

Differentiating dislocations, topicalisation, and extraposition in Biblical Hebrew: Evidence from negation¹

Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé 

Department of Hebrew, University of the Free State, South Africa
E-mail: millercl@ufs.ac.za

Jacobus A. Naudé 

Department of Hebrew, University of the Free State, South Africa
E-mail: naudej@ufs.ac.za

Abstract

Left dislocation, right dislocation, topicalisation, and extraposition involve a constituent in a non-canonical position at the edge of the sentence. In Biblical Hebrew, the differentiation of these four constructions is complicated by two additional constructions. At the left edge of the sentence is a construction that is like topicalisation in that it has no resumptive element within the sentence although it apparently occurs outside of the left boundary of the matrix sentence. At the right edge of the sentence, we identify for the first time a comparable construction of “heavy extraposition” which is like extraposition in that it has no resumptive element within the sentence although it apparently occurs outside of the right boundary of the matrix sentence.

In this article, we examine the evidence that negation provides for differentiating the syntactic features of the six constructions. We present the data for negation involving each of these constructions with attention to the scope of negation as sentential negation or constituent negation (Snyman and Naudé 2003, Naudé and Rendsburg 2013). In particular, we examine the implications of negation for delimiting and defining the constructions, especially left dislocation and topicalisation, which are shown to involve important asymmetrical features. The facts about negated sentences provide important evidence that the presence (or absence) of resumption is critical to differentiating left dislocation and topicalisation (contra Westbury 2014, 2016). Negation thus provides important positive information for the syntactic structures

¹ An earlier version of this article was presented in the Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew section at the Society of Biblical Literature’s annual meeting in Atlanta, Georgia (23 November 2015). We are grateful to the participants of the session for their questions and comments. We also thank the two anonymous reviewers for their comments. This work is based on research supported in part by the National Research Foundation of South Africa (NRF; Cynthia L. Miller-Naudé UID 95926 and Jacobus A. Naudé UID 85902). The grant holders acknowledge that the opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in any publication generated by NRF-supported research are those of the authors, and that the NRF accepts no liability whatsoever in this regard.

of these six constructions and provides a crucial foundation for differentiating their functions with respect to information structure.

Keywords: Biblical Hebrew; edge constructions; negation; topicalisation; left dislocation; extraposition; right dislocation; syntax

1. Introduction

Biblical Hebrew displays a significant amount of syntactic variation in constructions involving constituents in non-canonical positions at the left and right peripheries of sentences. Two constructions involve constituents at the beginning of the sentence (the left periphery), namely topicalisation and left dislocation. Two constructions involve constituents at the end of the sentence (the right periphery), namely extraposition and right dislocation.

The differentiation of these four constructions in Biblical Hebrew is complicated both by a plethora of terminology as well as by disagreements concerning the relevant features that distinguish them.² Although topicalisation and left dislocation have been differentiated in linguistic analyses of Biblical Hebrew (Naudé 1990, Holmstedt 2014), a minority position considers the two to be varieties of “fronting” which optionally exhibits resumption (Westbury 2014, 2016).³ The salient characteristics of the four constructions is further complicated by two additional constructions. At the left edge of the sentence is a construction that is like topicalisation in that it has no resumptive element within the sentence although it is apparently like left dislocation in that it occurs outside of the left boundary of the matrix sentence. Naudé (1990) refers to this as a variety of topicalisation; Holmstedt (2014) refers to it as “extreme topic fronting”. We refer to it as “heavy topicalisation” because the topicalised element occurs much further to the left than in simple topicalisation. At the right edge of the sentence, we identify for the first time a comparable construction of “heavy extraposition”, which is like extraposition in that it has no resumptive element within the sentence although it is apparently like right dislocation in that it occurs outside of the right boundary of the matrix sentence.

In this article, we examine the evidence that negation provides for differentiating the syntactic features of the six constructions with particular attention to the scope of negation. The facts about negation provide new syntactic evidence for delimiting and defining these constructions, especially with respect to the presence (or absence) of resumption and the determination of the sentence boundary. Negation thus provides important positive information for the syntactic

² Biblical Hebrew differs in important ways from Modern Hebrew. Cf. Gad-Horin (1976), Alexopoulou, Doron and Heycock (2004), Landau (2009), Doron and Heycock (2010), and Shlonsky (2014).

³ Both approaches are described and contrasted in Van der Merwe, Naudé and Kroeze (2017: 510–518). The question of the syntactic features of resumption in Biblical Hebrew is another issue worthy of a separate study – see McCloskey (2006), Doron (2011), Oosthuizen (2016), and Cowper and DeCaen (2017).

structures of these six constructions and provides the crucial foundation for differentiating their functions with respect to information structure.⁴

2. Overview of the constructions

In this section, we describe the four basic constructions – topicalisation, left dislocation, extraposition, and right dislocation – with respect to the central characteristics that differentiate them. Left and right dislocation have been differentiated from topicalisation and extraposition, respectively, in three ways within generative grammar (see, e.g., Haegeman 1994, Rizzi 1997, Radford 2009): (i) the relation of the constituent to the matrix sentence (left and right dislocation occur outside of the matrix sentence whereas topicalisation and extraposition occur within the matrix sentence); (ii) the non-canonical order of constituents resulting from movement (topicalisation and extraposition) or base generation (dislocation); and (iii) the constituent is resumed within the matrix sentence (right dislocation and left dislocation) or not (topicalisation and extraposition).⁵ A fifth construction in Biblical Hebrew is like topicalisation in that it lacks resumption but is also similar to left dislocation in that it appears outside of the left boundary of the sentence. In §3.7, we will identify a sixth construction in Biblical Hebrew that is like extraposition in that it lacks resumption but is also like right dislocation in that it appears outside of the right boundary of the sentence.

The first construction, topicalisation, involves a constituent at the very beginning of the sentence. The construction involves the movement of a constituent which leaves a trace (Naudé 1990: 124, Holmstedt 2014: 116–117).⁶

(1) *wayyədabbēr* *YHWH 'ālê-kem mit-tôk* *hā- 'ēš*
 CONS: IPFV:spoke:3MS YHWH to-2MP from-midst.of DEF-fire

qôl *dəbārîm 'attem šōmā 'im*
 voice.of words you: MP PTCP:hear: MP

û-təmûnâ 'ênə-kem *rō 'im* *zûlātî qôl*
 and-form NEG.EX-2MP PTCP:see:MP only voice

“Then the LORD spoke to you out of the fire.

The sound of words you were hearing the sound of words,
 but a form you were not seeing a form, only a voice.” (Deuteronomy 4:12)⁷

⁴ The use of the various constructions to convey information structure has been explored by a wide range of scholars – see, e.g., Lunn (2006), Holmstedt (2014), Redd (2014), and Korchin (2015).

