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1. Introduction

As with many issues in Biblical Hebrew (BH) grammar, the phenomenon of apposition appears to be fairly well understood in the main. Apposition is typically defined as the modification of one noun phrase (NP₁) by a second noun phrase (NP₂), without any morphological or syntactic signal such as cliticization (i.e., the so-called construct state), and such that the two NPs could be reformulated into a well-formed equative predication (i.e., NP₁ is NP₂). However, both the diversity of examples presented in descriptions of BH apposition and the lack of consensus concerning the structure of apposition (and even its legitimacy as a distinct syntactic relation) signal that apposition is a much more complicated and layered grammatical phenomenon than commonly thought. Our goal in this study is first to move towards a clearer linguistic description of apposition, and in the process establish the salient issues and indicate questions for future study.

2. Brief Overview of Past Analyses

Grammarians have long noted the juxtaposition of one NP with another for the purposes of modifying the first NP. Gesenius includes a brief but substantive discussion of apposition in his 1817 grammar, though, strangely, it was abbreviated to one paragraph until Kautzsch’s revisions. In fact, it is not until the end of the nineteenth century that apposition receives more than passing attention by any Hebrew grammarian. For the purposes of the present study, we will not survey past treatments, but use the treatment in the commonly used grammar by Joüon and Muraoka (second edition, 2006), as a reference point.

The discussion of apposition in Joüon and Muraoka (2006, second edition) is similar to the earlier works, especially Kautzsch 1909. Their approach is essentially taxonomic with occasional appeals to historical features (i.e., features no longer apparent in BH) or comparative Semitic data. This approach is immediately apparent in the first paragraph, where

*This paper is a component of a monograph that we are writing on apposition in Biblical Hebrew.
they define apposition as the juxtaposition of two NPs, but also categorize it as “coordination” in contrast to the subordination involved when an NP is modified by another NP “in the genitive or attribute accusative” (449). In fact, they later claim that at a previous stage of the language, when Hebrew still had morphological case, an appositive NP “may originally have been an attributive accusative.” How this explains BH synchronically or adequately describes apposition in BH is unclear to us.

Semantically, Joüon and Muraoka characterize the semantics of apposition as “a relationship of identity or equation” and then proceed to provide a taxonomy of appositional relationships by semantic type, though the identification of these types as linguistically relevant is never justified. In quick summary, their categories (with examples) are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. NP(_1)(genus)-NP(_2)(species)</td>
<td>בְּתוּלָה נַﬠֲרָה ‘a young woman, a virgin’ &gt; ‘a virgin young woman’ (Deut 22:23);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. NP(_1)-NP(_2)(quality)</td>
<td>אֱמֶת אֱמָרִים ‘words, truth’ &gt; ‘true words’ (Prov 22:21);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. NP(_1)-NP(_2)(material)</td>
<td>הקומתָה הָיָהשָׁה ‘the altar, the bronze’ &gt; ‘the bronze altar’ (2 Kgs 16:14);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. NP(_1)(quantifier)-NP(_2)(entity)</td>
<td>כָּסֶף כּכְּרַיִם ‘talents [dual], silver’ &gt; ‘two silver talents’ (1 Kgs 16:24);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. NP(_1)-NP(_2)(numeral)</td>
<td>עַרְיִים שְׁלֹשִׁים ‘cities, three’ &gt; ‘three cities’ (Josh 21:32);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. NP(_1)(quantifier)-NP(_2)</td>
<td>שלשׁ עַרְיִים ‘three, sons’ &gt; ‘three sons’ (Gen 6:10);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. NP-PN</td>
<td>הָנָהָר פְּרָת ‘the river, Euphrates’ &gt; ‘the Euphrates River’ (1 Chr 5:9);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. NP(kinship)-PN</td>
<td>אָבִי אֵלָה ‘my father, Abraham’ (Gen 32:10);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. PN-NP(kinship)</td>
<td>תַרְחָא אָבִי ‘Terah, his father’ (Gen 11:28);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. PN-NP(office/occupation/title)</td>
<td>דָוִד הַמֶּלֶך ‘David, the king’ (2 Sam 13:39);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. NP-Quantifier+Pronoun</td>
<td>יֵשׁוֹעַ כָּלַע ‘Israel, all of it’ &gt; ‘all of Israel’ (2 Sam 2:9);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. “Loose Apposition”</td>
<td>עַרְיִים סֵחֲרָה חוֹמָה דַּלָּתִים בָּרֹת ‘fortified cities: a high wall, gates, and a bar’ (Deut 3:5);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Pronominal Suffix-NP</td>
<td>הָﬠֵמֶק יֹשֶׁבֶת אֵלָיִךְ הִנְנִי ‘dweller of the valley’ (Jer 21:13).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the data illustrate quite well that apposition is a flexible and
productive noun modification strategy, it is unlikely that there are thirteen (or more\(^1\)) distinct semantic categories that are linguistically operative. Even among those listed, it is unclear how \#4 and \#6 are really different. Similarly, the notion of “loose apposition” misses the point that this use of apposition is specific to list-making. In the end, the principle of parsimony requires that we at least look for deeper connections that would result in significantly fewer types and that the type of taxonomic approach illustrated by Joüon and Muraoka 2006 is questionably helpful for determining the principles of BH grammar.

