should be possible to spell out both clauses (albeit with some redundancy) (see Ott 2014, 2015). Finding at least one such example would constitute strong support for the ellipsis hypothesis. Second, under the assumption that the dislocate moves in CP₁, reconstruction to a lower position is predicted to be available for scope and for binding (though this prediction is also made by the more traditional movement accounts of Left Dislocation).

In summary, the ellipsis analysis of Left Dislocation correctly predicts the mixed set of connectivity effects we find in Biblical Hebrew. Independently supported assumptions about the nature of calculating identity in ellipsis carried over straightforwardly to explain gender mismatches in Left Dislocation. Insights from Landau (2009) regarding the nature of null prepositions and experiencers shed light on an otherwise intransigent example with a category mismatch. Movement analyses fail to predict anti-connectivity effects and hence fall short of explaining the same breadth of data as the ellipsis analysis.

3.5 Summary of Biblical Hebrew Dislocations

The goals of this section have been twofold. Empirically, I have argued that Biblical Hebrew attests both Hanging Topics and Left Dislocation. Each can be distinguished by a variety of tests diagnosing connectivity between the dislocate and correlate. Whereas Hanging Topics show no connectivity effects, Left Dislocates exhibit some connectivity with their correlates. My analysis demands a recategorization of dislocations in the Biblical Hebrew specialist literature and provides new data for typological comparisons. On the basis of these empirical contrasts, I have argued that Hanging Topics are base-generated in a left peripheral position (most likely in the specifier of a functional head, such as Top), whereas Left Dislocates are elliptical sentence fragments appearing linearly juxtaposed to the host clause as a result of asyndetic coordination.

4 Resumptive Relative Clauses

4.1 Preliminaries: Terminology in the relative clause

Prior to considering resumptive relative clauses in any detail, certain terminological preliminaries are in order. Recall that ʔašer, šeC-, φ, the z-series, and hC- are all analyzed as relative complementizers here, and not as relative pronouns, since all are attested with resumption, and none are attested in pied-piping structures. I refer to the clause immediately following the relative complementizer as the highest clause—that is, the highest
clause inside the relative clause. Any clauses embedded under the highest predicate are referred to as embedded clauses. Thus, in (115), the relative head "the man" is coreferential with an embedded object gap, "I" is the highest subject, and "you" is the embedded subject. (115) the man₁ [hcp that I know [ecp that you saw ___₁ ]]

The three other positions relevant to our discussion are the following: possessors, complements of prepositions, and locative adverbials.

### 4.2 Introduction and Literature Review

Although the syntactic and Biblical Hebrew literature on resumption discuss dislocation constructions in some detail, the locus classicus of resumptive pronouns is the relative clause. Informally, resumptive pronouns are pronominal elements occurring in a position inside the relative clause otherwise expected to contain a gap. A representative Biblical Hebrew example is (116).

(116) h₃-min h₆-th₂šêš₁ ṭ₃šer šiwəwît²-kâ l₃-bîltî ṭ₃-kol mimmen-₃-nû₁ ūkâlta
Q-from the-tree.MS C command.PFV.1S-2MS.ACC to-NEG eat.INF from-3MS eat.PFV.2MS

'Did you eat from the tree₁ that I commanded you to not eat from it₁?' (Gen 3.11)

Standard treatments of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses in Biblical Hebrew reference grammars focus on two variables: (i) the position of the resumptive pronoun within the relative clause, and (ii) the status of the relative clause as syndetic or asyndetic. It has generally been recognized that subject, direct object, and locative adverbial positions alternate between gaps and resumptive pronouns, and that subject resumptive pronouns are relatively rare (Kautzsch 1910: 445; Joüon and Muraoka 2016: 561-562; Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 333-337). Most reference grammars also recognize that certain positions never host resumptive pronouns, including chiefly temporal adverbials (Waltke and O’Connor 1990 334; Joüon and Muraoka 2016: 562) and adjuncts inside relative clauses with verbs of speech (verba dicendi) whose complements are taken to be 'about' the relative head in some sense, (Kautzsch 1910: 445; Joüon and Muraoka 2016: 563). Nevertheless, other oblique positions are not addressed in the same detail. While Kautzsch explicitly acknowledges that only resumptive pronouns are attested inside prepositional phrases, he makes no mention of resumptive pronouns/gaps corresponding to relative-internal possessors (1910 446). Joüon & Muraoka do precisely the opposite (2016 561). Fewer scholars have focused on the syndetic vs. asyndetic distinction in analyzing resumption, with the exceptions of Waltke & O’Connor (1990 333-338) and van der Merwe et al. (2017 304-309) who show that resumptive

---

56 Although many Biblical Hebrew scholars employ the term "genitive" to refer to possessors (Waltke and O’Connor 1990 330-340, Parunak 1996, Joüon and Muraoka 2016 561) I prefer "possessor" here since Biblical Hebrew does not possess an overt genitive case.
pronouns occur in asyndetic relatives as well as in syndetic relatives with the complementizers ?ašer, šeC-, and the z-series. They do not, however, consider the full range of relativizable positions for each.

In summary, though the specifics vary, the consensus holds that resumptive pronouns (i) alternate with gaps in subject, direct object, and locative adverbial positions, (ii) are obligatory as the complements of prepositions and as possessors, and (iii) never occur in certain other positions (e.g. temporal adverbials). Most also agree that resumptive pronouns are attested in syndetic relatives with the complementizers ?ašer, šeC-, and the z-series, and in asyndetic relatives (i.e. with the φ complementizer).⁵⁷

Holmstedt [2002, 2016] updates these traditional accounts and provides the most comprehensive overview of resumption in Biblical Hebrew relative clauses to date. His surveys focus on the same two familiar variables: (i) the relative internal position of the resumptive pronoun/gap, and (ii) the choice of relative complementizer. His empirical contributions are substantial and lay the groundwork for all future inquiries into relative clause resumption in Biblical Hebrew. I will highlight two of his most important achievements here. First, Holmstedt attempts to systematically document which positions are attested hosting resumptive pronouns for each relative complementizer [2016: 142-144; 170-172]. He notes that subject and direct object resumption is attested with the complementizers ?ašer and šeC-, and that resumption of adjunct (i.e. oblique) positions is attested with ?ašer, šeC-, and the z-series [2016: 172-173]. For Holmstedt, adjunct positions include (i) complements of prepositions, (ii) and locative adverbials (for the latter, cf. 2016: 143). Second, Holmstedt catalogues the set of constituents which behave resumptively in relative clauses. In addition to anaphoric pronouns, he claims that noun phrases semantically related to the relative head and full copies of the relative head are marginally attested as resumptive elements on the basis of the examples in (117) and (118) [2016: 170-172]. Note, however, that what he considers to be resumption by a semantically related noun phrase is more accurately resumption by a quantificational phrase.

(117) Resumption by a quantificational phrase

kol t’pillà kol t’hinnà ?ašer ṯîyeh l’-kôl hâ-ʔâdām l’-kōlî ʔamm-ʔâkà every prayer every supplication C be.1PFV.3FS to-every the-man to-every people-2MS.GEN yîsrâ’èl ?ašer yëdâ’èn bîšî negâ’è l’bîbô-Israel C know.1PFV.3MP each affliction heart-3MS.GEN

‘every prayer, every supplication that belongs to any man, to any of your people, Israel, that each one knows the affliction of his heart’ (1 Kgs 8.38; see also 2 Chr 6.29)

(118) Resumption by a full copy of the relative head

w’-samtî ?et zarî’-ąkà ka-ʔâpar hâ-ʔâreš ?ašer ?îm yûkal ʔîs and-place.PFV.1S ACC offspring-2MS.GEN like-dust the-earth C if be.able.1PFV.3MS man

⁵⁷Van der Merwe et al. also claim that resumptive pronouns never occur with the complementizer hâC-.
I will make your offspring like [the dust of the earth], that if a man is able to count [the dust of the earth], so shall your offspring be counted.” (Gen 13.16)

Such examples are extremely rare in the corpus of Biblical Hebrew and I set them aside for the purposes of this paper. I will instead focus on canonical resumption with pronouns.

In Holmstedt’s otherwise extremely thorough account of relative clause resumption, there remain a few notable errors. I begin with his analysis of PP-internal resumption, regarding which he makes the following bold claim: ”[I]n Hebrew, either the whole PP is overt...or, much less commonly, the whole PP is null” (2016: 174). This claim is based on the following examples:

(119) bam-māqôm 1 ʔâšer yibhâr YHWH ʔâlōhê-kā [PP b- 01 ]
in.the-place.MS C choose.IPV.3MS YHWH god-2MS.GEN on-3MS
'in the place 1 that YHWH your god chooses it 1 ’ (Dt 12.18)

(120) ʔeł ham-māqôm 1 ʔâšer yibhâr YHWH __ 1
to the-place.MS C choose.IPV.3MS YHWH
'to the place 1 that YHWH chooses __ 1 ’ (Dt 12.26)

In (119), the verb bhâr ‘to choose’ selects for a PP complement and the relative head 'the place' is coreferential with a pronoun internal to that PP. However, in (120), there is no PP internal to the relative clause. The question, then, is whether or not there is a silent PP in (120), or whether the gap simply corresponds to a nominal direct object. If we survey the full range of complements selected by the verb bhâr ‘to choose’, we find that it may rarely occur with a direct object, as in (121):

(121) lḥ̱ma ʔan dāwîd 1 ʔabd-i ʔâšer bāḥartî ʔôt-01
for.the.sake.of David servant-1S.GEN C choose.PFV.1S ACC-3MS

I argue that this set of examples can be explained if we assume that the verb bhâr selects for two types of complements: either a DP, as in (121), or a PP, as in (119). We need not assume with Holmstedt that (120) involves a gapped PP. Rather, I argue that (120) involves a relativized direct object, parallel to (121)—there is no preposition

58 Note that epithets—non-pronominal DPs, typically with some affective meaning—have figured in discussions of resumption in other languages. See especially Aoun and Choueiri 2000 on resumptive epithets in Arabic like the following:

(i) ʃoft 1-bonîl ʔašli bikhîkro ʔan no ha-l-habiîle 1 ma râfi tørbâfî s-saba? saw.1S the-girl that think.2P that this-the-idiot NEG FUT win.3FS the-race

'I saw the girl 1 that you think that this idiot 1 will not win the race.' (Lebanese Arabic; Aoun and Choueiri 2000: 8)
(overt or silent) in such examples. PPs themselves are thus never gapped, and resumptive pronouns are always obligatory inside PPs, as in (119) \[59\]

Similar peculiarities abound in Holmstedt’s analysis of the alternation between resumptive pronouns and gaps in other positions. For instance, regarding the direct object position, Holmstedt seems to believe that "gaps" can be analyzed underlingly as null resumptive pronouns: "the pair in (122) and (123) illustrates promotion (and thus overt and null resumption) from the verbal complement position" (Holmstedt 2016: 170; emphasis added).

(122) ?el ?eresi ?asher tarti \[^1\] lâ-hem to land.FS C explore.PFV.1S for-3MP
'to a land\[^1\] that I explored \[^1\] for them.’ (Ezek 20.6)

(123) way-yōsî?û dibbat hâ-?eresi ?asher târû \[^2\] ôt-âhî ?el b’nê yîsrâ’êl and-bring.IPFV.3MP bad.report.FS the-land C explore.PFV.3P ACC-3FS to children Israel
'They brought a bad report of the land\[^1\] that they explored it\[^2\] to the children of Israel.’ (Num 13.32)

Yet, Holmstedt never articulates why it is that he assumes that (122) actually contains a null resumptive pronoun. As we will see, while there is evidence for null resumptive pronouns in Biblical Hebrew, they are consistently in subject position. This arguably follows from the fact that subjects in finite clauses are commonly null due to the fact that Biblical Hebrew is a pro-drop language. In the absence of convincing evidence to the contrary, I will assume that pronouns are not present when they are not pronounced; thus, (122) involves a gap, while (123) involves a resumptive pronoun.

Next, though Holsmtedt should be lauded for his attempt to champion statistical methods in researching the Biblical Hebrew relative clause, many of his figures are in need of revising. As a case in point, he cites 35 examples of purported subject resumption in Biblical Hebrew, distinguishing between resumption in null copula clauses, participial clauses, and finite verbal clauses (2016: 172, fn. 47) \[60\]. Several of these examples, however, are problematic: one does not contain a subject resumptive pronoun, one lacks a relative clause entirely, three contain existential constructions that do not clearly involve resumptive pronouns, and one example is listed twice. Moreover, I have identified five examples with highest subject resumption that he overlooks, in addition to several examples of embedded subject resumption. This issue will be discussed in greater detail in the following section.

Despite these issues, Holmstedt’s work stands as a remarkable contribution to our understanding of the em-

---

59 Strangely, Holmstedt seems to be aware of data like (121), but fails to generalize these cases to the analysis of (120) (2016: 174, fn. 48).
60 His higher count of 40 in the same footnote appears to include ‘resumption’ by epithets, which are not considered here.
empirical distribution of resumptive pronouns in relative clauses.\textsuperscript{61} Indeed, the present work relies heavily on that of Holmstedt. I have culled examples from the tagged Holmstedt-Abegg Syntactic Database of Ancient Hebrew using Accordance Bible Software, and have checked my corpora extensively against the examples in Holmstedt \textsuperscript{[2002, 2016]}. I am also greatly indebted to Dr. Holmstedt for personally sharing his data on resumptive pronouns in $^2$šēr relative clauses with me. In the end, however, our corpora do not always align; he cites certain examples which I do not believe involve resumption, and I have found several examples of resumption which he seems to have missed. Overall then, my work refines and builds on the recognized corpus of relative clause resumption in Biblical Hebrew and brings all of this evidence together for the first time. I provide both raw counts and frequency estimates (along with citations) for all examples of third-person pronominal resumption that I have identified in Biblical Hebrew relative clauses, categorized by complementizer and relativized position.\textsuperscript{62} All of my examples are given in Appendices 3-5.

In addition, I make two novel empirical contributions in the following section. First, by distinguishing between unembedded and embedded positions inside relative clauses, I uncover a heretofore unrecognized embedding effect, such that embedded positions are consistently more likely to be resumed than are their corresponding unembedded positions in Biblical Hebrew. Second, I demonstrate that resumption in Biblical Hebrew relative clauses is island-insensitive. Biblical Hebrew therefore parallels other languages with productive resumptive relative strategies like Irish and Lebanese Arabic.

4.3 Empirical Distribution

In this section, I will provide the most comprehensive account of resumption in Biblical Hebrew relative clauses to date\textsuperscript{63} I focus on the complementizers $^2$šēr, šēC-, φ, and the z-series, and I leave aside discussion of the complementizer haC- for reasons elaborated above. The data are organized by relativized position, and, where relevant, I note distinctions between complementizers. In cases where I have found no distributional differences, I only present examples in the main text of $^2$šēr relatives for the sake of space. See Appendices 3-5 for comprehensive lists.

\textsuperscript{61}On his functional proposals for motivating resumptive pronouns in optional positions, see below.

\textsuperscript{62}For my statistical analyses, I leave out non-third person resumption. See Joosten \textsuperscript{[1993]} for data.

\textsuperscript{63}Once again, I am greatly indebted to Robert Holmstedt for generously sharing his data on resumption in Biblical Hebrew relative clauses with me, in which he aggregated much of the data on $^2$šēr that I cite here. In the end, however, our corpora do not entirely overlap. I do not include non-3rd person resumption in my counts, and I include a number of examples of resumptive pronouns in $^2$šēr relatives that he does not (roughly 5 in highest subject position, 18 in highest object position, and 21 in unembedded and embedded locative adverbial position). Of course, all errors remain my own.

I cannot deal seriously with the figures cited in Parunak \textsuperscript{[1996]} for resumptive pronouns in the Genesis corpus. Although he cites statistics for resumption, organized by case function inside the relative clause (i.e. nominative, genitive, accusative), he does not cite all of his examples, making it impossible to check his work. Likewise for Tsujita \textsuperscript{[1991]} for resumption in Genesis and Deuteronomy.
All estimates for ‘šer relatives (e.g. for the number of gaps in highest object position) were calculated using a random sampling method. I used the Google random number generator in two separate samples to select from the 23,213 total Hebrew verses in the Hebrew Bible. The first sample consisted of 378 verses, in which I counted the number of subject and object gaps in relative clauses. The second sample consisted of 400 verses, in which I counted the number of locative adverbial gaps in relative clauses. I estimated both sample sizes using Survey Monkey’s Sample Size Calculator, the first at 95% confidence with a 5% margin of error, and the second at 95% confidence with a 4.86% margin of error.

4.3.1 Obligatory resumptive pronouns

For all Biblical Hebrew relative complementizers, relativized (subject or object) possessors and complements of prepositions only host resumptive pronouns.

(124) a. ¿šer subject possessor, resumptive pronoun

[\text{w"-haššil-"enî} \quad \text{miy-"ad} \quad \text{b"nēśî} \quad \text{nēkār} \quad \overset{\text{"ašer}}{\text{pî-hemî}}]

\text{dibber} \quad \overset{\text{šâw}}{\text{?}}

\text{and-deliver.IMP.MS-1S.ACC from-hand children.MP foreign.MP C mouth.MS-3MP GEN speak.PFV.3MS vanity}

'Rescue me from the hand of foreign children that their mouth speaks vanity.' (Ps 144.11)

b. ¿šer object possessor, resumptive pronoun

[\text{we-"lîš"â"y} \quad \text{dibber} \quad \overset{\text{el hā-\overset{\text{\text{'ašar}}}{\text{tiššā}}} \quad \overset{\text{"ašer}}{\text{heh\overset{\text{\text{'ašar}}}{\text{yā}}} \quad \overset{\text{et}}{\text{b"n-\overset{\text{\text{'ašar}}}{\text{\text{'ašar}}}}}]

\text{and-Elisha say.PFV.3MS to the-woman.FS C revive.PFV.3MS ACC son-3FS.GEN}

'Now Elisha said to the woman who he revived her son...' (2 Kgs 8.1)

(125) ¿šer complement of preposition, resumptive pronoun

[\text{ki} \quad \text{tôr-ēm} \quad \overset{\text{et}}{\text{had-derek\overset{\text{\text{'ašar}}}{\text{\text{'ašar}}}}} \quad \overset{\text{\text{'ašar}}}{\text{yēl\overset{\text{\text{'ašar}}}{\text{\text{'ašar}}}}} \quad \overset{\text{\text{'ašar}}}{\text{b\overset{\text{\text{'ašar}}}{\text{\text{'ašar}}}}]

\text{because teach.IPFV.2MS-3MR.ACC ACC the-way.FS the-good.FS C walk.IPFV.3MP on-3FS}

'Because you will teach them the good way that they should walk on it.' (1 Kgs 8.36)

No relative head in Biblical Hebrew is attested corresponding to a possessor gap or gap inside a prepositional phrase, as illustrated in (126). This naturally follows from the fact that neither possessors nor prepositions can be stranded in Biblical Hebrew (see Holmstedt 2016: 155).

(126) a. Unattested preposition-stranding in Biblical Hebrew

*[Operator]₁ ¿šer ... [P₁]

b. Unattested possessor-stranding in Biblical Hebrew

*[Operator]₁ ¿šer ... [Possessor₁]

64 Accessed by searching "random number generator" in the Google search engine.
4.3.2  Obligatory gaps

For all complementizers, gaps are obligatory when relativizing non-locative, adverbial positions. For example, relative heads corresponding to temporal adjuncts are only attested corresponding to gaps.

(127) ḥaḏ hay-yōm ṭām ḥašlôm 1
until the-day  C come.PFV.3MS in-safety
‘...until the day1 that he came back safely 1’ (2 Sam 19.25)

Moreover, it has been recognized since at least Kautzsch (1910: 445) that relatives with verba dicendi often contain gaps within the highest clause (i.e. not in the direct speech clause). Consider the following representative example, in which the relative head "the well" does not correspond to any constituent inside the relative clause. Rather, the quotation embedded inside the relative is loosely associated with determining the relative head's referent: the speaker refers to a well from which YHWH wanted Moses to give the Israelites water.

(128) ḥaḏ ḥab-bā’ ṭām ḥašlôm 1
the-well 3 say.PFV.3MS YHWH to-Moses gather.IMP.MP ACC the-people and-give.IPFV.1S
‘that is the well such that YHWH said to Moses: 'Gather the people, and I will give them water.” (Num 21.16)

I propose that we analyze these relatives along the lines of English "such that" relatives, in which the relative head likewise need not be coreferential with any constituent internal to the relative clause. Thus, in (129), the relative head "a guy" does not correspond to any position internal to the relative clause.

(129) I want to hire a guy such that I know the store will open early. (Safir 1986: 678, fn.14; attributed to Tony Kroch)

66 This does not mean, however, that these clauses never contain constituents coreferential with the relative head. For instance, in (i) the relative head is coreferential with the pronominal clitic object -nâ 'it' contained within the embedded direct speech clause as observed in Brockelmann (1912: 585).

(i) min ḥag-gōyim ṭām ḥašlôm 1
from-the-nations MP C b’nē yisrā’ēl hō bā-hem 1
children Israel NEG enter.IPFV.2MP among-3MP
‘from the nations1 that YHWH said to the Israelites: "You shall not enter among them1."’ (1 Kgs 11.2)

I assume, however, that material inside quotations is inaccessible in the sense that dependencies cannot be formed between positions inside and outside the quotation, as in the ungrammatical English relative clause in (ii).

(ii) *This is the book1 that Mary said: "Oh yeah, John read 1.”

67 Similar examples include Deut 34.4; Jdg 8.15; 1 Sam 9.23; Hos 13.10; Lam 2.15; Qoh 12.1; see Joüon and Muraoka 2016: 562.
Although I am certainly not the first to identify these examples in Biblical Hebrew, I am the first to draw the parallel with "such that" relatives in English.

### 4.3.3 Subjects

For the complementizers ?ašer, šeC-, and φ, resumptive pronouns and gaps are both attested in the highest subject position.

(130)  a. ?ašer highest subject, gap

\[
\text{'Cursed is the man (that) } \text{1 eats bread today.' (1 Sam 14.28)}
\]

(131)  a. šeC- highest subject, gap

\[
'\text{Your hair is like a flock of goats (that) } \text{1 leap down from Mount Gilead.' (Song 4.1)}\]

(132)  a. φ highest subject, gap

\[
'\text{I am the man (that) } \text{1 has seen affliction with the rod of his wrath.' (Lam 3.1)}\]

This is striking given that resumptive pronouns are banned for the highest subject position in many languages, including Irish, Modern Hebrew, and Palestinian Arabic.

(133)  *an fear1 a raibh \[\text{breoite}\] the man CAN be.PAST he ill

(134)  *ha-?arie1 [še-/?ašer] hu1 taraf ?et ha-yeled barax the-lion C he devoured ACC the-boy escaped
McCloskey has formalized this fairly robust cross-linguistic generalization as the Highest Subject Restriction:

(136) **Highest Subject Restriction**  
The highest subject of a clause cannot be occupied by a resumptive pronoun. [*McCloskey* 2011: 77; emphasis original]

The presence of resumption in the highest subject position in examples like (130b), (131b), and (132b) demonstrates that the Highest Subject Restriction is not a categorical constraint in Biblical Hebrew. Similar provisions must be made for Lebanese Arabic, and even later stages of Hebrew (e.g. Mishnaic Hebrew), which likewise permit highest subject resumption.

(137) t\`aas\~as l-walad\~1 yalli [huwwe\~1] xazza? l-kteeb punished.3MS the-boy that (he) tore.3MS the-book  
'The boy\~1 that (he\~1) tore up the book was punished.' (Lebanese Arabic; slightly adapted from [Aoun 2000: 15])

(138) \`e\~1 `e\~h\~em\~1 s\~rik\~im \~se-y\~abo?\~u b\~a-hen ham-mayim these.MP C-3PM require.PTCP.MP C-enter.3PM on-3PF the-water  
'These (are) (they\~1) that they\~1 require that water enter onto them...’ (Mishnaic Hebrew; [Mik 10.4])

Granting this typologically rare feature of Biblical Hebrew, highest subject resumption is nevertheless infrequent in Biblical Hebrew. Let us consider each complementizer in turn. Out of 378 randomly sampled verses, I found 27 instances of highest subject gaps. Multiplying my sample proportion (27/378) by the population size (22944, i.e. the number of Hebrew verses in the Hebrew Bible) gives us a maximum likelihood estimate of 1606 total highest subject gaps in ?a\~ser relatives in the entire corpus. By contrast, I have found a total of 30 highest subject resumptive pronouns with the complementizer ?a\~ser.