⁵ Instead of “resumption” or “resumptive element,” the term “correlate” may be used (e.g., López 2016).

⁶ The precise description of the location to which the constituent moves has been described as the “C-specifier position” (Naudé 1990), the “preverbal topic position” (Naudé 1994), the “highly articulated CP” (Holmstedt 2014), and the “TopicP specifier position” (Cowper and DeCaen 2017).

⁷ The glosses follow the Leipzig Glossing Rules with the addition of the following abbreviations: GENT = gentilic suffix; CONS = consecutive verb form; INF.CS = infinitive construct; JUSS = jussive; NEG.EX = negative existential; NEG.NI = negative non-indicative. Because the stem formations of Hebrew verbs (e.g., Qal, Niphal, etc.) are not relevant to the linguistic analysis presented here, they are not indicated in the glosses. The reading of the *Ketiv* (“written”) text as opposed to the *Qere* (“read”) text of the Hebrew Bible is indicated as (K) and (Q) in the transliterated texts. However, in no instance does the difference in reading affect the linguistic analysis.

In both sentences in (1), the object occurs at the beginning of the sentence before the subject and verb; it is outside of its normal position in the sentence.⁸ A zero trace marks the location where the constituent originally occurred in the sentence, indicated in the translation by the small subscripted type.⁹ This construction was identified by Naudé (1994) as involving the preverbal topic position.¹⁰

A single sentence may exhibit multiple instances of topicalisation, as illustrated in (2):

- (2) *û-petaḥ hat-tēbâ bə-šidd-āh tāsīm*
and-door.of DEF-ark on-side-3FS IPFV:sit:3FS
“And the door of the ark_i on its side_j; you will place _{the door of the arki on its sidej.}” (Genesis 6:16)

The second construction, left dislocation, involves a constituent that occurs outside of the sentence and has a resumptive element that occurs within the matrix sentence:

- (3) *šāpôn wə-yāmîn `attâ bərā `tā-m*
north and-south you:2MS PFV:create:2MS-3MP
“North and south, you created them.” (Psalm 89:13)

In example (3), the resumptive element occurs *in situ*, that is, in the normal position of the constituent in the sentence. It is also possible for the resumptive element itself to be topicalised so that it occurs at the beginning of the matrix sentence. This is illustrated in (4):

- (4) *kōl mapreset parsâ wə-šōsa `at šesa ` pərās-ōt ma `ālat gērâ*
all PTCP:divide:FS hoof and-PTCP:cleave:FS cleft.of hoof-FP PTCP:brin.up:FS cud

bab-bəhēmâ `ōt-āh tō `kēlû
in:DEF-beast ACC-3FS IPFV:eat:2MP
“Everything that parts the hoof and is cleft footed and chews the cud among the animals,
it you may eat it.” (Leviticus 11:3)

⁸ The question of whether topicalisation in Biblical Hebrew involves A-movement or A-bar movement will be addressed in future research.

⁹ Although Biblical Hebrew is a *pro*-drop language, we argue that the phonologically null subject *pro* on finite verbs cannot function as a resumptive element (see Naudé 1996, 1999 and Holmstedt 2014). If *pro* could function as resumption, then, in cases where an independent pronoun occurs as a resumptive element, there would need to be some way to determine which one is the resumptive, and there would need to be some explanation for the independent subject pronoun. By contrast, Alexopoulou, Doron and Heycock (2004) assume that the subject *pro* of *pro*-drop languages could function as a resumptive element in clitic left dislocation. In such cases, there would be no distinction between left dislocation and topicalisation of the subject constituent. Cowper and DeCaen (2017: 26) argue that because the left-dislocated element in *casus pendens* constructions can be seen as a specific type of modal construction, the phonologically null subject *pro* can function as a resumptive element. They also consider the constructions with a phonologically null subject *pro* to be ambiguous. However, these scholars do not provide an explanation for cases in which an independent subject pronoun occurs as a resumptive element alongside a finite verb (e.g., Psalm 37:9 *wəqôre YHWH hēmâ yirāšû `areš* “and those who wait for the LORD they will inherit the land”).

¹⁰ The structural position of the Biblical Hebrew verb (both finite forms and participial forms) has been examined in detail by Naudé (1990, 1991, 1993, 1996: 79–81, and 1999).

A single sentence may exhibit multiple left-dislocated elements, each with its resumptive element, as in (5):¹¹

- (5) *wə-haś-śābāʿ le-ʿāšîr ʿên-ennû mannîaḥ l-ô l-išôn*
 and-DEF-plenty to-rich NEG.EX-3MS rest:PTCP:MS to-3MS to-sleep:INF.CS
 “And the plenty_i (belonging) to a rich person_j it_i does not give rest to him_j to sleep.”
 (Qoheleth 5:11)

The fact that there is a sentence boundary between the left-dislocated constituent and the matrix sentence is evident in (6) from the fact that parenthetical elements and conjunctions may occur between the dislocated constituent and the sentence:

- (6) *wə-ʿabd-î kālēb ʿeqeb hāyətâ rūʿh ʿaḥeret ʿimm-ô wayyammallēʾ*
 and-servant-1S Caleb because PFV:COP:3FS spirit other with-3MS CONS:IPFV:fill:3MS

ʿaḥār-āy wahābî ʾōtî-w ʿel=hā-ʾāreṣ ʾāšer=bāʾ šāmm-â
 after-1S CONS:PFV:bring:1S-3MS to=DEF-land REL=PFV:come:3MS there-LOC

wə-zar ʿ-ô yôršenn-â
 and-seed-3MS IPFV:hold:3MS-3FS

“But my servant Caleb—because he has a different spirit and remained loyal to me—I will bring him to the land that he had entered, and his offspring shall hold it as a possession.” (Numbers 14:24)

Example (6) also demonstrates a sentence boundary at the beginning of the matrix sentence by the presence of a so-called “*waw* consecutive” verbal form. *Waw* consecutive verbal forms occur only in initial position within the sentence and do not allow any constituent, not even a conjunction or negative marker, to occur before them.

Interrogatives may also occur at the sentence boundary, as in (7):

- (7) *û-kəpōr šamayim mî yalād-ô*
 and-frost.of heaven who PFV:bear:3MS-3MS
 “... and the frost of heaven who bore it?” (Job 38:29)

Additional elements that may occur at the sentence boundary between the left-dislocated element and the matrix sentence include the presentative *hinnēh* (“behold”), vocatives, sentence-adverbials, and *kî* (“that”) as a marker of sentential complements.