Moreover, there are inaccuracies in Joüon and Muraoka’s description. For example, they assert that a preposition or the differential object marker (DOM)\(^2\) אֶת is repeated on the appositive (450). They also claim, without qualification, that in the case of NP cliticization (the so-called construct), “the nomen regens is repeated,” such as in אַנְשֵׁי הָﬠִיר אַנְשֵׁי סָדֹם ‘men of the city, men of Sodom’ (Gen 19:4). This also is inaccurate, since there are many examples like Gen 20:18 אַבְרָהָֽם׃ אֵ֥שֶׁת־שָׂרָ֖הﬠַל־דְּבַ֥ר ‘because of the matter of Sarah, the wife of Abraham’ (not: ‘because of the matter of Sarah, the matter of the wife of Abraham’).

3. Canonical Apposition–Towards a Linguistic Description

A. Classifying the Data

The variety of examples presented in the BH literature suggests that apposition in BH is a rather broadly understood and fuzzily-delineated grammatical notion. It should comfort us that this state of the question is not unique to BH studies. Indeed, providing a unified definition of apposition such that the wide variety of structures in English or any other commonly studied language are accounted for has proven to be an elusive task for linguists of all types. In a recent study, Acuña-Fariña writes:

A panoramic view of the theories of apposition reveals the liberality that is needed if one aims at covering such a heterogeneous range of structures. Thus, apposition has been seen as a juxtaposition of coreferential NPs (Fries 1952; Roberts 1966; Bogacki 1973), as a dependency structure (Poutsma 1904; Curme 1947; Hadlich 1973), as coordination (Hockett 1958; Allerton

\(^1\)We do not list Joüon and Muraoka’s paragraphs in which they discuss proper nouns that are bound (§131n) or the divine name (§131o).

\(^2\)Although the particle אֶת is often referred to as a “definite direct object marker” or even the accusative marker (nota accusativi), it is better understood as a “differential object marker” (see Bekins 2014).
1979; Brown & Miller 1980), or as a third kind of syntactic relationship defined in various ways, but different from coordination and subordination (Hockett 1955; Sopher 1971; Delorme & Dougherty 1972; Bitea 1977; Koktová 1985; Taylor 2002: 235ff.). More recently, a few gradative approaches have aimed at illustrating a spectrum which exhibits features of both coordination and dependency, as well as of sheer peripherality (Matthews 1981; Quirk et al. 1985; Meyer 1992; Burton-Roberts 1993; Taylor 2002: 235ff.). This is partly in keeping with yet more approaches which seek to reveal the true nature of apposition by invoking several concurrent levels of description. For instance, Dupont (1985) considers apposition to be coordination at a deeper level, but dependency at the surface. Some have made the point that apposition is not a syntactic notion at all (Zemb 1968; Longrée 1987; Peterson 1999; to a certain extent also Burton-Roberts 1993; Huddleston & Pullum 2002; Ackema & Neeleman 2004; Acuña-Fariña 2006). It appears that the concept is not only simply overstretched, but surely ill-conceived from the start. (2009:454)

Whether or not one takes apposition to be a distinct syntactic relationship or a cover term for a variety of different syntactic relationships, there is something about these examples that suggests a commonality—and to be clear, the diversity of BH examples is sufficiently paralleled by the wide variety of English examples given in, for example, A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language by Quirk et al (1985). In the following overview of “core” apposition types in BH, we tentatively follow the main distinctions and combinations described in Quirk et al 1985, though we find it more helpful to refer to the components of the construction as the anchor for the first constituent, the appositive for the second constituent, and apposition for the whole (see Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 1351).