---

68 See [Klein 2014; 2016] and [Salzmann 2017] for additional discussion of languages in which the Highest Subject Restriction is not (categorically) operative. It appears as though there is some disagreement between these empirical surveys, however. [Hawkins 2014: 23] claims that Arabic, Hausa, and Yoruba, *inter alia*, only permit gaps in the highest subject position. Klein, on the other hand, claims that these same languages either allow (Arabic) or require (Hausa and Yoruba) resumptive pronouns in highest subject position [2016: 57-58].

69 It is unclear to me what, if any, distinction can be drawn between resumption in null copula clauses, participial clauses, and finite verbal clauses without a clearer view of their syntax. I abstract over these differences for the purposes of my analysis. See [Wilson 2018] for a recent formal account of copular clauses in Biblical Hebrew. See [McCloskey 2011: 85, fn. 14] on the presence of highest subject resumptive pronouns in Irish copular clauses.

70 [Holmstedt 2016: 172, fn. 47] cites 35 examples of highest subject resumption in Biblical Hebrew, distinguishing between those in null copula clauses, those in participial clauses, and those in finite verbal clauses. Seven of these examples deserve mention: (i) Lev 11.29 lacks a relative clause (and therefore trivially lacks a subject resumptive pronoun); (ii) Ezek 20.9 includes a resumptive pronoun inside a prepositional phrase and not in the highest subject position; (iii) Song 1.6 contains a first person resumptive pronoun, which I do not consider in my statistical summaries; (iv) Neh 2.13 is listed twice; and (v) Gen 7.8, 30.33, and Deut 29.14 do not clearly involve...
pronouns occur in 1.8% of all ?ašer relative clauses with a highest subject variable position (i.e. 30/1636). Given the far fewer number of šeC- relatives in my corpus, I am able to give exact counts for gaps as well as resumptive pronouns in highest subject position: out of a total of 57 highest subject šeC- relatives, 2 examples (i.e. 3.5%) are attested with resumptive pronouns.

(132b) is the sole example of a φ relative with a resumptive pronoun in the highest subject position. I have not been able to confidently count the number of highest subject gaps in φ relatives, because the majority that are cited in Holmstedt (2016) and the Biblical Hebrew reference grammars could alternatively be parsed as biclausal structures, in which the relative head and resumptive pronoun belong to separate clauses.

(139) binyâmin z’qāḇ yiṯrāḇ
Benjamin wolf MS tear IPFV.3MS

Relative parse: "Benjamin is a wolf (that) tears.'
Non-relative parse: "Benjamin is a wolf. He tears." (Gen 49.27)

These two parses could theoretically be disambiguated with relative heads that do not set up discourse antecedents for cross-sentential anaphoric dependencies, such as negatively quantified DPs.

(140) a. He destroyed no villagei (that) his ancestors had lived in .
   b. *He destroyed no villagei. His ancestors lived in iti.

For the sake of space, however, I must leave a more complete analysis of highest subject gaps in φ relatives to future research.71

This survey illustrates that, though attested, resumptive pronouns are robustly dispreferred in the highest subject position, occurring in just 1.8% of ?ašer relatives, in 3.5% of šeC- relatives, and in a single example of an φ relative. This anti-pronominal prejudice will surface again in our discussion of highest object resumption below. The final complementizer, the z-series, shows no alternation. This complementizer is only attested with

subject resumption. Each of the last three examples contains the negative existential ?ēn which hosts a 3rd person clitic pronoun that is coreferential with the relative head, as in (1):

(i) û-min hab-b’hêmâ1 ?ašer īnten-nâ1 t’hôrâ...
and-from-the-beast FS C NEG.EXIST-3FS clean FS

"of a beast that (it1) is not clean...' (Gen 7.8)

It is unclear to me what status these clitics have: are they agreement markers, or are they really functioning as anaphoric, resumptive pronouns? Barring a more fleshed out analysis of such constructions, I remove them from my corpus. I add the following six examples to the three that Holmstedt cites: Lev 11.26(x2); 1 Sam 11.7; possibly 2 Kgs 17.26; Qoh 8.13, 9.2. See Shlonsky (1997: ch. 4) for an analysis of negative existentials in Modern Hebrew.

I have identified five examples of resumptive pronouns in the highest subject position which Holmstedt appears to have missed: (i) with ?ašer: Jer 27.9 and Ps 88.6; (ii) with šeC: Qoh 2.18 and Lam 2.16; (iii) with φ: Ezek 22.24. This is in addition to five examples of embedded subject resumption with ?ašer (Exod 22.8; Num 11.16; Deut 20.20; 1 Sam 25.11; Mic 5.7) and one with φ (Jer 5.15).

highest subject gaps, as in (141).

(141)  
\[
\text{z-series highest subject, gap} \\
\text{mip-p\textsuperscript{n}n r\textsuperscript{s}šā\textsuperscript{ā}îm\textsubscript{1} zū šaddū-nī} \\
\text{from-face wicked.MP C devastate.PFV.3P-1S.ACC} \\
\text{from the wicked\textsubscript{1} that \textsubscript{1} have devastated me'} (Ps 17.9)
\]

Remarkably, the dispreference for subject resumption disappears in embedded contexts. Though the corpus of embedded subject relatives is extremely small (only six with ?a\textsuperscript{a}šer and one with φ), all but one make use of resumption. (142) exemplifies embedded subject resumption, and (143) is the only example of an embedded subject gap.

(142)  
\[
\text{?a\textsuperscript{a}šer embedded subject, resumptive pronoun} \\
\text{?ēspā l-ī šibhîm \textsubscript{i}sīs miz-ziq\textsuperscript{n} nē yīšrā\textsuperscript{ā}ēl ?a\textsuperscript{a}šer yādā\textsuperscript{ā}tā kî [hēm\textsubscript{1}] ziq\textsuperscript{n} nē gather.IMP.MS to-me seventy man.MS from-elders Israel C know.PFV.2MS C 3MP elders hā-ŷām the-people} \\
\text{Gather for me seventy men\textsubscript{1} that you know that they\textsubscript{1} are elders of the people.' (Num 11.16)}
\]

Two examples in particular warrant further discussion. Both (148) and (149) appear to contain embedded subject gaps.

(144)  
\[
\text{ki-k \textsuperscript{a}pîr\textsubscript{1} b\textsuperscript{a}edrē sō\textsubscript{i}n ?a\textsuperscript{a}šer [Adjunct.Island ūm ūbār the-people} \\
\text{like-young.lion.MS among-flocks sheep C \textsubscript{1} if cross.over.PFV.3MS w\textsuperscript{a}-rāmas \textsubscript{1} w\textsuperscript{a}-tāra\textsuperscript{ā}p \textsubscript{1}] w\textsuperscript{a}-?ēn ma\textsuperscript{s}īl} \\
\text{and-trample.PFV.3MS and-tear.PFV.3MS and-NEG.EXIST deliverer} \\
\text{(The remnant of Jacob will be...) like a young lion\textsubscript{1} among flocks of sheep that [Adjunct.Island if (he\textsubscript{1}) crosses over and (he\textsubscript{1}) tramples and (he\textsubscript{1}) tears up ], then there is no deliverer.' (Mic 5.7)}
\]

(145)  
\[
\text{gōy\textsubscript{1} φ ... lō? ūtīsma\textsuperscript{ā} mah y\textsuperscript{a}dabbēr \textsubscript{i} [Wh-Island what (it\textsubscript{1}) says].} (Jer 5.15)
\]

In (148), the relative head k\textsuperscript{a}pîr ‘a young lion’ is interpreted as the subject of a series of verbs inside the relative-internal conditional clause (e.g. ūbār "cross over"), but is not coreferential with anything inside the highest clause. The main predication inside the relative in (148) is the conditional apodosis "(then) there is no deliverer". In (149), the relative head gōy ‘a nation’ is coreferential with the null subject of the verb y\textsuperscript{a}dabbēr con-
tained within an embedded question (i.e. "you don't hear what (it) says"). Yet conditional clauses and embedded interrogatives are both syntactic islands, the former a species of adjunct islands. Hence, we would not expect a filler-gap dependency to be licit across these island boundaries, in line with the ungrammatical literal English translations of the Biblical Hebrew examples.

(146) *a young lion that [Adjunct Island if ___1 crosses over and ___1 tramples and ___1 tears up], then there is no deliverer.

(147) *a nation that you don't hear [Wh-Island what ___1 says].

Therefore, the Biblical Hebrew relative clauses in (148) and (149) must not contain gaps, despite their surface appearance. Rather, I posit that both examples contain null pro subject resumptive pronouns.72

(148) ḥašer embedded subject

ki-kḥîpîr1 bâ-ḥedrê šôʔn Ḫašer [Adjunct Island ṭîm ṭâbar ]

like-young.lion.ms among-flocks sheep C if cross.over.PFV.3MS

wâ-râmas [pro1] wâ-ṭâraṭ [pro1] wâ-ʔēn massûl

and-trample.PFV.3MS and-tear.PFV.3MS and-NEG.EXIST deliverer

'(The remnant of Jacob will be...) like a young lion among flocks of sheep that [Adjunct Island if (he1) crosses over and (he1) tramples and (he1) tears up], then there is no deliverer.' (Mic 5.7)

(149) ṣ embedded subject

gôy1 ṣ ... lôʔ ṭîsmaʔ [Wh-Island mah yâ dabber ]

nation.ms C NEG hear.PFV.2MS what say.PFV.3MS

'a nation (that) ... you don't hear [Wh-Island what (it1) says].' (Jer 5.15)

This proposal is commensurate with the fact that Biblical Hebrew commonly permits null arguments in the subject position. In summary, then, all embedded subject relatives except one contain (overt or null) resumption and contrast markedly with their highest subject counterparts, for which we observed a statistical preference for gaps with the complementizers ḥašer and šeC- (and possibly φ).

4.3.4 Objects

For the complementizers ḥašer, šeC-, and φ, resumptive pronouns and gaps are both attested in highest object position.

(150) a. ḥašer highest object, gap

wâ-naʕâbâ ṭâlôhîm ḥašer lôʔ yâdaʔtâ ḥašer wa-ʔâbôte-kâ

and-serve, JUS.1p gods.mpl other.mpl C NEG know.PFV.2MS and-fathers-2MS.GEN

'Let us serve other gods that you and your fathers don't know ___1.' (Deut 13.7)

b. ḥašer highest object, resumptive pronoun

72 See Aoun (2000: 17) for a similar account of Lebanese Arabic null subject resumption.
nēl'kā ʔah₃rē ʔәlōhîm₁ ʔahērím ʔašēr lōʔ yē'da'îtā-m₁
go.JUS.1P after gods.MP other.MP C NEG know.PFV.2MS-3MP.ACC

'Let us go after other gods₁ that you don't know them₁.' (Deut 13.3)

(151) a. šeC- highest object, gap
ū-pāntī ʔanî b₃-kol ma'î ʃ₁-ay se'-yahû yād-ay
and-face.PFV.1S 1S on-ալ works-1S.GEN C-do.PFV.3P hands.FD-1S.GEN
I faced all my works₁ that my hands had done __₁.' (Qoh 2.11)

b. šeC- highest object, resumptive pronoun
ʔak zeh hay-yôm₁ šeq-qiwînû-hû
surely this.MS the-day.MS C-await.PFV.1P-3MS.ACC
'Surely this is the day₁ that we have awaited it₁.' (Lam 2.16)

(152) a. φ highest object, gap
t₃bōʔ-ēhû šōṭā₁ φ lōʔ yēda'__₁
come.upon.JUS.3FS-3MS.ACC destruction.FS C NEG know.PFV.3MS
'Let destruction₁ (that) he doesn't know __₁ come upon him.' (Ps 35.8)

b. φ highest object, resumptive pronoun
h₄-kā-zeh yihye ʃom₁ φ ?ebhār-ēhû₁
Q-like-this be.IPFV.3MS feast.MS C choose.IPFV.1S-3MS.ACC
'Will the feast₁ (that) I choose it₁ be like this?' (Isa 58.5)

As with the highest subject position, resumptive pronouns are the statistical outliers. In ?ašer relatives, I have identified 79 highest object resumptive pronouns. In my random sample of 378 verses, I found 38 examples of highest object gaps in ?ašer relatives, yielding an estimated total of 2294 highest object ?ašer gaps in the Hebrew Bible ((38/378)*22944). Therefore, I estimate that resumptive pronouns occur in 3.3% of highest object ?ašer relative clauses (i.e. 79/2373). In šeC- relatives, I count two resumptive pronouns out of a total 20 highest object relatives—that is, 10% of highest object šeC- relatives are resumptive. Finally, 6 out of 55 highest object φ relatives contain resumptive pronouns (i.e. 10.9% resumptive pronouns). The z-series is only attested with highest object gaps, as in (153).

(153) z-series mO, gap
tōsiʔ-ēnî mē-rešet₁ zu ʕām₃nû __₁ lî
bring.out.IPFV.2MS-1S.ACC from-net C hide.PFV.3P for-1S
'You bring me out of the net₁ that they have hidden __₁ for me.' (Ps 31.5)

Once again, however, the picture in embedded clauses is somewhat trickier. First, embedded object relatives are only attested with the complementizer ?ašer. Second, relative heads corresponding to objects in finite embedded clauses are extremely rare. The only example I have found employs a gap.

(154) ?ašer finite embedded object, gap
Representative examples are given in (155):

(155) a. ?ašer non-finite embedded object, gap

\[ w^\circ \text{nhamti} \, \text{šal hā-rā'ā} \, ?ašer hāšabti \, la-\,\text{šōt} \, l-\,\text{ā} \]

and-relent.PFV.1S over the-evil C plan.PFV.1S to-do.INF to-3MS

'I will relent from the evil that I planned to do ___ to him.' (Jer 18.8)

b. ?ašer non-finite embedded object, resumptive pronoun

\[ w^\circ \text{hì?} \, \text{ēm} \, \text{šel hā-?āres} \, ?ašer nāšā?ti \, \text{et yād-i} \, \text{lā-} \]

and-bring.PFV.1S-3MP.ACC to the-land.FS C raise.PFV.1S ACC hand-1S.GEN to-give.INF

\[ \text{šōt-} \, \text{hā} \, \text{hēm} \]

ACC-3FS to-3MP

'I brought them to the land that I swore (lit. 'I raised my hand') to give it to them.' (Ezek 20.28)

Thus, whereas resumptive pronouns occur in 3.3% of highest object ?ašer relatives, they occur in 19.2% of non-finite embedded object ?ašer relatives (i.e. 11/57). This contrast between highest and embedded positions is reminiscent of the contrast we saw above with subject resumptive pronouns, and will surface once more in the following section on locative adverbial positions.

### 4.3.5 Locative Adverbials

For the complementizers ?ašer, šeC-, and φ, resumptive pronouns and gaps are attested in highest locative adverbial position, as in (156)–(158).

(156) a. ?ašer highest locative adverbial, gap

\[ \text{wa-y}^\circ \text{hi} \, \text{šīmmād-} \, \text{bād-} \, \text{derek} \, \, ?ašer hālākti \, l-\]

an-be.PFV.3MS with-1S on.the-road.FS C walk.PFV.1S

'He was with me on the road that I walked ___' (Gen 35.3)

b. ?ašer highest locative adverbial, resumptive pronoun

\[ \text{šān} \, \text{yōqē} \, \text{et b-nē} \, \text{yisra'ēl mib-bēn hag-gōyim} \, ?ašer hālāk-\,\text{kū}\]

1S take.PTCP.MS ACC children Israel from-among the-nations C go.PFV.3P there

---

For non-finite embedded object gaps: Gen 11.6, 44.1(FR); Exod 13.5, 32.14; Lev 7.36, 8.5; Num 33.56(FR), 34.13; Deut 1.8, 1.35, 6.10, 7.13, 10.11, 11.9, 11.21, 12.1, 18.20(FR), 19.8, 19.19, 26.3, 28.11, 28.27, 28.35, 30.20, 31.7, 34.11; Josh 4.10, 5.6, 21.43; 1 Sam 10.2; 2 Sam 7.23; 1 Kgs 9.21, 21.15; Jer 11.8, 18.8, 32.22, 32.23; Ezek 47.5; Jonah 3.10; Zech 1.6(FR); Qoh 9.10; Esth 4.7, 9.23(FR); Neh 9.15; 1 Chr 17.21; 2 Chr 8.6.

I have excluded 17 examples of pronominal objects in purpose infinitivals from my calculations, all of which are embedded in ?ašer relatives: Deut 4.14, 4.26, 6.1, 7.1, 11.11, 11.29, 12.1, 12.29, 15.4, 19.2, 23.21, 25.19, 30.18, 31.13, 32.47; Ezra 9.11. These purpose clauses appear to be adjuncts, rather than complements of the highest verb.
I am taking the Israelites from the nations that they went there.’ (Ezk 37.21)

(157) a. šeC- highest locative adverbial, gap (only example)

?el m³ qóm¹ še-han-n³hālîm hólākîm ³šām hēm šābîm lā-lākê
to place C-the rivers go PTCPMP there 3MP return to-go-INF
'To the place 1 that the rivers go _-1, there they return.’ (Qoh 1.7)

b. šeC- highest locative adverbial, resumptive pronoun (only example)

Jerusalem fs the-built fs like-city fs C-be-bound PTCP FS to-3FS together
šē-[šām¹] šälû šbâṭîm ]
C-there go.up.PFV.3P tribes
'Jerusalem—the one built like a city 1 [RC1 that _-1 is bound together to itself (i.e. is built firmly)], [RC2 that the tribes go up there1].’ (Ps 122.3-4)

(158) a. φ highest locative adverbial, gap

?ē zeh had-derek¹ φ hālāk _-1
where this the-road C go.PFV.3MS
'Where is the road 1 that he walked __-1?' (1 Kgs 13.12)

b. φ highest locative adverbial, resumptive pronoun (only example)

ham-môlik ?ōt-ānû bâm-mîdîbâr b²-ʔeres lâyābâ w³-šûhâ b²-ʔeres šiyyā w³-șalmawiṣ the-lead PTCP MS ACC 1P in-the-wilderness in-land desert and-pit in-land dry and-darkness b²-ʔeres¹ φ lô? ūabar b-āhî ʔiṣ w³-lô? yâšab ?ādâm šām¹
in-land FS C NEG cross.over PFV.3MS in-3FS man MS and-NEG dwell PFV.3S man MS there
'(Where is YHWH...) the one leading us in the wilderness, in a deserted and pitted land, in a dry and dark land, in a land 1 (that) no one has crossed over it 1 and no one has dwelt there 1.’ (Jer 2.6)

I have found 139 highest locative adverbial resumptive pronouns in ?ašer relatives, and only one each for šeC- and φ relatives, given in (157b) and (158b), respectively. In my random sample of 400 verses, I identified 2 highest locative adverbial gaps in ?ašer relatives, which yields an estimate total of 114 highest locative adverbial gaps in ?ašer relatives (i.e. (2/400)*22944). Thus, resumptive pronouns occur in 54.9% of all highest locative adverbial ?ašer relatives. Of the two highest locative adverbial šeC- relatives, one contains a gap and one contains a resumptive pronoun (both given above in (157)). Of the nine highest locative adverbial φ relatives, only the example in (158b) contains a resumptive pronoun (i.e. 11.1% resumptive pronouns). Finally, three highest locative adverbial relatives are attested with the z-series complementizers, all of which contain gaps.

(159) z-series highest locative adverbial, gap

hōḏi·-ēnî derek¹ zū ūēlēk _-1
show IMP MS 1S ACC way C go IMP PFV.3S
'Show me the way 1 that I should go _-1!’ (Ps 143.8)

I have been able to identify trends limited to certain predicates. For example, the root nāḥ in the Hiphil stem meaning 'to banish, drive' occurs as the highest predicate in 14 relative clauses with a relativized highest locative adverbial, all of which are resumptive: Deut 30.1; Jer 8.3, 16.15, 23.3, 23.8, 24.9, 29.14, 29.18, 32.37, 40.12, 43.3, 46.28; Ezek 4.13; Dan 9.7. The root hîk in the Qal stem meaning 'to walk, go,' occurs as the highest predicate in 16 relative clauses with a relativized highest locative adverbial, 14 of which contain gaps (Gen 33.3; Deut 1.31; Josh 1.7, 1.9; Judg 2.17; 2 Sam 7.9, 8.6, 8.14; 1 Kgs 13.9, 13.12; 2 Kgs 21.21; Ruth 1.16; 1 Chr 17.8, 18.13) and 2 of which contain resumptive pronouns (Jer 45.5; Ezek 37.21).
Relativized embedded locative adverbials are only attested with ʾašer. 14 examples are attested with resumptive pronouns, 13 of which are inside non-finite complements.

(160) a. ʾašer finite embedded locative adverbial, resumptive pronoun

way-yittēn ʾet ?ūriyyāʾ el ham-māqōm1 ʾašer yādāʾ ki ?anšē ḥâyīl šām1
and-give.IPFV.3MS ACC Uriah to-the-place C know.IPFV.3MS C men power there

’He assigned Uriah to the place1 that he knew that soldiers were there1.’ (2 Sam 11.16)

b. ʾašer non-finite embedded locative adverbial, resumptive pronoun

wa-haḥīf ʾēl ham-māqōm1 ʾašer bāḥārtī šākēn ʾet šām-i
and-bring.PFV.1S-3MP.ACC to-the-place C choose.PFV.1S to-place.INF ACC name-1S.GEN

šām1 there

’I will bring them to the place1 that I chose to place my name there1.’ (Neh 1.9, [Qere])

I have only identified one possible case of an embedded locative adverbial gap in an ʾašer relative, given in [161].