Varieties of left dislocation in Biblical Hebrew are described in Miller-Naudé and Naudé (2019) on the basis of (i) the nature of the resumptive element with respect to co-referential identity; (ii) the relationship of the left-dislocated constituent to the root sentence, especially with respect to agreement; and (iii) the relationship of the sentence involving left dislocation to the broader

¹¹ Examples such as (5) preclude the analysis suggested by an anonymous reviewer that “heavy” topicalisation could simply be a second instance of left dislocation. Rather, each instance of left dislocation within a sentence exhibits resumption.

syntactic context with respect to root sentences and island constraints (see also Miller-Naudé 2019). However, for the purposes of the discussion of negation and edge constructions in this article, the sub-types of left dislocation are not relevant.¹²

The third construction, extraposition, is in many ways the mirror image of topicalisation in that a constituent is moved to the end of the sentence outside of its canonical position. In (8), the object is moved out of its normal position after the verb to the end of the sentence with the result that two prepositional phrases occur before the object:¹³

- (8) *û-šəlaḥtem bə-yād-ām 'əl-ay kol=dābār 'āšer tišmā 'û*
 CONJ-PFV:send:2MP in-hand-3MP to-1S every=matter REL IPFV:hear:2MP
 “... and you must send everything which you hear through them (lit. in their hand) to me everything which you hear.” (2 Samuel 15:36)

Extraposition often involves the movement of a relative clause away from its head:¹⁴

- (9) *way-yāqom melek=hādāš 'al=mišrayim 'āšer lō 'yāda 'et=yôsēp*
 CONJ-IPFV:rise3MS king=new over=Egypt REL NEG=PFV:know:3MS ACC=Joseph
 “A new king who did not know Joseph arose over Egypt who did not know Joseph.” (Exodus 1:8)

The fourth construction, right dislocation, is in many ways the mirror image of left dislocation in that a constituent occurs outside of the end of the sentence and a resumptive element occurs within the matrix sentence.¹⁵ In (10), the object in the matrix sentence is a pronominal clitic on the definite object marker; the co-referential right-dislocated constituent is composed of conjoined NPs, each introduced with the definite object marker:¹⁶

- (10) *wayyak 'ot-ām bo- 'ōpālîm(K) 'et= 'ašdôd wə- 'et=gəbûley-hā*
 CONS:IPFV:strike:3MS ACC-3MP with-tumors ACC=Ashdod and-border:MP-3FS
 “He afflicted them with tumours—Ashdod and its vicinity.” (1 Samuel 5:6)

These four constructions differ in systematic ways. Two of them occur at the front edge or left boundary of the sentence, namely topicalisation and left dislocation. Two of them occur at the final edge or right boundary of the sentence, namely right dislocation and extraposition. Two of them occur outside of the matrix sentence, namely left dislocation and right dislocation, whereas two of them occur at the edge but inside of the matrix sentence, namely topicalisation and extraposition. While all four constructions involve constituents in a non-canonical order, they differ with respect to whether they involve movement out of a non-canonical position in the sentence – topicalisation and extraposition – or whether they are generated in a non-

¹² The syntactic sub-types of left dislocation will be explored in a future article.

¹³ See also, for example, Isaiah 40:3; 41:18 and 19.

¹⁴ See also, for example, Genesis 24:15, Judges 18:17, Ruth 1:7, and Leviticus 6:8.

¹⁵ The precise syntactic characteristics of right-dislocation constructions have not yet been exhaustively explored. Determining whether there is syntactic symmetry between left dislocation and right dislocation in every respect is a question for future research. On the distinction between right dislocation and extraposed appositives, see Holmstedt and Jones (2017: 45–46).

¹⁶ We exclude here cases in which a nominal element is found in the matrix sentence and a co-referential NP occurs on the right edge of the sentence (e.g., Genesis 19:4, 35:14; Exodus 27:6; 2 Kings 4:3).

canonical position in the sentence, namely left dislocation and right dislocation. Furthermore, two of them involve resumption of the dislocated element within the matrix sentence, namely left dislocation and right dislocation, whereas the other two involve no resumption, namely topicalisation and extraposition. We summarise these features in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Syntactic features of left dislocation, topicalisation, extraposition, and right dislocation

	Matrix sentence			
	Left dislocation	Topicalisation	Extraposition	Right dislocation
Edge	left	left	right	right
Relation to matrix sentence	outside	inside	inside	outside
Movement / generated	generated	movement	movement	generated
Resumption	yes	no	no	yes

Two additional constructions have been identified by Naudé (1990, 1999) and Holmstedt (2014).¹⁷ At the left edge is a construction that is like topicalisation in that it has no resumptive element within the sentence although it apparently occurs outside of the left edge of the sentence. Naudé (1990) refers to this as a variety of topicalisation, while Holmstedt (2014) refers to this as “extreme topic fronting”. We will refer to it as “heavy topicalisation”:

- (11) *û-dabar mah=yar'ê-nî wāhiggadî l-āk*
 and-word what=IPFV:cause.see-1S CONS:declare:1S to-2MS

“... and the word which he shows me (and) I will declare _{it} to you.” (Numbers 23:3)

The constituent at the left edge is not resumed within the matrix sentence, however, the sentence boundary between the leftward constituent and the sentence is indicated by the so-called “*waw* consecutive” perfect verb at the beginning of the matrix sentence. Holmstedt (2014) argues that this is a marginal construction and that it is not clear that the occurrence of *waw* necessarily marks a sentence boundary; the conjunction *waw* (“and”) might instead occur for ease of sentence processing.

Although presumably a similar kind of construction could occur on the right edge of the sentence, a biblical example has not been identified previously. We will illustrate such an example involving negation in §3.7 below. The features of “heavy” topicalisation and “heavy” extraposition, as compared to the other constructions, are illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2: Syntactic features of “heavy” topicalisation and “heavy” extraposition

	Matrix sentence						
	Left dislocation	Heavy topic fronting	Topicalisation		Extraposition	Heavy extraposition	Right dislocation
Relation to matrix sentence	outside	outside	inside		inside	outside	outside
Resumption	yes	no	no		no	no	yes

¹⁷ We do not consider here a seventh construction in which a nominal constituent provides the *frame of reference* for the sentence(s) that follow(s) (e.g., 1 Samuel 20:23). We argue elsewhere that the construction is neither a variety of topicalisation nor a variety of left dislocation (Miller-Naudé and Naudé 2019).

