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Abstract
The status of the third person pronoun as a third element in verbless clauses has been a much studied issue in the history of biblical Hebrew syntax. As with most intriguing grammatical phenomena, scholarly opinion on this issue has shifted considerably over the last century or more. While the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries witnessed adherents to both copular and non-copular analyses for the ‘pleonastic’ pronoun in the so-called tripartite verbless clause, the second half of the twentieth century saw a consensus emerge, influenced particularly by the arguments of eminent scholars like Muraoka and Goldenberg: there was no pronominal copula in biblical Hebrew. In this paper we argue that this position does not adequately account for the data from linguistic typology or comparative Semitics and does not reflect a sensitive reading of the discourse context of many biblical examples.

1. Introduction
Our purpose in this essay is to revisit a well-studied Hebrew grammatical phenomenon in order to nuance what has become the majority analysis. The specific phenomenon is the so-called tripartite verbless clause,¹ that is, a clause lacking an overt verb as the predicate and consisting of three primary constituents, at least one of which is a third-person pronoun (henceforth, ‘PRON’), as in (1), given with two translations.

(1) Gen 36:8
עֵשֶׁנָה אָדוֹן
a) ‘Esau is Edom’ (= copular analysis)
b) ‘Esau, he is Edom’ (= dislocation analysis)

For well over a century, the status of PRON in this clause type has been much debated. The basic question is whether PRON functions as an anaphoric pronoun, producing a dislocation structure, or as a copular element. In his 1888 study of word order in the verbless clause Albrecht concluded that “in allen diesen Beispielen das

* We thank John A. Cook and David Kummerow for extensive feedback on this paper, although we bear all responsibility for the views and any errors contained within.

1 Technically, it is more accurate to refer to this structure as a “three-part non-verbal copula clause,” where the non-verbal copula is either null (Ø) or, as we argue below, pronominal. See Zewi and Lev 2008 for an exhaustive bibliography on the verbless clause in Hebrew (although the reader should be aware that the section on general linguistics does not include any of the myriad generative studies).
Pronomen wirklich als Copula aufzufassen ist” (1888:251). With Albrecht in this “copula camp” we may include, among others, Ewald 1879, Brockelmann 1913, 1956, and, later, Israeli scholars like Bendavid 1971 and Sappan 1981.2


The problem with both approaches is that neither analysis makes good contextual

---

2 Albrecht 1888; Ewald 1879:§297a; Brockelmann 1913, 2:41, 104, §§22, 52-53; 1956:§30a; Sappan 1981:92-111.
3 Waltke and O’Connor (1990) discuss the tripartite verbless clause in §88.4.1b and 16.3.3. In the former section, they call PRON a superfluous ‘dummy’ pronoun (so also Joosten 1991:221). In the latter section they invoke the label “copula” but do so in a way that suggests that they see a copula as a “pleonastic” constituent. They then analyze all the examples (excepting Gen 36:8) as ‘casus pendens’ constructions. Note, however, that in their discussion of subject pronouns with finite verbs, Waltke and O’Connor suggest that it is “doubtful that any major linguistic element can truly be superfluous or redundant” (§16.3.2a).
4 Driver 1892:267-271, §198-§199; Davidson 1901:§106; GKC 1910:453, §141f; Joüon 1923:466-70, §154; Waltke and O’Connor 1990:§16.3.3a-b; JM 2006:§154i.
5 Andersen identifies the PRON as both a resumptive and pleonastic pronoun (1970:36). He recognizes that some examples of the PRON, like Ezek 22:24 ‘את ארצך לא תSimpleName את אשה ‘you are a land not cleaned’, could legitimately be identified as a copula. But he takes the PRON examples in his corpus (the Pentateuch) to be either pleonastic/resumptive pronouns in dislocation structures (e.g., Gen 36:8 אֶרֶץ אַתְּ “Esau, he is Edom” 1970:60, #84) or “duplication” (e.g., Gen 25:16 אלAleluויהָ beINי יִשְׂמַעֲלוּ “these are the sons of Ishmael”, 1970:52, #5).
6 Muraoka discusses the PRON in a chapter titled, “Pronominal Copula.” And yet his discussion makes it clear that he generally views the PRON as contributing some sort of emphasis to the clause. He concludes the chapter thusly: “It therefore is not a mere copula in the Indo-European sense of the term nor should it be reduced to the status of a pleonastic and dispensable particle, for it lexically marks what would otherwise be indicated, I presume, only prosodically” (1985:82). For Muraoka’s later views, see §5 below.
7 Gross’ 1987 monograph on the pendens construction contains a wealth of data, but we agree with Naudé’s fundamental critique that Gross’ heavily taxonomic approach and choice of linguistic theory cause him to miss important structural generalizations (Naudé 1990:117-20). On the specific issue of the pronominal copula, Gross argues against the copular analysis for two primary reasons (1987:137-38): he does not perceive that the pronoun adds the same kind of information that the lexical copula does; and since it
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sense with all the examples. A via media, which has been occupied by surprisingly few (e.g., Sappan 1982, Khan 1988, 2006), is that both functions of PRON existed in BH: as a resumptive constituent in dislocations and as a copular item.

2. PRON as a Resumptive Pronoun in Dislocation
Many tripartite verbless clauses are cases of left-dislocation (LD), with a few examples of right-dislocation (RD). Syntactically dislocation is an adjunction structure in which a constituent sits at the left (front) or right (back) edge of a clause and is resumed within the clause itself by a coreferential constituent, most often a pronoun (see also Holmstedt 2012).

is not obligatory in all verbless clauses, the dislocation analysis is preferable. Besides Naudé 1990 and this current work, we can now add another rebuttal to this argument: Kummerow 2011 and f.c. grounds the copular analysis deeply in typology and functional linguistics.

8 Zewi argues that the tripartite verbless clauses including PRON are examples of “extraposed subject and a predicate clause” (1996:52). She allows, however, that PRON may have developed into a copula in modern Hebrew (1996:43).

9 As Muraoka notes in his 1999 study, he “took leave” of the term “copula” applied to PRON for good in his revision of Joüon’s grammar (Joüon and Muraoka 1991, 2006).

10 For example, Geller takes the PRON as a necessary part in forming a cleft construction that serves to contrast the clefted noun with alternatives deduced from the context.

Some of the explicitly contrastive examples refer to God; for example, Deut. 4:35 ki YHWH hâ hâ’elôhim ‘ên ‘ôd millêbaddô “for it is YHWH who is God, none but He alone”; cf. also 4:39; Josh. 24:27; I Kgs. 8:60; 18:39; Jer. 14:22; Neh. 9:6, 7. It seems likely that, especially in the context of hymns and prayers, such references to divinity may always be understood to imply contrast with other gods or divine beings, even if unstated. The nuance may be expressed as “God alone,” “He alone,” “I alone,” etc.; or, as required by context, “God Himself,” “You Yourself,” etc. (1991: 20)

However, since not all examples express a discernible contrast, Geller suggests that in general the clefted noun grounds the statement in the discourse and the following clause with the subject pronoun emphasizes the fact of the predication. Geller indicates that only half of the examples he collected exhibit a contrast like that in 1 Kgs 18:39 יְהוָה אָמַר אָזָא הָאֱלֹהִים יְהוָה אָמַר אָזָא הָאֱלֹהִים; the remaining fall into one of six functional categories that Geller discerns. Yet, he relates all seven categories to a single general function: deixis.

All the clauses in which the pleonastic construction occurs “point to” another aspect of the speech context, another clause or, in the case of syntactic resumption…, part of a clause, in regard to some aspect of syntactic, topical or rhetorical function. (1991: 23)
The agreement features of the resumptive constituent must match those of the dislocated constituent, as they do in the LD example in (2a).

(2a) Gen 34:23b
‘their livestock and their property and all their animals, are they not ours?’