Quirk et al introduce three pairs of contrasts to account for the diversity of apposition types: full vs. partial, strict vs. weak, and restrictive vs. nonrestrictive. Full apposition fulfills three conditions: (i) either the anchor or the appositive can be omitted without affecting the acceptability of the clause; (ii) each constituent fulfills the same syntactic function in the resulting clauses; (iii) there is no difference between the original clause with apposition and the two resulting clauses in extralinguistic reference. Thus, a BH example of full apposition exists in Gen 20:2, given in example (1)—note that we will indicate the anchor by single underlining and the appositive by double underlining.
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In the context, removing either the anchor or the appositive does not affect the acceptability or intelligibility of the discourse referent, and both have the same syntactic function—the complement of the preposition אֶל, which is a verbal adjunct in the clause. In contrast, partial apposition fails by one or more of these criteria. This especially occurs when a numeral is the anchor, such as in Gen 7:12, given in (2)—note that an asterisk * marks an unacceptable example:

(2) לָֽיְלָה׃ וְאַרְבָּﬠִ֖ים י֔וֹם אַרְבָּﬠִ֣ים יַעַל־הָאָ֑רֶץ הַגֶּ֖שֶׁם וַֽ יְהִי *'and the rain was upon the earth forty day(s) and forty night(s)’
   > *the rain was upon the earth forty
   > *the rain was upon the earth day

Neither the numeral without the entity quantified nor vice versa produces an acceptable clause. The distinction between full and partial reflects to a significant degree one part of the traditional approach to apposition. Whereas Sarah and his wife may produce an acceptable predication, Sarah is his wife, a numeral and noun do not, *forty are day.

The strict versus weak apposition contrast concerns the syntactic categories that are in apposition. In strict apposition, the two constituents are of the same syntactic category. This is by far the case in most BH examples, as in (3):

(3) נַפְתָּלִי מִמַּטֵּה הוּא אַלְמָנָה בֶּן־אִשָּׁה *‘a son of a woman, a widow, was he, from the tribe of Naphtali’
   (1 Kgs 7:14)

However, there are rare cases that are arguably weak apposition, such as in example (4), where the NP anchor is modified by an adjective appositive that is clearly not in a typical adjectival phrase:

(4) אֶת־יְחִֽידְךָ אֶת־בִּנְךָ קַח־נָ֠א וַיֹּ֡אמֶר *‘and he said, “take your son, your only”’ (Gen 22:2)
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Whether or not we conclude that the example in (4) is weak apposition, aside from the apposition of a clause to the adverb כי (e.g., 2 Sam 24:10), cases like this are indeed rare in BH. So much so that we should question whether proposed examples like (5), cited by Kautzsch (1909:447), and (6), cited by van der Merwe, Naudé, and Kroeze (1999:229), are in fact apposition.

(5) והנה בכל לאישה עמה זאכלי
‘and she gave also to her husband (who was) with her and he ate’
(Gen 3.6)

(6) כְּדֵיָהוּ לַ fram in וּמִרְכָּבָה אָדָם טָמִים
‘and indeed, (he) is coming to you and four hundred men (are) with him’ (Gen 32:7)

As my translations suggest, both examples can be given far simpler analyses, grounded in frequently attested grammatical structures. Thus, it seems that for BH we can concern ourselves almost exclusively with strict apposition.

The third distinction that Quirk et al make is restrictive versus nonrestrictive. Restrictiveness in apposition revolves around the type of presupposition set that is created for the proper identification of the anchor. In restrictive apposition (RA), the anchor introduces a presupposition of a set of possible referents, some of which can be specified by the appositive and some of which cannot. In nonrestrictive apposition (NRA), the anchor also establishes a set of possible referents, but it is the anchor alone that makes the particular referent specific and identifiable. In contrast, in RA, the anchor alone does not render the intended referent identifiable; the appositive is needed to make the referent specific and identifiable. The simplest contrasts in BH are appositions with numerals, illustrated in (7) and (8):

(7) וַיִּלָּוֵד אֶת־יָפֶת אֶת־חָם אֶת־שֵׁם בָּנִים שלושה נוֹחַ
‘and Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth’ (Gen 6:10)