These two “heavy” constructions have been used by, for example, Gross (1987) to argue that resumption is optional, with the result that left dislocation and topicalisation are lumped together. However, such an analysis is not preferable because of other syntactic differences between left dislocation and topicalisation. To mention one important syntactic difference, a left-dislocated constituent may involve a deeply embedded constituent, as exemplified in (12):

- (12) *zeh mōšeh hā-’iš ’āšer he’ēlā-nū mē-’eres mišrayim lō’*
 this Moses DEF-man REL PFV:brought:3MS-1P from-land.of Egypt NEG

yāda’ nū meh=hāyā l-ō
 PFV:know:1P what=PFV:COP:3MS to-3MS

“This Moses the man who brought us from the land of Egypt, we do not know [what happened to him].” (Exodus 32:1)

In this example, the resumptive element is embedded within a finite complement clause of the verb “know.” Similarly, in (13), the resumptive element is embedded within an infinitival complement clause:¹⁸

- (13) *wə-’et=ha-yəbūšī yōšəbē yərušālaym lō’ yākəlū(Q) bənē=yəhūdā*
 and-ACC=DEF-Jebusite:GENT PTCP:live:MP Jerusalem NEG PFV:able:3MP sons.of=Judah

l-hōrīš-ām
 to-INF:drive.out-3MP

“But the Jebusites, the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the people of Judah were not able [to drive them out].” (Joshua 15:63)

By contrast, topicalisation cannot involve the movement of a constituent out of an embedded structure to the head of a sentence, as illustrated in (14a):

- (14a) *wə-zākartā kī ’ebed hāyītā bə-mišrāyim*
 CONJ-PFV:remember:2MS COMP slave PFV:be:2MS in-Egypt

“You must remember that a slave you were _{a slave} in Egypt.” (Deuteronomy 16:12)

By contrast, it is not grammatical in Biblical Hebrew for a topicalised constituent to move out of a subordinate sentence. In other words, the sentence in (14b) is ungrammatical:

- (14b) *A slave you must remember that _{a slave} you were in Egypt

¹⁸ Example (12) involves a variety of left dislocation in Biblical Hebrew which is like “hanging topic” in that there is no case agreement with the resumptive element. By contrast, example (13) involves a variety of left dislocation in Biblical Hebrew which is like “clitic left dislocation” in that there is case agreement with the resumptive element. It is important to note that both (12) and (13) are identical in allowing the resumptive element to be deeply embedded within a subordinate clause. This syntactic feature then does not distinguish these two varieties of left dislocation in Biblical Hebrew (Miller-Naudé and Naudé 2019) as it does in some other languages (see, e.g., Anagnostopoulou 1997, Alexiadou 2006: 671–675).

Topicalisation is thus subject to “island” constraints (see Alexiadou 2006: 682–685), whereas left dislocation in Biblical Hebrew is not. Because of the numerous syntactic differences between topicalisation and left dislocation, we prefer to keep examples of “heavy topicalisation” separate from ordinary topicalisation in order to study them further. (The same is true of “heavy extraposition” and extraposition, which will be examined below.)

3. Negation and edge constructions

3.1 Introduction

As preparatory for the discussion, we identify two basic kinds of negation in Biblical Hebrew: sentential negation and constituent negation (Snyman and Naudé 2003, Snyman 2004, Naudé and Rendsburg 2013; see also generally Dahl 1979, Payne 1985, Horn 2001). In sentential negation, the negative marker occurs immediately before the verb and the scope of negation extends to the entire sentence, as in (15):

- (15) *kī lōʾ=taḥpōš zebaḥ*
 for NEG=IPFV:delight:2MS sacrifice
 “For you do not delight in sacrifice.” (Psalm 51:18)

By contrast, in constituent negation, the scope of negation applies only to a single constituent, as illustrated in (16):

- (16) *lōʾ bi-gbūrat has-sūs yeḥpās*
 NEG in-strength.of DEF-horse IPFV:delight:3MS
 “Not in the strength of a horse he delights in the strength of a horse.” (Psalm 147:10)

The scope of the negative marker extends only to the prepositional phrase that follows it and not to the sentence as a whole.¹⁹

As we will see below, negation provides an important syntactic feature for differentiating the various edge constructions in Biblical Hebrew.

3.2. Negation and topicalisation

Topicalised sentences may be negated with *lōʾ*, the usual marker of negation in indicative sentences, in one of two locations – preceding the topicalised constituent or preceding the matrix sentence. Negation before the topicalised constituent results in constituent negation, as seen in (17) below:

- (17) *lōʾ bas-sēter dibbartī bi-mqôm ʾereš ḥōšek*
 NEG in:DEF-secret PFV:speak:1S in-place.of land.of darkness
 “Not in secret I spoke to you in secret in a place of a land of darkness.” (Isaiah 45:19)

¹⁹ An anonymous reviewer suggests that the negative *ʾal* preceding a prepositional phrase in Isaiah 64:8 has clausal scope and is thus a counter-example. We understand instead that the negative has scope only over the constituent “Don’t forever remember iniquity (although you do remember it now)”.

In this example, negation extends only to the prepositional phrase – there is no denial that God spoke, but only that his speaking was not *in secret*.

By contrast, when a topicalised sentence has negation before the matrix sentence, negation extends to the entire sentence, including the topicalised constituent. This is illustrated in (18) below:

- (18) *mib-bāš-ām lō' tō'kēlū ū-bə-niblāt-ām lō' tiggā'ū*
 from-flesh-3MP NEG IPFV:eat:2MP and-in-caracasses-3MP NEG IPFV:touch:2MP
 “... from their flesh you shall not eat from their flesh and their carcasses you shall not touch their carcasses.” (Deuteronomy 14:8)

Evidence that the scope of negation extends to the entire sentence, including the topicalised constituent, can be seen from examples, such as that in (19) below, in which the topicalised constituent is a negative polarity item:

- (19) *wə-kol=dābār lō' yikkāhēd min=ham-melek*
 and-all=word NEG IPFV:hidden:3MS from=DEF-king
 “And nothing (lit. every word not it is hidden) is hidden nothing from the king.” (2 Kings 18:13)

A topicalised sentence with negation before the matrix sentence may have more than one topicalised constituent within the scope of sentential negation, as in (20):²⁰

- (20) *wə-'attā bə-rahāmē-kā hā-rabbīm lō' 'āzabtā-m*
 and-you in-compassions-2MS DEF-great:MP NEG PFV:abandon:2MS-3MP
bam-midbār
 in:DEF-wilderness
 “And you, in your great compassion, you did not abandon them in the wilderness in your great compassion.” (Nehemiah 9:19)

Both of the topicalised constituents are within the scope of the sentential negation.

3.3. Negation and left dislocation

Left-dislocation sentences exhibit only sentential negation; the left-dislocated element is never negated as a constituent. In (21), the dislocated constituent is a prepositional phrase and the resumptive element is a prepositional phrase with a pronominal clitic. The negative marker *lō'* immediately precedes the verb and the scope of negation extends to the entire sentence:²¹

- (21) *ū-mē-'ēš had-da'at tōb wā-rā' lō' tō'kal mimme-nū*
 and-from-tree.of DEF-knowledge good and-evil NEG IPFV:eat:2MS from-3MS
 “And from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, you must not eat from it.”
 (Genesis 2:17)

²⁰ An alternative analysis views this sentence as involving an “extreme topic focus”; see Holmstedt (2014: 147 n. 58).

²¹ See also, for example, Proverbs 30:18 and Jeremiah 34:17.