In the example in (2a), the LD structure is made unambiguous by the position of the interrogative ה. That is, since the interrogative ה is a phrasal clitic that attaches to the left edge of the clause, the preceding constituentolucion can only be in a site that is adjoined to the left edge (Naudé 1990).

Although most cases of dislocation are not quite as clearly marked as the example in (2a), the use of the structure is typically identifiable. Consider the examples of LD and RD in (2b-c), respectively.

(2b) Left-dislocation: Isa 1:7
‘your land, before you strangers are consuming it!’

(2c) Right-dislocation: Josh 24:12
‘it [the ‘hornet’] drove them out from before you, the two Amorite kings’

As for any copular function of PRON, Geller asserts such a function did not develop until after biblical Hebrew.

11 Although Sappan 1981 identifies more cases of copular PRON than we do, he follows a similar via media and makes an important methodological point (107):

In order to fix precisely the true relationship that is between the prevalence of the copular pronoun in prose and that in poetry, we must, of course, examine not only the extent of the linguistic matter in sections of prose and poetry, but also the number of nominal clauses found in these sections, in which the copular pronoun is likely to come; we must also take into account its use in recurring formulae in prose, as in poetry (e.g., ה האלוהים).

Sappan thus asserts that any sound investigation will not simply examine the occurrences of PRON, but also investigate those verbless clauses in which PRON is not used. Only then is it likely that any coherent analysis may be achieved.
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In a dislocation analysis each constituent is provided a syntactic role, even though there are more possible arguments than can be licensed by the verb. For instance, in (2b) the NP כָּלָהֵמָהּ הלַא לִלְוֹ the verb. The remaining two constituents, אֲדֹמֵהָם and וְקִנְיָנָם, create a tension in that only one can be licensed by the verb (it does not matter whether we capture this in terms of Case assignment or θ-roles). As a case of LD, the אֲדֹמֵהָם and וְקִנְיָנָם are linked by coindexation and thus constitute just one syntactic constituent in terms of the argument structure. The same analysis applies to the example of RD in (2c).

Pragmatically, LD presents a Topic-Focus structure. The dislocated constituent is the Topic, orienting the reader either to which entity (among multiple discourse possibilities) the following clause adds information or to scene-setting information (e.g., place, time). The first lexical constituent in the clause carries Focus, which sets that item over against others in an established membership set. Consider Gen 34:23, presented again in (2d):

(2d) Gen 34:23
מקָהָם וְקִנְיָנָם וְכָל־בְּהֶמְתָּם מִקְנֵהֶם
‘their livestock and their property and all their animals, are they not ours?’

The initial NP מקָהָם וְקִנְיָנָם וְכָל־בְּהֶמְתָּם establishes that, of all the possible entities active in the discourse, this is the one about which a predication will be made. The initial lexical constituent in the clause, the suffixed pronoun in the PP לַא, presents the Focus: this property is ours (not yours or anyone else’s).

Although structurally similar, RD differs in its pragmatic function from LD. In general terms, a right-dislocated constituent either re-activates a discourse entity that is no longer accessible due to discourse distance or makes explicit an entity that was present only implicitly in the discourse (see Ziv 1994; Mayol 2007; Holmstedt 2012). Either explanation could fit Josh 24:12, given again in (2e):

(2e) Right-dislocation: Josh 24:12
מְלָכֵי הָאֱמֹרִי אוֹתָם מִפְּנֵיכֶם מַלְכֵי הָאֱמֹרִי
‘it [the ‘hornet’] drove them out from before you, the two Amorite kings’

In (2e) the right-dislocated שְׁנֵי מַלְכֵי הָאֱמֹרִי either refers to “the Amorites” who “fought with you” four verses back in v. 8 or explicitly introduces the Amorite kings, who had only been implied in the previous context. No Focus is associated with right-dislocation in BH.

In summary, while many tripartite verbless clauses in the Hebrew Bible are of the

12 Our Topic-Focus analysis of left-dislocation is modified from Prince’s (1998) ‘partially-ordered set inference triggering function of left-dislocation’.
13 See Holmstedt 2009a for a presentation of this model of information structure.
dislocation type we have just described, with PRON ‘resuming’ a preceding or following dislocated constituent, there are a number of examples for which the pragmatics of the dislocation structures are contextually infelicitous.\(^{14}\) We thus turn to the copular analysis.

3. PRON as a Pronominal Copula

According to Regina Pustet (2003) a copula is “a linguistic element which co-occurs with certain lexemes in certain languages when they function as a predicate nucleus” (2003:5). Critically, a copular element does not have any lexical-semantic content, although it may contain tense-aspect-mood features and even, by its presence, signal certain semantic nuances, such as an identificational (or equative) versus predicational interpretation (Doron 1986; Rothstein 1995).

The use of a pronoun as a copular element has been noted for a wide range of languages; as Stassen notes in the *The World Atlas of Language Structures*:

> We find [the pronominal copula] especially in northern and central Asia, in North Africa and the Middle East, and in eastern Indonesia and Melanesia. Hebrew, Motu (Oceanic; Papua New Guinea), Turkish, and Beja (Cushitic; Sudan) are examples of languages with the pro-copula strategy; in Turkish and Beja, the pro-copula takes the form of a suffix. (2003:487)

For BH we will start with the one type of construction involving PRON that strongly points towards a copular analysis: the type in which the initial constituent and PRON do not share a full set of agreement features, as in (3).

\[(3)\] 

\text{אַתָּה מֶלֶךָ אֱלֹהִים}

‘you PRON/are my king, O God’ (vs. RD: ‘you are he, my king!’)

The lack of person agreement between אַתָּה and מֶלֶךָ in (3) is striking and it eliminates a LD analysis, since the resumptive constituent and the dislocated constituent must agree fully. As the alternative translation indicates, it is possible to analyze this as a case of RD,\(^{15}\) that is, ‘you are he, my king’, where ‘he’ and ‘my king’ are coreferential. The problem with this is that follows the PRON מֶלֶךָ, which would be anaphoric in a RD analysis. Thus, in normal terms מֶלֶךָ cannot be the antecedent of אַתָּה and the PRON must have an antecedent in the discourse preceding this verse. And yet there is no explicit or implicit third-person

\(^{14}\)Khan makes the point that the dislocation analysis and accompanying Focus interpretation of PRON in, e.g., Isa 52:6 (אַתָּה מֶלֶךָ) and Ps 44:5 (אַתָּה אֱלֹהִים) is “rather forced” (2006:171). The reason for this is that the context provides no viable membership set against which to contrast the supposedly focused constituent; thus, the PRON in such examples is more economically analyzed as copular.

\(^{15}\)It is also possible that this particular example is a case of ‘afterthought’, which is distinguished prosodically and syntactically from right-dislocation (Ziv 1994).
antecedent in the context of the preceding verses in Psalm 44. Thus, the infelicity of a
dislocation analysis for some tripartite verbless clauses, like the one in (3), forces us to
consider other analyses, foremost of which is the copular nature of PRON.