(8) וַיִּתֵּן בָּנֹת אַרְבָּﬠָה בָּנִים לְהֵימָן הָאֱלֹהִים
‘and God gave to Heman sons, fourteen, and daughters, three’ (1 Chr 25:5)

Numerals often appear in apposition in BH, sometimes as the anchor and
sometimes as the appositive.\textsuperscript{3} We interpret apposition where the numeral is the anchor as RA (as in 7), because (a) the clause is not normally interpretable without the appositive and (b) similar constructions missing the appositive are not attested. In contrast, those appositions in which the count noun is the anchor and the numeral is the appositive appear to be NRA, since the host clause will normally be interpretable without the appositive numeral (as in 8).

In terms of the semantics, in (7) the appositive בָּנִים restricts the meaning of the anchor, the numeral שְׁלֹשָׁה, entailing a contrast between “three sons” and some others sets of three (such as three daughters). The two examples in (8) entail no such contrasts (Huddleston and Pullam 2002: 447) and the anchors בָּנוֹת and בָּנָה, are identifiable without the numerical qualification.

Although the formal syntactic characteristics of RA are debated, it is generally agreed that in the standard nominal RA, the appositive is within the scope of the governing anchor NP (or DP), as the tree diagram in (9) illustrates (de Vries 2002: 211).

\begin{align*}
(9) \quad & \text{NP} \\
& \text{N} \\
& \text{three} \\
& \text{DP} \\
& \text{sons}
\end{align*}

The standard NRA has a different structure, and theories on the nature of this structure vary significantly (see De Vries 2002: 204-10). Whatever the specific analysis, the commonality is that the NRA is understood to stand outside of the scope of its anchor. The conservative approach is to take the NRA as an adjunct or modifier of the NP (or DP), that is, not within the NP but adjoined to it (Potts 2005: 151), as in (10).

\textsuperscript{3}Numerals differ from adjectives in BH because (a) adjectives always follow their head nouns, but numerals may precede or follow their modified noun; and (b) numerals in BH are not inflected for number, marking them as morphologically distinct from adjectives, which are inflected for number. However, they are similar to adjectives in that they are inflected for gender in relation to their head nouns (according to a complex system). For more details on the syntax of numerals, cf. Kautzsch 1909:§134; Joüon and Muraoka 2006:§142; and Waltke and O’Connor 1990:§15.
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It has also been proposed that the appositive is joined to its anchor as a coordinate phrase (CoordP), as in (11) (de Vries 2002: 212-13).

(10) NRA as NP Adjunction

It has also been proposed that the appositive is joined to its anchor as a coordinate phrase (CoordP), as in (11) (de Vries 2002: 212-13).

(11) NRA as coordination

We will take up the structural question and its implications for BH apposition in our monographic treatment. However, we will make a couple of important tie-ins to the coordination analysis as we discuss the BH data below.

For now, the salient point is that there is a structural distinction between RA and NRA. Why? Drawing a distinction between RA and NRA raises questions about many aspects of the traditional view of apposition. The relationships of the anchor and appositive to one another and to the rest of the clause are different for RA and NRA. The claim that the anchor and its appositive are “nouns or noun equivalents referring to the same person or thing” must be reconsidered in light of the observation that RA and NRA show different patterns regarding the syntactic categories of their constituents and the extent of co-referentiality required.4

In order to maintain some continuity with the traditional definition, yet account for the distinct characteristics of RA and NRA, apposition as we

---

4Note that de Vries’ analysis qualifies the traditional view that appositions are not joined together by a coordinating conjunction, because de Vries argues that they are joined together by a (often null) specifying coordinator

Holmstedt and Jones, Apposition
use it in this paper is a broad term that encompasses both RA and NRA. Apposition is an important and useful term in this respect because it enables one to discuss constructions such as those presented in (1)-(4) and (7)-(8) as somehow related. Limiting the term apposition to full or partial, strict or weak, or restrictive or nonrestrictive, even if they represent more than one syntactic structure, would cause us to miss insightful generalizations as well as leave un-labeled a significant set of constituent juxtapositions.5

Any given example of apposition combines all three of Quirk et al’s basic contrasts. Thus, consider again the examples in (1)-(4) and (7)-(8):