Left-dislocation sentences may be negated with other negative markers, but the scope of negation is always the sentence and not the left-dislocated constituent. In (22), the non-indicative negative marker *'al* before the verb negates the entire sentence:

- (22) *û-lā- 'ātōnôt hā- 'ōbādôt lə-kā hay-yôm šalōšet hay-yāmîm*
 and-to:DEF-donkeys DEF-PTCP:lost:FP to-2MS DEF-day three DEF-days
'al=tāsem 'et=libbā-kā lā-hem
 NEG.NI=JUSS:set:2MS ACC=heart-2MS to-3MP

“As for your donkeys that were lost three days ago, do not set your mind on them.”
 (1 Samuel 9:20)

In (23), the negative existential *'ên* at the left edge of the matrix sentence negates the entire sentence:

- (23) *wə- 'āhî-nû haq-qāṭōn 'ên-ennû 'ittā-nû*
 and-brother-1P DEF-small NEG.EX-3MS with-1P
 ... and our youngest brother, he is not with us.” (Genesis 44:26)

Regardless of the negative marker, left-dislocated constituents cannot carry the scope of negation apart from the sentence. In other words, because the resumptive element, which is co-referential with the dislocated constituent, is still part of the matrix sentence, it is impossible to negate the dislocated constituent separately from the sentence that it precedes. We illustrate this conclusion further in (24):

- (24) *gəbah= 'ēnayim û-rəḥab lēbab 'ōt-ô lō' 'ūkāl*
 high.of=eye:DU and-broad.of heart ACC-3MS NEG IPFV:able:3MS
 “... a haughty and proud (man) him I do not endure _{him}.” (Psalm 101:5)

The left-dislocated element is resumed in the main sentence with the pronominal object *'oto*, which would ordinarily occur after the verb, but has been topicalised to the beginning of the sentence. The negative marker appears before the verb in the surface sentence, but the scope of the negation is the entire sentence.

The negative marker *lō'* preceded by the interrogative marker *hā-* is used for rhetorical questions in which the polarity of the sentence is reversed. This construction represents a case in which the negative with the interrogative marker precedes the left-dislocated constituent, but the scope of negation extends to the entire sentence and not only to the left-dislocated constituent.²² An example appears in (25) below.

- (25) *hā-lō' 'ēt 'āšer yôriš-əkā kəməš 'ēlōhē-kā 'ōt-ô*
 INTERR-NEG ACC REL IPFV:cause.to.possess:3MS-2MS Chemosh god-2MS ACC-3MS

²² See also Deuteronomy 31:17 and Isaiah 44:8 in which *hālō'* precedes a sentence with a topicalised PP but there is no constituent negation. Cowper and DeCaen (2017) refer to negation in constructions with *hālō'* as “high” negation, and understand the negative as occurring in the polarity phrase in the left periphery. In future research, we will consider the scope of negation of constructions with *hālō'*.

tîrāš

IPFV:possess:2MS

“Will you not possess that which Chemosh your god causes you to possess (lit. Is it not the case [that] what Chemosh your god causes you to possess it you will possess > What Chemish your god causes you to possess, it you will certainly possess)?” (Judges 11:24)

Negated left-dislocation constructions also illustrate complexity in various ways. The following pair of examples (26a and b) illustrates the insertion of an appositional element (which further explains the possible relationships) between the left-dislocated constituent and the matrix sentence:

(26a) *’erwat bat=bin-kā ’ô bat=bittākā lō’*
nakedness.of daughter.of=son-2MS or daughter.of=daughter-2MS NEG

təgalleh ’erwāt-ān
IPFV:uncover:2MS nakedness-3FP

“The nakedness of the daughter of your son or the daughter of your father—do not uncover their nakedness.” (Leviticus 18:10)

(26b) *’erwat ’ăḥôtā-kā bat=’ābî-kā ’ô bat=’imme-kā*
nakedness.of sister-2MS daughter-of=father-2MS or daughter.of=mother-2MS

môledet bayit ’ô moledet ḥûš lō’ təgalleh
PTCP:born.of:FS house or PTCP:born.of:FS outside NEG IPFV:uncover:2MS

’erwāt-ān
nakedness-3FP

“The nakedness of your sister—the daughter of your father or the daughter of your mother, born of the house or born outside—do not uncover their nakedness.” (Leviticus 18:9)

Example (26a) provides the simpler left-dislocated constituent. By contrast, the dislocated constituent in (26b) includes multiple conjoined appositional phrases in order to specify all of the possible kinds of sisters who are included in the prohibition.

In (27), a quotative frame intervenes between the left-dislocated constituent and the matrix sentence:

(27) *û-mip-pārî hā-’ēš ’ăšer bə-tôk=hag-gan ’āmar ’ēlōhîm lō’*
and-from-fruit.of DEF-tree REL in-midst.of DEF-garden PFV:say:3MS God NEG

tō’kālû mimmennû wə-lō’ tig’û b-ô pen=təmutûn
PFV:eat:2MP from:3MS and-NEG IPFV:touch:2MP in-3MS lest=IPFV:die:2MP

“And from the fruit of the tree which is in the middle of the garden, God said: ‘You will not eat from it and you will not touch it lest you die.’” (Genesis 3:3)

There are two ways to understand the first prepositional phrase in (27): as part of the woman's speech, or as part of God's speech (with the quotative frame introducing God's speech intervening between the prepositional phrase and the main part of the quotation). In the first interpretation, the left-dislocated constituent and the matrix sentence are in two different deictic layers. In the second interpretation, the quotative frame is internal to the quotation, an unusual position in Biblical Hebrew narrative (Miller 1995).

We have seen that topicalisation and left dislocation differ with respect to negation in that only topicalisation allows constituent negation. Topicalisation and left dislocation are similar with respect to negation in that both exhibit sentential negation, as is apparent in example (28):

(28) *kesep lō' yaḥšōbū*
silver NEG IPFV:regard:3MP

wə-zāhāb lō' yaḥpəšū b-ō
and-gold NEG IPFV:delight:3MP in-3MS

“Silver they do not regard ^{silver},
and gold they do not delight in it.” (Isaiah 13:17)

The two parallel lines are structured similarly except that the first line involves topicalisation of the object constituent, whereas the second line involves left dislocation of the object constituent.

We now turn to negation involving the right edge, namely extraposition and right dislocation.