The distributional symmetries and structural parallels between the use of PRON as a
copular pronoun and the verbal copula היה are also suggestive. First, the copula היה and
PRON הוא may appear with NP (4), PP (5), and AP (6) predicates.17

(4) NP Predicate
   a) 2 Kgs 5:1
      נָעַמָּן שַׂר צְבָא מֶלֶךְ־אֲרָם
      'Na‘aman, commander of the army of the king of Aram was a great man’
   b) Ezek 14:6
      הָעָרֶץ שְׁמָמָה תִּהְיֶה
      ‘the land will be a desolation’
   c) Lev 3:20
      אֵלֶּה מִשְׁפְּחֹת הָלוֹלוֹת
      ‘these PRON/are the families of the Levites’

(5) PP Predicate
   a) Num 32:1
      מַעֲנַה לְרַב מִקְנֶה לִי
      ‘many cattle belonged to the sons of Reuben’
   b) Gen 44:17
      הוּא בָּיְדוֹ הַגָּבִיעַ דְּמַצְוָא אֲשֶׁר
      ‘the man in whose hand the cup is found—he will belong to me as a servant’
   c) Lev 14:13
      הָאָשָׁם לְהוֹא כֹּהֵן
      ‘the guilt offering belongs to the priest’

(6) AP Predicate
   a) Gen 3:1
      הַנָּחָשׁ עָרוּם
      ‘the serpent was wise’

16 The comparison excludes, of course, cases in which היה is not copular but the existential
verb, as in Gen 1:3 הָיָה אֵוֶר יִרְאוֹר ‘Let light exist!’ And light existed.’
17 The use of the pronominal copula with PP (possessive) and AP (property) predicates is
rare. The vast majority of pronominal copulas are used with NP predicates.
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b) Lev 11:36
מִקְוֵה־מַיִם
וּבוֹר
מַעְיָן
אַךְ
טָהוֹר
יִהְיֶה
‘but a spring and a cistern (a reservoir of water) will be clean’

c) Lam 1:18
עָדִיק הָאָדָם
יְהוָה
‘Yhwh is righteous’

While the verbal copula appears to make the past and non-past semantics of the situation explicit, the copular pronoun is used to establish the present tense. Thus, like the use of the verbal copula, the copular pronoun represents a case of privative opposition, an asymmetrical markedness relationship between two members such that one is marked for a feature that the other lacks. Thus the presence of the copular items sets tense, but their absence produces ambiguity, forcing an appeal to the context for the temporal frame.

Second, the pattern of verbal negation matches expectations, since in contrast to אֵין used for the perfect (7a) and imperfect (7b), the copular pronoun is associated with אֵין, as in (7c), just like participial clauses (7d).

(7) Negation
a) Gen 38:21
לֹא הָיְתָה קְדֵשָׁה בָזֶה
‘a prostitute has not been in this place’

b) Exod 20:3
לֹא יִהְיֶה עַל־פָּנָי אֲחֵרִים אֱלֹהִים־לְךָ
‘other gods will not belong to you before me’

c) Gen 44:26
הַקָּטֹן אָחִינוּ אֵינֶנּוּ אִתָּנוּ
‘our youngest brother NEG=PRON/is not with us’

d) Exod 5:16
תֶּבֶן נִתָּן אֵין לַעֲבָדֶיךָ
‘straw is not being given to your servants’

Note that in (7c), the negative אֵין selects the bound form of the copular pronoun, which is attached as an enclitic.18 The clitic nature of the copular pronoun, whether as the bound

18 For examples of copular clitic pronouns (attached toֹ, יש, or עוד), see Gen 44:14, 26, 30, 34; Exod 3:2; Lev 13:34; Num 11:33; 1 Kgs 12:2; 20:40; Jer 33:1; 38:4; Job 8:22; Qoh 9:16; Esth 3:8; 5:13; Neh 2:2; 2 Chr 14:6; 34:3. For examples of the clitic pronoun that are better
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affixal form in (7c) or as the morphologically full but prosodically dependent form in (3), which was attached by a maqqef, is furthermore support that in these constructions PRON is not the subject pronoun, since when PRON is the subject pronoun it is accentually independent (see Zwicky 1985 on identifying a clitic).

A third parallel with the ה is the ability to occur with participial clauses, illustrated in (8a-c):

(8) ה and Participle

a) Exod 3:1
משה היה רעה אתי צאן תור
‘Moses was herding the sheep of Jethro’

b) 1 Sam 1:13
נה ה היא מספרת עילולה
‘Hannah PRON/is speaking to herself’

c) Jer 38:4
כי היה היא אמרה להשלת לעם לעם
‘because this man NEG=PRON/is not seeking the welfare of this people’

The fourth and final parallel with the verbal copula is triggered V-raising. Verbal copula clauses, like finite verbal clauses in general, exhibit ‘triggered inversion’. That is, V-raising is motivated by the presence of certain clause-initial constituents, resulting in the ‘inversion’ of basic SV order to VS (see Holmstedt 2009a, 2011). This triggered VS inversion occurs with subordinators like ב (in 9a) and על (in 9b).

---

analyzed as resumptive pronouns of a dislocated constituent, see Gen 18:22; 1 Sam 13:7; 2 Sam 3:22; Qoh 1:7; 5:11; 9:5; Lam 4:17. For a remaining six examples, the discourse context does not strongly suggest one reading, the copular or the resumptive, over the other: Gen 42:13, 32, 36 (2x); Zech 8:10; Ps 104:35.

19 See also Gen 37:2; Exod 3:1; Lev 15:2; 19; Num 14:33; Deut 28:29, 34; 30:4; Judg 1:7; 1 Sam 2:11; 2 Sam 3:6, 17; 7:6; 1 Kings 5:1; 12:6; 22:35; 2 Kings 6:8; 9:14; 17:25, 28–29, 32–33, 41; 21:15.

20 See also Deut 31:3 (2x); Isa 43:25; 51:12; 2 Chr 28:23.

21 For other examples with a negative, see also Qoh 9:16 and Esth 5:13. There also appears to be one example with a finite verb, Exod 3:2, although that verb is often analyzed as a rare Qal passive participle or emended to a Pual participle (by adding a prefix נ). For the single possible example without a negative, see Deut 31:3. If Deut 31:3 is better interpreted as a case of LD, then there appears to be a restriction on the use of the copular pronoun with participles such that the combination is restricted to negative clauses.
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(9) Verbal Copula: SV > C-VS (C = subordinator)
   a) Gen 13:6: C-V-S
      כִּי־הָיָהּ רָבָּה רְכוּשָׁם
      ‘because their property was great’
   b) Exod 13:9: C-V-S
      לִפְנֵי יְהוָה תּוֹרַת
      ‘in order that the instruction of Yhwh will be in your mouth’

V-raising is also triggered by modality, which includes negative operators (10a-b).

(10) Verbal Copula: SV > M-VS (M = modal operator)
   a) Gen 42:11: N-EG-V-S
      לֹא־הָיוּ מְרַגְּלִים עֲבָדֶיךָ
      ‘your servants have not been spies’
   b) Deut 28:65: N-EG-V-S
      לֹא־יִהְיֶה לְכַף־רַגְלֶךָ מָנוֹחַ
      ‘a resting place will not be for the sole of your foot’

Finally, V-raising is triggered by the presence of a Focus constituent in the left-periphery of the clause, such as the Focus-fronted predicate complements in (11a-b).

(11) Focus-Fronted Predicate Complements
   a) Gen 46:34: PC-V-S
      מִקְנֶה אַנְשֵׁי הָיוּ מִנְּעוּרֵינוּ עֲבָדֶיךָ
      ‘your servants have been cattle-men from our youth’

---

26 See also Gen 47:9; Exod 10:23; 16:13; 37:9, 14, 25; 38:2; Num 26:64; Josh 17:8; 21:10; 22:20; Judg 3:31; 6:40; 8:30.
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b) Gen 15:13: (C)-PC-V-S\(^{27}\)

וְיִשָּׁתֶם הָרֹאשֶׁה הָאָבִיךָ אֶל־לְךָמְ

‘that your seed will be a stranger in a land not theirs’

The suppletive copular pronoun participates only in one type of triggered inversion: V-raising when the predicate complement is Focus-fronted, as in (12).