(161) ʾašer non-finite embedded locative adverbial, gap

ū-bad-deber tāmūṭū bam-māqōm1 ʾašer āḥāṣpētem lā-bō? lā-gûr
and-in.the-pestilence die.IPFV.2MP in.the-place C want.IPFV.2MP to-enter.INF to-sojourn.INF
šām1 there

’You will die by pestilence in the place1 that you want to go ___1 (in order) to live there.’ (Jer 42.22)

The embedded non-finite verb bwî "to go" is intransitive in Biblical Hebrew and does not select for non-finite clausal complements. Therefore, I parse the clause lā-gûr šām "to go there" as a purpose infinitival and not as a complement of bwî. As reflected in my translation, I assume that the relative head "the place" forms a filler-gap dependency with an adverbial adjunct inside the embedded non-finite clause lā-bō? "to go __", and not directly with the locative adverbial šām "there" contained in the purpose infinitive. In summary, resumptive pronouns occur in 14/15 embedded locative adverbial ʾašer relatives, or in 93.3% of the examples. The embedding effect once again rears its head.
4.3.6 Summary

Table 5 summarizes the distribution of resumptive pronouns and gaps in Biblical Hebrew relative clauses. Table 6 gives raw counts for all positions. Citations are given in footnotes only for examples which are not cited in Appendices 3-5, which list all of the examples of resumptive pronouns in "optionally resumptive" positions (i.e. subject, object, and locative adverbial positions) for the four complementizers under discussion. The only positions for which estimates for gap data are lacking are highest locative adverbial position for ǝšer relatives, and highest subject position for φ relatives. The only positions for which estimates for resumptive pronoun data are lacking are (highest and embedded) complements of prepositions for ǝšer relatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highest Subject</th>
<th>Embedded Subject</th>
<th>Highest Object</th>
<th>Embedded Object</th>
<th>Subject Possessor</th>
<th>Object Possessor</th>
<th>Highest Complement of Preposition</th>
<th>Embedded Complement of Preposition</th>
<th>Highest Locative Adverbial</th>
<th>Embedded Locative Adverbial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ǝC-</td>
<td>RP/Gap</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>RP/Gap</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ</td>
<td>RP/Gap</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP/Gap</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>RP</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z series</td>
<td>Gap</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Distribution of Resumptive Pronouns and Gaps in Biblical Hebrew Relative Clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highest Subject</th>
<th>Embedded Subject</th>
<th>Highest Object</th>
<th>Embedded Object</th>
<th>Subject Possessor</th>
<th>Object Possessor</th>
<th>Highest Complement of Preposition</th>
<th>Embedded Complement of Preposition</th>
<th>Highest Locative Adverbial</th>
<th>Embedded Locative Adverbial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ǝšer</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>est. 2284</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Not Counted</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ǝC-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Not Counted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ</td>
<td>Not Counted</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z series</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Resumptive Pronoun and Gap Statistics in Biblical Hebrew Relative Clauses

I do not discuss cases where the resumptive pronoun is a possessor of a noun contained inside a prepositional phrase, as in the following:

(i) kol ǝšer nātan YHWH hokmā b'la-b'la
    every man wise heart give.PFV.3MS YHWH wisdom in-heart-3MS.GEN
    'every wise-hearted man that YHWH set wisdom [PP in his heart]' (Exod 36.2)

I also do not discuss any position which only hosts gaps.
Before moving on, let us briefly discuss the embedding effect we encountered in the preceding sections. The basic generalization is that resumptive pronouns are consistently more frequent in embedded positions than in the corresponding unembedded ones. This observation holds for subject, object, and locative adverbial positions in ʔəš šer relatives. Resumptive pronoun frequency data for the complementizers ʔəš šer, šeC-, and φ are given in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Highest Subject</th>
<th>Embedded Subject</th>
<th>Highest Object</th>
<th>Embedded Object</th>
<th>Highest Locative Adverbial</th>
<th>Embedded Locative Adverbial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʔəš šer</td>
<td>est. 1.8%</td>
<td>83.3% (5/6)</td>
<td>est. 3.3%</td>
<td>19.2% (non-finite)</td>
<td>est. 54.9%</td>
<td>93.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šeC-</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>50% (1/2)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ</td>
<td>Not Counted</td>
<td>100% (1/1)</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Frequency of Resumptive Pronouns in 'Optionally Resumptive' Positions

It is tempting to attribute this disparity to a kind of distance effect, such that the more embedded a relativized position is, the more likely it is to be resumed. Linear distance plays a role in gradiently determining whether resumptive pronouns or gaps are deployed in Modern Hebrew relative clauses according to Ariel (1999: 236-237), and finite embedding categorically determines the presence vs. absence of resumption in Swiss German.

---

76 Gen 11.6, 44.1(FR); Exod 13.5, 32.14; Lev 7.36, 8.5; Num 33.56(FR), 34.13; Deut 1.8, 1.35, 6.10, 7.13, 10.11, 11.9, 11.21, 12.1, 18.20(FR), 19.8, 19.19, 26.3, 28.11, 28.27, 28.35, 30.20, 31.7, 34.11; Josh 4.10, 5.6, 21.43; 1 Sam 10.2; 2 Sam 7.23; 1 Kgs 9.21, 21.15; Jer 11.8, 18.8, 32.22, 32.23; Ezek 47.5; Jonah 3.10; Zech 1.6(FR); Qoh 9.16; Esth 4.7, 9.23(FR); Neh 9.15; 1 Chr 17.21; 2 Chr 8.6.
77 Gen 1.11, 1.12; Dt 8.9, 29.17; 2 Sam 17.10; 1 Kgs 3.26; Isa 5.28, 30.13; Jer 17.5, 17.7, 19.3, 49.12; Ezek 21.30, 21.34, 23.20(x2), 24.6, 40.6, 40.20, 40.22, 40.45, 40.46, 42.15, 43.4; Amos 2.9; Mic 6.12; Job 3.23, 4.19, 8.14, 22.16; Ps 1.2, 26.9-10, 33.12, 95.5, 144.7-8(x2), 144.11(x2); Prov 2.15; Qoh 2.21, 7.26; Dan 10.1.
78 Gen 17.14, 42.21; Lev 16.27, 16.32, 21.10; Num 3.3; Deut 28.49; Josh 12.1; 1 Kgs 8.39; 2 Kgs 8.1, 8.5, 17.34, 18.22(x2); Ezek 3.6, 6.9(x2), 17.16(x2); Ps 1.3; Job 5.5, 39.6(x2); 2 Chr 6.30.
79 Jdg 7.12, 8.26; 2 Kgs 6.11; Jonah 4.10; Ps 124.1, 124.2, 124.6, 129.6, 133.2, 133.3, 135.2, 135.8, 135.10, 136.23, 137.8, 137.9; Song 1.6, 3.7, 3.11, 4.1, 4.2, 6.5, 6.6, 8.12; Qoh 1.3, 1.9(x4), 1.11(x2), 1.14, 2.7, 2.9, 2.12, 2.17, 2.18, 2.21, 2.26, 3.15, 3.22, 4.2, 4.10, 6.10(x2), 7.24, 8.7, 9.12, 10.5, 10.14, 11.3, 11.8; Lam 5.18; 1 Chr 5.20, 27.27(FR).
80 Ps 129.7(x2), 137.8; Song 1.7(FR), 3.1(FR), 3.2(FR), 3.3(FR), 3.4(FR); Qoh 2.11(x2), 2.18, 2.19(x2), 2.20, 2.22, 5.14, 5.17; Ezra 8.20.
81 Ps 144.15; Qoh 2.21.
82 Ps 122.3, 144.15, 146.3; Qoh 8.14.
83 Gen 26.10, 29.25, 42.28; Exod 4.13, 14.5, 14.11; Lev 17.11; Deut 32.17; Judg 8.1, 15.11; 2 Sam 22.44; Isa 6.6, 15.7, 29.1, 42.11, 42.16(x2), 64.2; Jer 15.14, 48.36(CS); Jonah 1.10; Ps 7.16, 9.16, 18.44, 25.12, 33.12, 35.8, 44.2, 51.10, 65.5(FR, x2), 74.2(x2), 81.6(CS); 105.8; Job 18.21(CS), 28.1, 29.16; Prov 9.5; Qoh 1.13, 5.12, 10.5; Lam 1.21; 1 Chr 15.12 (FR), 16.15, 29.3; 2 Chr 1.4 (FR), 15.11, 18.23.
84 Gen 24.22; Josh 7.21; 2 Sam 20.21; Num 7.13; Josh 7.21; 2 Sam 20.21; Isa 1.30; Ezek 22.24; 2 Chr 16.9 (FR).
85 Jer 5.15; Ezra 1.5.
86 Exod 18.20; Isa 42.1, 44.1, 44.2; Isa 63.19(x2); Jer 2.6, 51.43 (x2); Ezek 20.25; Hab 1.14; Ps 12.6, 32.2, 84.6; Job 3.3, 3.15, 29.12; Neh 8.10.
87 1 Kgs 13.12; 2 Kgs 3.8; Isa 48.17, 51.1(x2); Job 38.19, 38.24(x2).
88 2 Sam 14.2; Ps 17.9.
89 Exod 13.8, 15.13, 15.16; Isa 43.21; Ps 9.16, 10.2, 31.5, 78.54, 104.8, 104.26, 132.12; Prov 23.22.
90 Hab 1.11.
91 Isa 42.24; Ps 74.2.
92 Ps 32.8, 142.4, 143.8.
relatives according to Salzmann (2017: 341-342). Such contrasts are crucial in understanding what appears to be an optional alternation between resumptive pronouns and gaps in many languages. I leave this as an avenue for future research into resumption in Hebrew and in other languages.

4.3.7 Islands

I will conclude this section by discussing the presence of resumptive pronouns inside syntactically opaque positions. The extensive literature on resumptive pronouns in other languages has famously observed that the relationship between resumptive pronouns and their binders is island-insensitive. For instance, in the Irish example in (162), the resumptive pronoun occurs inside a relative clause island, and in the Swiss German example in (163), the resumptive pronoun is contained in a wh-island.

(162) **Irish, resumptive pronoun in relative clause island**
[cúpla teach aíochta1] [RC a bhfuil cál ar na béilli [RC.Island a uilmhaionn siad1]]
couple house lodgin.gen C C be.pres fame on the meals C prepare.pres they
’a few inns1 that are famed for the meals they1 prepare’ (McCloskey 2017b: 3814)

(163) **Swiss German, resumptive pronoun in wh-island**
Das isch d Frau1, [RC won i nöd wäiss [Wh.Island wurum de Hans [ere1] wett hälffe ]]
This be.3s the woman C I not know.1s why the John her.dat want.3s help.inf
‘This is the woman1 that I don’t know why John wants to help her1.’ (Salzmann 2017: 352)

Even in languages like English which do not productively employ resumptive pronouns outside of islands, resumption is relatively acceptable inside islands, where gaps are more unacceptable by comparison (Ackerman et al. 2018 [Asudeh 2012 McCloskey 2017a Morgan and Wagers 2018]). Example (164) illustrates that gaps are normally preferred to resumptive pronouns in simplex English relative clauses without islands, whereas example (165) shows that this preference is reversed when the resumptive/gap is contained inside an adjunct island.

(164) Mike is the kind of guy that you know [*he / φ] will come through in the end.
(165) Mike is the kind of guy that you never know [Adjunct Island if { he / *φ } will come through in the end].

Until now, it has gone unrecognized that resumption in Biblical Hebrew relative clauses is insensitive to wh-islands, coordinate structure islands, and relative clause islands.

(166) **67 sher embedded subject resumptive pronoun, wh-island**
w*-nātattî la-rnāšîm1 ?*sher lō? yāda’ātî [Wh.Island ?ē miz-zeh hēmmāu1]
and-give.pfv.1s to-men C neg know.pfv.1s where from-this 3mp
‘And I will give (my bread, water and meat) to men1 that I don’t know [Wh.-Island where they1 are from].’
(1 Sam 25.11)
Moreover, we have seen that cases of apparent gaps inside islands are can be accounted for by positing null pro subject resumptives. Examples (148) and (149) are repeated here as (169) and (170).

(169) 94 šer embedded subject resumptive pronoun, adjunct island
ki-kšōr bā-ṭarāp šō’n šer [Adjunct Island ūm yāḥar pro1]
like-young.lion.ms among-flocks sheep C
wē-ramās pro1 wē-ṭārāp pro1 wē-ʔēn massil
and-trample.pfv.3ms and-tear.pfv.3ms and-neq.exist deliverer

(170) φ embedded subject, wh-island
gōy1 φ ... šēma’1 [Wh-island mah y’abbēr pro1]
nation.ms C neg hear.pfv.2ms what say.pfv.3ms
‘a nation1 (that) ... you don't hear [Wh-island what (it1) says].’ (Jer 5.15)

Borer [1984b] reports similar facts for Modern Hebrew. Apparent gaps inside islands appear only in contexts which independently support pro-drop. Null pro resumption inside the relative clause island is licit in the past tense, but is ungrammatical in the present tense due to a general ban on pro-drop in the present tense.

(171) ha-ʔiša1 še-ra’iti et ha-namer še-{ gidla / *megadelet }...
the-woman that-saw.1s ACC the-tiger that-{ raised.3fs / raises.3fs }
‘the woman1 that I saw the tiger that (she1) raised / raises...’ [Borer 1984b 246]

In conclusion, we may add Biblical Hebrew to the list of languages like Irish and Swiss German which employ resumptive pronouns in both island and non-island contexts. This amounts to the generalization in

93 See also Gen 26.18; Deut 22.3; Ezek 20.11, 20.13; 2 Kgs 18.21; Jer 28.3; Ezra 1.7; 2 Chr 33.19
94 See also 2 Kgs 21.12 and Jer 19.3
95 It is noteworthy that Steiner [1997: 171-172] seems to have been aware of the island-insensitivity of Biblical Hebrew resumptive
Biblical Hebrew relative clause A-bar dependencies can terminate in resumptive elements.

4.4 Motivating Resumption

This section addresses proposals made by Biblical Hebrew specialists and linguists alike as to the set of variables which motivate the usage of resumptive pronouns in optionally resumptive positions. Recall that resumptive pronouns in Biblical Hebrew alternate with gaps in subject, direct object, and locative adverb positions, in both unembedded and embedded positions, at least for the complementizer ạšer. This has led many scholars to seek out a method to the madness, so to speak—namely, why such variation should exist. The figures in Table 7 suggest that resumption in optional, unembedded positions is dispreferred, assuming that frequency reasonably approximates preference. This finding reflects what McCloskey has referred to as an "anti-pronominal prejudice" in reference to resumption in Irish (2017a) (see also Chomsky’s (1981) "Avoid Pronoun" principle). I will conclude that no functional proposal to date fully captures the extant variation between resumptive pronouns and gaps in Biblical Hebrew. Only Weak Crossover configurations force the use of resumptive pronouns in otherwise optional positions. This effect can be accounted for entirely by the syntactic theory, without recourse to functional explanations (see Safir 1986, 1996).

4.4.1 Proposal 1: Disambiguating the relative head

Holmstedt (2016: 182), following Tsujita (1991), hypothesizes that resumptive pronouns may be used to disambiguate the variable position inside the relative clause. Apparent ambiguities arise when the direct object is relativized, and the relative-internal subject and direct object bear the same person, number, and gender features, as in (173)–(174):

(173) wạ-kipper hak-kóhèn1 ạšer yimšah ọt-ọ
and-atone.PFV.3MS the-priest C anoint.IP.FV.3MS ACC-3MS

'And the priest1 that (one) anoints him shall make atonement.' (Lev 16.32)

(174) ù-bọy-bọ yàsá? ọm yèhôrâm ?el yèhù?1 ben nimši ạšer
and-in-coming.INF-3MS.GEN go.out.PFV.3MS with Jehoram to Jehu son Nimshi <ạšer
mọsah-ọ VHW hakrit ?et bêt ạháb
anoint.PFV.3MS-3MS.ACC YHW to-cut.off.INF ACC house Ahab

'And when he came, he went out with Jehoram to Jehu1, son of Nimshi, that YHWH anointed him1 to cut off the house of Ahab.' (2 Chr 22.7)

pronouns, though he never formalizes the generalization as such: "Hebrew has considerable flexibility in forming relative clauses. It allows types whose English counterparts are ungrammatical", after which he cites Exod 33.1, Josh 13.21-22, and 1 Sam 25.11, and later Gen 26.18, Jer 28.3, and Ezra 1.7, all of which contain resumptive pronouns inside islands.

This, of course, is in addition to the fact that only resumptive pronouns are permitted inside islands.

96 This See also Num 26.59, 35.25. See also Gen 34.1 for a possible example with a direct object gap and null subject, both of which bear 3fs features, i.e. in which an impersonal construction does not trigger usage of the resumptive strategy.
The relative in (173) contains an impersonal construction in which the null subject is nonreferential and triggers default third masculine singular agreement on the relative-internal verb (see Joüon and Muraoka 2016 §155b on impersonal construction in Biblical Hebrew). These default features coincidentally match those of the relative head 'the priest', and consequently those of the resumptive pronoun 'him'. In (174), the relative-internal subject 'YHWH' and relative-internal object 'him', corresponding to the relative head 'Jehu, son of Nimshi', are both third masculine singular. These authors contend that an ambiguity would arise if (173) and (174) were constructed with gaps instead of resumptive pronouns.

Contra Holmstedt and Tsujita, I contend that there is no ambiguity present in either case. First, it is not clear that (173) would be ambiguous if rendered with a filler-gap dependency, because the relative-internal verb ְמָשַׁח 'to anoint' is bivalent and therefore requires two arguments: a subject, and an object. Crucially, there is no overt second argument with which the relative head could be confused. If the relative head "the priest" were interpreted as the relative-internal subject, ְמָשַׁח would lack an object (e.g. *"the priest that anoints __"). Hence, this example presents no ambiguity.

In (174), there is likewise no possible confusion of subject and object roles. Bekins (2012: 128) observes that proper nouns in direct object position are almost invariably case-marked by the differential object marker ְפְט. If (174) had instead been constructed with a gap in direct object position, YHWH—a proper noun—would still unambiguously be parsed as the subject since it is not differentially object marked. Consequently, there is no way that (174) could mean "Jehu, son of Nimshi, who anointed YHWH...". I conclude that there is no parsing ambiguity involved in (173), (174), and similar examples in Biblical Hebrew. In fact, of the 79 examples of highest object resumption in בָּשֵׁר relatives, I submit that none would be ambiguous if rendered with gaps instead of resumptive pronouns.

The disambiguation hypothesis faces further difficulties in accounting for locative adverbial resumption.

98 In cases where the relative-internal predicate entails that the subject be of a certain biological sex, e.g. with the verb ְיָלָד 'to give birth', the null impersonal subject will trigger 3fs agreement, as in Num 26.59.
99 The same verb is used in Num 35.25, and in Num 26.59, the relative-internal verb is ְיָלָד 'to give birth', which also selects for a subject and object.
100 In Bekins' corpus, 118/119, or 99% of attested examples, are marked by ְפְט.
101 This example in particular is certainly unambiguous: it is highly improbable that anyone could anoint the deity.
102 The disambiguation hypothesis is also challenged by the presence of examples which contain apparent ambiguities like (i): the relative head and relative-internal subject are both third masculine singular.

(i) ְיִים יָּהְוָה יָדָע ְתָּשְׁרוֹנַהּ יָּדָע ְתָּשְׁרוֹנַהּ יָּדָע ְתָּשְׁرواֹמָלֶק בָּבֶל נְבֶעְבַּדְנֶזְזָאר מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַּبֶל יְדַע בַּבֶל יְדַע בַ֬
Many examples with locative adverbial resumptives contain inanimate relative heads that are to be unambiguously interpreted as locative adjuncts internal to the relative clause.

(175) way-yaškəm ʔabrāhām bab-bōqer ʔel ham-māqôm1 ʔašer ʕāmaq ʕāməd sām西北7 ʔet<br>and-go.early.IPFV.3MS Abraham in.the-morning to the-place.MS C stand.PFV.3MS there with<br>p'nè YHWH face YHWH

'Abram went early in the morning to the the place1 that he had stood there1 before YHWH.' (Gen 19.27)

I have found no clear examples where the use of a gap instead of a resumptive locative adverb would lead to an ambiguity or potential parsing error. Overall, ambiguity avoidance seems to play no role in motivating resumption in optional positions in Biblical Hebrew. This conclusion finds parallels in McCloskey’s (2017a: 89–90) corpus analysis of Irish relative clause resumption, where he reports that only 10/66 examples of highest object resumption would be rendered ambiguous with a gap.

4.4.2 Proposal 2: Animacy

It has been argued for several other languages that animate relative heads are more likely to be resumed than are inanimate heads. Bošković (2009) claims for Serbo-Croatian that highest object resumption is obligatory with animate heads and optional with inanimate heads. McCloskey (2017a: 90-91) observes that, while only 30.5% of relative clauses in his corpus of Irish have animate heads, a full 76% with highest object resumption have animate heads. Thus, animate heads are significantly more frequent in resumptive relatives than in relative clauses in general.

Unfortunately, a similar explanation does not seem feasible for Biblical Hebrew. In ʔašer relatives with highest object resumption, I have categorized examples according to two parameters: the animacy of the relative head (which is equivalent to the animacy of the resumptive pronoun), and the animacy of the subject internal to the relative clause. Representative examples are given in (176)–(179).

(176) **Animate Head, Animate Relative Subject**<br>ʔəšrē hag-geber1 ʔašer t'yass'ren1 nū1 yāh<br>blessed the-man C instruct.IPFV.2MS-3MS.ACC Yah<br>'Blessed is the man1 that you instruct him1, O Yah.' (Ps 94.12)

(177) **Inanimate Head, Animate Relative Subject**<br>ʔēšē bə-yēš hay-yā'ar ʔašer n'tattīʕī w1 lā-ʔēš lī'-ʔōkālā<br>wood the-vine on-tree the-forest C give.PFV.1S-3MS.ACC to.the-fire for-fuel<br>'... the wood1 of the vine of the tree of the forest that I gave it1 to the fire as fuel' (Ezek 15.6)

---

103 Modulo certain specificity effects. See also Sharvit 1999
(178) **Animate Head, Inanimate Relative Subject**

Animate Head, Inanimate Relative Subject

way-yabû kol ïšî hamâšû libb-ô1 and-come.IPV.3MP every man C lift.IPV.3MS-3MS.ACC heart.MS-3MS.GEN

Then every man1 that his1 heart stirred him1 up (lit. 'his heart raised him')... came.' (Exod 35.21)

(179) **Inanimate Head, Inanimate Relative Subject**

Inanimate Head, Inanimate Relative Subject

kam-moš1 įšî hamâšû nû1 like-chaff.MS C drive.away.IPV.3FS-3MS.ACC wind.FS

Like chaff1 that the wind blows it1 away.' (Ps 1.4)

Only 60% (45/75) of these examples involve an animate relative head (i.e. the types exemplified in [176] and [178])—a slight, but not overwhelming, majority. Thus, highest object resumption does not correlate strongly with the animacy of the relative head. Summary statistics are given in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Animate Head</th>
<th>Inanimate Head</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Animate Relative Subject</strong></td>
<td>37 exs (49.3%)</td>
<td>29 exs (38.6%)</td>
<td>66 exs (89.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inanimate Relative Subject</strong></td>
<td>8 exs (10.7%)</td>
<td>1 ex (1.3%)</td>
<td>9 exs (10.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>45 exs (60%)</td>
<td>30 exs (40%)</td>
<td>75 exs (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Animacy in īšî relative clauses with highest object resumptive pronouns

Neither does the animacy account accurately predict the distribution of highest subject resumption in īšî relatives, wherein 60% (18/30) contain an animate relative head. Representative examples with animate and inanimate heads are given in [180]–[181], respectively, and the statistics are summarized in Table 9.

(180) **Animate Head**

wô-gam įel han-nokrî hamâšû mê-îamm-ôkâ yišrül įel huî1 and-also to the-foreigner.MS C NEG from-people-2MS.GEN Israel 3MS

'(And you shall give to each according to his lifestyle...) and also to the foreigner1 that he1 is not from your people, Israel.' (1 Kgs 8.41)

(181) **Inanimate Head**

wâ-îaggîd lâ-hem įet yadî hamâšû įlôh-ay hamâšû įel hûî1 tôbâ tôlâ-ay and-tell.of.IPV.1S to-3MP ACC hand.FS god-1S.GEN C 3FS good.FS upon-me

'I told them of the hand1 of my god that it1 was good upon me.' (Neh 2.18)

---

104 I have left out the following two verses: Deut 4.19 and Jer 8.2. Both contain conjoined relative heads containing such NPs as 'the sun' and 'the moon', whose status as (in)animate may partly depend on how anthropomorphized they are.

105 Exod 6.5, 18.9, 28.3; Lev 16.32, 25.42, 25.55, 26.45; Num 26.59, 35.25; Deut 12.2, 13.3, 18.14, 28.48, 29.25, 33.8(x2), 34.10; Jos 2.10, 7.14(x3), 10.25, 13.21; 1 Kgs 11.34, 21.25; 2 Kgs 16.3; Jer 19.4, 29.22, 44.3; Zech 7.14; Ps 94.12 (x2), 107.2-3 (x2); Dan 11.38; 2 Chr 8.7-8, 22.7

106 Gen 5.29, 26.18, 27.27; Lev 18.5, 23.2, 23.4, 23.37; Num 13.32, 34.13; Deut 11.12; Jos 21.9; Isa 28.4, 29.11, 62.2; Jer 27.19-20, 28.3; Ezek 4.10, 5.16, 15.6, 20.11, 20.13, 32.9, 36.21; Jonah 4.10; Ps 78.2-3, 88.6; Qoh 7.13; Ezra 1.7; 1 Chr 6.50

107 Exod 25.2, 35.21(x2), 35.26, 35.29, 36.2; Isa 66.13; Esth 7.5

108 Ps 1.4
The animacy account fares even worse for explaining the variation between resumptive pronouns and gaps in locative adverbial position, since the majority of those cases involve inanimate heads, for example "land" or "place". Therefore, I conclude that animacy should not be considered a strong determinant for motivating resumption in optional positions in Biblical Hebrew.