3.4. Negation and extraposition

Negation involving extraposition is not common. In the example in (29), sentential negation with the standard negator *lō'* occurs in the matrix sentence; an independent subject pronoun and a conjoined NP are extraposed rightward (Naudé 1999).²³

(29) *lō' tištū=yayin 'attem ū-bənē-kem 'ad= 'ōlām*
NEG IPFV:drink:2MP=wine you:MP and-sons-2MP until=forever

“You shall not drink wine, you and your sons for ever.” (Jeremiah 35:6)

Similarly, in (30), the matrix sentence is negated with the negative existential *'ēn* and involves sentential negation:

(30) *wə-'ēn= 'ōd lā-hem śākār kī niškaḥ zikr-ām*
and-NEG.EX=yet to-3MP reward because PFV:is.forgotten:3MS memory-3MP

“... a reward is no longer theirs a reward, because memory of them is forgotten.” (Qoheleth 9:5)

The subject NP has been moved to the end of the sentence. However, like topicalisation, an extraposed constituent cannot move past a sentence boundary; in (30), the subordinate clause

²³ Similarly, see Job 24:2 and Jeremiah 44:3.

beginning with *kī* constitutes a sentential boundary. In other words, like topicalisation, extraposition is rightward movement only within the sentence.²⁴

In a few instances, as in (31), the extraposed constituents are negated:

- (31) *šim 'û=zō 't bayit=ya 'āqōb han-niqrā 'im bə-šēm yiśrā 'ēl*
 IMP:hear:MP=this house.of=Jacob DEF-PTCP:be.called:MP in-name.of Israel
- û-mim-mē yəhūdā yāšā 'û han-nišbā 'im bə-šēm YHWH*
 and-from-waters.of Judah PFV:go.out:3P DEF-PTCP:swear:MP in-name.of YHWH
- û-bē- 'lōhē yiśrā 'ēl yazkîrû lō' be- 'ēmet wə-lō'*
 and-in-God.of Israel IPFV:cause.to.remember:3MP NEG in-truth and-NEG
- bi-šdāqā*
 in-righteousness

“Hear this, O house of Jacob, who are called by the name of Israel and from the waters of Judah they went out, who swear by the name of the LORD not in truth and not in righteousness and by the God of Israel they invoke not in truth and not in righteousness.” (Isaiah 48:1)

The two extraposed PPs at the end of the matrix sentence are adjuncts, which probably relate to both of the preceding predications – swearing and invoking.²⁵ The PPs are negated with *lō'* and the scope of negation is the constituent. In a sense, these extraposed prepositional phrases are the mirror image of topicalised prepositional phrases that could occur at the beginning of the sentence. Like topicalised phrases, extraposed phrases may exhibit constituent negation.

3.5. Negation and right dislocation

Right-dislocation constructions present an important asymmetry to left dislocation with respect to negation. A left-dislocated construction never involves constituent negation of the dislocated constituent; indeed, constituent negation is impossible since the resumed co-referential element within the sentence would then differ in polarity from the dislocated element. In right-dislocated constructions, we do not find any examples of negation occurring between the matrix sentence and the following right-dislocated constituent, but the reason is the same – the dislocated constituent cannot have a different polarity from its resumed element (the pronominal correlate in the matrix sentence).

In (32), the resumptive object (or correlate) in the matrix sentence is topicalised before the verb; the co-referential NP is right-dislocated.²⁶

²⁴ See Baltin (2006) on the constraints on extraposition with respect to the Right Roof Constraint.

²⁵ An alternate analysis would understand the conjoined negated prepositional phrases at the end of the sentence as an instance of right-node raising.

²⁶ An anonymous reviewer suggests an alternative analysis for example (30) involving instead the extraposition of a NP that is appositional to the demonstrative on the assumption that a demonstrative cannot serve as a resumptive element. We argue that deictics can serve as a resumptive element on the basis of examples of resumption with the locative deictic *šām* “there” (Genesis 25:10, Psalm 137:1; see Naudé 1999: 115 and

- (32) 'ak 'et=zeh lō' tō'kālū mim-ma'ālê hag-gērâ
Indeed ACC=this NEG IPFV:eat:2MP from-PTPC:bring.up:MP DEF-cud

û-mim-maprîsê hap-parsâ 'et=hag-gāmāl
and-from-PTCP:divide:MP DEF-hoof ACC=DEF-camel

“Indeed this one you shall not eat this one from those that chew the cud and from those that divide the hoof — the camel....” (Leviticus 11:4)

We turn now to negation and the “heavy” constructions.

3.6. Negation and heavy topicalisation

Heavy topicalisation, like ordinary topicalisation, may involve the leftward movement of a wide variety of constituents. However, heavy topicalisation most frequently involves a temporal adjunct (e.g., a prepositional phrase) or an adverbial clause (e.g., an infinitive construct phrase) which is separated from the matrix sentence by a sentence boundary.²⁷ In (33), the heavy topic is a temporal expression which is separated from the matrix sentence by the narrative verbal form (the so-called “*waw* consecutive imperfect”):

- (33) bə-tiš 'â lə-ḥōdeš way-yehēzaq hā-rā'āb bā- 'îr wə-lō'
in-ninth to-month CONS-IPFV:become.strong:3MS DEF-famine in: DEF-city and-NEG

hāyâ leḥem lə- 'am hā- 'āreš
PFV:be:3MS bread to-people.of DEF-land

“In the ninth (day) of the month (and) the famine became severe in the city in the ninth day of the month and there was not bread for the people of the land (lit. bread did not exist for the people of the land).” (2 Kings 25:3)

The prepositional phrase “in the ninth (day) of the month” is a temporal expression which seems to apply to both sentences which follow, the first with a narrative verbal form (“the famine became severe”) and the second with the existential copula (“bread did not exist...”).

In (34), the heavy topic consists of an infinitival clause (“as she spoke to Joseph day by day”) which is introduced with *wayhî*, the *waw* consecutive imperfect form of the verbal copula *hāyâ*.

Holmstedt 2014: 121), the temporal deictic 'āz “then” (Job 28:26, 27; see Gross 1987: 60), and the subject near demonstrative plural deictic 'elleh “these” (Genesis 31:43).

²⁷ Blau (1977: 22–25) describes the construction as a sentence adverbial in initial position separated from the rest of the sentence with the conjunction *waw* (“and”). Similarly, Khan (1988: 87) refers to the heavy topic as a “clause initial sentence adverbial”. Wilson (2019) argues that *wayhî* in this construction introduces athetic expression.

The matrix sentence is introduced with the conjunction *waw* (“and”) and the negative marker *lō* preceding a perfective verb:

- (34) *wayhî kə-dabbər-āh ʿel=yôsēp yôm yôm wəlō ʿ šāma ʿ ʿēleyhā*
 CONJ:IPFV:be:3MS as-INF.CS:speak-3FS to=Joseph day day and-NEG PFV:hear:3MS to-3FS
- liškab ʿešlāh lihyôt ʿimmāh*
 to-INF.CS:sleep beside-her to-INF.CS:be with-3FS

“And it happened as she spoke to Joseph day by day, (and) he did not listen to her to sleep beside her, to be with her.” (Genesis 39:10)

Negation occurs at the beginning of the matrix sentence, but the scope of negation does not extend to the heavy topic, viz. the infinitival clause. Negation thus provides additional confirmation that the heavy topic is in fact separated from the matrix sentence by a sentence boundary. Furthermore, negation of constructions with heavy topicalisation differs significantly from those with ordinary topicalisation in two ways. First, in ordinary topicalisation, the topicalised constituent is within the scope of sentential negation of the matrix verb. Secondly, the topicalised constituent in ordinary topicalisation may have constituent negation; the topicalised constituent in heavy topicalisation does not exhibit constituent negation.