(12) Isa 9:14: PC-PRON-S\(^{28}\)

הָרֹאשֶׁה הָאָבִיךָ אֶל־לְךָמְ

‘the elder and statesman PRON/is the head’

In (12) the context clearly establishes that the NP הָרֹאשֶׁה is the syntactic subject: it is a known entity in the discourse and the center of the metaphor begun in the preceding verse. The agreement features of PRON also suggest that 험 is the syntactic subject, since it carries MS agreement features, matching PRON, whereas the features of the conjoined NPs 험 ומשה would be resolved as MP. The lack of agreement between the first constituent, the conjoined NPs, and PRON argues against a LD analysis like ‘as for the elder and statesman—he is the head’. But the desired pragmatics are still achieved within the copular structure: the Focus-fronting of the predicate complement provides the contextually felicitous pragmatic nuance.

In contrast to the V-raising when the predicate complement has been Focus-fronted, V-raising is not triggered for the copular pronoun when the potential triggers are syntactic, i.e., subordinators, or semantic, i.e., modality. Thus, the presence of the negative הָרֹאשֶׁה in (13) does nothing to the word order.

(13) Gen 44:30: S-NEG=PRON\(^{29}\)

הָרֹאשֶׁה אֵין אֲחָנוֹ

‘the lad NEG= PRON/is not with us’

The lack of modality-triggered V-raising reflects the fact that the copular pronoun is used only in indicative clauses. Thus we see that there are some constraints on the use of the copular pronoun that distinguish it from the verbal copula. And while PRON does serve as a suppletive copula for indicative present tense clauses, there are a few more constraints on

---


\(^{28}\) See also Lev 25:33. In light of Lev 14:13, in which a fronted PP (Focus) does not trigger V-raising of the copular pronoun, it may be that V-raising in such constructions is triggered only by a fronted predicate. Such complexities require further investigation. See Kummerow f.c. for tentative arguments against taking Lev 14:13 and 25:33 as copular.

\(^{29}\) See note 18.
its usage. First, it does not allow pro-drop, that is, it does not allow the syntactic subject to be null (see Naudé 1991, 1999; Holmstedt 2009b), as in (14).

(14) Pro-Drop (Null Subject)
   a) Verbal Copula: Gen 1:14
   וְשָׁנִים וּלְיָמִים וְלוֹמָעִים לְאֹתֹת וְהָיוּ
   ‘and pro (they = the lights) shall be for signs and for seasons and for days and years’

   b) Copular Pronoun: Lev 14:13 (modified)
   לַכֹּהֵן הוּא ( * vs. לַכֹּהֵן הוּא הָאָשָׁם)
   *‘pro (= the guilt offering) belongs to the priest’

This asymmetry follows from the fact that the copular pronoun, unlike the verbal copula, does not carry a full set of agreement features matching the syntactic subject. Thus, in Hebrew, a null subject is not licensed for clauses with the copular pronoun. In a case like (14b), the lack of the NP subject והשעה would force the anaphoric interpretation of the PRON הוּא.

Second, unlike the copular verb (15a-b), the copular pronoun cannot be used with a third-person pronominal subject,\(^{30}\) illustrated in (16).

(15) Copular Verb with 3rd-Person Pronominal Subject
   a) Gen 3:20
   הַיְוָה הָיְתָה אֵם כָּל־חָי
   ‘she was the mother of every living person’

   b) Gen 16:12
   הוּא יִהְיֶה אָדָם פֶּרֶא
   ‘he will be a wild ass of a man’

(16) Gen 16:12, modified
   *הוּא יִהְיֶה אָדָם פֶּרֶא
   ‘he PRON/is a wild ass of a man’

However, the copular pronoun may be used with pronominal subjects when its bound form is an enclitic attached to the negative אֵין, as in (17).

---

\(^{30}\) Demonstratives are an exception; see example (4c).
Excursus: PRON in Qumran Hebrew

Tripartite verbless clauses are common in Qumran Hebrew (QH) just as in BH, but due to the smaller size of the corpus the analysis of PRON is more difficult. In BH, clauses such as (3) show person disagreement, which strongly suggests a copular interpretation for PRON. On the other hand, QH offers no such clauses that provide a self-supporting justification to posit a copular PRON.

Of course, we may not assume that the copular PRON falls out of use in QH simply because there are no QH clauses where PRON demonstrates disagreement in person. Indeed, evidence from the Mishnah suggests that a copular use of PRON continues into the rabbinic period (see (19) below). The most likely explanation for the absence of copular PRON clauses like (3) in QH is the small sample size. PRON clauses with person disagreement are rare even in the larger corpus of BH, so it is not unexpected for such clauses to be absent in a smaller corpus such as the DSS. Nevertheless, since there is nothing unambiguous in QH, the analysis begins from a position of uncertainty. All QH uses of PRON must be studied as a whole to determine the likelihood that PRON functions as a copula within the QH corpus.

To date only one study, Naudé 2002, has been devoted to PRON in QH. Naudé argues that PRON cannot be a copula in QH due to the distribution of the copular verb היה, which is distinct from that of PRON (2002:167-8). He proposes that PRON is a subject enclitic that permits a referential NP to appear in place of a predicate in a verbless clause. This proposal fits the majority of the QH data because nearly all tripartite verbless clauses in QH take the form [referential NP] [third person pronoun] [referential NP] as in (18a).

31 The only other example of this phenomenon is with the second-person pronoun: Neh 2:2 אתה אתך,holi ‘you are not sick’.

32 We use the term “Qumran Hebrew” to refer to the Hebrew of the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS). It is a chronological rather than geographical distinction and should not be taken to imply the existence of a specific dialect of Hebrew local to Qumran.

33 There is in fact exactly one clause in the DSS where PRON demonstrates person disagreement: ‘you PRON/are Yhwh; you chose our fathers from old’ (4Q393 f3.6). However, the form and contextual function of this clause is shared in common with Neh 9:6-7. The possibility of archaizing in 4Q393 precludes analyzing this PRON as a post-biblical copula.

34 The issue of the comparative distribution of PRON and the verbal copula היה has been discussed at length in §3 above. Lacunae in the distribution of PRON in QH relative to BH are likely due to sample size.

35 Naudé’s theory is based on a distinction between predication and specification, where a clause that juxtaposes two referential NPs with no verb is considered a specification clause.
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Similarly, verbless clauses with alternative forms (that is, those with a PP, AP, or non-referential NP in clause-final position) do not often use the third person pronoun as a third element (2002:162). When they do, the pronoun is normally found in the third position, and the clause is best understood as a case of left-dislocation of the subject with resumption by the pronoun. Nevertheless, there are exceptions to these tendencies that Naudé does not mention, such as (18b–c).

(18b) 4Q200 6:5 (4Q Tobit)  
אשר לוהי והעולמים יהא מלכותו  
‘...whose kingdom PRON (is) everlasting’

(18c) 1QS 11:4-5  
כי אמת אל הוהי/היאוה סלע פועמי  
‘For the truth of God PRON (is) the rock of my steps’

In (18b), where the tripartite verbless clause is a subordinate clause, the pronoun follows the predicate PP לוהי והעולמים and precedes the subject NP מלכותו. In this clause, the pronoun cannot be a subject clitic because it precedes the subject. Neither can this pronoun license a referential NP in place of a predicate because the only referential NP in the clause is the subject. In (18c) the second NP, סלע פועמי, is the subject while the first NP, אמת אל הוהי, is the predicate. As in (18b), the pronoun precedes the subject and therefore cannot be an enclitic. Since the subject enclitic hypothesis leaves much data unexplained, we should discard it in favor of alternative models.

One intriguing aspect of PRON in the DSS is the distribution of its agreement

36 As is the case with the most QH clauses of this type, this clause interprets a preceding biblical quotation by citing a lemma (נמה) and then providing its interpretation.

37 It is very difficult to distinguish between waw and yod in the script, leaving this pronoun ambiguous as either 3ms or 3fs.