### 4.4.3 Proposal 3: Restrictiveness

In his survey of resumption in relative clauses in the book of Genesis, Parunak argues that resumption marks the relative as restrictive (1996: 112-116). As evidence for this claim, he cites the following near-minimal pair, translating the relative in (182) with a locative adverbial gap as non-restrictive, and the relative in (183) with a locative adverbial resumptive pronoun as restrictive.

(182) way-yitt’n-ēhû ?el bêt has-sōhar m°qôm m°sûrîm 1
and-place.IPFV.3MS-3MS.ACC to house the-prison place prisoners the-king confined
'He put him in the prison, the place, which the king’s prisoners were confined.' (Gen 39.20)

(183) way-yitten ?ōt-ām b°-mîšmar bêt šar ha-tabbāhîm ?el bêt has-sōhar m°qôm m°sûrîm 1
and-put.IPFV.3MS ACC-3MP in-custody house chief the-guard to house the-prison place prisoners the-king
Joseph confined there
'He put them in the custody of the house of the chief of the guard, in the prison, the place that Joseph was confined there.' (Gen 40.3)

There are a number of issues with this analysis. First, Holmstedt has observed that the relative heads in both (182) and (183) are indefinite and appositional to has-sōhar ‘the prison’, and thus are unlikely to be modified by non-restrictive relative clauses (2016: 168-169). Non-restrictive relatives typically require unique, definite, generic, or specific indefinite antecedents (cf. "[Ömer / these guys / a particular guy / *a guy], who Aurora saw"; de Vries 2002: 182-183). Without a much richer discourse context in which m°qôm ‘place’ could be uniquely identified, both (182) and (183) should be regarded as restrictive relatives (Holmstedt 2016: 169). The presence of restrictive relatives with gaps therefore undermines the tight association between restrictiveness and

---

109Gen 17.12; Num 9.13, 17.5, 35.31; Deut 17.15; 1 Sam 10.19; 1 Kgs 8.41, 9.20-21; 2 Kgs 25.19; Jer 27.9, 40.7; Ezek 12.10, 43.19; Ruth 4.15; Qoh 4.2, 7.26; 2 Chr 6.32, 8.7-8
110Gen 7.2, 9.3; Lev 11.39; Num 14.8; Deut 20.15, 20.20; 2 Kgs 22.13; Hag 1.9; Ps 16.2-3; Ps 88.6(?); Neh 2.13 (Qere), 2.18
resumption. Additionally, if we look at the entire corpus of ?ašer highest object resumptive pronouns in Biblical Hebrew, we find that 49/78 (63%) are restrictive and 29/78 (37%) are non-restrictive. Examples (184) and (185) are representative of non-restrictive relatives with and without highest object resumption, respectively.

(184) way-yihak yitrô ʿal kol haṭ-tôbâ ?ašer ʿāšā YHWH l-ṭiṣrâ ?elî ?ašer and-rejoice.IPFV.3MS Jethro for all the-good C do.PFV.3MS YHWH to-Israel C
hissîl-ô1 miy-yad mîṣrâyîm snatch.PFV.3MS-3MS.ACC from-hand Egypt

Jethro rejoiced for all the good that YHWH did to Israel1, whom1 he snatched from the hand of Egypt.’ (Exod 18.9)

(185) l-maʾâyân yārûšâlaim1 ?ašer bāḥârtî
for.the.sake.of Jerusalem C choose.PFV.1S

For the sake of Jerusalem1 who I chose ___1.’ (1 Kgs 11.13)

I conclude that restrictiveness is not a strong determinant for resumption in ?ašer relatives.

4.4.4 Summary of functional proposals

In this section, I have argued that three functional proposals aimed at accounting for the variation between resumptive pronouns and gaps in optionally resumptive positions fail to capture the full range of Biblical Hebrew data. Yet one might protest that, while no variable suffices to predict all of the data individually, all of the variables taken together might correlate strongly with the presence or absence of resumptive pronouns. In this case, we would predict that the resumptive strategy would predominate in (i) restrictive relative clauses, with (ii) animate relative heads, which (iii) would be ambiguous with a gap. Yet we find examples like (186) with precisely these features that nonetheless lack resumption.

111 I do not count Ezek 4.10 in this count, on which see below.

Restrictive relatives: Gen 5.29, 26.18, 27.27; Exod 25.2, 28.3, 35.21(x2), 35.26, 35.29, 36.2; Lev 16.32; Num 13.32, 34.13, 35.25; Deut 11.12, 12.2, 13.3, 18.14, 28.48, 29.25; Jos 7.14(x3), 10.25, 21.9; 2 Kgs 16.3; Isa 28.4, 29.11, 62.2, 66.13; Jer 19.4, 27.19-20(?), 28.3, 44.3; Ezek 15.6, 32.9; Jonah 4.10; Zech 7.14; Ps 1.4, 78.2-3, 88.6, 94.12(x2); Qoh 7.13; Esth 7.5; Dan 11.38; Ezr 1.7; 1 Chr 6.50; 2 Chr 8.7-8.

Non-restrictive relatives: Exod 6.5, 18.9; Lev 18.5, 23.2, 23.4, 23.37, 25.42, 25.55, 26.45; Num 26.59; Deut 4.19, 33.8(x2), 34.10; Josh 2.10, 13.21; 1 Kgs 11.34, 21.25; Jer 8.2(x3), 29.22; Ezek 5.16, 20.11, 20.13, 36.21; Ps 107.2-3(x2); 2 Chr 22.7.

112 I have excluded Ezek 4.10 from these counts due to the fact that it is neither a restrictive nor a non-restrictive relative, but rather an amount relative. Amount relatives are unique in that the relative head denotes some quantity, event, degree, or kind, and is not actually referential. In (1), the resumptive pronoun -nû ’it’ refers to the amount of food that the addressee will eat, not the actual loaves of bread and pieces of meat that he or she will consume at some point in the future.

(i) û-maʾašer tohôl-kā bô-miṣqôl eṣer-seqel lay-yôm
and-food-2MS.GEN C eṭl-IPFV.2MS-3MS.ACC by-weight twenty shekel to.the-day

‘And your food1 that you will eat tî1 shall be twenty shekels by weight a day.’ (Ezek 4.10)

To the best of my knowledge, this is the first time that an amount relative has been recognized as such in Biblical Hebrew (cf. Holmstedt 2016: 195, who claims not to have found any in Biblical Hebrew). Other amount relatives in Biblical Hebrew which use gaps are Gen 23.16 and Esth 4.7. Another possible instance of a resumptive pronoun in an amount relative is Ezek 29.20.
LIKEWISE, WE WOULD PREDICT TO FIND GAPS IN (I) NON-RESTRICTIVE RELATIVE CLAUSES, WITH (II) INANIMATE RELATIVE HEADS, WHICH (III) WOULD BE UNAMBIGUOUS WITH A GAP. (187) MEETS THESE REQUIREMENTS, BUT CRUCIALLY UTILIZES A RESUMPTIVE PRONOUN.

Examples like (186)—(187) weaken the force of the aforementioned functional proposals. Thus, I conclude that none is sufficient to account for the distribution of resumptive pronouns and gaps in Biblical Hebrew relative clauses.

4.4.5 Weak Crossover Configurations

Despite the lack of a convincing functional explanation for the distribution of resumptive pronouns, the literature on resumption in other languages has identified one syntactic configuration (among many others) in which direct object resumption is rendered obligatory: Weak Crossover (McCloskey 1990; Safir 1986, 1996; Sichel 2014). Weak Crossover configurations are structures in which an A-bar bound variable is coreferential with a non-c-commanding pronoun which is also not its antecedent (Safir 1986, 1996; McCloskey 2017b: 3816).

I adopt Safir’s definition of A-bar binding in (188).

(188) A-bar binding
X A-bar binds Y if X is an A-bar position and X binds Y. (Safir 1996: 317)

Such configurations are degraded when the A-bar binder binds both a base-generated pronoun and a gap derived by movement, as illustrated by the English example in (189).

(189) *the child₁ that his₁ mother loves __₁

On the other hand, when both variables are bound pronouns, such configurations are perfectly acceptable, as shown in (190) for Modern Hebrew.

(190) ze ha-yeled₁ še-ima šelo₁ ohevet { oto₁ / * __₁ } / * __₁

This is the boy₁ who his₁ mother loves him₁. ‘(Sichel 2014: 666)
It is therefore unsurprising that I have found eight ?ašer relatives in Biblical Hebrew with highest object resumptive pronouns in Weak Crossover contexts and none with gaps. Example (191) is representative: the null operator in [Spec, CP] binds both the subject possessor -ô "his" and the highest object resumptive pronoun -nû "him".

(191) kìsiš1 ?ašer ?imm-ô1 t'nahâmen-[nû1] kên ?ânôkî ?a nâhem-ô kem
like-man mother-3MS.GEN comfort.IPFV.3FS-3MS.ACC thus 1s comfort.IPFV.1S-2MP.ACC
'Like a man1 that his1 mother comforts him1, so I will comfort you.' (Isa 66.13)

Safir accounts for the absence of Weak Crossover effects in other languages by stipulating that Ā-chains must bind a consistent type of variable: they must either bind only pronouns, or only gaps resulting from movement (1996: 318). I adopt Safir’s account for the Biblical Hebrew data and conclude that Weak Crossover configurations force the use of resumptive pronouns to maintain Ā-consistency. Thus, unlike the previous functional proposals, the relationship between Weak Crossover and resumption is entirely regular and can be predicted by features of the syntax.

4.5 Modeling Resumption

The major desideratum in syntactic research on resumption is a satisfactory theoretical account of how resumptive dependencies are formed. The most significant stumbling block for any analysis lies in explaining how resumptive pronouns can at times exhibit properties traditionally associated with movement, and at other times, not. Those who focus on the movement-like properties of these dependencies (e.g. the possibility for reconstruction) treat resumptive pronouns fundamentally like gaps. Those who focus on their non-movement-like properties (e.g. island insensitivity) treat resumptive pronouns as normal pronouns base-generated independently of their A-bar binders. In this section, I first show that relative A-bar dependencies terminating in resumptive pronouns in Biblical Hebrew exhibit both types of properties. The hybrid approach defended by Sichel (2014), which posits distinct derivations for resumptive pronouns that allow reconstruction and those that do not, makes incorrect predictions about the relationship between reconstruction and resumption in Biblical Hebrew and must posit A-bar movement out of otherwise opaque domains. Instead, following Guilliot & Malkawi (2006; 2011) and Rouveret (2008), I argue that resumptive pronouns are definite determiners whose complements are copies of the relative head which undergo NP-ellipsis. Base-generating the null operator in [Spec, CP] captures the non-movement properties of resumption, while including a copy of the relative head internal to the relative clause accounts for reconstruction effects. The conclusions support the base-generation

\[113\] These are: Exod 25.2, 35.21(x2), 35.26, 35.29, 36.2; Isa 66.13; Esth 7.5.
analysis of resumptive relative clauses (see Borer 1984b; Sells 1984; McCloskey 1990). Moreover, this analysis demands that the relationship between reconstruction and movement must be loosened (contra Sportiche 2017).

4.5.1 Two Models for Relative Clauses

Research into relative clauses in the generative literature is a veritable industry, and it will suffice us here to distinguish between two generally accepted derivational alternatives: a head-raising analysis (193), and a head-external analysis (194).

(192) [?lōhîm ?hērîm] ?šer lô?  yîda?tâ-m1
gods.MP other.MP C NEG know.PFV.2MSMP.ACC

‘other gods1 that you don’t know them1’ (Deut 13.3)

(193) Head-raising relative clause

(194) Head-external relative clause

In the head-raising structure, the relative head is generated within the relative clause, and subsequently moves to its surface position in [Spec, CP] (see Vergnaud 1974; Kayne 1994; Bhatt 2002; Bianchi 2004; Cecchetto and Donati 2015, inter alia). In the head-external structure, the relative head is base-generated outside of the relative clause (see Chomsky 1977; Sahl 1986, 1996; Borsley 1997, inter alia). The relationship between the

114 On relative clauses in general, see de Vries 2002. On variants of the head-raising analysis, see especially Bhatt 2002; Bianchi 2004; Grosu and Landman 1998. On variants of the head-external analysis, see Aoun et al. 2001; McCloskey 1990; Sahl 1986. For two excellent overviews of these analyses with respect to resumption, see Rouveret 2011; Salzmann 2017.

115 I am masking many of the intricacies of head-raising proposals here for the sake of space. I do not, for instance, distinguish between those proposals which posit further movement of the relative head out of a complex constituent containing it and the A-bar binder (e.g. a null-operator or relative pronoun), stranding the A-bar binder in [Spec, CP] (see Vergnaud 1974; Bhatt 2002; Cecchetto and Donati 2015).
relative head and variable position is mediated by a null operator, which is either base-generated in [Spec, CP] or moves there from the variable position. Essentially, the differences between the two boil down to how the A-bar dependency is construed—either as movement, or as binding. I will adopt Safir’s definition of resumptive pronouns in terms of A-bar binding given in (195) which is compatible with either analysis of relative clauses.

(195) X is a resumptive pronoun iff...:
   a. X is a pronominal element, and
   b. X is A-bar bound (Safir 1986: 684)

In the following sections, I will assess the evidence in favor of each of these two derivations for resumptive relatives in Biblical Hebrew. It is important to note that there is no reason a priori why both derivations could not be available in a given language, since each makes distinct empirical predictions. In fact, Sichel (2014) has argued that both derivations are available in Modern Hebrew and Lebanese Arabic. In the end, however, I will argue that Biblical Hebrew resumptive relatives always instantiate a head-external structure similar to (194).

4.5.2 Evidence for relative clauses with base-generated null operators

Three properties support the availability of the head-external derivation for Biblical Hebrew resumptive relatives. First, as we have seen, resumptive pronouns in relative A-bar dependencies are not subject to Weak Crossover violations.

(196) w’-ʔè zeh hû? ʔ asign lèqem 3MS fill.PFV.3MS C fill here 3MS-3MS.GEN to-do.INF thus

‘And where is he₁ that his₁ heart compelled (lit. ‘his heart filled him’) to act this way?’ (Esth 7.5)

As we discussed previously, Safir (1986, 1996) argues convincingly that Weak Crossover violations derive from a general parallelism constraint on A-bar dependencies. According to Safir, the crucial factor contributing to Weak Crossover violations is not the surface form of the variable—whether a resumptive pronoun or gap—but rather how it relates to its A-bar binder: either through movement and binding (his ”derivational A-binding”) or through base-generation and binding (his ”representational A-binding”). If direct object resumptive pronouns were spelled-out traces in a movement chain, we predict that they should give rise to Weak Crossover violations, contrary to fact. This suggests that a derivation of direct object resumptive pronouns is necessary in which the resumptive pronoun does not relate to its A-bar binder via movement.

Next, we have also seen that the relationship between a relative head and resumptive pronoun can span island boundaries. Example (166), which contains a resumptive pronoun embedded inside a wh-island, is repeated here as (197).
(197)  ?ašer eS resumptive pronoun, Wh-Island

\[
\text{wō-nātātī la-?a nāšim1 ?ašer lō? yāda’ātī ?ē miz-zeh hēmmā1 and-give.PFV.1S to-men C NEG know.PFV.1S where from-this 3MP}
\]

‘And I will give (my bread, water and meat) to men that I don’t know where they are from.’ (1 Sam 25.11)

Only the head-external analysis can account for such examples under the standard assumption that movement out of islands is impossible (see Ross 1967).

The third piece of evidence for the head-external derivation comes from mismatches in number, gender, and person between the relative head and resumptive pronoun, as shown in (198)–(200).

(198)  **Number mismatch**

\[
\text{wō-’āhabdātī ?et ?key?”bē1-kā  ?ašer yōśall’hen-nū?’ YHWH b-āk and-serve.PFV.2MS ACC enemies.MP-2MS.GEN C send.IPfv.3MS-3MS.ACC YHWH on-2MS}
\]

‘You will serve your enemies (mp) that YHWH sends them (ms) (lit. 'him/it') against you.’ (Deut 28.48)

(199)  **Gender mismatch**

\[
\text{wō-’āsāpītī ?et-kem min hā-?a rāsōţ1 ?ašer nō’pōsōtem bā-hem1 and-gather.PFV.1S ACC-2MP from the-lands.FP C be-scattered.PFv.2MP among-3MP}
\]

‘I will gather you from the lands (fp) that you are scattered among them (mp).’ (Ezek 11.17)

(200)  **Person mismatch**

\[
\text{hō-lō? ?ānōkî ?a tōn1-3kā  ?ašer rākābtā yāl-ay1 Q-NEG 1S donkey-2MS.GEN C ride.PFV.2MS on-1S}
\]

‘Am I not your donkey that you have ridden on (me1).’ (Num 22.30)

Mismatches can be accounted for if the relative head and resumptive pronoun are related only indirectly, mediated via a null operator in \[\text{Spec, CP}\]. In the head-external derivation, both the binder and bindee are base-generated independently and could in theory bear distinct \(\phi\)-features, assuming that this variation does not impede the relevant coreference conditions or the binding relation. Such mismatches are problematic, on the other hand, if resumptive pronouns are spelled-out lower copies in a movement chain, since both copies should bear the same features, *ceteris paribus*. Thus, three independent sets of facts provide empirical evidence for the availability of head-external relative clauses in Biblical Hebrew.\textsuperscript{116} We will now turn to consider the evidence for head-raising structures.

### 4.5.3 Reconstruction and Possible Evidence for Head-Raising Relatives

One of the most frequently cited properties of resumption in favor of the head-raising analysis is the possibility of reconstructing the relative head to the position of the resumptive pronoun (see Aoun and Benmamoun).

\textsuperscript{116}A base-generated null operator is also necessary in "such that" relatives, because the relative head does not relate directly to any position inside the relative clause. However these relatives are to be accounted for, they demand both the A-bar binder and the relative head to be generated peripheral to the relative clause proper.
For instance, in Lebanese Arabic, relative heads may reconstruct for, among other things, variable binding.

(201) šažareet žnaynt-[o], yalli nada btaʿrif ṭ?ənno [wala žnayneetl] byəhməl-un ballašo trees garden-his that Nada know:3FS that no gardener neglect:3MS-them started:3P yzahhro bloom:3P

'The trees of his garden that Nada knows that no gardener, neglects (them)2 started to bloom.' (Choueiri 2002: 138; cited in Aoun and Li 2003: 128)

In (201), the pronoun "his" can be bound by the negative quantificational phrase "no gardener" inside the relative clause, despite the fact that the relative head is ultimately pronounced in a position not c-commanded by the quantificational phrase. Proponents of the head-raising analysis assume that reconstruction is uniquely a property of movement and attribute reconstruction effects with resumption to movement (cf. Fox 1999).

Nevertheless, the head-raising derivation is typically restricted to explain only a subset of relative clauses with resumptive pronouns. One prominent approach since Bianchi (2004) has been to draw a distinction between optional and obligatory resumption in non-island contexts. Sichel (2014) has defended this position for Modern Hebrew and Lebanese Arabic, for which she has claimed that reconstruction is banned with optional resumptive pronouns but allowed (but not required) with obligatory resumptive pronouns. Her findings are summarized in Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reconstruction?</th>
<th>Optional Resumptive Pronouns</th>
<th>Obligatory Resumptive Pronouns</th>
<th>Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are de dicto readings available?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Principle A reconstruction possible?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is reconstruction for variable binding possible?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are embedded idiomatic readings available?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are amount readings available?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are free relatives possible?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Interpretive contrasts between optional and obligatory resumptive pronouns in non-island contexts (adapted from Sichel 2014: 663)

Since obligatory resumptive pronouns and gaps both permit reconstruction, Sichel argues that they must share derivational traits. Her basic proposal is that obligatory resumptive pronouns and gaps instantiate the head-raising derivation, whereas optional resumptive pronouns embody the head-external derivation. As I will demonstrate presently, however, no neat contrast between optional and obligatory resumptive pronouns can

Sportiche (2017) is an exception, arguing that resumption is always a result of movement. In island-contexts, for which movement should otherwise be impossible, he posits a Mixed Two-Step Derivation: a constituent is first clitic left dislocated out of the island and then is promoted via head-raising to [Spec, CP]. I do not consider this option further here.
be identified on the basis of reconstruction in Biblical Hebrew relative clauses. The discussion will focus on the last three tests in Table 10: reconstruction for (i) idiom interpretations, (ii) amount readings, and (iii) free relatives.

Let us begin with reconstruction for idiom interpretation. Idioms are non-compositional expressions whose meaning cannot be reduced to those of their constituent parts. Rather, idioms are assigned an idiosyncratic, global interpretation. We may assume, then, that the constituents forming an idiom must be generated in some local configuration. Sichel claims that reconstruction for phrasal idioms in Modern Hebrew is possible with obligatory resumptive pronouns (e.g. in PP-internal position) and with gaps, but impossible with optional resumptive pronouns (e.g. as the highest object). Examples (202)–(203) exemplify this contrast.

(202) ha-ec\textsubscript{1} še-hu tipes al\textsubscript{AV1} the-tree that-he climbed on\textsubscript{it}

‘the high position he took’ (2014: 661)

(203) ha-tik\textsubscript{1} še-tafru \{\textsubscript{1} / \#\textsubscript{OTO1}\} la-sar haya kašur le-nadlan
the-case that-they.sewed\textsubscript{1} / \#\textsubscript{it} the.minister was related to.real.estate

‘The case that they pinned on the minister was related to real estate.’ (2014: 659)

In Biblical Hebrew, however, reconstruction for idiom interpretation is attested for all three variants: obligatory resumptive pronouns, as in (204), optional resumptive pronouns, as in (205), and gaps, as in (206).

(204) \textit{To touch on X’s heart = to inspire X}

ha-ḫayil\textsubscript{1} ?šer nāgā\textsubscript{f} ?lōhîm b\textsuperscript{a}-libb-\textsubscript{ām\textsubscript{1}}
the.army.MS God on.heart-3MP.GEN

‘the army\textsubscript{1} that God had inspired (lit. ‘touched their\textsubscript{1} heart(s)’).’ (1 Sam 10.26)

(205) \textit{To pierce a name = to give a name}

w\textsuperscript{a}-q\textordmasculine{ŠIR} l-āḵ šēm\textsubscript{1} ḫāḏāš ?šer pî YHW\textsuperscript{a} bēn-\textsubscript{nū\textsubscript{1}}
and.be.called.PFV.3MS to-2MS name.MS new.MS C mouth YHWH pierce.1PFV.3MS-3MS.ACC

‘And you will be given a new name\textsubscript{1} that YHWH will give (lit. ‘pierce it\textsubscript{1}’).’ (Isa 62.2)

(206) \textit{To make X fall by lot to Y = to allot X to Y}

zō\textsuperscript{f} t há-ʔāres\textsubscript{1} ?šer tappîlû \textsubscript{1} min-naḥ\textsuperscript{a}lā l-\textsuperscript{SIB\textordmasculine{TÊ}} yiśrā\textordmasculine{îl}
this.FS the.land.FS C make.fall.1PFV.2MP by.lot to.tribes Israel

‘This is the land\textsubscript{1} that you shall allot (lit. ‘make fall by lot’) to the tribes of Israel.’ (Ezek 48.29)

The second set of reconstruction facts concerns amount readings in relative clauses. In amount relatives, the head denotes a quantity, event, degree, or kind, rather than a particular referent (de Vries 2002: 16, 25). For instance, in the English sentence in (207), the relative head ‘beer’ refers to the amount of beer that Stephen drank, not the actual liquids he ingested.

\textsuperscript{118}I have found no examples of Biblical Hebrew relative clauses for which the former three tests are applicable.

\textsuperscript{119}Glossing is preserved from Sichel (2014).
(207) I would need to live two lifetimes to drink the beer that Stephen drank last night. (modeled after similar examples in Grosu and Landman 1998)

According to Sichel, amount readings are available in Modern Hebrew with both obligatory resumptive pronouns and with gaps, but are unavailable with optional resumptive pronouns.