3.7 Negation and heavy extraposition

At the right edge, we would expect to find a construction that is analogous to heavy topicalisation, in other words, a “heavy” extraposition construction. Such a construction would be like extraposition in that it would have no resumptive element in the sentence although it apparently occurs outside of the right edge of the sentence. This construction has not been identified previously. A possible example is found in (35a):

- (35a) *ū-bə-yāmīm ʿāḥādīm yiššābēr wə-lō ʿ bə-ʿappayim wə-lō ʿ bə-milḥāmā*
 and-in-days one:PL IPFV:be.broken:3MS and-NEG in-anger and-NEG in-war

“And in a few days he will be broken not by anger and not in battle and not by anger and not in battle.” (Daniel 11:20)

If the conjunction *waw* (“and”) is understood as indicating a sentence boundary, then the negated prepositional phrases occur outside of the sentence boundary; the sentence thus exhibits heavy extraposition. Alternatively, one could understand the two negated prepositional phrases as involving elliptical sentences, as in (35b) (see Miller 2005, 2007a):²⁸

- (35b) “And in a few days he will be broken and he will be broken not by anger and he will be broken not in battle.”

Another example occurs in (36), where there is a complex construction that can be interpreted as involving both right dislocation and heavy extraposition:

²⁸ On the patterns of negation inside and outside of prepositional phrases in Biblical Hebrew, see Miller-Naudé and Naudé (2017).

(36) *wā'ēšlah lipnê-kem 'et=tašrā'â wattāgāreš 'ôt-ām mip-pānê-kem*
 CONS:IPFV:send.1S before-2MP ACC=hornet CONS:IPFV:drive ACC-3MP from-before-2MP

šānê malkê hā- 'ēmōrî lō' bā-ḥarbā-kā wə-lō' bā-qašte-kā
 two.of kings.of DEF-Amorite:GENT NEG by-sword-2MS and-NEG by-bow-2MS

“I sent before you the hornet and it drove them out before you not by your sword and not by your bow—
the two kings of the Amorites—not by your sword and not by your bow.” (Joshua 24:12)

In this example, the right-dislocated constituent, “the two kings of the Amorites”, is resumed in the matrix sentence with the objective pronoun *'ôtām* (“them”). There are also two negated extraposed prepositional phrases which have been moved beyond the right-dislocated constituent to appear at the very end of the construction. They clearly involve constituent negation of the two prepositional phrases. The fact that right-dislocated constituents are outside of the final sentence boundary, whereas extraposed constituents are normally within the sentence boundary, demonstrates that this sentence is an example of “heavy” extraposition and not “normal” extraposition. From an information structure point of view, we suggest that this unusual order of constituents, i.e. the heavy extraposition occurring in (36), is a result of cognitive processing – the order of constituents makes it clear that the right-dislocated constituents relate to the matrix sentence while simultaneously indicating that the negation of the extraposed prepositional phrases has scope only over those two constituents.²⁹

4. Conclusions

We have examined the ways in which four major and two minor kinds of edge constructions intersect with negation. Because negation may involve either constituent negation or sentential negation, negation provides a powerful means for determining the syntax of these constructions. In particular, negation provides additional evidence for the asymmetry between left dislocation and topicalisation. Topicalisation constructions can be negated in two primary ways. First, the topicalised constituent can be negated; only the topicalised constituent falls within the scope of the negation. Second, the sentence as a whole can be negated by placing the negative marker before the matrix sentence; the topicalised element thus falls within the boundary of the sentence. Left dislocation, by contrast, allows only sentential negation as a result of its underlying syntactic structure; the co-referential resumption within the matrix sentence that refers to the dislocated element and the dislocation itself cannot have differing polarities. This evidence therefore reinforces the crucial distinction between constructions involving resumption and those without resumption; topicalisation and left dislocation should therefore not be lumped together as a single construction referred to as “fronting”.

The constructions on the right edge have similar syntactic structures in that right dislocation, like left dislocation, involves a dislocated constituent outside of the sentence boundary which is resumed within the matrix sentence. By contrast, extraposition, like topicalisation, involves a constituent that is moved to the end of the sentence but remains within the sentence boundary. However, there is also an asymmetry between left- and right-edge constructions. Left dislocation may have a negative marker between the dislocated constituent and the matrix sentence to indicate sentential negation, whereas right dislocation indicates sentential negation

²⁹ Miller (2007b) argues similarly that the conjunction *waw* often appears between poetic parallel lines with verb gapping for information processing purposes; *waw* indicates the boundaries of the poetic lines as well as the sentences.

by a negative marker at the beginning of the construction because that is where the matrix sentence begins. Right dislocation, like left dislocation, may be preceded by a negative marker to indicate constituent negation. The two “heavy” constructions – heavy topicalisation, and the much rarer and previously unidentified heavy extraposition – also involve an asymmetry with respect to negation: heavy extraposed constituents may exhibit constituent negation whereas heavy topicalised constituents do not. The asymmetries between the left and right edge of the sentence with respect to negation relate to sentence processing and the linearity of speech. Negation then provides important heuristic information concerning the syntactic structures and thus the interpretation of Biblical Hebrew edge constructions.

References

- Alexiadou, A. 2006. Left dislocation (including CCLD). In M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.) *The Blackwell companion to syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 668–699. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996591.ch37>
- Alexopoulou, T., E. Doron and C. Heycock. 2004. Broad subjects and clitic left dislocation. In D. Adger, C. DeCat and G. Tsoulas (eds.) *Peripheries: Syntactic edges and their effects*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. pp. 329–358. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-1910-6_14
- Anagnostopoulou, E. 1997. Clitic left dislocation and contrastive left dislocation. In E. Anagnostopoulou, H. van Riemsdijk and F. Zwarts (eds.) *Materials on left dislocation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. pp. 151–192. <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.14.11ana>
- Baltin, M. 2006. Extraposition. In M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.) *The Blackwell companion to syntax*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 237–271. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996591.ch25>
- Blau, J. 1977. *An adverbial construction in Hebrew and Arabic: Sentence adverbials in frontal position separated from the rest of the sentence*. Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Vol. 6 No. 1. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0041977x00124607>
- Cowper, E. and V. DeCaen. 2017. Biblical Hebrew: A formal perspective on the left periphery. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics* 38: 1–33.
- Dahl, Ö. 1979. Typology of sentence negation. *Linguistics* 17(1-2): 79–106.
- Doron, E. 2011. On the syntax and semantics of resumptive pronouns. In A. Rouveret (ed.) *Resumptive pronouns at the interfaces*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. pp. 289–317. <https://doi.org/10.1075/lfab.5.07dor>
- Doron, E. and C. Heycock. 2010. In support of broad subjects in Hebrew. *Lingua* 120(7): 1764–1776. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2009.12.002>