38 Note that (18b) is the only clause listed in Baasten 2006 wherein a tripartite verbless clause with PRON in second position includes a prepositional phrase (2006:206).

39 It is also possible to argue that in verbless clauses with two referential NPs there is no subject or predicate. The semantics of such a clause is sometimes conceived in terms of the assignment of a value to a variable. The value has a higher level of particularity than the variable, and in that regard the relationship approaches predication, but it does not quite reach it (Declerk 1988:1-3). In that framework, what we refer to here as the subject would become the variable, and what we call the predicate would become the value.

40 Other clauses where PRON precedes the subject occur in CD 7.15 and 1QpHab 6.4.
patterns. Unfortunately this evidence is rarely available, for three reasons. First, the similarity between waw and yod in the script of the DSS frequently results in an inability to distinguish between the 3ms and 3fs personal pronouns אנו and אנה. These particles are crucial to the analysis, so this problem turns out to be quite a significant obstacle. Second, it is difficult to make use of number agreement in many cases due to the possibility that a singular form is being used as a collective. Third, the third person feminine plural pronoun היא does not occur as PRON in the DSS, and therefore it cannot be known that was not used in place of והנה as PRON.

In spite of these problems, a few clauses remain where agreement features provide useful data, either because the middle character of a אנה happens to be clearly identifiable as a yod rather than a waw or because a collective reading is impossible in the context. There are five tripartite verbless clauses with two referential NPs and a PRON where PRON clearly agrees with one NP and disagrees with the other.\(^41\) In four of these five clauses PRON agrees with the predicate against the subject. In only one clause does PRON agree with the subject against the predicate (CD 8.10-11 (= CD 19.23)). This is atypical in BH, where PRON normally agrees with the subject, and is therefore unexpected in QH.

All five of these clauses (as well as most clauses with PRON in QH) are “lemma : interpretation” formulae in the pesher genre. It is therefore difficult to be certain whether the behavior of PRON in these clauses is pervasive throughout QH or is limited to the pesher formula. Taking into account the correlation of these clauses with the pesher genre, four potential solutions present themselves.

First, the initial NP may be a title (X: It is Y). This would explain those clauses of the type subject–PRON–predicate (CD 8.10-11 (= CD 19.23); 1QpHab 12.9; 4Q252 5.2), but not those of the type predicate–PRON–subject (CD 7.15; 1QpHab 6.4).\(^42\) This theory would also require a supplementary hypothesis to explain the variation in agreement of PRON with the subject (CD 8.10-11 (= CD 19.23)) and the predicate (1QpHab 12.9; 4Q252 5.2).

Second, some clauses may involve left-dislocation of the first NP and a resumptive PRON. Like the title theory, this only explains those clauses of the form subject–PRON–predicate. Also like the title theory, this theory needs a supplementary hypothesis to explain the agreement of PRON with the constituent that follows it rather than the left-dislocated subject. Baasteden considers a PRON which agrees with a subsequent predicate noun to be an instance of attraction, where the predicate NP that follows PRON has influenced PRON to agree with it rather than its antecedent (Baasteden 2006:210-11). This is likely the best

\(^{41}\) These clauses occur in CD 7.15; 8.10-11 (= CD 19.23); 1QpHab 6.4; 12.9; 4Q252 5.2. Another potentially useful clause is fragmentary in 4Q169 f1-2.3. The person disagreement in 4Q393 f3.6 has already been discussed. Clauses where the two referential NPs do not agree but the agreement direction of the pronoun is unclear occur in 1QS 11.4; 1QpHab 12.3, 4; 4Q169 f3-4 1.10; 4Q394 f3-7 2.17; f8 4.10, 11; 4Q396 f1-2 3.1 (2x); 4Q398 f11-13 4; 11Q13 2.15. In CD 7.17 a manuscript correction has taken place in which it is not possible to be sure which reading is original.

\(^{42}\) The other two clauses with PRON in QH that exhibit predicate–PRON–subject order are 1QS 11.4 and 4Q200 6.5.
available option to explain the predicate agreement if these are taken as cases of LD.\footnote{43 In this regard, Baasten cites Muraoka (1999:206 and n. 56).}

Third, there may be right-dislocation of the second NP. This option explains the two predicate–PRON–subject clauses that give the first two theories some difficulty, that is, CD 7.15 and 1QpHab 6.4, but it is not useful for the clauses with subject–PRON–predicate order since the predicate NPs are new to the discourse (see the discussion of example (3) above).

To explain all five clauses using the first three constructions requires utilizing both the RD analysis and either the LD analysis or the title analysis, each of which needs to be supplemented with the attraction theory. This explanation is unattractive due to its complexity and the dubious application of the pragmatic characteristics of LD and RD to these clauses in context. In light of this, the copular reading of PRON with predicate agreement is worthy of consideration. The agreement of copular PRON with the predicate rather than the subject in QH would be surprising in light of the agreement of PRON with the subject in BH. However, an analogous system of predicate agreement is used in Modern Israeli Hebrew. According to Doron (1995:325), the agreement of PRON with the predicate (replacement) NP in Modern Hebrew privatively marks an identificational clause, while clauses where PRON agrees with the subject are unmarked and may be predicational or identificational.\footnote{44 The distinction between predicational and identificational clauses is the same one made by Naudé when he refers to PRON licensing the use of a referential NP in place of a predicate, although Naudé uses the term “specificational” rather than “identificational.” For more on the distinction between predicational and identificational clauses, see Stassen (1997:101–13).}

The pesher formula, which accounts for almost all uses of PRON in QH, is by nature identificational in that it identifies a lemma from the base text as a reference to some other entity, and so the use of predicate agreement to mark these clauses as identificational fits well in the pesher context. It also provides an attractive explanation for the one case of subject agreement (see 18a), because although this clause is a pesher formula and is identificational, an alternative predicational reading is also available. The use of subject agreement, which is the unmarked form, would leave open the option of both the predicational and the identificational reading.\footnote{45 The lemma in question, יין, ‘their wine’, comes from Deut 32:33. The identificational pesher interpretation is ‘their wine is [i.e. refers to] their customs’. The alternative, predicational interpretation is ‘their wine is their ways’, i.e., ‘their drunkenness is their way of life’.}

In sum, several factors complicate the study of PRON in QH. There is no reason to doubt that PRON was available to be used as a copula, but neither has clear and simple evidence of the construction been preserved. The particularities of the pesher style and the confusion between waw and yod provide a context where confidence about particular interpretations is elusive. However, a copular interpretation is available that makes use of data from Modern Israeli Hebrew and explains the peculiar tendency of PRON to agree with the predicate in QH.
4. The Copular Pronoun in Historical-Comparative Perspective

Setting the data we have presented in historical Hebrew and comparative Semitic perspective further supports the development of a copular pronoun in BH. First, a brief historical view: consider example (19), which is similar to the biblical data we adduced above.

(19) Rabbinic Hebrew
    a) אֲנִי אִם הַטָּמֵא
       ‘If I am the unclean one’ (Naz 8.1)
    b) הַמִּדְרָשׁ וְלֹא הַמַּעֲשֶׂה
       ‘and the central thing is not the study but the deed’ (Avot 1.17)

In (18) and (19) and (19a) the subject and PRON do not agree in person features, while in (19b) the word order is predicate-PRON-subject, reflecting the Focus-fronting of the predicate המִדְרָשׁ. Thus the not-too-common copular pronoun construction in BH continues in post-biblical Hebrew, although the frequency of occurrence remains similar.

The development of a copular pronoun in Hebrew is paralleled by a similar trend in many Semitic languages. For some languages for which we have adequate data the historical change is observable. For example, Old Aramaic shows no copular use of the pronoun, but it has developed by Imperial and Middle Aramaic, for which the examples from Ahiqar (20a) and Daniel (20b) are illustrative.