(208) hu rac axšav et ha-merxak₁ še-higati el Aviv lifney šana he runs now ACC the-distance that-reached.I to.it before year 'He now runs the distance that I ran a year ago.' (2014: 662)

(209) hu rac axšav et ha-merxak₁ še-ani racti { / oto₁ } lifney šana he runs now ACC the-distance that-I ran / *it before year 'He now runs the distance that I ran a year ago.' (2014: 662)

While I have been unable to identify an obligatory resumptive pronoun permitting an amount reading in Biblical Hebrew, both optional resumptive pronouns [210] and gaps [211] with amount readings are attested.

(210) ū-ma?kol₁-kā ?ašer tō?kālen-nū₁ b₄-mišqöl ?ešrîm šeqel lay-yōm and-food-2MS.GEN C eat.IPV.2MS-3MS.ACC by-weight twenty shekels to.the-day 'And your food that you will eat shall be twenty shekels by weight a day.' (Ezek 4.10)

(211) wa-yišqol ?abrahâm P-êprôn ?et hak-kesep₁ ?ašer dibber b₄-?oznê b’nê and-weigh.PFV.3MS Abraham to-Ephron ACC the-silver C speak.PFV.3MS in-ears children Hêt ?arba’ mē?ōt šeqel kesep Hittite four hundred shekel silver 'Abraham weighed out to Ephron the silver that he had declared in the hearing of the Hittites: four hundred shekels of silver.' (Gen 23.16)

Finally, Sichel reports that free (or headless) relatives are acceptable with obligatory resumptive pronouns and gaps, but degraded with optional resumptive pronouns. Here, Sichel follows previous literature that has claimed that free relatives instantiate the head raising structure and force interpretation of the lower copy (Grosu and Landman 1998; Bianchi 2004).

(212) mi ſe-at ozeret b-hodu nišar xaver le-kol ha-xayim who that-you help to-him in-India remains friend to-all the-life 'People you help in India remain your friend for the rest of your life.' (2014: 662)

(213) mi ſe-at pogešet { / oto₁ } be-hodu nišar xaver le-kol ha-xayim who that-you meet / *him in-India remains friend to-all the-life 'People you meet in India remain your friend for the rest of your life.' (2014: 662)

Once again, no sharp contrasts seems to hold in Biblical Hebrew. Free relatives are attested with obligatory resumptive pronouns, cf. [214], optional resumptive pronouns, cf. [215], and gaps, cf. [216].
(214) ?aḥar ʔašer ʔemšâ? ḫên b°-ʔēnây-[w]
    after C find.IPVF.1S grace in-eyes-3MS.GEN
'after the one that I will find favor in hisⁱ eyes' (Ruth 2.2)

(215) kî mi yûkâl l°-tqqên ʔet ʔašer ʔiwwâr-[d]
    because who be.able.IPVF.3MS to-straighten.INF ACC C bend.PVF.3MS-3MS.ACC
'Because who can straighten what he has bent (it¹).' (Qoh 7.13)

(216) w°-sâkâh ʔet ʔašer ʕâšîṯâ l-ð
    and-forget.PVF.3MS ACC C do.PVF.2MS to-3MS
'And he will forget what you did __ to him.' (Gen 27.45)

Table 11 summarizes the reconstruction facts for both Modern and Biblical Hebrew. The basic generalizations that emerge are summarized in (217).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reconstruction?</th>
<th>Optional RPs</th>
<th>Obligatory RPs</th>
<th>Gaps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mod Heb</td>
<td>Bib Heb</td>
<td>Mod Heb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are embedded idiomatic readings available?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are amount readings available?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are free relatives possible?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) In Modern Hebrew, reconstruction is available for obligatory resumptive pronouns and gaps. Reconstruction is banned for optional RPs.

(b) In Biblical Hebrew, reconstruction is available for obligatory and optional resumptive pronouns, and gaps.

At this point, we could pursue one of two conceivable hypotheses to account for the reconstruction facts in Biblical Hebrew. If we maintain that reconstruction is strictly a property of movement, then we must propose that gaps and resumptive pronouns in any position are potentially derived by the head-raising structure. In this scenario, Biblical Hebrew and Modern Hebrew would differ in the derivation of optional resumptive pronouns. Call this the *Uniform Head-Raising Hypothesis*:

(218) Uniform Head-Raising Hypothesis: In Biblical Hebrew, head-raising relatives can yield both obligatory and optional resumptive pronouns and gaps.

120 Note that these three properties are not mutually exclusive. For instance, [6] attests a free relative with an obligatory resumptive pronoun in the idiom 'to find favor in X's eyes', meaning roughly 'to be liked by X'.

(i) ?aḥar ʔašer ʔemšâ? ḫên b°-ʔēnây-[w]
    after C find.IPVF.1S favor in-eyes-3MS.GEN
'after (him¹) who I will find favor in his¹ eyes' (Ruth 2.2)

121 Salzmann [2017: 373-375] claims that similar contrasts between 'optional' and 'obligatory' resumptive pronouns in Swiss German are absent.
Alternatively, we could loosen the connection between reconstruction and syntactic movement in Biblical Hebrew. Call this the *Reconstruction as Non-Movement Hypothesis*, as in (219).

(219)  Reconstruction as Non-Movement Hypothesis: Biblical Hebrew reconstruction in relative clauses is not (necessarily) linked to movement.

I propose that the Uniform Head-Raising Hypothesis vastly overgenerates when the full array of Biblical Hebrew A-bar dependencies is taken into account. The Reconstruction as Non-Movement Hypothesis, by contrast, successfully predicts the properties of Biblical Hebrew relative clauses when outfitted with an appropriate model of NP-ellipsis, to be discussed in detail below. Recall that the head-raising analysis posits a movement dependency between the variable position and relative head. Thus, in (204), repeated here as (220a), the relative head *hayil* 'army' would need to move from the relative-internal possessor position out of a PP to its surface position. The corresponding head-raising analysis is given in (220b). I abstract over functional layers and movement dependencies which are tangential to the present argument.

(220)  a. ha-ḥayil$_1$ ṭašer nāgaʾ$_1$ ṭelohim b$^\text{h}$-libb$^\text{h}$-ām$_1$

\begin{description}
\item[the-army$_1$] touch.PFV.3MS God on-heart-3MP.GEN
\end{description}

'the army$_1$ that God had inspired (lit. 'touched their$_1$ heart(s)'). (1 Sam 10.26)
The fundamental problem with this hypothesis is that movement out of PPs is unattested in other types of A-bar movement in Biblical Hebrew. Displacement of an interrogative phrase from within a PP must be accompanied by displacement of the preposition itself, a phenomenon known as "pied-piping" (Ross 1967). 

Likewise for displaced *wh*-DPs from within PossP:

(i) |*yeṯ šôr mi| lâqaḥtî
ACC ox who take.REFL.1S

'Whose ox have I taken?' (1 Sam 12:3)
(221) \[
\text{[?ah}^a\text{rè mî yâšâ? melek yišrâ?èl } \\
\text{after who go...MS king Israel} \\
\text{'[After whom] went the king of Israel ___?'] (1 Sam 24.15)}
\]

There are no attested examples of *wh*-questions parallel to the proposed head-raising structure, in which a *wh*-word moves to [Spec, CP], strands the preposition in-situ, and yields a resumptive pronoun in the variable position.

(222) *Unattested wh-question:*
*\text{mî } who \text{ yâšâ? melek yišrâ?èl } ?ah}\text{rây-w} \\
\text{who go...MS king Israel after-MS} \\
\text{(int.) ‘Who did the king of Israel go after?’}

Thus, if we accept the head-raising derivation for resumptive relative clauses in Biblical Hebrew, we are left with no explanation as to why the same machinery could not be used to construct *wh*-questions. The head-raising analysis also cannot explain the absence of pied-piping in relative clauses, despite the fact that it is obligatory in *wh*-questions.

(223) *Unattested relative clause:*
*\text{hâ-ìš } the-man after \text{ ?ahar } ?ašer yâšâ? melek yišrâ?èl} \\
\text{the-man after C go...MS king Israel} \\
\text{(int.) ‘the man after whom the king of Israel went’}

Thus, the head-raising analysis makes incorrect predictions about the derivational options available for constructing A-bar dependencies in Biblical Hebrew: it predicts that *wh*-questions could involve preposition-stranding, coupled with resumption, and it predicts that head-raising relative clauses could employ pied-piping, both contrary to fact.

On the other hand, the Reconstruction as Non-Movement Hypothesis does not posit a movement relationship between the variable position and relative head and hence does not face the issues just elaborated. Building on the work of Guilliot & Malkawi (2006, 2011), Rouveret (2008), and Salzmann (2017), I propose that resumptive pronouns are concealed definite descriptions which contain a copy of the relative head subject to NP-ellipsis (Elbourne 2001).

(224) *Resumptive relative clause with elided NP*

\[
[\text{DP D [NP NP}_1 \text{ CP ... [DP [D RP [NP}_2 \text{ ] ] ] ] ] ]}
\]

This straightforwardly derives reconstruction with resumption given that a representation of the relative head is present inside the relative clause to license idiomatic interpretations, amount readings, and free relatives. I
illustrate this proposal in (225a) for idiom interpretation, where NP-ellipsis is triggered by adding the E feature to a functional head in the nominal domain (Merchant 2014).

(225) a. šēm1 hādāš ʿašer pi YHWH yiqq0 ʾen-nūl
   name.MS new.MS C mouth YHWH pierce.1PFV.3MS-3MS.ACC
   'a new name1 that YHWH will give (lit. 'pierce it1')' (Isa 62.2)

b. and you will be given a...

Thus, we can account for reconstruction with a head-external structure, and resumptive relatives in Biblical Hebrew receive a unified theoretical treatment.

The NP-ellipsis account of relative clause resumption makes several predictions, a few of which I will argue are indeed borne out in the attested data. First, assuming that ellipsis is not obligatory (i.e. that adding the E feature is not mandatory), I will argue that reconstruction should be possible inside islands. For instance, in the Swiss German example in (i), a pronominal variable contained in the relative head is bound by a negative quantificational phrase inside an adjunct island in the relative clause.

(i) D [Zii[t vo sim1 Läbe], wo mer erlächtert isch, wänn in de Bäi[n] niemert1 drüber redt, isch d Pubertät
   the period of his life C one relieved be.3SG when in the bar no.one there.about talk.3SG be.3SG the puberty
   lit.: 'The time of his life that one is relieved when nobody1 talks about it in the bar is puberty.' (Salzmann 2017: 365)

Indeed, reconstruction into islands is what inspired NP-ellipsis approaches to resumption in the first place (see Guillot and Malkawi 2006). Although I have not identified any examples of reconstruction into islands in Biblical Hebrew, this can be attributed to the size of the corpus. Out of an estimated 5500 ʾašer relatives, I have found eleven examples of island-internal resumptive pronouns, and only three examples of reconstruction to optional positions. Therefore, I predict (at 95% confidence) that in order to find at least one example of reconstruction to an optional position inside an island in an ʾašer relative, the corpus would need to consist of 2.7 million relative clauses with ʾašer. The following equation was used to reach this estimate: 1 - (1 - (3/5500) * (11/5500))^2 > 0.95, where n ≈ 2.7 million is the population size necessary to observe at least one case of optional resumption inside an island with reconstruction.
feature to the relevant head is not obligatory), it is predicted that there should be cases in which the relative-
internal copy is pronounced. This appears to be the case in (226), where the relative head "the dust of the earth" is resumed by a full DP copy inside an adjunct island internal to the relative clause.

(226) wº-samtî ?êt zarî-aḵā ka-ṭa-par hā-ṭāres ?ašer ?im yûḵal ?īš and-place.PFV.1S offspring-2MS.GEN like-dust the-earth C if be.able.IPFV.3MS man li-mnôt ?êt yº-par hā-ṭāres gam zarî-aḵā yimmâneh to-count.INF dust the-earth also offspring-2MS.GEN be.counted.IPFV.3MS ‘I will make your offspring like [the dust of the earth¹], that if a man is able to count [the dust of the earth¹], so shall your offspring be counted.’ (Gen 13.16)

Next, material outside of the ellipsis site is not subject to the identity conditions on ellipsis, by hypothesis. This predicts that mismatches between the relative head and resumptive pronoun should be permitted in material higher than the head hosting the E feature. As discussed previously, we find both number and gender mismatches in Biblical Hebrew resumption.

(227) (=198) Number mismatch
wº-ṭāḥadêtā ?êt ?oyº-bê₁-kā ?ašer yº-sall’hen-nû₁ YHWH b-āk and-serve.PFV.2MS ACC enemies.MP-2MS.GEN C send.IPFV.3MS-3MS.ACC YHWH on-2MS ‘You will serve your enemies₁ (mp) that YHWH sends them₁ (ms) (lit. ‘him/it’) against you.’ (Deut 28.48)

(228) (=199) Gender mismatch
wº-ṭāṣāptî ?êt-kem min hā-ṭa-râšôtî ?ašer nº-pōšôtêm bā-hem₁ and-gather.PFV.1S ACC-2MP from the-lands.FP C be.scattered.PFV.2MP in-3MP ‘I will gather you from the lands₁ (fp) that you are scattered among them₁ (mp).’ (Ezek 11.17)

To capture these facts, I assume that the extended nominal projection includes dedicated Num and Gen heads (contrast Kramer 2015).

(229)

If the E feature is added to the Num head of the relative-internal DP, identity is only calculated over the complement of Num—namely, GenP. Num (and Gen) will value the ϕ-feature probe on D which is subsequently

---

124I set aside the issue of person mismatches for future research. What appears to be necessary in such cases is some mechanism for transferring the person features of the matrix subject to the null operator to then be passed on to the resumptive pronoun. This would be possible in a system Kratzer’s 2009 where pronouns can be generated devoid of certain features and gain them throughout the derivation. See also the discussion in Collins and Postal 2012 on defining sources for pronominal agreement.
spelled out as a resumptive pronoun. Mismatches will arise in cases where Num inside the relative clause is valued differently than Num in the relative head. I assume here that both number and gender features are represented by the binary features $[\pm \text{plural}]$ and $[\pm \text{feminine}]$, respectively.

(230)

If the E feature is added to the Gen head, identity will be calculated over $nP$ only, and gender mismatches will be permitted, as in (231).
All of these facts fall out if resumptive pronouns are remnants of NP-ellipsis.

What this section has demonstrated, then, is that several properties of Biblical Hebrew resumptive pronouns in relative clauses are captured by a head-external derivation, in which a null-operator is base-generated in [Spec, CP] and binds the resumptive pronoun in-situ. Reconstruction in resumptive relatives can be attributed to the presence of a copy of the relative head internal to the relative clause which is elided under identity with its antecedent (see Elbourne 2001). The ellipsis account of resumption makes predictions about $\phi$-feature mismatches and the non-obligatoriness of deletion, both of which are borne out by the Biblical Hebrew data. I conclude that all resumptive relatives in Biblical Hebrew can be derived by the head-external derivation; none requires a head-raising analysis.

4.6 Summary

This section has dealt with primarily three main lines of inquiry. The first was empirical and probed the distribution of resumptive pronouns and gaps in nearly all positions for four relative complementizers in Biblical Hebrew. The resulting taxonomy revealed several important features of resumption in Biblical Hebrew: (i) highest subjects may be resumed (thereby violating the Highest Subject Restriction; McCloskey 1990); (ii) subjects, objects, and locative adverbials are all more likely to be resumed in embedded positions; and (iii) resumption occurs in both island and non-island contexts. The second assessed three prominent functional
proposals aimed at explaining the use of resumptive pronouns in optional positions and concluded that none fully accounts for the Biblical Hebrew data. Finally, it was argued that resumption in Biblical Hebrew relative clauses is best modeled without reference to a head-raising derivation. Reconstruction, which has traditionally been tightly associated with movement, was shown to be a by-product of Elbourne's analysis of pronouns as definite determiners with elided complements. This analysis made correct predictions about φ-feature mismatches and the non-obligatory nature of deletion giving rise to an overt, relative-internal copy of the head. These results not only shed light on the syntax of resumption in Biblical Hebrew, but also contribute to the debate surrounding how resumptive pronouns (and relative clauses in general) are formed.

5 Conclusion and Outlook

In this paper, I have systematically documented and analyzed three constructions in Biblical Hebrew: (i) Hanging Topics, (ii) Left Dislocation, and (iii) relative clauses. Each has been shown to exhibit quite distinct properties, despite the fact that all three have been descriptively analyzed as involving resumption. Hanging Topics and Left Dislocates differ non-trivially in the extent to which they show connectivity effects with the host clause. I have argued that these differences can be captured by adopting Ott's characterization of Left Dislocation as a form of clausal ellipsis. In this way, the Biblical Hebrew data contribute to the theoretical debate surrounding dislocation constructions and the composition of the left periphery. With regards to relative clauses, this paper has provided substantial grist for future typological research into cross-linguistic patterns of resumption. By striving for exhaustiveness in its empirical scope, this paper has compiled the most comprehensive catalogue of relative clause resumption in Biblical Hebrew to date, and in doing so has uncovered three heretofore unrecognized generalizations: (i) resumptive pronouns occur both inside of and outside of syntactic islands, (ii) resumptive pronouns may occur in the highest subject position inside relative clauses, and (iii) the preference for resumptive pronouns increases markedly in embedded positions. Inspired by Guilliot and Malkawi's (2006; 2011) analysis of resumption in Lebanese Arabic and French, this paper has argued that resumptive pronouns in Biblical Hebrew relative clauses are never the by-products of movement. Several properties of resumptive pronouns in Biblical Hebrew were argued to fall out from a slightly modified version of standard, base-generated null operator accounts of relative clauses, in which the resumptive pronoun is bound in-situ (see McCloskey 1990, 2002; Merchant 2004b). I have argued that such a theory, appended with a mechanism for NP-ellipsis, derives the properties of Biblical Hebrew resumption surveyed here.

An important conclusion of this study is that resumptive pronouns (including the correlates of Hanging Top-
ics and Left Dislocates) in Biblical Hebrew are not spelled-out lower copies or traces. This is a key finding for the syntactic literature on resumption, since much research has been preoccupied with resolving the fact that resumptive pronouns simultaneously exhibit properties associated with movement and non-movement. All of the facts, I argue, are compatible with a non-movement analysis. Should my arguments extend to other languages with productive resumptive strategies, this conclusion will prove vital for understanding the mechanics of constructing A-bar dependencies cross-linguistically. In particular, it would provide significant theoretical support for McCloskey’s (2002) observation that resumptive pronouns do not differ from the regular series of pronominal elements in a language in any significant way, since resumptive pronouns are argued to be derived by ellipsis along the lines of Elbourne’s (2001) analysis of E-type anaphora and pronominals more generally.

Finally, this paper has set the stage for future investigations into several issues only briefly mentioned here. For instance, as intimated in Section 3, much ink has been spilled over the information structural properties of Biblical Hebrew dislocations. If syntactic structure at least partially correlates with information structure (see López 2016), then the bipartite syntactic classification advocated for here may prove vital. What’s more, I have not given an account of why Biblical Hebrew does not seem to be subject to the Highest Subject Restriction, at least not categorically. This is an important line of empirical inquiry for establishing the possible domains of A-bar binding and how such binding relations are constrained by their bindees (see McCloskey 1990, 2017a). Lastly, this paper has for the most part set aside the issue of deriving locative adverbial resumption in Biblical Hebrew. The system presented here predicts that they will exhibit the same properties as other pronominal elements, though many of the tests will no longer apply; for instance, since locative adverbials do not overtly display $\phi$-feature agreement, the mismatching tests are inapplicable. It is hoped that this paper will inspire syntactic research on Biblical Hebrew and other (ancient) Semitic languages that is informed by principled comparisons with other languages, that strives for empirical comprehensiveness, and that relies on solid statistical methods. Such research is indispensable for understanding the syntactic mechanisms which give rise to resumption.
6 Appendix 1: Left Dislocation

6.1 Accusative DP dislocate with D(P) correlate

(232) kî ?et kol há-ʔārésî šer ?attá rô?eh l^1-kâ ?ett'n-sên[nâ]{1}
because ACC all the-land.FS.C 2MS see.PTCP.MS to-2MS give.IPFV.1S-3FS.ACC
'Because all the land1 that you see—I will give it1 to you.' (Gen 13.15)

(233) w^2-gam ?et benî há-ʔāmâ l^1-gôy šmen[nū]{1}
and also ACC son the-handmaid to-nation set. give.IPFV.1S-3MS.ACC
'And even the son1 of the handmaid—I will make him1 into a nation.' (Gen 21.13)

(234) w^2-ʔet há-ʔārésî šer nätatî l^1-ʔab ráhâm yîrâshq l^1-kâ ?ett'n-sên[nâ]{1}
and ACC the-land.FS.C give.PFV.1S to-Abraham and-to-Isaac to-2MS give.IPFV.1S-3FS.ACC
'And the land1 that I gave to Abraham and to Isaac—I will give it1 to you.' (Gen 35.12)

(235) w^2-ʔet há-ʔāmî hef^ešîr [ʔôt-ô]{1} le-ʕârim
and ACC the-people make.cross.PFV.3MS ACC-3MS to the-cities
'And the people1—he (i.e. Pharaoh) made them1 cross over to the cities.' (Gen 47.21)

(236) ?et haš-sippôr ha-hâyâlî yiqqâh [ʔôt-âhî]{1} w^2-[ʔet] šîš há-ʔârez w^2-[ʔet] š^mî
ACC the-bird.COLL the-living.FS take.IPFV.3MS and ACC wood the-cedarwood and ACC scarlet hat-tôlôâtî w^2-[ʔet] há-ʔêzôb
the-worm and ACC the-hyssop
'[The living bird]1, he shall take [it]1 and [the cedarwood] and [the scarlet yarn] and [the hyssop].' (Lev 14.6)

(237) ?et maḥtôtî ha-ḥâṭṭâ?îm há-ʔêlîleh b^a-nâpšôt-äm w^2-ʔâsû [ʔôt-âmî] riqqûyê
ACC pans.FP the-sinners the-these in-lives-3MP.GEN and-do.PFV.3P ACC-3MP hammered.things
šâhîm šippûy lam-mizbê^a h
sheet.metal covering for.the-altar
'The plates1 of these men who sinned with their lives—they will make them1 into hammer-beaten sheets of metal, a covering for the altar.' (Num 17.3)

(238) w^2-ʔak ?et had-dâbârî šer ?âdabber ?âlê-kâ [ʔôt-ôî] taf^ašêh
and-only ACC the-thing C speak.IPFV.1S to-2MS ACC-3MS do.IPFV.2MS
'Only the thing1 that I tell you— it1 you shall do.' (Num 22.20)

(239) w^2-ʔepës ?et had-dâbârî šer ?âdabber ?âlê-kâ [ʔôt-ôî] t^ôdabber
and-only ACC the-thing C speak.IPFV.1S to-2MS ACC-3MS speak.IPFV.2MS
'Only the thing1 that I tell you— it1 you shall speak.' (Num 22.35)

Q-NEG ACC C put.IPFV.3MS YHWH in-mouth-1S.GEN ACC-3MS be.sure.IPFV.1S to-speak.INF
'Should not [what YHWH puts in my mouth]1—it1 I shall be sure to speak?' (Num 23.12)

(241) ?et kol had-dâbârî šer ?ănôkî m^2-sawweh ?et-kem [ʔôt-ôî] tišm^ûr lâ-ʔâsôt
ACC all the-thing C 1S command.PTCP.MS ACC-2MP ACC-3MS be.sure.IPFV.2MP to-do.INF
'Everything1 that I command you— it1 you shall be sure to do.' (Deut 13.1)
(242) wē̑-?ē̑ ha-ybūsî  yōsîḇê  yē̑rūšālaim lō? yūkîlū  bōnē  yē̑hūdā
and-ACC the-Jebusite dwell.PTCP.MP Jerusalem  NEG be.able.IPPIV.3MP children Judah
lē-hōrîš-āmî1

re-dispossess.IMP-3MP.ACC

'The Jebusites, who inhabit Jerusalem—the children of Judah couldn't dispossess them.' (Josh 15.63)