(1) יִֽאמֶר אֲחֹ֣תִי אֲשֶׁ֔ר אָמַ֖ר אֶל־שָׂרָ֑ם אֶֽל־אֶֽל־שָׂרָ֤ם אֶֽל־אֶֽל־אֶֽל־אֶֽל־אֶֽל־אֶֽל־אֶֽל־אֶֽל־אֶֽל־אֶֽל־אֶֽל׃

‘and Abraham said concerning Sarah, his wife, “She is my sister”’

(1 Kgs 7:14) = FULL, STRICT, NONRESTRICTIVE

(2) לָֽיְלָה׃ וְאַרְבָּﬠִ֖ים י֔וֹם אַרְבָּﬠִ֣יםﬠַל־הָאָ֑רֶץ הַגֶּ֖שֶׁם וַֽהֲֽיֹיִֽר יָֽהְיוּ׃

‘and the rain was upon the earth forty day(s) and forty night(s)’

(2) = PARTIAL, STRICT, RESTRICTIVE

(3) נַפְתָּלִ֗י מִמַּטֵּ֣ה הוּא אַלְמָנָ֨ה בֶּן־אִשָּׁה֩

’a son of a woman, a widow, was he, from the tribe of Naphtali’

(1 Chr 25:5) = FULL, STRICT, NONRESTRICTIVE

(4) אֶת־יְחִֽידְךָ אֶת־בִּנְךָ קַח־נָ֠א וַֽהֲֽיֹיִֽר

‘and he said, “take your son, your only”’ (Gen 22:2)

= PARTIAL, WEAK, NONRESTRICTIVE

(7) וַיּוֹלֶד וְאֶת־יָֽפֶת׃ אֶת־חָ֥ם אֶת־שֵׁם

‘and Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth’ (Gen 6:10)

= PARTIAL, STRICT, RESTRICTIVE

(8) וַיִּתֵּ֨ן וַיּוֹלֶד וַיָּשָׁרָו וַיַּשְׁלַ֥ש וַיָּשָׁר וַיִּתֵּ֨ן

‘and God gave to Heman sons, fourteen, and daughters, three’ (1

Chr 25:5) = FULL, STRICT, NONRESTRICTIVE

These representative data suggest that, besides cases in which numerals

5For an alternative view, see Acuña-Fariña (1999), who argues that the term apposition has been applied too broadly and has lost its usefulness.
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are the anchor, BH apposition is a mostly nonrestrictive noun modification strategy.

B. Semantic Categories

The next step is to consider the semantics of apposition—what kind of modification do appositives provide about their anchors? From our above survey of past analyses for BH apposition, it should be clear that grammarians have focused on the lexical information represented by the appositive, such as genus, material, quality, or quantity. But, while these categories may be interesting, they are fundamentally not about the semantics of appositional modification, that is, the semantics of the relationship between the anchor and the appositive.

For the less common RA, the semantics seem straightforward—the appositive specifies and identifies the particular referent of the anchor from among the membership set created by the anchor. Interestingly, the anchor and appositive in RA produce questionable predications, if we employ the traditional definition. For example, with the numeral example in (2), “forty is day(s)” is awkward at best.

In contrast to RAs, predication generally makes clear sense for the anchor and appositive in NRAs, such as “Sarah is his wife.” But NRA does not specify and identify the particular referent of the anchor. Rather, the data for NRA suggest a variety of semantic functions. In an attempt to capture and categorize the variety of ways that NRAs relate to their anchors, Quirk at al (1985: 1308) provide the scheme given in (12):

(12) Semantic Types of non-restrictive appositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Equivalence</td>
<td>‘or’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) appellation:</td>
<td>‘that is’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) identification:</td>
<td>‘namely’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) designation:</td>
<td>‘that is to say’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) reformulation:</td>
<td>‘in other words’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Attribution [specification]</td>
<td>‘being’ or ‘as you know’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to de Vries 2002, appositions of equivalence may be syndetic or asyndetic in English; i.e., the gloss may or may not be present. Keeping in mind the traditional notion that an appositive should be able to exist in a predicative relationship with the anchor, note Stassen’ (1997: 101-13) two forms of predication: identification, where a predicate B is a “label” or “name” for an argument A, and specification, where B is an attribute or characteristic of A. Identification correlates with Quirk’s idea of equivalence, while Stassen’s specification correlates with Quirk’s idea of attribution.
C. Inclusion
   (i) exemplification: ‘for example’
   (ii) particularization: ‘especially’

What follows in the next section is a brief description of each of Quirk et al’s semantic types, illustrated with one or more BH examples of NRA apposition.