(20a) Middle Aramaic: Ahiqar (C1.1.46)
      אנה הווה אַדִיקר
      ‘I am Ahiqar’

(20b) Imperial Aramaic: Daniel 2.38
      אַנְתְּ־ הַמַּעֲשֶׂה דִּי רֵאשָׁה
      ‘you are the head of gold’

Moreover, the use of the anaphoric pronoun as a copula is nearly ubiquitous in Classical Syriac (Nöldeke 1904: §311), as in (21), and remains a feature of modern Aramaic dialects (see Khan 2006).

---

47 Note that we include the negative לא with the NP המִדְרָשׁ as a single constituent, since the לא here is an item adverb and does not negate the clause.
48 A number of the tripartite verbless clause examples in Muraoka and Porten 2003 should be analyzed as copular constructions as well.
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(21) Syriac: John 8.39 (Peshitta)

‘our father PRON.3MS/is Abraham’

Similarly, Akkadian does not use the pronoun as a copula in any of the third or second-millennia languages as they exist in Mesopotamia, but this form of copula did develop in Western Peripheral Akkadian of the second half of the second millennium (22a) and is also used in Neo-Assyrian (22b) and Late Babylonian (22c).

(22) Akkadian
a) Western Peripheral Akkadian (Huehnergard 1986: 244-46)
‘the king of Ugarit PRON.3MS/is my lord’ (RS 20.16:10-11 / Ugaritica 5 118, no. 38)

b) Neo-Assyrian (von Soden 1969:$126f, modified)
ayyāru uren ūṭābu ūšū
‘Ayyar PRON.3MS/is a good month’ (ABL 652, 13)

c) Late Babylonian (von Soden 1969:$126f, modified)
N. aḫu’a ūšū
‘N. PRON.3MS/is my brother’ (BIN I 9, 14)

And to round out the comparative Semitic picture by moving into the first millennium C.E., both Classical Ethiopic (Ge‘ez) (23) and Classical Arabic (24) use the 3MS pronoun as a non-

49 Huehnergard (1986) argues that the copular use of the pronoun not only existed in the oldest layers of Akkadian, it was likely Proto-Semitic. Huehnergard references Li and Thompson’s 1977 study (p. 240, n. 79), but does not seem to have appreciated the developmental and thus chronological implications. If the use of the pronominal copula is typically a feature that develops out of another construction and in fact represents the grammaticalization of the independent pronoun, it is unlikely that it developed in Proto-Semitic, was used sparingly in Old Babylonian—to the point of being an extreme rarity, but then developed freely in West Semitic (including Western Peripheral Akkadian) as well as in Neo-Assyrian and Late Babylonian. Moreover, none of the examples adduced by Huehnergard are unambiguously the copular use of the pronoun. The pronouns in each of the examples agrees fully with the nominal subject and Huehnergard does not provide the context (or make any reference to the context), so it is impossible to tell from his examples whether a Dislocation analysis might make equal (or more) discourse sense. The only type of data needed for a clear case is precisely what we see in later Semitic examples — cases in which the pronoun (typically 3MS) does not fully agree with the subject NP. Grammaticalization typically proceeds in only one direction; it does not often reverse itself. Thus, it is highly questionable that the pronominal use of the copula was a Proto-Semitic feature, regardless of the development of the predicator state in Akkadian.
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verbal copula.

(23) Classical Ethiopic (Dillmann 1904:439-40, §194; also Lambdin 1978:29-30)
\[ \text{zāti yǝfǝti jǝrYǝtǝy} \]
\[ \text{‘this \text{PRON.3MS/\text{is}} my pact’ (Gen 17:10)} \]

(24) Classical Arabic (Fischer 2003:192)
\[ \text{‘ulā‘ika humū ‘ul-ka‘firūnā} \]
\[ \text{‘those \text{PRON.3MP/\text{are}} the unbelievers’} \]

5. The Development of the Copular Pronoun
How and why did Hebrew develop the third-person pronoun as a present tense copular item? To be brief, the presence of a ‘verbless’ clause in ancient Hebrew—that is, a clause in which two noun phrases are equated without an overt verbal copula, as in (29), where we have marked the null copula with ø—is precisely the environment in which non-verbal copulas have developed in many languages of the world.50

(29) Josh 22:34
\[ \text{יְהוָה הָאֱלֹהִים} \]
\[ \text{‘Yhwh ø/\text{is} God’} \]

Dozens of languages with verbal and non-verbal copulas have been studied in the last thirty years of typological linguistics and a small set of paths of grammaticalization has emerged. For instance, according to Li and Thompson in their seminal 1977 article (and confirmed many times since), the copular use of the anaphoric pronoun often develops out of what they call a ‘Topic-Comment’ construction, which includes LD. Specifically, the anaphoric pronoun that resumes the dislocated constituent ceases to have any anaphoric function; it grammaticalizes, moving from anaphoric device to copular marker. In (30) we provide Li and Thompson’s schema for the pronoun-to-copula path of grammaticalization (with slight modification).

(30) Anaphor \(\Rightarrow\) Copula (Li and Thompson 1977: 420)
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[NP NP]} & \quad / \quad \text{[NP, [PRON, NP]]} & \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{[NP, COP, NP]} \\
\text{SUBJ PRED} & \quad \text{TOP SUBJ PRED} & \quad \text{SUBJ PRED} \\
\text{Verbless Clause} & \quad \text{Left-Dislocation} & \quad \text{Copular Clause}
\end{align*}
\]

While in some languages the grammaticalization process appears to be complete, that is, the pronoun no longer functions as as anaphor in any environment, such as with shí in Mandarin Chinese, in other languages the pronoun has \textit{retained} an anaphoric function in \textit{addition to} the added copular function (see Pustet 2003:56). Modern Israeli Hebrew and all

varieties of Arabic that use the pronominal copula (Classical Arabic, Palestinian Arabic, Lebanese Arabic, etc.) belong to this latter group. So, too, does Biblical Hebrew.

Interestingly, there are two paths of grammaticalization. The first is the type we have been discussing, with the third-person pronoun, as in (31a-b) and the examples we have already presented.

(31) Anaphoric Pronoun ⇒ Copula

2 Kgs 19:15

יִשְׂרָאֵלָהוּ וּשְׁבֵּבָו יַכֵּרֵבִים אַתָּה מִדְּמַרִים לְבַדְּךָ לְכָלָּאַלֶּחָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל.

‘O Yhwh, God of Israel, sitting (between) the Cherubim – You(2MS) PRON.3MS/are the God(MS), you alone, for all the kingdoms of the earth.’

As with the Rabbinic Hebrew example in (19a), the 3MS pronoun אַתָּה in (31) does not agree with the 2MS subject pronoun אַתָּה.51

The second path of development for the copular pronoun is through the demonstrative pronouns. As (32) illustrates, the mechanism of the second path is the same as the first path—a LD construction in which the demonstrative pronoun is resumptive.

(32) Demonstrative ⇒ Copula (Diessel 1999: 147, modified)

[NP NP] / [NP [DEM, NP.]] ⇒ [NP COP. NP.]

Verbless Clause Casus Pendens Copula Clause

This type of demonstrative-copula does exist in BH, as in (33), but is rare.52

(33) הַאַתָּה Demonstrative ⇒ Copula

Genesis 27.21

הַאַתָּה אַתָּה בְּנֵי יֹשֵׁב אֵלֶּחָה

‘You DEM,MS/are my son Esau, or not?’ (i.e., ‘Are you my son Esau or not?’)