(243) hē̑-lō?  [wē̑-?ē̑šer yōrîsâ-kā  kāmōš  ?ē̑lōhê-kâlā1  tōt-ō1  tīrāš]
Q-NEG ACC C bequeath.IPPIV.3MS-2MS.ACC Chemosh God-2MS.GEN ACC-3MS possess.IPPIV.2MS
wē̑-?ē̑ kol2  wē̑-?ē̑šer hōrîš  YHWH  ?ē̑lōhê-nū  mē-pānē-nū  tōt-ō2
and-ACC all C bequeath.IPPIV.3MS YHWH god-1P.GEN from-before-1P.GEN ACC-3MS

nīrāš  possess.IPPIV.1P

'Will not [what Chemosh your god bequeaths]1—it1 you will inherit? All2 that YHWH our god has be-
queathed before us—it2 we will possess.' (Judg 11.24, x2)

(244) kī  tōt-ō1  kē-hayyōm times?ūn  tōt-ō1
because ACC-3MS as-today find.IPPIV.2MP ACC-3MS

'Because him1—even today you shall find him1.' (1 Sam 9.13)

(245) wē̑-?ē̑ nepēšî  ?ōyō-bē-kā  yē̑qallî-ennâ1  bō-tōk  kāp  haq-qâla’ī
and-ACC life.FS enemies-2MS.GEN sling.IPPIV.3MS-3FS.ACC in-middle hollow the-sling

'And the life1 of your enemies—he will sling it1 in the middle of the sling’s hollow.' (1 Sam 25.29)

(246) wē̑-gām  wē̑-?ē̑ ma’î-kâl  ?îm-mō-2  wa-y[s]i-re-hâ1  pro2 mig-gēbîrâ
and-even ACC Maacah mother-3MS.GEN and-turn.IPPIV.3MS-3FS.ACC1  from-queenship

'And even Maacah1, his2 mother—he2 turned her1 aside from queenship.' (1 Kgs 15.13)

(247) kī  [wē̑-?ē̑šer yō?mar YHWH  ?ēl-ay1  tōt-ō1  qādabbêr]
because ACC C say.IPPIV.3MS YHWH to-1S ACC-3MS speak.IPPIV.1S

'Because [what YHWH says to me]1—it1 I will speak.' (1 Kgs 22.14)

(248) gam  tōt-ō1  hakkū-hû1
also ACC-3MS strike.IMP.MP-3MS.ACC

'Even him1—strike him1!' (2 Kgs 9.27)

(249) kī  tīm  wē̑-?ē̑ YHWH1  wē̑-?ē̑šer hehî-lâ  wē̑-?ē̑-kem mē-?ē̑res  mishrayim  bō-tōkōh  gâdōl
but rather ACC YHWH C bring.up.IPPIV.3MS ACC-2MP from-land Egypt with-strength great
ū-bî-zrōdî1  n’tûyā  tōt-ō1  tîrâtû
and-with-arm outstretched ACC-3MS fear.IPPIV.2MP

'But rather YHWH1 who brought you up out of Egypt with great strength and an outstretched arm—him1
you shall fear.' (2 Kgs 17.35)

(250) wē̑-?ē̑ kol  ?ānšē ha-ḥayil šîhîyât  ?ālāpîm  wē̑-he-ḥărâs  wē̑-ham-masîr  ?elep
and-ACC all men the-war seven thousand and-the-craftsman and-the-metalworker thousand
hak-kōl gibborîm yōśē  milhâmâ wa-ybîlî-mî1  melēk bâbel  gôlâ
the-all warriors do.PTCP.MP war and-bring.IPPIV.3MS-3MP.ACC king Babylon captive
bâbel-ā

Babylon-to

'And [all the men of war, 7,000 (members), and the craftsmen and metal workers, 1,000, all warriors
doing war1—the king of Babylon took them1 captive to Babylon.' (2 Kgs 24.16)

(251) wē̑-?ē̑ YHWH1 sēbâ-?ōt  tōt-ō1
ACC YHWH hosts ACC-3MS honor.IPPIV.2MP
6.2 Accusative DP dislocate with PP correlate

(252) hō-lō? ʔet haq-qīṭṭēr1 qāsēr qīṭṭartem bō'-yārē yō'hūdā ū-bō'-hūṣōt yō'rūšālaim attem Q-NEG ACC the-incense.MS C burn.PFV.2MP in-cities Judah and-in-streets Jerusalem 2MP wa-ʔaḇōtē-kem mal'kē-kem wō'-yām hā'-āres ʔōt-ām1 and-fathers-2MP,GEN kings-2MP,GEN and-princes-2MP,GEN and-people-the-land ACC-3MP zākār ḤWYH remember.PFV.3MS YHWH

'The incense, which you burned in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem, (that is), you, your fathers, your kings, your princes, and the people of the land–has YHWH not remembered it1 (lit. 'them')?' (Jer 44.21)

(253) ʔet zimmāt-ēk wā-.ʔet tōfāḇōt-ayik1 attem nāsātīm1 ACC wickedness.FS-2FS,GEN and-ACC abominations.FP-2FS,GEN 2FS carry.PFV.2FS-3MP,ACC

'Your wickedness and your abominations1–you have borne them1.' (Ezek 16.58)

6.3 PP dislocate with PP correlate

(255) wā-.ʔet ḥūqqōt1-ay lō? hālōkū bā-hem1 and-ACC statutes.FP-1S,GEN NEG walk.PFV.3P in-3MP

'And my statutes1–they didn't walk [in them1].’ (Ezek 20.16)

(256) ū-[PEP] mē-ʔēṣ had-da'at tōb wā-rāš1 lō? tōkāl mimmen-nū1 and- from-tree the-knowledge good and-evil NEG eat.PFV.2MS from-3MS

'But [PP] from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil1, you shall not eat [PP from it1]’ (Gen 2.17)

(257) ū-[MP-pōʾrī1 hā-ʔēṣ qāsēr bō'-tōk hag-gān] āmar qōlōhām lō? tōkālū and-from-fruit the-tree C in-middle the-garden say.PFV.3MS God NEG eat.PFV.2MP mimmen-nū1 from-3MS

'But [PP] from the fruit1 of the tree that is in the middle of the garden–God has said (that) you shall not eat [PP from it1].’ (Gen 3.3)

(258) wā-ʔābdō-kā wa-ʔaḇōtē-kā qāsēr yihyū l-āk [mē-ʔēt hag-gōyīm1 and-servant-2MS,GEN and-handmaid-2MS,GEN C be.PFV.3MP to-2MS from-with-the-nations.MP qāsēr sīḇōtē-kem] [mē-hem1] tiqūnū ǰēbed wā-ʔāmā C surround-2MP from-3MP buy.PFV.2MP slave and-handmaid

'And as for your slave2 and your handmaid3, who belong to you–[from the nations1 that surround you]–[from them1] you may buy a slave2 and a handmaid3.’ (Lev 25.44)

(259) wā-gām [mib-bōʾnē1 hat-tōsāḇīm hag-gārīm ʿimmā-kem] [mē-hem1] tiqūnū and-also from-children the-inhabitants the-sojourn.PTCP,MP with-2MP from-3MP buy.PFV.2MP
'And also [from the children\textsubscript{1} of the inhabitants that sojourn with you]–[from them\textsubscript{1}] you may buy (slaves)…' (Lev 25.45)

(260) \text{w}^-\text{[}\text{y}im hā^-\text{a}māhōt\textsubscript{1} \text{ʔa}śer \text{ʔamart} | \text{yim\textsubscript{m}ām} | \text{i}kkāb\textsubscript{a}dā\text{ and- with the-handmaids.FP that speak.PVF.2FS with-3MP be.honored.IPVF.1S}}

'And [with the handmaids\textsubscript{1} (fp) that you speak to], with them\textsubscript{1} (mp) I shall be honored.’ (2 Sam 6.22)

(261) \text{w}^-\text{[}\text{ʔel melek} yūhūdā hās\textsubscript{a}lōēh \text{ʔet}^-\text{a}kem li-drōś \text{ʔet} YHWH kōh tō\textsubscript{0}m'rū\text{ and-to king Judah the-send.PTCP.PTCP.MS ACC-2MP to-see.INF ACC YHWH thus say.IPVF.2MP}}

\text{"el\textsubscript{1} āywī}\text{ to-3MS}

'[To the king\textsubscript{1} of Judah that is sending you to seek YHWH]–thus you shall say [to him\textsubscript{1}].' (2 Kgs 22.18)

(262) [\text{ʕal hā-ʔāres\textsubscript{1} m'rāṭayīm}] \text{ʔālēh} \text{ʕālē-hā\textsubscript{1}}

against the-land.FS Merathaim go.up.IMPR.2MS against-3FS

'[Against the land\textsubscript{1} of Merathaim]–go up [against it\textsubscript{1}].' (Jer 50.21)

(263) [\text{b'-ma}³\text{li'āl-ō \text{ʔa}šer mā'āl}] \text{ū-\text{[b'-haṭṭā]?t\textsubscript{2}-ō \text{ʔa}šer ḥātāʔ}]

in-treachery-3MS.GEN C act.treacherously.PVF.3MS and-in-sin-3MS.GEN C sin.PVF.3MS

\text{b-ām\textsubscript{i+2} yāmūt}

in-3MP die.IPVF.3MS

'[In his treachery\textsubscript{1} that he has done], and [in his sin\textsubscript{2} that he has committed]–[in them\textsubscript{1+2}] he shall die.' (Ezek 18.24)

(264) \text{ū-\text{[b'-ʕawl\textsubscript{1}-ō \text{ʔa}šer ḥāsā]} \text{b-ō} yāmūt}

and-in-injustice-3MS.GEN C do.PVF.3MS in-3MS die.IPVF.3MS

'But [in his injustice\textsubscript{1} that he has done]–[in it\textsubscript{1}] he shall die.' (Ezek 33.13)

(265) [\text{kad-dāgīm} ʃen-ne\textsuperscript{e}ḥāzīm bi-mšōdā rā'yā\textsubscript{a} w\textsuperscript{e}[\text{kaṣ-sipp\textsuperscript{o}rim\textsubscript{2} hā-ʔaḥūzōt bap-pāh}]

like-fish.MP C-captured.PTCP.MP in-net evil and-like.the-birds.P the-caught.PTCP.FP in.the-snare

\text{kā-hēm\textsubscript{i+2} yūqāṣīm}

like-3MP be.ensnared.PTCP.MP children the-man to-time evil

'[Like fish\textsubscript{1} captured in an evil net], and [like birds\textsubscript{2} caught in a snare]–[like them\textsubscript{1+2}] the children of man will be ensnared at an evil time.' (Qoh 9.12)

(266) \text{w}^-\text{[}\text{ʔel melek\textsubscript{1} yūhūdā hās\textsubscript{a}lōēh \text{ʔet}^-\text{a}kem li-drōś ba-YHWH] kōh tō\textsubscript{0}m'rū\text{ and-to king Judah the-send.PTCP.PTCP.MS ACC-2MP to-see.INF on-YHWH thus say.IPVF.2MP}}

\text{"el\textsubscript{1} āywī}\text{ to-3MS}

'[To the king\textsubscript{1} of Judah that is sending you to seek YHWH]–thus you shall say [to him\textsubscript{1}].' (2 Chr 34.26)

\textbf{6.4 PP Dislocate with Loc Adv Correlate}

(267) \text{b'-qiylabel\textsubscript{1} i} \text{ʔa}šer kārīṭi li-i b\textsuperscript{3}e-ʔeše\textsuperscript{a} k\textsuperscript{a}n'\text{an\text{[}\text{sāmm-ā}1 tiqb\textsuperscript{r-ênî}}

in-grave-1S.GEN C cut.PVF.1S for-1S in-land Canaan there-to bury.IPVF.2MS-1S.ACC

'[In my grave which I carved out for myself in the land of Canaan]–[there\textsubscript{1}] you shall bury me.’ (Gen 50.5)

(268) \text{[ba-ʔa}šer kārāʾy\textsubscript{1}] \text{[sām] nāpāl šādūd}

in-C sink.PVF.3MS there fall.PVF.3MS destroyed

'[Where he sank\textsubscript{1}–[there\textsubscript{1}] he fell down destroyed.’ (Judg 5.27)
(269) [ʕal nah²rōt₁ bābel] šām₁ yāšabnū gam bākînū
at rivers Babylon there sat.PFV.1P even cry.PFV.1P
'At the rivers₁ of Babylon–[there₁] we sat, we even cried.' (Ps 137.1)

(270) [ʔel m'qóm₁ še-han-n²ḥālim hōl²kîm] šām₁ hēm šābîm lâ-lekêṭ
to place C-the-streams.MP go.PTCP.MP there 3MP return.PTCP.MP to-go.INF
'To the place₁ that the streams flow!–there they (i.e. the streams) go back again.' (Qoh 1.7)
7 Appendix 2: Hanging Topics

7.1 Nominative DP dislocate with D(P) correlate

- Gen: 23.11, 24.14, 26.15, 28.13, 28.22, 49.19, 49.28
- Exod: 1.22, 12.44, 15.15
- Deut: 2.23, 4.3, 7.15, 14.6, 14.27, 20.20, 28.61
- Josh: 1.3, 11.13, 13.6
- Judg: 7.5
- 1 Sam: 15.9, 17.25
- 2 Sam: 14.10, 22.41
- Isa: 1.7, 15.7, 42.3, 53.4, 56.6-7
- Jer: 2.24, 25.31, 27.11, 33.24, 36.14, 53.4, 59.12
- Ezek: 4.12(x2), 7.15, 7.20, 11.5, 16.19, 17.19, 19.12, 30.18, 32.7, 32.8, 33.27, 44.29
- Hos: 8.6, 9.6
- Amos: 1.11
- Zeph: 2.4
- Ps: 18.41, 20.4, 32.10, 50.23, 65.4, 67.5, 68.10, 74.17, 89.12, 89.13, 90.17, 101.5(x2), 125.5, 140.12, 145.6, 147.20
7.2 Nominative DP dislocate with PP correlate

- Exod: 9.19, 32.1, 32.23
- Lev: 2.11, 7.7, 7.18, 7.33, 13.18, 13.29, 13.47, 20.6
- Num: 5.10, 26.33
- Deut: 11.12, 18.19, 32.24
- Jos: 15.16
- Judg: 1.12, 17.5
- 2 Sam: 15.2, 16.18((Qere)), 22.2
- 1 Kgs: 1.20, 12.17
- 2 Kgs: 1.4, 1.6, 1.16, 20.29, 25.22
- Isa 4.3, 9.1, 11.10, 13.17
- Jer: 6.19
- Ezek: 5.6, 14.4, 14.13, 20.16, 33.12, 35.8

See Groß (1987: 82-103) for data.

8 Nominative DP dislocate with Loc Adv correlate

- Gen: 25.10
- Deut: 12.11
- Isa: 7.25
- Job: 28.5
- Prov: 26.27
- Qoh: 3.16(x2)

See Groß (1987: 82-85) for data.
9 Appendix 3: \textit{ʔašer} Relative Clauses, "Optionally Resumptive" Positions

9.1 \textit{ʔašer} Highest Subject Resumptive Pronouns

(271) ०-\textit{min} hab-\textit{b}⁺ hēmāṯ? \textit{ʔašer} lō? ṭhōrā̠ SizePolicy if \textit{ṭnayim} ?iš\textit{w} w o-ʔišt-ō \\
and-from-the-beast.FS C NEG clean.FS 3FS two \textit{man} and-mate-3MS.GEN \\
'(You shall take) two—\textit{two}—\textit{and} its mate—of the beast\textit{t\textone}: \textit{it} t\texttwo is not clean.' (Gen 7.2)

(272) kol re\textit{mešt} \textit{ʔašer} hū? FS hay lá-kem yihyeh l\textsuperscript{3}⁴-ʔōk\textsuperscript{3}⁴lā \\
every crawling.thing.MS C 3MS living to-2MP be.IPV.3MS for-food \\
'Every crawling thing, that \textit{it} t\texttwo is alive will be food for you.' (Gen 9.3)

(273) ỵḷid bāyịt Ṣû-миqnat kese̱p mik-kōl ben\textsuperscript{1} nēkār \textit{ʔašer} lō? mis-zarā̠-ʔịkā̠ \\
born house and-purchase money from-all \textit{son}.MS foreign.MS C NEG from-offspring-2MS.GEN \\
hū? FS 3MS \\
'(All eight-year-olds will be circumcised, whether...\textcdot\textcdot one born of (your) house, or one purchased from \textit{any foreigner}, that \textit{he} t\texttwo is not among your offspring.' (Gen 17.12)

(274) w o-kị yāmūt min hab-\textit{b}⁹ hēmāṯ? \textit{ʔašer} hū? FS lá-kem l\textsuperscript{3}⁴-ʔōk\textsuperscript{3}⁴lā Ḥan-nōgēa̱ʕi̱̣ \\
and-if die.IPV.3MS from-the-beast.FS C 3FS for-2MP for-food the-touch.PTCP.MS \\
b o-niblāt-āh yītmā? Ṣad Ḥā-ʕāreb \\
on-carcass-3FS.GEN be.unclean.IPV.3MS until-the-evening \\
'If one of the beasts\textit{t\textone}: \textit{it} t\texttwo is food for you dies, the one who touches its carcass will be unclean until evening.'  (Lev 11.39)

(275) w o-hā-ʔiš tahōr ū-bā-derēk lō? háyā w o-ḥādal la-ʔịsōt \\
and-the-man.MS C 3MS clean.MS and-on-road NEG be.PPV.3MS and-cease.PPV.3MS to-do.INF \\
hap-pesaḥ w o-nikrōtā Ḥan-nēpēš Ḥa-Ḥị Ḥē-ʔammē-Ḥā \\
the-passover and-be.cut.off.PPV.3MS the-person.FS the-that from-people-3FS.GEN \\
'the man\text{t\textone} that he t\texttwo is clean and is not traveling and ceases to keep the passover—that person shall be cut off from his people.' (Num 9.13)

(276) w o-ḥēḥịʔ tāt-ānū Ḥe-Ḥā-ʔāreb Ḥaz-zōʔ tū-ni tān-āh \\
and-bring.PPV.3MS ACC-1P to the-land the-this and-give.PPV.3MS-3FS.ACC to-us land.FS C 3FS \\
zābat Ḥālāb ū-dābāš flow.PTCP.FS milk and-honey \\
'And he will bring us to this land and give it to us—a land\textit{t\textone} that \textit{it} t\texttwo flows (with) milk and honey.' (Num 14.8)

NEG approach.IPV.3MS man.MS stranger.MS C NEG from-offspring Aaron 3MS to-offer.INF \\
q tōrē qlipnē YHWH \\
incense before YHWH \\
'a foreign man\textit{t\textone} that he t\texttwo is not from Aaron’s offspring will not approach to offer incense before YHWH.' (Num 17.5)

(278) w o-lō? Ṭiqqāḥu kōpěr ḷ-nepeš rōse̱h tāhū? FS \textit{ʔašer} rashāʕ ḷ-mōt \\
and-NEG take.IPV.2MP ransom for-life murderer.MS C 3MS guilty.MS for-die.INF \\
'You shall not accept a ransom for the life of a murderer\textit{t\textone} that he t\texttwo is guilty of death.' (Num 35.31)
NEG be.able.IPV2.MS to-set.INF over-2MS man.MS foreign.MS C NEG brother-2MS.GEN 3MS

'You may not (lit. 'you will not be able to') set over yourselves (i.e. as king) a foreign man, that he is not your brother.' (Deut 17.15)

(280) kên taštêš lî-kol he-ŷârîm hâ-rê hôqôtî mimmâ-kâ mî?ôd ?ašer lô? mê-ŷârê
thus do.IPV2.MS to-all the-cities.FP the-distant.FP from-2MS very C NEG from-cities
hâ-gôyîm hâ-?elleh hêmā naï
the-nations the-these 3FP

'Thus you shall do to all the cities very far from you that they do not belong to the cities of these nations.' (Deut 20.15)

(281) ū-bânîtā mâšôr yâl hâ-ŷîr ?ašer hû?î yîsôš yîmmâ-kâ milḥâmâ
and-build.IPV2.MS siegeworks against the-city.FS C 3FS do.PTCP.FS with-2MS war

'You will build siegeworks against the city that it does war with you.' (Deut 20.20)

(282) wô-?attêm hayyôm mî?astêm yêt ?ašer hû?î mōšîqî lâ-kem mik-kol
and-2MP today refuse.PFV2.MP ACC God.MS-2MP.GEN C 3MS save.PTCP.MS to-2MP from-all
râ-yôtê-kem wô-šârôtê-kem
calamities-2MP.GEN and-distresses-2MP.GEN

'Today you have rejected your god that he saves you from all your calamities and distresses.' (1 Sam 10.19)

(283) wô-?âm yâl han-nokrî lô? mē-ŷâmmâ-kâ yîsîrâ?el hû?î
and-also to the-foreigner.MS C NEG from-people-2MS.GEN Israel 3MS

'And you shall give to each according to his lifestyle... and also to the foreigner that he is not from your people, Israel.' (1 Kgs 8.41)

(284) kol hâ-ŷâm han-nôṯâr min hâ-?êmōrî lâ-ḥittî lâ-pîrīzî hâ-ḥîwîl
all the-people.MS the-remaining.s from the-Amorite the-Hittite the-Perizzite the-Hivite
wô-ha-yübûsî lô? mîb-hê-nê yîsîrâ?el hêmâ naï lôqôtî tay-ya’il-lêm šâlîmoh
and-the-Jebusite C NEG from-children Israel 3MP and-bring.IPV3.MS Solomon
lî-mas yôbê-lô ᵄlî yôyôm hâz-zeh
labor-serving until the-day the-this

'All the people remaining from the Amorites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites are not of the people of Israel...Solomon brought them into slave labor until today.' (1 Kgs 9.20-21)

because great.FS anger YWHH C 3FS burn.PFV3.FS on-1P

Because great is the anger of YWHH that it burns against us.' (2 Kgs 22.13)

(286) ū-mîn hâ-ŷîr lâqâḥ šârîsî yêḥâd ?ašer hû?î pâqîd yâl ?anše hâm-milḥâmâ
and-from the-city take.PFV3.MS officer.MS one.MS C 3MS appointed.MS over men the-war

'And he took from the city one officer that he was appointed over the men of war.' (2 Kgs 25.19)

(287) wô-?attêm yâl tîmâ?yû ?el nîṭîyê-kem wô-?el qôsâ-kâ-kem wô-?el
and-2MP NEG listen.IPV2.MP to prophets-2MP.GEN and-to diviners-2MP.GEN and-to
hêlîmôtê-kem wô-?el ?ônînê-kem wô-?el kâšâpê-kem ?ašer hêmâ 3+4+5
dreamers-2MP.GEN and-to fortune.tellers-2MP.GEN and-to sorcerers-2MP.GEN C 3MP
?ômîrîm ?ašer lê-kem...
say.PTCP.MP to-2MP

...
'Do not listen to your prophets, diviners, fortune-tellers and sorcerers that they say to you...’ (Jer 27.9)

(288) way-yîśmû kol šårē ha-hîyâlîm ?ašer baš-sâdeh hêmmâ1 wô-anšê-hem ki and-hear.IPVF.3MP all captains.MP the-armies.MP C in-the-field 3MP and-men-3MP.GEN C hiqiqîd melêk bâbel ?et gô-dalyâhû ben ?ašqâm bâ-âres appoint.PFV.3MS king Babylon ACC Gedaliah son Ahikam in-the-land 'All the captains of the armies that they1 and their soldiers were in the field, heard that the king of Babylon appointed Gedaliah, son of Ahikam, in the land.' (Jer 40.7)

(289) wô-kol bêtî yîśâ?el ?ašer hêmîd bô-tôk-ām and-all house Israel C 3MP in-midst-3MP.GEN '...and all the house1 of Israel that they1 are in their midst.' (Ezek 12.10)