1. Equivalence: Appellation

Appellation is a “naming relation” where both constituents are definite and the appositive is usually a proper noun (Quirk et al. 1985: 1308). In English, that is may be inserted. A typical example, with יְהוֹאָשׁ as the anchor and the PN יְהוֹיָדָעַה the appositive, is given in (13).

(13) וְלַכֹּ֣הֲנִ֔ים הַכֹּהֵן֙ לִיהוֹיָדָ֤ע יְהוֹאָ֜שׁ הַמֶּ֨לֶךְ וַיִּקְרָא֩ ’and the king, (that is,) Jehoash, summoned Jehoiada the priest and the (other) priests’ (2 Kgs 12:8)

Appellation, especially in the cases with a definite NP like יְהוֹאָשׁ, may also be a more specialized title formula, similar to “King Jehoash,” in which the anchor is capitalized when written (see Meyer 1992: 47-48, where such appositions are called “pseudo-titles”).

2. Equivalence: Identification

In identification NRAs, the anchor is an NP, usually indefinite, although not necessarily, while the appositive is more specific. In these examples, (14)-(16), namely can be inserted. Note that in these constructions it is possible for an indefinite anchor to be paired with a definite appositive, as in (14), which contradicts Waltke and O’Connor’s claim about apposition that the “all its parts agree in definiteness and reference” (1990:227).

(14)ﬠֵינַ֖ יִם מְכַלּ֥וֹת וְאֶת־הַקַּדַּ֔חַת אֶת־הַשַּׁחֶ֣פֶת בֶּֽהָלָה֙ﬠֲלֵיכֶ֤ם וְהִפְקַדְתִּ֨י נָ֑פֶשׁ וּמְדִיבֹ֣ת
‘and I shall impose upon you a terror, (namely,) the consumption and the fever that bring eyes to an end and make life pine away’ (Lev 26:16)
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‘and I shall avenge the blood of my servants, (namely,) the prophets, and the blood of all the servants of Yhwh from the hand of Jezebel’ (2 Kgs 9:7)

‘Hear the word of the great king, (namely,) the king of Assyria’ (2 Kgs 18:28)

A particularly interesting example of identification is the common construction in which a singular subject (which has agreement with a singular verb) is the anchor for a plural appositive that includes a resumptive pronoun. In example (17), אברם, the anchor, represents himself, his wife, his possessions, and even his nephew, and the appositive identifies more fully what the anchor really entails in this particular activity or event.

‘and Abram went up from Egypt, (namely,) he and his wife and all that was his, and Lot (who was) with him, to the Negev’ (Gen 13:1)

Note that the anchor and appositive are often separated by other constituents, such as the locative PP ממצרים.

3. Equivalence: Designation

In the designation type of apposition, the anchor is more specific than the appositive; therefore “namely” cannot be inserted. Examples (18) and (19), which are common appositions, are arguably NRAs of designation.

‘and they abandoned all of the commandments of Yhwh, their God.’ (2 Kgs 17:16)

‘and Joram, the king, returned to heal in Jezreel from the wounds that the Arameans gave him at Ramah’ (2 Kgs 8:29)

Cf. Waltke and O’Connor 1990:§16.3.2.c for many other examples. Lev 14:6 and 2Kgs 11:2 contain such appositions with objects rather than subjects. These are sometimes interpreted as reduced clauses (small clauses).
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4. Equivalence: Reformulation

In an apposition of reformulation, the appositive is a rewording of the anchor, as in (20).

(20) שֶׁ֚בַע יְמֵ֙י וְהָי֣וּ פְּﬠָמִ֑ים שֶׁ֣בַע שָׁנִ֖ים שֶׁ֚בַע לְךָ֗ וְסָפַרְתָּ֣ו שָׁנָֽה׃

‘and you shall count off seven sabbaths of years, seven times, so that the seven sabbaths of years will be for you forty nine years’ (Lev 25:8)

The reformulation in (20) is literal, but reformulation can also be metaphorical, as in (21), where staggering is a metaphorical reformulation of wine; here the important property of wine is that staggering is one of its effects.