- Gad-Horin, G. 1976. Aspects of syntactic preposing in spoken Hebrew. In P. Cole (ed.) *Studies in Modern Hebrew syntax and semantics*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company. pp. 193–207.
- Gross, W. 1987. *Die Pendenskonstruktion im Biblischen Hebräisch*. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag.
- Haegeman, L. 1994. *Introduction to government and binding theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Holmstedt, R.D. 2014. Critical at the margins: Edge constituents in Biblical Hebrew. *Kleine Untersuchungen zur Sprache des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt* 17: 109–156. <https://doi.org/10.5508/jhs.2011.v11.r8>
- Holmstedt, R.D. and A.R. Jones. 2017. Apposition in Biblical Hebrew: Structure and function. *Kleine Untersuchungen zur Sprache des Alten Testaments und seiner Umwelt* 22: 21–51. <https://doi.org/10.5508/jhs.2011.v11.r8>
- Horn, L.R. 2001. *A natural history of negation*. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Khan, G. 1988. *Studies in Semitic syntax*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Korchin, P. 2015. Suspense and authority amid Biblical Hebrew front dislocation. *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 15: Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.5508/jhs.2015.v15.a1>
- Landau, I. 2009. Against broad subjects in Hebrew. *Lingua* 119(1): 89–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2008.08.004>
- López, L. 2016. Dislocations and information structure. In C. Féry and S. Ishihara (eds.) *Oxford handbook of information structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 383–421. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199642670.013.003>
- Lunn, N.P. 2006. *Word-order variation in Biblical Hebrew poetry: Differentiating pragmatics and poetics*. Bletchley: Paternoster Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jss/fgn066>
- McCloskey, J. 2006. Resumption. In M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (eds.) *The Blackwell companion to syntax*: Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 94–117. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470996591>
- Miller, C.L. 1995. *The representation of speech in Biblical Hebrew narrative: A linguistic analysis*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- Miller, C.L. 2005. Ellipsis involving negation in biblical poetry. In R.L. Troxel, K.G. Friebel and D.R. Magary (eds.) *Seeking out the wisdom of the ancients: Essays offered to honor Michael V. Fox on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns. pp. 37–52. <https://doi.org/10.1086/658975>
- Miller, C.L. 2007a. Constraints on ellipsis in Biblical Hebrew. In C.L. Miller (ed.) *Studies in comparative Afroasiatic linguistics presented to Gene B. Gragg*. Chicago: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago. pp. 165–180.

- Miller, C.L. 2007b. The relation of coordination to verb gapping in biblical poetry. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 32(1): 41–60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309089207083764>
- Miller-Naudé, C.L. 2019. *Sentential edges and their structures in Biblical Hebrew*. 8th Hyvernat Memorial Lecture, 28 March 2019. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America.
- Miller-Naudé, C.L. and J.A. Naudé. 2017. The scope of negation inside and outside of the Biblical Hebrew prepositional phrase. In A. Moshavi and T. Notarius (eds.) *Advances in Biblical Hebrew linguistics: Data, methods, and analyses*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns. pp. 297–319. <https://doi.org/10.5508/jhs.2018.v18.r2>
- Miller-Naudé, C.L. and J.A. Naudé. 2019. *Differentiating dislocations in Biblical Hebrew*. Paper presented at the Biblical Hebrew and Rabbinic Hebrew: New Perspectives in Philology and Linguistics Conference, 10 July 2019, University of Cambridge, UK. <https://doi.org/10.5774/48-0-293>
- Naudé, J.A. 1990. A syntactic analysis of dislocation in Biblical Hebrew. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 16: 115–130.
- Naudé, J.A. 1991. Qumran Hebrew as a null subject language. *South African Journal of Linguistics* 9(4): 119–125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10118063.1991.9724303>
- Naudé, J.A. 1993. On subject pronoun and subject noun asymmetry: A preliminary survey of Northwest Semitic. *South African Journal of Linguistics* 11(1): 11–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10118063.1993.9724323>
- Naudé, J.A. 1994. The verbless clause with pleonastic pronoun in Biblical Aramaic. *Journal for Semitics* 6(1): 74–93.
- Naudé, J.A. 1996. Independent Personal Pronouns in Qumran Hebrew Syntax. Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of the Free State.
- Naudé, J.A. 1999. Syntactic aspects of co-ordinate subjects with independent personal pronouns. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 25(2): 75–99.
- Naudé, J.A. and G.A. Rendsburg. 2013. Negation: Pre-modern Hebrew. In G. Khan (ed.) *Encyclopedia of Hebrew language and linguistics*. Leiden: Brill. pp. 801–811. https://doi.org/10.1163/2212-4241_ehll_ehll_com_00000810
- Oosthuizen, J. 2016. Establishing coreference in left dislocation constructions. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus* 50: 47–63.
- Payne, J.R. 1985. Negation. In T. Shopen (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 197–242.
- Radford, A. 2009. *Analyzing English sentences: A minimalist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Redd, J.S. 2014. *Constituent postponement in Biblical Hebrew verse*. Göttingen: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvk12t02>

Rizzi, L. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of grammar*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. pp. 281–337. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8_7

Shlonsky, U. 2014. Topicalization and focalization: A preliminary exploration of the Hebrew left periphery. In A. Cardinaletti, G. Cinque and Y. Endo (eds.) *Peripheries*. Tokyo: H. Syobo. pp. 327–341.

Snyman, F.P.J. 2004. The scope of the negative *lō'* in Biblical Hebrew. *Acta Academica Supplementum* 3: 1–315.

Snyman, F.P.J. and J.A. Naudé. 2003. Sentence and constituent negation in Biblical Hebrew. *Journal for Semitics* 12(2): 237–267.

Van der Merwe, C.H.J., J.A. Naudé and H.J. Kroeze. 2017. *A Biblical Hebrew reference grammar*. 2nd edition. London: Bloomsbury.

Westbury, J.R. 2014. *Left Dislocation in Biblical Hebrew: A Cognitive Linguistic Account*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Stellenbosch.

Westbury, J.R. 2016. A functional profile of left dislocation in Biblical Hebrew. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus* 50: 65–90. <https://doi.org/10.5842/50-0-717>

Wilson, D.J. 2019. *Wayhî* and theticity in Biblical Hebrew. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 45(1): 89–118.