(290) wô-nâṭattâ ?el hak-kôhânimî ha-l-wiyyîm ?ašer hêmîd mizzera' šâdôq and-give.PFV.2MS to the-priests.MP the-Levites.MP C 3MP from-offspring Zadok 'And you shall give to the Levite priests1 that they1 are from the offspring of Zadok.' (Ezek 43.19)

(291) ya'ân meh nô-tûm YHWH sô-bâ?ôt y'ân bêtî-1 i ?ašer hûî1 šârēb because what oracle YHWH hosts because house-MS.1S.GEN C 3MS wasted.MS ""Why?” Oracle of YHWH of Hosts. "Because of my house1 that it1 is wasted.” (Hag 1.9)

(292) ?âmart la-YHWH ?ô'dîn-î ?âtâ tîbâtî-1 bal yâl-êkâ li-qô-dôšîm1 ?ašer say.PFV.2FS to-YHWH lord-1S.GEN 2MS goodness-1S.GEN only upon-2MS to-holy.ones.MP C bâ-âres hêmmâ1 wô-?addîrê kol hepš-î b-ām in-the-land 3MP and-noble.ones all delight-1S.GEN in-3MP 'You shall say to YHWH: "You are my lord. My goodness is only in you." And (you shall say) to the holy ones1 that they1 are in the land: "Noble ones—all my delight is in them."’ (Ps 16.2-3)

(293) kômô hîlîlîm sôkîbê qeber ?ašer lô? zê'kartâ-mî 1ôd wô-hêmmâ1 like slain.MP lying.PTCP.MP grave C NEG remember.PFV.2MS-3MP.ACC still and-3MP miy-yâdî-kâ niqzârû from-hand-2MS.GEN be.cut.off.PFV.3P 'Like the slain1 lying in graves that you don't remember them1 anymore, and they1 are cut off from your hand.' (Ps 88.6)


(295) wô-sâbbô'hô ?a'nî ?êt ham-mêthîm šek-kôbî mêtû min ha-hayyîm ?ašer and-praise.PTCP.MS 1S ACC the-dead.PTCP.MP C already die.PFV.3P than the-living.MP C hêmmâ1 hayyîm ?ašer denâ 3MP living.MP still 'I praised the dead that already died over the living1 that they1 are still living.' (Qoh 4.2)

(296) ú-môše? ?a'nî mar mim-mâwa't ?êt hâ-?issâ1 ?ašer hîî1 mîšôdim wa-hô-râmîm and-find.PTCP.MS 1S bitter.MS from-death ACC the-woman.FS C 3FS net and-net libb-âh heart-3FS.GEN
'I find (something) more bitter than death: the woman is a net, and her heart is a net.' (Qoh 7.26)

(297) wā-ʔēhî sōḇēr bā-hōmōtî yārûšâlaim ?ašer [hēmî] pârûṣîm] and-be.IPVF.1S inspect.PTCP.MSG in-gates.FP Jerusalem C 3MP beroken.PTCP.MSG

'I was inspecting the gates of Jerusalem that were broken down.' (Neh 2.13 [Qere])


'I told them of the hand of my god that it was good upon me.' (Neh 2.18)

(299) wō-gam ?el han-nōkîšî ?ašer lô? mē întāmm-ʔākā yiśrâʾēl [hû?î] and-also to the-foreigner.MSG NEG from-people-2MS.GEN Israel 3MS

'(And you shall give to each according to his lifestyle...) and also to the foreigner, that he is not from your people, Israel.' (2 Chr 6.32)


'All the people remaining from the Hittites, the Amorites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites that they 1+2+3+4+5 aren't from Israel—from their children that remained after them in the land, that the Israelites did not finish off—Solomon brought them up to do forced labor until today.' (2 Chr 8.7-8)

9.2 ?ašer Embedded Subject Resumptive Pronouns

(301) ʿal kol dē barî pešāʾî ʿal šōr ʿal ḫâsîm ʿal šēh ʿal šalmā ʿal kol concerning every man transgression over ox transgression over sheep over cloak over every ?ašer yōʾmar kî [hû?î] zeh ʿad hā-ʔēlōhîm yâbō? dē bar 3nē-hem lost.thing C say.IPVF.3MS C 3MS this.MSG until-the-god come.IPVF.3MS matter.MSG two-3MP

'Concerning the matter of any transgression—whether over an ox, a donkey, a sheep, a cloak, or any lost thing—that (one) says that this is it, the matter of the two of them (i.e. the two parties) shall come before God.' (Exod 22.8)

(302) ?espā lî šibḥîm ?îsî miz-ziq 3 nē yiśrâʾēl ?ašer yādaʾtā kî [hēmî] ziq 3 nē gather.IMP.MSG to-me seventy men.MSG from-elders Israel C know.IPVF.2MS C 3MP elders hâ-ʔâm the-people

'Gather for me seventy men 1 that you know that they 1 are elders of the people.' (Num 11.16)

(303) raq ʿěsî ʔašer tēḏāʾ kî lô? ʿēs maʔaḵāl [hû?î] 3tōtō tashit only tree.MSG C know.IPVF.2MS that NEG tree food 3MS ACC-3MS destroy.IPVF.2MS wō-kārātā and-cut.down.IPVF.2MS

'Only the tree 1 that you know that it 1 is not a tree for eating—it you may destroy and cut down.' (Deut 20.20)
9.3 ʔašer Highest Object Resumptive Pronouns

(304) wō-nāṭattī la-ʔaḵwāṣim1 ʔašer lōʔ yādaʔtī ʔē miz-zeh hēmmāʔ and-give.PFV.1S to-men C NEG know.PFV.1S where from-this 3MP

'And I will give (my bread, water and meat) to men1 that I don't know where they1 are from.' (1 Sam 25.11)

(305) ki-kāṭpir bāʔ-yeḏrē sōʔn ʔašer [Adjunct Island ʔim yābar like-young.lion.MS among-flocks sheep C if cross.over.PFV.3MS wō'-rāmas [proj] wō'-tārap [proj] wō'-ʔēn màssīl and-trample.PFV.3MS and-tear.PFV.3MS and-NEG.EXIST deliverer

'(The remnant of Jacob will be...) like a young lion1 that [Adjunct Island if (he1) crosses over and (he1) tramples and (he1) tears up], then there is no deliverer.' (Mic 5.7)

9.3 ʔašer Highest Object Resumptive Pronouns

(306) zeh yāʔēnaḥmah-ĕnū mim-maṭašē-nū ú-mē-ʔīṣšābōn yādē-nū min hā-ʔaḏāmā1 this relieve.IPV.3MS-1P.ACC from-work-1P.GEN and-from-toil hands-1P.GEN from-the-ground.FS ʔašer ʔaʔrē-āh1 YHWH C curse.PFV.3MS-3FS.ACC YHWH

'This one will relieve us from our works and the toil of our hands, from the ground1 that YHWH has cursed it1.' (Gen 5.29)

(307) way-yāhpōr ʔēt bāʔérōt1 ham-mayim ʔašer [Conj] ḥāpˈrū 1b-imē ʔabráhām and-dig.IPV.3MS ACC wells.FP the-water C dig.PFV.3P in-days Abraham ?ābī-w ] [Conj2 wa-yassatmū-[mī] pālīṣīm ʔahārē mōt ʔabráhām ] father-3MS.GEN and-close.IPV.3MP-3MP.ACC Philistines after death Abraham

'He (Isaac) dug the [wells (fp) of water1 that [Conj] they dug 1 in the days of Abraham, his father], and [Conj2 the Philistines closed them1 (mp) after Abraham died].' (Gen 26.18)

(308) rōʔēh rēʾah bāʔ-nē lōʾ sādeh1 ʔašer bērāk-ām1 YHWH see.IMP.MS smell son-1S.GEN like-smell field.MS C bless.PFV.3MS-3MS.ACC YHWH

'See, the smell of my son is like the smell of a field, which YHWH has blessed it1.' (Gen 27.27)

(309) wō-ʾgam ?ānāšāmaʔtī ʔēt naʿāqāt bāʾnē1 yīsrāʾēl ʔašer misrayīm maṭaḥbīḏin and-also 1S hear.PFV.1S ACC groaning.FS children.MP Israel C Egypt enslave.PTCP.MP ?ōt-āmā1 ACC-3MP

'And even I have heard the groaning of the Israelites1, whom1 Egypt is enslaving.' (Exod 6.5)

(310) way-yiḥak yitrō ʾal kol ḥaṭ-tōbā ʔašer ʔāšā YHWH lōʾ yīsrāʾēl1 ʔašer and-rejoice.IPV.3MS Jethro for all the-good C do.PFV.3MS YHWH to-Israel C hisīl-ām1 miy-yad misrayām snatch.PFV.3MS-3MS.ACC from-hand Egypt

'Jethro rejoiced for all the good that YHWH did to Israel1, whom1 he snatched from the hand of Egypt.' (Exod 18.9)

(311) méʔēt kol ?īṣū ʔašer yiddāben-[nūtā] libb-ām1 tīqqʿhū from-with every man C compel.IPV.3MS-3MS.ACC heart-3MS.GEN take.IPV.2P

'From everyone1 that his1 heart compels him1, you shall take (an offering).' (Exod 25.2)

(312) wōʔ-attā tēḏabbēr ʔel kol ḥakhmē lēb ʔašer mīlātī-[wūtī] rēhā ʾahokmā and-2MS speak.IPV.2MS to every wise heart C fill.PFV.1S-3MS.ACC spirit wisdom
'And you shall speak to every wise person that I have filled him (with) a spirit of wisdom.' (Exod 28.3)

'(As for) every man and woman that their hearts compelled them to bring (something) for all the work that YHWH commanded by Moses for them to do—the Israelites brought an offering for YHWH.' (Exod 36.29)

'And the priest wisdom, everyone Moses called to Bezalel and to Oholiab and to every wise-hearted man in whose heart YHWH placed feasts.' (Lev 23.2)

'(As for) every man and woman that their hearts compelled them to bring (something) for all the work that YHWH commanded by Moses for them to do—the Israelites brought an offering for YHWH.' (Exod 36.29)
These are the appointed times of YHWH, the convocations of holiness, that you shall proclaim them at their appointed time.’ (Lev 23.4)

Because they are my servants, that I brought them out from the land of Egypt.’ (Lev 25.55)

I will remember on behalf of them the covenant of (their) predecessors C that I brought them out from the land of Egypt.’ (Lev 26.45)

They brought a bad report of the land1 that they explored it1 to the children of Israel.’ (Num 13.32)

The name of Amram’s wife (was) Jochebed1, daughter of Levi, whom1 (she) bore to Levi in Egypt.’ (Num 26.59)

This is the land1 that you shall inherit it1 by lot.’ (Num 34.13)

And he shall dwell there until the death of the great priest1 that (one) anointed him1 with holy oil.’ (Num 35.25)
'Because these nations you will serve your enemies and you will indeed destroy all the places where the nations you are dispossessing them served their gods.' (Deut 12.2)

'You will let all the enemies, that you don't know them.' (Deut 13.3)

'Because these nations you are dispossessing them listen to fortune tellers and diviners.' (Deut 18.14)

'You will serve your enemies (mp) that YHWH sends them (ms) (lit. 'him/it') against you.' (Deut 28.48)

'And they served other gods and bowed down to them-gods they didn't know them and he (i.e. YHWH) had not allotted for them.' (Deut 29.25)

'And (give) your Urim to your pious man that you tested him at Massah (and) fought him on the waters of Meribah.' (Deut 33.8, x2)

'A prophet has not arisen in Israel like Moses whom YHWH knew face to face.' (Deut 34.10)
'(We have heard...) what you did to the two Amorite kings that were beyond the Jordan—to Sihon and to Og, whom you destroyed.' (Josh 2.10)

(339) w'$-hāyāhaš-$sēbat$1 $qâ$š$'am$3 YHWH yiqrab lam-mišpâḥōt and-be.PVF.3MS the-tribe.MS C take.PVF.3MS-3MS.ACC YHWH approach.PVF.3MS to.the-clans w'$-ham-mišpâḥāh$2 $qâ$š$'am$3 YHWH tiqrab lab-bâttîm and-the-clan.FS C take.PVF.3MS-FS.ACC YHWH approach.PVF.3FS to.the-houses w'$-hab-bâ-yâtì3 $qâ$š$'am$3 YHWH yiqrab lag-gâbârîm and-the-house.MS C take.PVF.3MS-3MS.ACC YHWH approach.PVF.3MS to.the-men

'Now it shall happen (that) the tribe$1 that YHWH takes it$1 will approach the clans, and the clan$2 that YHWH takes it$2 will approach the houses, and the house$3 that YHWH takes it$3 will approach the men.' (Josh 7.14, x3)

(340) kì kâkā ya'$-šeh YHWH l'$-kol ?ôŷ$-bē'-$kem $qâ$š$'am nilhâmîm YHWH because thus do.PVF.3MS YHWH to.all enemies-2MP.GEN C 2MP fight.PTCP.MP ACC-3MP

'Because thus shall YHWH do to all your enemies$1 that you are fighting them$1.' (Josh 10.25)

(341) w'$-kol mamlûkî'ût sîhôn melek hâ'$â$môrî [IRC1 $qâ$š$'am$3 mâlāk b'$-ḥēšbôn] [IRC2 $qâ$š$'am$3 and-all kingdom Sihon.MS king the-Amorites C rule.PVF.3MS in-Heshbon C hîkkâ mōseh [?ōt-ō]1 w'$-[et nôšî?]2 ê miyâν ...] strike.PVF.3MS Moses ACC-3MS and-ACC rulers Midyan

'And all the kingdom of Sihon$1, king of the Amorites, [IRC1 that ____ ruled in Heshbon], [IRC2 that Moses struck [him]$1 and [the rulers of Midyan $] ...].' (Josh 13.21)

(342) way-yît$'nû mim-maṭîhî b'nē yû$hûdâ ū-mim-maṭîhî b'nē šîm'yôn ?ēt he-$yârîm$1 and-give.PVF.3MP from-tribe children Judah and-from-tribe children Simeon ACC the-cities.FP hâ?-țiîleh $qâ$š$'am$3 yiqrâ? [?ēt-hên]1 b'$-ṣêm the-these C call.PVF.3MS ACC-3FP by-name

'And they gave from the tribe of the Judahites and from the tribe of the Simeonites these cities$1 that (one) calls them$1 by name.' (Josh 21.9)

(343) l'mâ'a'n dâwîdî ?âbd-i $qâ$š$'am$3 bâ$hârî for.the sake of David servant-1S.GEN C choose.PVF.1S ACC-3MS

'For the sake of David$1, my servant, that I chose him$1.' (1 Kgs 11.34)

(344) raq lô$ hôyâ k'$-ahâb$1 [IRC1 $qâ$š$'am$3 hîtmakkër la-$ô$ såt hâ-ʁâ'î b'$-fênî YHWH] [IRC2 only NEG be.PVF.3MS like-Ahab C sell.PVF.REFL.3MS to-do.INF the-evil in-eyes YHWH $qâ$š$'am$3 hēssâttâ [?ōt-ō]1 ?îzebel ?îš-tō$1 C incite.PVF.3FS ACC-3MS Jezebel wife-3MS.GEN

'Only there was none like Ahab$1 [IRC1 who ____ sold himself to do what was evil in YHWH's opinion], [IRC2 whom$1 Jezebel, his$1 wife, incited$] ...' (1 Kgs 21.25)

(345) w'$-gâm ?ēt b'nônō he$hê'hî hâ-$rê$š k'$-tô$'nô bôt hag-gôyîm$1 $qâ$š$'am$3 and-also ACC son-3MS.GEN send.PVF.3MS in.the-fire like-abominations the-nations.MP C hōrîš YHWH [?ōt-âmî]1 mip-p'nē b'nē yîsrâ'ěl drive.out.PVF.3MS YHWH ACC-3MP from-before children Israel

'He burned even his son in the fire according to the abominable practices of the nations$1 that YHWH drove them$1 out from before the Israelites.' (2 Kgs 16.3)
(346) w³-hāyā šīsāt nōḇēl š³ḇî ṭīp̄ ar-tō š³šer ū lā rōš gēš š³mānîm and-be.pfv.3fs flower fading,ptcp.ms beauty glory-3ms,gen C on head valley richness k²-hikkûrāh₁ b³-šērtem qâyîš š³šer yîr̄eh hā-rō-ēh ū-tō Newb.ah₁ b³-šōḏ-āh like-early,fig in-before summer C see.pfv.3ms the-see,ptcp.ms ACC-3fs in-continuance-3fs,gen b³-kapp-ō yīhōwēn-nā

in-hand-3ms,gen swallow.pfv.3ms-3fs.acc

'A flower of fading glory that is at the head of the rich valley will be like an early fig, before summer that one sees it (and) while it is still in one's hand, one eats it.' (Isa 28.4)

(347) wat-t‘hî lā-kem ḥāzūṭ hak-kōl k³-dîbrē has-sēpər he-ḥâṯûm š³šer yîttnū and-be.pfv.3fs to-2mp vizion,fs the-whole like-words the-book,ms the-sealed,ms C give.pfv.3mp

šōḏ-ō tel yôdē³qâ has-sêper ACC-3ms to know,ptcp.ms the-book

'The vision of all this has become to you like the words of the sealed book 1 that (they) give it to one who knows books.' (Isa 29.11)

(348) w³-qôrâ? l-āḵ šēm₁ hâḏāš ū-tîshōn YHWH yiqq³ben-nū and-be.called,ptv.3ms to-2ms name,ms new,ms C mouth YHWH pierce.pfv.3ms-3ms,acc

'And a new name 1 will be given to you that YHWH will give it 1 (lit. 'that the mouth of YHWH will pierce', where 'mouth piercing a name' = 'giving a name').' (Isa 62.2)

(349) k³-tîš ū-tîshōn ūmm-ō₁ t‘nāḥ³men-nū₁ kên ū-nōkî ū-nəhēm-³kem like-man C mother-3ms,gen comfort,ptv.3fs-3ms,acc thus 1s comfort,ptp.1s-2mp,acc

'Like a man that his 1 mother comforts him₁, so I will comfort you.' (Isa 66.13)

(350) ū-s³tāhû-m laš-šemēš₁ w³-lay-yârē³h₂ ū-l³-kōl₃ š³bâ? has-šâmāyim ū-tîshōn and-spread.out,ptv.3p-3mp,acc to.the-sun and-to.the-moon and-to-all host the-heavens C

w³-bēhū_m₁₂₃ wa-š³šer ū-tîshōn ū-bāḏū_m₁₂₃ wa-š³šer hâl‘kû ū-ah³rē-ḥem₃₁₂₃ wa-š³šer love,ptv.3p-3mp,acc and-C serve,ptv.3p-3mp,acc and-C walk,ptp.3p after-3mp and-C

d³rāḇū_m₁₂₃ wa-š³šer hištâh₃wû lā-ḥem₃₁₂₃ seek,ptv.3p-3mp,acc and-C bow.down,ptp.3p to-3mp

'And they spread them out to the sun₁ and to the moon₂ and to all, the host of heaven that they loved them₁₂₃ and that they served them₁₂₃ and that they walked after them₁₂₃ and that they sought them₁₂₃ and that they bowed down to them₁₂₃.' (Jer 8.2, x3)

(351) wa-yqatt‘rû b-ō lē-ʔōhîm ū-ḥerēm ū-tîshōn ū-yîdîŷū_m₁ hēmmā and-offer,incense,ptp.3mp in-3ms to-gods,mp other,mp C NEG know,ptv.3p-3mp,acc 3mp

w³-šôṭê-hem ū-mal‘kē y‘hūdâ and-fathers,3ms,gen and-kings Judah

'They offered incense in it (i.e. the place in question) to other gods, that they and their fathers and the kings of Judah didn't know them₁.' (Jer 19.4)

(352) w³-yâl ye‘ter hak-kēlim₁ han-nōṯārîm bā-ʔîr haz-zōʔ ū-tîshōn ū-yîdîŷū_m₁ and-concerning remainder the-vessels,mp the-remaining,ptcp.mp in-the-city the-this C NEG

l‘qâh-amţî n‘būqâdneʔssar melek bâbîl take,ptv.3ms-3mp,acc Nebuchadnezzar king Babylon'

'And concerning the rest of the vessels₁ remaining in the city that Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, didn't take them₁.' (Jer 27.19-20)

(353) ū-nî mēšîb tel ham-māqōm haz-zēh ʔet [kol k³lë bēt YHWH] ū-tîshōn [conj]

1s bring.back,ptcp.ms to the-place the-this acc all vessels,mp house YHWH C
When I send the deadly arrows
Babylon burned

I am about to bring back to this place [all the vessels of the temple of YHWH] that [Conj] Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, took

And I am about to bring back to this place [all the vessels of the temple of YHWH] that [Conj] Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, took

I have shown them my judgments
Babylon burned

May YHWH make you like Zedekiah
Babylon burned

And your food
Babylon burned

And like Ahab
Babylon burned

May YHWH make you like Zedekiah
Babylon burned

And your food
Babylon burned

In the fire

And like Ahab
Babylon burned

That man does them
Babylon burned

I have shown them my judgments
Babylon burned

They have rejected my judgments
Babylon burned

Know
Babylon burned
'When I bring your destruction among the nations on lands1 (fp) that you haven't known them1 (mp).'
(Ezek 32.9)

(362) wā- ?ehmōl ṭal šēm1 qods-î ṭāṣer ḫill- lū- hū1 bēt yišraʾēl
and-pity.IPVF.1S over name.MS holiness-1S.GEN C profane.PFV.3P-3MS.ACC house Israel
'I pitied my holy name1 that the house of Israel profaned it1.' (Ezek 36.21)

(363) ṭattā ḥastā ṭāl haq- qiqāyōn1 ṭāṣer lō? ʾāmalāt b-ō1 w²-lō?
2MS pity.PFV.2MS over the-plant C NEG labor.PFV.2MS on-3MS and-NEG
'You had pity for the plant1 that you didn't labor over it1 and you didn't raise it1.' (Jonah 4.10)

(364) w²- ṭēsāʾa ṭ-ēm2 ṭāl kol hag-gōyim1 ṭāṣer lō? yôḏāʾū- mî1
and-scatter.IPVF.1S-3MP.ACC over all the-nations C NEG know.PFV.1P-3MP.ACC
'I scattered them2 among all the nations1 that they2 didn't know them1.' (Zech 7.14)

(365) kam-mōšî ṭāṣer tidd- āpen- nū1 rūaḥ
like-chaff.MS C drive.away.IPVF.3FS-3MS.ACC wind.FS
'Like chaff1 that the wind blows it away.' (Ps 1.4)

(366) ṭabbîṯā ḥīḏōṯî mindi qēdem ṭēsāʾer šāmāȳnū ṭēm1
utter.IPVF.1S sayings.FP from old C hear.PFV.1P and-know.IPVF.1P-3MP.ACC
'Let me utter sayings1 (fp) of old that we have heard ṭēm1 and we know them1 (mp).' (Ps 78.2-3)

(367) kī mō ḥaʾlālim1 šōk bē ṭāber ṭēsāʾer lō? zāʾērē ṭēm1
like slain.MP lying.PTCP.MP grave C NEG remember.PFV.2MS-3MP.ACC still and-3MP
miy- yāḏāʾ- kā nīḡzarū
from-hand-2MS.GEN be.cut.off.IPVF.3P
'Like the slain1 lying in graves that you don't remember them1 anymore, and they1 are cut off from your hand.' (Ps 88.6)

(368) ṭāṣēr hag-geber1 ṭēsāʾer [Conj1 tē’yas̄s̄ren- nū1 ] lā yāh ū-[Conj2 mit-tōrā’- kā
blessed-the-man C instruct.IPVF.2MS-3MS.ACC Yah and- with-law-2MS.GEN
[tē’lammēden- nū1 ] ] teach.IPVF.2MS-3MS.ACC
'Blessed is the man1 that [Conj1 you instruct him1], O Yah, and [Conj2 you teach him1 with your law].' (Ps 94.12, x2)