(21) תַּרְﬠֵלָֽה׃ יַ֣ יִן הִשְׁקִיתָ֗נוּ

‘you caused us to drink wine, staggering’ (Ps 60:5)

5. Attribution

In NP appositions of equivalence, either the anchor or the appositive could be omitted and the resulting sentence would be an entailment of the original (Huddleston and Pullam 2002: 447). Hence, the traditional definition of apposition only concerns appositions of equivalence. In contrast, in an apposition of attribution, the appositive is not equivalent to the anchor; instead, it modifies or describes it. In example (21), the anchor is a referential NP and one of the following appositives is indefinite and non-referential (see Quirk et al. 1985: 1313):

(22) מִצְרִ֔י אִ֣ישׁ הַטַּבָּחִים֙ שַׂ֤ר פַּרְעֹ֜ה סְרִ֨יס פוֹטִיפַר֩ וַיִּקְנֵ֡הוּ

‘and Potiphar, the official of Pharaoh, the captain of the guard, a man, an Egyptian, bought him’ (Gen 39:1)

Example (22) is rare, however, and almost all other attributive appositions

8Based on the translation, it might seem that staggering could be taken as a verbal modifier for the verb drink; but in the Hebrew there is no verb drink. If there were an English equivalent for feed with regard to beverages, this would produce a better translation, corresponding to You fed us wine, staggering. For commentary on alternative interpretations of this phrase, see Kautzsch 1909:§131c.
we found have both an indefinite anchor and an indefinite appositive, as in (23).

and you shall offer with the bread seven spotless lambs, year-olds’ (Lev 23:18)

In BH an appositive can also be used to indicate the material of which something consists, such as נְחֹשֶׁת in (24), חֹשֶׁן in (25), and עֻגֽוֹת in (26).

and the singers, Heman, Asaph, and Ethan, on cymbals (of) bronze to make sound’ (1 Chr 15:19)

and they put the two cords (of) the gold on the two rings on the edges of the breast-piece’ (Exod 39:17)

quickly fetch three seahs (of) flour, finely milled flour, knead (it), and make cakes’ (Gen 18:6)

Some appositions of attribution have an intensifying function. The appositive alters the sense of the anchor by strengthening it, qualitatively or quantitatively. The most common examples of this are with NP repetition, as in (27):

and the censers and the bowls, which were gold gold and silver, the captain of the guard took’ (2 Kgs 25:15)

The intensifying apposition of attribution with the metals in (27) suggests

More examples of appositive of material can be found in Kautzsch (1909:§127h, 131d). Other common constructions of this form include a number as an anchor followed by the object numbered in apposition (cf. Kautzsch 1909:§97a, §134b); and a period of time and its composition, e.g., a month, days (= a month of days = a whole month).

In (26), the appositive flour, finely milled flour is probably also itself an apposition. It could be an apposition of designation (flour, that is to say, finely milled flour) or particularization (flour, especially finely milled flour). See also the discussion below for (34).
“pure gold” and “pure silver”. However, this also occurs with non-material NPs, such as גֵּבִים in (28):

(28) אמר הָאָמָר יְהוָה עָשָׂה חַזְקָה נְתִינָה | גֵּבִים

‘and he said, “Thus said Yhwh: Make this ravine (into) ditches, ditches” (2 Kgs 3:16)

In (28), the apposition of the same NP suggests an intensifying of type (i.e., deep ditches) or number (i.e., abundant ditches). Less common, but clearly a type of intensifying apposition, is the juxtaposition of two VPs. This mostly occurs in poetry, as (29) and (30), though it also occasionally appears in prose, as with the passive participles in (31):

(29) בַּת־צִיּוֹן בְּתוּלַת לְךָ לָﬠֲגָה לְךָ בָּזָה

‘Virgin daughter Zion despises you, derides you’ (2 Kgs 19:21)

(30) אָרֶץ אֻמְלָלה אָבַל

‘(The) land mourns, languishes’ (Isa 33:9)

(31) יִשְׂרָאֵל בְּנֵי מִתּוֹךְ לִי הַמָּה נְתֻנִים נְתֻנִים כִּי

‘because given, given [> totally given] were they for me from the midst of the children of Israel’ (Num 8:16)

6. Inclusion

The final semantic relationship for apposition is inclusion. In inclusion, the appositive is an example of the anchor—one specific instance of it. The example can be representative, a paradigm case, in which case Quirk et al (1985) refer to the relationship as particularization, marked in English by words and phrases such as especially, in particular, mainly, and mostly; or it can be an example that is not necessarily representative, which they refer to as exemplification, marked in English by for example or say.