Why has Hebrew, or any other language, developed the copular use of the pronoun?53 In such languages, it appears that a “gap” is perceived in present tense equational and predicational clauses and the gap is often filled, even if partially. The mechanism by which the gap is filled is often through reanalysis and grammatical change, such as the path of grammaticalization that Li and Thompson observed (30). This explanation fits the Hebrew data well: the dislocated NP in a Left-Dislocation construction was reanalyzed as the

51 Lack of person agreement also occurs in modern Israeli pronominal copula clauses, e.g., ‘I am Mr. Joseph’, Rothstein 2001: 34-38; cf. Li and Thompson 1977: 430; Doron 1986: 326, n. 16)


53 The deeper question is why any language, including Hebrew, allowed ‘copula dropping’ in the first place (Pustet 2003:34; Stassen 2005).
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syntactic Subject and PRON as the copular element. And yet, as is often the case in grammaticalization, the old and new functions of PRON both remained active, producing superficially identical structures that were no doubt distinguished only by prosody and discourse context.

6. Conclusion
As we noted at the outset, not all scholars have accepted the copular analysis, even for just a few of the examples, and this non-copular approach has carried the day for the last decade or two. For example, in his 1999 study Muraoka denies the copular use of PRON in any stage of Hebrew out of principle:

I doubt that one can prove the existence of the copula in any Semitic language. The notion undoubtedly originated with Indo-European languages in which a nominal clause without a copula in the present tense is virtually nonexistent. Classical Syriac ... can hardly be said to possess such a copula, as Goldenberg and I argued. Even a heavily Europeanized language such as Modern Hebrew does not appear to us to use הוהי as a genuine copula fully comparable to its Indo-European namesake. (1999:199; see also Joünon-Muraoka 1993:§154i-j)

Muraoka appears to be reacting to nineteenth and early twentieth-century copular analyses that relied too heavily on comparison with Indo-European languages. In the context of typological studies of and (non-Euro-centric) definitions for non-verbal copular elements, his principled objection is not justified. Similarly, Goldenberg’s (2005, 2006; so also Joosten 1991, 2006) arguments against the existence of any copula in Hebrew (or Syriac) reflects a Eurocentric definition of copular items. Goldenberg’s position is supported by his specific analysis of a predication syntax and his view that the verbal inflectional suffixes as syntactic subjects—while this is at least a principled and theory-driven analysis, it is not one that we find compelling.

Arguing for either a dislocation or a copular analysis of all tripartite verbless clauses, to the exclusion of the other analysis, reflects a lack of sensitivity to the discourse context of

---

54 It is possible that the reanalysis was actually motivated by the grammar: the development of a copular pronoun may reflect a ‘last resort’ process by which the tense-semantic interpretation of a certain predication type is “saved” from ambiguity. See Naudé 2002 for a last-resort analysis of PRON in Qumran Hebrew tripartite verbless clauses.

55 Taking the inflectional suffixes as syntactic constituents, as Goldenberg does, rather than agreement features forces one to propose that the presence of an NP or pronoun that appears to be the syntactic subject is actually a sort of syntactic dislocation (without the pragmatic effects). Not only does this lack economy and elegance, it necessarily leads to highly implausible syntax when a real dislocation is used: there would be two dislocated elements (the real dislocation and the syntactic subject) in a chain outside of the core clause, in every clause with an overt subject NP.
many examples and an ignorance of the cross-linguistic research on copulas and copular items. For this issue, the best account is not an “either-or” but a ‘both-and’.

Appendix A: Dislocation Examples
For each example listed below, a good discourse-sensitive argument can be made that the pronoun in the “tripartite” structure should be read as the resumptive pronoun in a dislocation.


"Modern Hebrew Language: A Cross-linguistic and Rhetorical Analysis" by Holmstedt and Jones

22
The page contains Hebrew text with several verses from the Bible. Here is a translation:

"And you shall not go through the land of the Amalekites or any land of the Canaanites. You shall not seek peace from them or make a covenant with them, that you may be unclean if you make a covenant with them. You shall not seek their peace or their wealth for them." (Deuteronomy 20:17)

"Joshua, the son of Nun, is not less than a prophet. The Lord your God says, "Not one of them shall be left."" (Joshua 11:10)

"Joshua said to the people, "You shall not be afraid of them, for the Lord your God is going to fight for you."" (Joshua 5:1)

"The Lord is with you, you shall not be afraid of him or tremble before him." (Joshua 1:9)

"Joshua answered the people, "Fear them not, for the Lord your God is going to fight for you."" (Joshua 11:6)

"And the Lord said to Joshua, "This day I have delivered the Amorites and their kings into your hand; have you treated them like the Canaanites?"" (Joshua 10:13)

"And the Lord said to Joshua, "Fear them not, for I have delivered them into your hand. They shall not be able to stand before you, they will flee before you."" (Joshua 10:8)

The page also contains references to other passages: Num 19:15, Num 21:26, Deut 4:24, Josh 5:15, Josh 6:19, Josh 11:10, 1 Sam 17:14, 2 Sam 12:21, 2 Sam 22:31, 2 Sam 23:18, 1 Kings 18:24, 1 Kings 20:3, 1 Kings 20:31, 2 Kings 7:9.
וּקְשֵׁי לֵב חִזְקֵי מֵצַח יִשְׂרָאֵל כִּי אֲשֶׁר וְהָיָ֥תָו וְאֲשֶׁר יְדֵיהֶ֑ם אֲשֶׁ֤ר רָאִיתִי יֵלֵֽכוּ׃

קָדְשֵׁי קָדְשֵׁי וְהַמִּנְחָה לְמוֹשָׁב בְּרֹאשׁ כָּל־בֹּשֶׂם וְזָהָ֔ב הַנֶּ֥פֶש כְּנֶ֧פֶשׁ תָּמֽוּת׃

הָאָב הַחֹטֵ֖את מִ֠נִּית מַעֲרָבֵךְ׃ נָתְנ֖וּ בְּכָרִ֤ים בָּם וְעַתּוּדִ֔ים עַמּוֹ וְצֹ֣אן׃

הֽוּא הָיָ֑ה כְָבָר הִ֖יא גַּם־זֶ֖ה הֵ֣נָּה הַבָּשָׂ֖ר וּכְלֵ֣י נְחֹ֔שֶׁת אֲלָפִ֜ים חֲמֵשֶׁת ר֙וּחַ הַגִּזְרָה֒ נְאֻם־יְהוָ֔ה הַזֶּ֤ה חַגַּ֜י לֹ֤א אֵלֶ֔יךָ אֹבִ֖ים אֵלָ֑י׃

ס וְס֖וּר מֵרָ֣ע מַשְׁחִֽית תִּלְדֵֽה׃


אֵלֶ֔יךָ אֵלָ֑י אָבִ֖ים אֵלָ֑י שִׂ֭נְאָה וּ אָח יְהוָ֨ה רוּחַ הָעֹלָ֥ה שִׂנְאָה וּ אָח יְהוָ֨ה רוּחַ הָעֹלָ֥ה שִׂנְאָה וּ אָח יְהוָ֨ה רוּחַ הָעֹלָ֥ה שִׂנְאָה וּ אָח יְהוָ֨ה רוּחַ הָעֹלָ֥ה שִׂנְאָה וּ אָח יְהוָ֨ה רוּחַ הָעֹלָ֥ה שִׂנְאָה וּ אָח יְהוָ֨ה רוּחַ הָעֹלָ֥ה שִׂנְאָה וּ אָח יְהוָ֨ה רוּחַ הָעֹלָ֥ה שִׂנְאָה וּ אָח יְהוָ֨ה רוּחַ הָעֹלָ֥ה שִׂנְאָה וּ אָח יְהוָ֨ה רוּחַ הָעֹלָ֥ה שִׂנְאָה וּ אָח יְהוָ֨ה רוּחַ הָעֹלָ֥ה שִׂנְאָה וּ אָח יְהוָ֨ה רוּחַ הָעֹלָ֥ה שִׂנְאָה וּ אָח יְהוָ֨ה רוּחַ הָעֹלָ֥ה שִׂנְאָה וּ אָח יְהוָ֨ה רוּחַ הָעֹלָ֥ה שִׂנְאָה וּ אָח יְהוָ֨ה רוּחַ הָעֹלָ֥ה שִׂנְאָה וּ אָח יְהוָ֨ה רוּחַ הָעֹלָ֥ה שִׂנְאָה וּ אָח יְהוָ֨ה רוּح
Appendix B: Copular Examples