(369) yō? m̄ rū ḡ? ūlē1 YHWH ṭēsāʾer [Conj1 ḡ?āl- ām1 ] miy- yāḏ šār ] ū-[Conj2
say.IPVF.3MP redeemed.MP YHWH C redeem.PFV.3MS-3MP.ACC from-hand trouble and-
mē? ṭās̄ōt qibbâš-ām1 ] mim-mīzrāḥ ū- mim- ma? rāb mis- šāpōn ū- miy- yām ]
from-lands gather.PFV.3MS-3MP.ACC from-east and-from-west from-north and-from-sea
'May the redeemed1 of YHWH speak who [Conj1 he (i.e. YHWH) has redeemed them1 from trouble], and
[Conj2 he has gathered them1 from the lands, from the east and west, and from the north and south (lit. 'seaward')).' (Ps 107.2.3- x2)

(370) kī mī yūkāl l̄- tāqqēn ṭēt ṭēsāʾer ʾyīwaw̄- ū1
because who be.able.IPVF.3MS to-straighten.INF ACC C bend.PFV.3MS-3MS.ACC
'Because who can straighten what1 he has bent.' (Qoh 7.13)

(371) w²- ḥē zeh hū? ṭēsāʾer m̄ lā? lā bīb- ū1 la- ḥās̄ōt kēn
and-where this 3MS C fill.PFV.3MS heart.3MS-3MS.GEN to-do.1INF thus
'And where is he1 that his1 heart filled him1 to act this way?' (Esth 7.5)
9.4 ?ašer Embedded Object Resumptive Pronouns


'He shall give honor to a god of fortresses in place of him (i.e. YHWH) and he shall give honor to a god that his fathers did not know it by means of gold and silver and precious stones and gifts.' (Dan 11.38)


'And King Cyrus brought out the vessels of YHWH's temple that [Conj1 Nebuchadnezzar brought out ___ from Jerusalem] and [Conj2 placed them1 in the house of his gods].' (Ezra 1.7)

(374) way-yît³-nû bag-ɢîrâl mim-mâṭtêh b³̲ na yhatâ û-mim-mâṭtêh b³̲ na šîmîôn and-give.PVF.3.SMP by.the-lot from-tribe children Judah and-from-tribe children Simeon û-mim-mâṭtêh b³̲ na bînyâmin ?ê-hê-ṭârîmî hâ-ʔešî Probj yiqr²-tû yel-hêmî b³̲-ʃêm and-from-tribe children Benjamin ACC the-cities.FP the-these C call.IPVF.3.SMP ACC-3.SMP by-name C

'And they gave by lot from the tribe of the Judahites and from the tribe of the Simeonites and from the tribe of the Benjaminites these cities1 (fp) that (they) call them1 (mp) by name.' (1 Chr 6.50)


'All the people remaining from the Hittites, the Amorites, the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites who aren't from Israel—from their children1 that ___1 remained after them in the land, that the Israelites did not finish them1 off—Solomon brought them up to do forced labor until today.' (2 Chr 8.7-8)


'And when he came, he went out with Jehoram to Jehu1, son of Nimshi, that YHWH anointed him1 to cut off the house of Ahab.' (2 Chr 22.7)
'I am bringing you to the land that I swore (lit. 'I raised my hand') to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob.' (Exod 6.8)

(378) ťêlêlî had-dû bârîm ʾašêr šîwâw YHWH la-ʾîšôt ʾît-ʾâmî these the-things.MP C command.PVF.3MS YHWH to-do.INF ACC-3MP

'These are the things that YHWH commanded to do them,' (Exod 35.1)

(379) marbîm hâ-ʾâm lî-hâbî? mid-dê hâ-ʾîbôdâ lam-mîlāʾîkâ ʾašêr be.exceeding.PTCP.MP the-people to-bring.INF from-sufficiency the-service for.the-work.FS YHWH la-ʾîšôt ʾît-ʾâmî command.PVF.3MS YHWH to-do.INF ACC ACC-3FS

'The people are bringing more than is needed for the work that YHWH commanded to do it,' (Exod 36.5)

(380) wô-šâmârtâ ?et ham-mišwâwâ wô-ʾet ha-ḥuşqîmâ wô-ʾet ham-mišpâṭîm âšêr and-keep.PVF.2MS ACC the-commandment.FS and-ACC the-statutes.MP and-ACC the-rules.MP 1S command.PTCP.3MS-2MS ACC today to-do.INF-3MP ACC YHWH ʾîkî mîš-šâwâ-ʾkâ hayyôm la-ʾîšôt ʾîmâh hêm 1S command.PTCP.3MS-2MS ACC today to-do.INF-3MP ACC ʾîmâh hêm 1S command.PTCP.3MS-2MS ACC today to-do.INF-3MP ACC

'And you shall keep the commandment1 and the statutes2 and the rules3 that I am commanding you today to do them1+2+3.' (Deut 7.11)

(381) ki ṭîm šâmôr tîsîm rûn ?et kol ham-mišwâwâ haz-zô? ʾašêr ṭônokî but rather keep.INF keep.PVF.2MP ACC all the-commandment.FS the-this 1S mîš-sawweh ?et kêm la-ʾîšôt ʾîmâh hêm 1S command.PTCP.3MS-2MS ACC to-labor serving until hay-yôm haz-zech the-day the-this

'But rather you should certainly keep all this commandment1 that I am commanding you to do it1.' (Deut 11.22)

(382) bô-nê-1-hem ʾašêr nôt rû ?aḥôrē-hem bâ-ʾîresā | ʾašêr lô? ʾîkî yâkâlû children-3MP GEN NEG be.able.PVF.3P bô-nê yišrâʾēl el lî-hâh rîm ʾîmâh wây yâʾāl-ēm šîlomōh lô-mas ʾôbēd ʾîd children Israel to-destroy.INF-3MP ACC and-bring.PVF.3MS-3MP ACC Solomon to-labor serving until hay-yôm haz-zech the-day the-this

'Their children1 that remained after them in the land, that the Israelites were not able to destroy them1 – Solomon brought them into slave labor until today.' (1 Kgs 9.21)

(383) way-yâqem ʾëdûtî bô-yaʾa qôb wô-tôrâw šâm bô-yâšrāʾēl ʾašêr and-establish.PVF.3MS decree.MS in-Jacob and-law.FS set.PVF.3MS in-Israel C šîwâwâ ?et ʾaḥôṯē-nû lî-hôḏî ʾîmâh lô-nê-hem command.PVF.3MS ACC fathers-1P GEN to-teach.INF-3MP ACC to-children-3MP GEN

'He established a decree1 in Jacob and he set a law2 in Israel that he commanded our fathers to teach them1+2 to their children.' (Ps 78.5)

(384) wô-ʿaḥ miš-šâm ?et há-ʾezôtî ṭônokî ṭônokî šîwāwît kâ and-take.1MP MS from-there ACC the-loincloth.MS C command.PVF.1S-2MS ACC lî-tâm nôš ʾî1 šâm to-hide.INF-3MS ACC ACC

'And take from there the loincloth1 that I commanded you to hide it1 there.' (Jer 13.6)

(385) wâ-ʾaḥbî-ʾem ?etel há-ʾāresā ṭônokî ṭônokî šîwāwît kâ and-bring.PVF.1S-3MP ACC to the-land.FS C raise.PVF.1S ACC hand-1S GEN to-give.INF ACC-3FS
lā-hem
to-3MP
'I brought them to the land1 that I swore (lit. 'I raised my hand') to give it1 to them.' (Ezek 20.28)

and-know.PFV.2MP that 1S YHWH in-bring.INF-1S.GEN ACC-2MP to ground Israel to the-land.FS
C raise.PFV.1S ACC hand-1S.GEN to-give.INF ACC-3FS to-fathers-2MP.GEN
'And you will know that I am YHWH when I bring you Israel's ground, to the land1 that I swore (lit. 'I raised my hand') to give it1 to your fathers.' (Ezek 20.42)

(387) û-n̂a'ḥaltem ?ōt-āhē1 tīš kō-?āhē-w ?ašē nāsā?tī ?et yād-ī
and-divide.PFV.2MP ACC-3FS each like-brother-3MS.GEN C raise.PFV.1S ACC hand-1S.GEN
lā-tittāhē1 la-?aḥōtē-kēm
to-give.INF-3FS.Acc to-fathers-2MP.GEN
'And you shall divide among each other what1 I swore (lit. 'I raised my hand') to give to your fathers.' (Ezek 47.14)

9.5 ?ašē Highest Locative Adverbial Resumptive Pronouns

9.5.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen: 2.11, 13.3, 13.4, 13.14, 19.27, 20.13, 21.17, 31.13(x2), 33.19, 35.15, 35.27, 40.3</td>
<td>1 Kgs: 2.3, 5.8, 7.7, 7.8, 8.47, 17.19, 18.10, 21.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod: 9.26, 12.13, 12.30, 18.5, 20.21, 21.13, 29.42, 30.6, 30.36</td>
<td>2 Kgs: 1.4, 1.6, 1.16, 6.1, 17.29, 23.7, 23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev: 18.3, 20.22</td>
<td>Jer: 7.12, 8.3, 13.7, 16.15, 19.14, 22.12, 22.26, 23.3, 23.8, 24.9, 29.7, 29.14, 29.18, 30.11, 32.37, 35.7, 40.12, 41.9, 45.5, 46.28, 49.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num: 9.17, 14.24, 15.18, 17.19, 33.54, 35.25, 35.26</td>
<td>Ezek: 1.12, 1.20, 4.13, 6.13, 11.16, 12.16, 20.29, 29.13, 34.12, 36.20, 36.21(x2), 37.21, 42.13, 43.7, 46.20, 46.24, 47.9(x2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut: 3.21, 4.5, 4.14, 4.26, 4.27, 6.1, 7.1, 11.8, 11.10, 11.11, 11.12, 11.29, 18.6, 23.21, 28.21, 28.37, 30.1, 30.3, 30.16, 31.13, 32.47, 32.50</td>
<td>Joel: 4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh: 10.27, 22.19</td>
<td>Ps: 104.16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Sam: 3.3, 9.10, 10.5, 14.11, 19.3, 20.19, 23.23, 26.5(x2), 29.4, 30.31</td>
<td>Ruth: 1.7, 3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sam: 2.23, 15.21, 15.32, 17.12, 21.12</td>
<td>Qoh: 9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kgs: 2.3, 5.8, 7.7, 7.8, 8.47, 17.19, 18.10, 21.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kgs: 1.4, 1.6, 1.16, 6.1, 17.29, 23.7, 23.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer: 7.12, 8.3, 13.7, 16.15, 19.14, 22.12, 22.26, 23.3, 23.8, 24.9, 29.7, 29.14, 29.18, 30.11, 32.37, 35.7, 40.12, 41.9, 45.5, 46.28, 49.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek: 1.12, 1.20, 4.13, 6.13, 11.16, 12.16, 20.29, 29.13, 34.12, 36.20, 36.21(x2), 37.21, 42.13, 43.7, 46.20, 46.24, 47.9(x2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel: 4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps: 104.16-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job: 39.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth: 1.7, 3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qoh: 9.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan: 9.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezra: 1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chr 6.11, 6.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

125I leave out cases of locative adverbials inside PPs, as these are obligatory resumptive pronouns. These examples are: Gen 3.23, 10.14, 24.5; Num 21.13; Deut 9.28, 11.10, 12.2; Josh 20.6; Jer 29.14; Mic 2.3; 1 Chr 1.12.
9.6 ʔašer Embedded Locative Adverbial Resumptive Pronouns

- Num: 35.6
- Deut: 12.5, 12.11, 12.21, 14.23, 14.24, 16.2, 16.11, 26.2
- 2 Sam: 11.16
- Jer: 22.27, 44.14
- Neh: 1.9
- 2 Chr: 12.13

10 Appendix 4: šeC- Relative Clauses, "Optionally Resumptive" Positions

10.1 šeC- Highest Subject Resumptive Pronouns

(388) hāšēbbî ṣēnayîm ik min-neğd-i ṣē-[hēm] hirihbû-nî
  turn.IMPF.SS eyes.D-2FS from-before-1S C-3MP overcome.PFV.3P-1S.ACC
  'Turn from me your eyes that they have overcome me.' (Song 6.5)

(389) tôbîm hâyû ḫalîlâ ḫereb mē-ifaxî râ’àb ṣē-[hēm] yâzûbû
  good.MP be.PFV.3P slain.MP sword from-slain.MP hunger C-3MP waste.away.IP.FV.3MP
  mîduqūrîm mit-tu’nûbî ṣâdîy
  pierced.PTCP.MP from-produce field
  'Better are those slain by the sword than those [I] slain by hunger that they waste away, pierced by the produce of the field.' (Lam 4.9)

10.2 šeC- Highest Object Resumptive Pronouns

(390) wâ-sânaʔtî ṣâ-nî let kol ḫamâlî-1
  and-hate.PFV.1S 1S ACC all work.MS-1S.GEN C-1S work.MS under the-sun
  še-[annîhî-nû] lâ-ʔâdâm šey-yihyeh ḫaʔr-āy
  C-leave.IP.FV.1S-3MS to.the-man C-be.IP.FV.3MS after-1S
  'I hated all my work [that I did] under the sun, [that I left it for the man that comes after me].' (Qoh 2.18)

(391) ṭâq zeh ḥay-yâmî šeq-qiwânu-[hû]
  surely this.MS the-day.MS C-await.PFV.1P-3MS.ACC
  'Surely this is the day that we have awaited it.' (Lam 2.16)
10.3 šeC- Highest Locative Adverbial Resumptive Pronoun

(392) yîrûsâlaim hab-bînûyâ kî-Šîrî rûš¯alaim Jerusalem.FS the-built.FS like-city.FS C-be.bound.PTCP.FS to-3FS together C-there

'Jerusalem—the one built like a city1 [RC1 that ____1 is bound together to itself (i.e. is built firmly)], [RC2 that the tribes go up there1].' (Ps 122.3-4)

11 Appendix 5: ∅ Relative Clauses, "Optionally Resumptive" Positions

11.1 ∅ Highest Subject Resumptive Pronouns

(393) ?att ?ereš1 ∅ lô? mîtôhârâ hî land.FS 2FS C NEG cleansed.FS 3FS

'You are a land1 (that) it1 is not cleansed.' (Ezek 22.24)

11.2 ∅ Embedded Subject Resumptive Pronouns

(394) gôy1 ∅ ... lô? tišmaš [Wh-island mah yôdabbër prô1]

' a nation1 (that) ... you don't hear [Wh-island what (it1) says].' (Jer 5.15)

11.3 ∅ Highest Object Resumptive Pronouns

(395) yizbâhû laš-[Conj1 šedîm1 [RC1 ∅ lô? ?îlôhîm2 [CP2 ∅ lô? sacrifice.IPFV.3MP to.the- demons.MP C NEG god gods C NEG yôdabbër prô1]] know.IPFV.3MP-3MP.ACC

'They sacrifice to [Conj1 demons [RC1 (that) ____1 aren't divine]], (to) gods2 [Conj2 (that) they don't know them2]].' (Deut 32.17)

(396) ha-kâ-zeh yihyeh šômî ṣômî [Non-RC translation: 'A moth eats him like a garment.'] (Job 13.28)

(397) hâ-kâ-zeh yihyeh šômî ṣômî [Non-RC translation: 'A moth eats him like a garment.'] (Job 13.28)

(398) wô-hû? kî-râhâb yibleh kî-begešî ṣômî [Non-RC translation: 'A moth eats him like a garment.'] (Job 13.28)
11.4 ø Highest Locative Adverbial Resumptive Pronouns


'(Where is YHWH...) the one leading us in the wilderness, in a deserted and pitted land, in a dry and dark land, in a land1 (that) no one has crossed over it1 and no one has dwelt there1.' (Jer 2.6)

12 Appendix 6: ḥašer Purpose Infinitivals

(401) la-li³šôt-kem ṭôt-âm bā-?âresî ḥašer ṭattem ūôb³rim šâmmî-â to-do-INF-2MP.GEN ACC-3MP in.the-land.FS C 2MP cross.over.PTCP.MP there-to lî²-rišt-āhî to-possess.INF-3FS.ACC

'(YHWH commanded me to teach you statutes and rules...) for you to do them in the land1 that you are crossing over there1 to possess it1.' (Deut 4.14)

(402) ki ṭâbôd tô-beḏûn mahêr mē-ʔal hâ-?âresî ḥašer ṭattem ūôb³rim because perish.INF perish.IP.FV.2MP quickly from-upon the-land.FS C 2MP cross.over.PTCP.MP ṭet hay-yardên šâmmî-â lî²-rišt-āhî ACC the-Jordan there-to to-possess.INF-3FS.ACC

'Because you will certainly perish quickly from upon the land that you are crossing the Jordan there1 to possess it1.' (Deut 4.26)

(403) la-li³šôt bâ-?âresî ḥašer ṭattem ūôb³rim šâmmî-â lî²-rišt-āhî to-do-INF in.the-land.FS C 2MP cross.over.PTCP.MP there-to to-possess.INF-3FS.ACC

'(This is the commandment that YHWH commanded me to teach you...) to do in the land1 that you are crossing over there1 to possess it1.' (Deut 6.1)

(404) ki yô³bi-a³kā YHWH ?ēlôhê-kâ ṭel hâ-?âresî ḥašer ṭattâ bâ? because bring.IP.FV.3MS-2MS.ACC YHWH god-2MS.GEN to the-land.FS C 2MS enter.PTCP.MS šâmmî-â lî²-rišt-āhî there-to to-possess.INF-3FS.ACC

'Because YHWH your god will bring you to the land1 that you are entering there1 to possess it1.' (Deut 7.1)

(405) w-rišt-êm ṭet hâ-?âresî ḥašer ṭattem ūôb³rim šâmmî-â lî²-rišt-āhî and-possess.IP.FV.2MP ACC the-land.FS C 2MP cross.over.PTCP.MP there-to to-possess-3FS.ACC

'You will possess the land1 that you are entering there1 to possess it1.' (Deut 11.8)

(406) wô²-hâ-?âresî ḥašer ṭattem ūôb³rim šâmmî-â lî²-rišt-āhî and-the-land.FS C 2MP cross.over.PTCP.MP there-to to-possess.INF-3FS.ACC land hills ū-bô³qâfôt and-valleys
The land [SUB]1 that you are crossing over there1 to possess it1 is a land of hills and valleys.’ (Deut 11.11)

(407)  
\[
\text{(407) } \text{ki } y^\text{a-hi}, \text{ akā } Y\text{HWH } ?^\text{e-lohē-kā } \text{el hā-?āreši } ?^\text{a-ser } ?\text{attā bā?}
\]

because bring.[IPFV:3MS-2MS.ACC] YHWH god-2MS.GEN to the-land.[FS C 2MS enter.PTCP.MS šamm1-ā lʒ-rišt-āḥ1 there-to to-possess.INF-3FS.ACC

'Because YHWH your god will bring you to the land1 that you are entering there1 to possess it1.' (Deut 11.29)

(408)  
\[
\text{?ēlēleh ha-ḥuqqîm w-3-ham-mišpāṭim ℓ-3-ser tišm-rūn ]lā-yā-sōt bā-?āreši } ?^\text{a-ser}
\]

these the-statutes and the-laws C be.sure.[IPFV:2MP to-do.INF in.the-land.[FS C nāṭan YHWH ?^e-lōhē ?^e-hōtē-kā lʒ-kā lʒ-rišt-āḥ1 give.[PFV:3MS YHWH god fathers-2MS.GEN to-2MS to-possess.INF-3FS

'These are the statutes and the laws that you shall be sure to do in the land1 that YHWH the god of your fathers gave to you to possess it1.' (Deut 12.1)

(409)  
\[
\text{ki } y^\text{a-krīt } Y\text{HWH } ?^\text{e-lōhē-kā } ?^\text{a-ṭ} hag-gōyim1 ?^\text{a-ser } ?\text{attā bā?}
\]

because cut.off.[IPFV:3MS YHWH god-2MS.GEN ACC the-nations.3MP C 2MS enter.PTCP.MS šamm1-ā lā-reṣêt [ʔōṭ-ām1] mip-pānē-kā there-to to-possess.INF ACC-3MP

'Because YHWH your god will cut off from before you the nations1 that you are entering there1 to possess them1.' (Deut 12.29)

(410)  
\[
\text{ki } b^\text{a-rēk y^bārek-3-kā } Y\text{HWH bā-?āreši } ?^\text{a-ser YHWH } ?^\text{e-lōhē-kā}
\]

because bless.[INF bless.[IPFV:3MS-2MS.ACC YHWH in.the-land.[FS C YHWH god-2MS.GEN nōṭēn lʒ-kā nahlā lʒ-rišt-āḥ1 give.PTCP.MS to-2MS inheritance.[FS to-possess.INF-3FS.ACC

'Because YHWH will certainly bless you in the land1 that YHWH your god is giving to you (as) an inheritance in order to possess it1.' (Deut 15.4)

(411)  
\[
\text{b-3-tōk } ?^\text{a-rēši-3-kā } ?^\text{a-ser YHWH } ?^\text{e-lōhē-kā nōṭēn lʒ-kā lʒ-rišt-āḥ1}
\]

in-middle land.[FS-2MS.GEN C YHWH god-2MS.GEN give.PTCP.MS to-2MS to-possess.INF-3FS.ACC

'(You will set apart three cities) in the middle of your land1 that YHWH your god is giving ___ to you to possess it1.' (Deut 19.2)

(412)  
\[
\text{l-3-maśṭan y^bārek-3-kā YHWH } ?^\text{e-lōhē-kā b-3-kol mišlāḥ yādē-kā } yāl hā-?āreši1 so.that bless.[IPFV:3MS-2MS.ACC YHWH god-2MS.GEN in-all work hand-2MS.GEN upon-the-land.[FS }
\]

?^a-ser ?\text{attā bā?} šamm1-ā lʒ-rišt-āḥ1 C 2MS enter.PTCP.MS there-to to-possess.INF-3FS.ACC

'So that YHWH your god will bless you in all the work of your hand upon the land1 that you are entering there1 to possess it1.' (Deut 23.21)

(413)  
\[
\text{b-3-hānirḥ YHWH } ?^\text{e-lōhē-kā lʒ-kā mik-kol } ?^\text{e-bēkā mis-sāḥib}
\]

in-give.rest.INF YHWH god-2MS.GEN to-2MS from-all enemies-2MS.GEN from-surrounding bā-?āreši1 ?^a-ser YHWH ?^e-lōhē-kā nōṭēn lʒ-kā nahlā lʒ-rišt-āḥ1 in.the-land.[FS C YHWH god-2MS.GEN give.PTCP.MS to-2MS inheritance.[FS to-possess.INF-3FS.ACC

'When YHWH your god gives you rest from all your surrounding enemies, in the land1 that YHWH your god is giving to you (as) an inheritance in order to possess it1.' (Deut 25.19)

(414)  
\[
\text{lō? tāyā-frīkūn yāmīm yāl hā-?ādāmā } ?^\text{a-ser } ?\text{attā yōbēr } ?^\text{a-hay-yarden}
\]

NEG stretch.out.[IPFV:2MP days upon-the-land.[FS C 2MS cross.over.PTCP.MS ACC the-Jordan lá-bō? šamm1-ā lʒ-rišt-āḥ1 to-enter.INF there-to to-possess.INF-3FS.ACC

118
'You shall not live long upon the land that you are crossing over the Jordan to enter there to possess it.' (Deut 30.18)


'All the days that you are living upon the land that you are crossing over the Jordan there in order to possess it.' (Deut 31.13)

(416) ū-bad-dâbîr haz-zeh taʔârikû yâmîm yâl ħâ-ʔâdâmâ₁ ?âšer ?attem and-by.the-word the-this stretch.out.IPFV 2MP days upon the-land.FS C 2MP ḫâbîrîm ?et hay-yardên šâmmâ₁-â lî-rišt-âhî cross.over.PTCP.MP ACC the-Jordan there-to to-possess.INF-FS ACC

'By this word you shall live long on the land that you are crossing over the Jordan there to possess it.' (Deut 32.47)


'The land that you are entering to possess it is an impure land.' (Ezra 9.11)
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