The examples listed below contain all the elements of the “tripartite” structure and make the best contextual sense as pronominal copulas. We were deliberately generous in reading in favor of the dislocation analysis (see Appendix A) or isolating ambiguous examples (see Appendix C) so that this resulting list of copular examples would reflect a “best case” corpus. Only when no other analysis made good contextual sense did we identify an example as copular. It is thus quite likely that readers who work through the contexts of the examples listed in Appendices A and C would add a number to this copular list.
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כִּי־אַתָּה מִשְׁפְּחֹת לְבַדְּךָ עָשִׂיתָ אַתָּה וּרְאוּ בְּתֹךְ בְּנֵי הָֽאֱלֹהִ֔ים לֹא־יִשָּׂא אֱלֹהֵ֣י הַגָּדֹ֤ל הַשָּׁמַ֜יִם وְכָל־אֲשֶׁ֤ר وְכָל־צְבָאָ֗ם הָאֱלֹהִ֗ים אֵלַ֖יعار אַבְרָהָֽם׃ וְשַׂ֥מְתָּ מֵאוּר הֵ֖ם אלהים כַּאֲשֶׁ֥ר הָאָ֑רֶץ אלהים לָהֶם׃ דִּבֶּ֥ר כַּאֲשֶׁ֖ר הַיִּצְהָרִ֔י וְלִקְהָ֗ת הַֽעַמְרָמִי וּמִשְׁפַּ֙חַת וּמִשְׁפַּ֙חַת יְהוָ֤ה הָאָ֔רֶץ לָהֶם׃ וְאַתָּ֖ה וּצְבָ֥א מִשְׁתַּחֲוִֽים:

נַחֲלָת֔וֹ יָת֖וֹם לֶחֶם מִשְׁפַּ֥ט גֵּר פָנִ֔ים وְאַלְמָנָ֑ה ל֖וֹ נַחֲלָתָ֔ם מִמי כָּל־עַמִּים כִּ֣י סֶֽלָה׃ וְעִ֥יר מִן־הַלְוִיִּ֔ם אֲחֻזָּת֖וֹ يִגְאַל מִמֶּ֗נּוּ וּמֹֽשְׁלוֹ֙ אֵלָ֑י

בַּמִּדְבָּֽר הַקְּהָתִֽי יִשְׂרָאֵֽל

זֹּאת לֹא־יִהְיֶה־לּ֖וֹ אֶחָ֑יו אַתָּ֣ה לֹא־יִהְיֶה־לּ֖וֹ אֶחָ֑יו שֶׁאָֽרַי הַבָּשָֽׂר׃

בְּקֶ֣רֶב לֹא־יִֽהְיֶה־לּ֖וֹ אֶחָ֑יו שֶׁאָֽרַי הַבָּשָֽׂר׃

אֱלֹהֵ֤י אֵ֧לֶּה הוּא יִשְׂרָאֵֽל 모ֹעֲדֵי אֶל־בְּנֵ֤י אֲשֶׁר־תִּקְרְא֥וּ ה֤וּא עִם־הַבָּשָֽׂר׃

תְּדַבֵּר כַּאֲשֶׁ֖ר הַיִּצְהָרִֽי וְלִקְהָ֗ת הַֽעַמְרָמִי וּמִשְׁפַּ֙חַת וּמִשְׁפַּ֙חַת יְהוָ֤ה הָאָ֔רֶץ לָהֶם׃ וְעִיר מִן־הַלְוִיִּ֔ם אֲחֻזָּת֖וֹ יִגְאַל מִמֶּ֗נּוּ וּמֹֽשְׁלוֹ֙ אֵלָ֑י

בַּמִּדְבָּֽר הַקְּהָתִֽי יִשְׂרָאֵֽל

זֹּאת לֹא־יִהְיֶה־לּ֖וֹ אֶחָ֑יו אַתָּ֣ה לֹא־יִהְיֶה־לּ֖וֹ אֶחָ֑יו שֶׁאָֽרַי הַבָּשָֽׂר׃

בְּקֶ֣רֶב לֹא־יִֽהְיֶה־לּ֖וֹ אֶחָ֑יו שֶׁאָֽרַי הַבָּשָֽׂר׃

אֱלֹהֵ֤י אֵ֧לֶּה הוּא יִשְׂרָאֵֽל 모ֹעֲדֵי אֶל־בְּנֵ֤י אֲשֶׁר־תִּקְרְא֥וּ ה֤וּא עִם־הַבָּשָֽׂר׃

תְּדַבֵּר כַּאֲשֶׁ֖ר הַיִּצְהָרִֽי וְלִקְהָ֗ת הַֽעַמְרָמִי וּמִשְׁפַּ֙חַת וּמִשְׁפַּ֙חַת יְהוָ֤ה הָאָ֔רֶץ לָהֶם׃ וְעִיר מִן־הַלְוִיִּ֔ם אֲчֻזָּת֖וֹ יִגְאַל מִמֶּ֗נּוּ וּמֹֽשְׁלוֹ֙ אֵלָ֑י

בַּמִּדְבָּֽר הַקְּהָתִֽי יִשְׂרָאֵֽל

זֹּאת לֹא־יִהְיֶה־לּ֖וֹ אֶחָ֑יו אַתָּ֣ה לֹא־יִהְיֶה־לּ֖וֹ אֶחָ֑יו שֶׁאָֽרַי הַבָּשָֽׂר׃

בְּקֶ֣רֶב לֹא־יִֽהְיֶה־לּ֖וֹ אֶחָ֑יו שֶׁאָֽרַי הַבָּשָֽׂר׃

אֱלֹהֵ֤י אֵ֧לֶּה יַצִּילֵ֔נוּ הָאֱלֹהִ֥ים מִי אוֹי יְהוָ֨ה צְבָא֜וֹת יח 27

Lam 1:18

בָּשָׂר: ס

Neh 9:6

הַשָּׁמַ֖יִם אֲשֶׁר־יְתַקְּרֵאֵ֣ם יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל אֲשֶׁר־יְתַקְּרֵאֵ֣ם יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל מַמְלְכ֣וֹת אַתָּה־אַתָּה כַּאֲשֶׁר יְתַקְּרֵאֵ֣ם יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל אֲשֶׁר־יְתַקְּרֵאֵ֣ם יִשְׂרָאֵ֖ל כָּל־עַמִּים כִּי מִי יָתֶר־פָּנִ֖ים אֶת־הַשָּׁמַ֕יִם פ

Neh 9:7

1 Chr 3:1

1 Chr 8:6
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Appendix C: Ambiguous Examples
The examples listed below contain all the elements of the “tripartite” structure. However, the discourse context suggests that either a dislocation or copartite analysis is felicitous and so for clarity these examples are not included in either appendix above.

One example presents unique interpretive difficulties: Lev 20:21. The lack of agreement between the 3fs pronoun את (an example of the perpetual Qere in the Torah) and the syntactic subject/dislocation אש is unexpected. It is possible that the feminine singular pronoun points to the antecedent as the abstract event ‘a man taking his brother’s wife’ that is described in the relative clause rather than the masculine singular head of the relative clause itself.

Lev 20:21; Deut 4:35, 39; 7:9; Josh 2:11; 1 Kgs 8:60; 18:39 (2x); Eccl 1:9 (2x); 1:17; Dan 8:21; 2 Chr 33:13.
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