11Note that (29) is an interesting example of the cliticization of a noun (i.e., the so-called construct relationship) with apposition-like semantics; the expected English translation, Zion’s daughter, does not convey the proper sense; daughter Zion is what is meant.

12Example (30) is cited by Avishur (1971: 72). The first verb, אָבַל, is inflected for masculine gender, thereby disagreeing with the feminine gender of אָרֶץ, the expected subject. However, taking אָרֶץ as the subject seems to be the only coherent option.

13There is overlap between this category and the “appositive of species” referenced in the standard grammars (Kautzsch 1909:§131b; Joüon and Muraoka 2006:§131b).
Several constructions that appear to be apposition of inclusion occur in BH, though they are not without complications. Consider example (32):

(32) סтопָּרֶֽף׃ בָּאֵ֖שׁ מְחַלֶּ֔לֶת הִ֣יא אֶת־אָבִ֙יהָ֙ לִזְנ֑וֹת תֵחֵ֖ל כִּ֥י כֹּהֵ֔ן אִ֣ישׁ וּבַת

‘and a daughter of a man, a priest — when she defiles (herself) by committing fornication, she profanes her father; she shall be burned in the fire’ (Lev 21:9)

This appears to be a straightforward example of partial strict restrictive apposition—the NPs אישׁ and כֹּהֵן are of the same category (strict), but do not produce contextually acceptable statements if the appositive is omitted (partial, restrictive). That is, the point of the verse is about a particular type daughter, a priest’s, not any man’s daughter. However, אישׁ and כֹּהֵן produce an awkward non-specific equative predication, “a man is a priest.” כֹּהֵן is a restrictive modifier, this cannot be apposition of inclusion, which is by definition NRA. Since such examples seem to have the semantics of inclusion, in that the appositive particularizes the anchor, but are also restrictive, it may be that they are not appositions at all, but unmarked relative clauses, “a man (who is) a priest.”

Often the data that are candidates for appositions of inclusion present such ambiguity—are they appositives or relatives? We provide two more for illustration in (33) and (34):

(33) יִקָּ֑ח לֹ֣א אֶת־אֵ֖לֶּה זֹנָ֔ה וַחֲלָלָ֣ה וּגְרוּשָׁה֙ אַלְמָנָ֤ה

‘a widow or a divorcée or a deflowered woman (who is /, for example,) a prostitute’ (Lev 21:14)

(34) (=26)ﬠֻגֽוֹת׃ וַﬠֲשִׂ֥י ל֖וּשִׁי סֹ֔לֶת קֶ֣מַח סְאִים֙ שְׁלֹ֤שׁ מַהֲרִ֞י

‘quickly fetch three seahs (of) flour, (which is /, especially) finely milled flour, knead (it), and make cakes’ (Gen 18:6)

Example (33) may be a restrictive relative (“a deflowered woman who is a prostitute”) or a NRA with the sense of exemplification (“a deflowered woman, such as a prostitute”). This may even be an apposition of equivalence—the choice depends largely on the author’s cultural presuppositions. Example (34) may be a restrictive relative (“flour that is finely milled flour”) or a NRA with the sense of particularization (“flour, especially finely milled flour”).

We can reach no clear conclusion regarding the presence of appositives of

14Though כֹּהֵן has the participial form, we take it as an agentive noun.
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inclusion in BH. Furthermore, as we noted with כֹּהֵן אִישׁ, the semantics of inclusion cannot be convincingly construed as predication. Perhaps “a deflowered woman is a prostitute” makes some sense, but less so “a man is a priest,” and less than this, the equation of קֶמַח and סֹלֶת, “flour is finely milled flour”. The purported appositives in these examples do not merely specify the nature of their anchors, but rather provide a more complex type of information about them, placing them on the margins of apposition, if not something else, such as a relative clause.

7. Summary

NP apposition is sometimes considered to be limited to the semantics of identification or equivalence, where the anchor and the appositive are co-referential and either can be left out of the sentence. This kind of apposition is frequent in BH, but unlike English, attributive appositions also occur frequently. For this reason it is better to describe NP apposition in BH as a phenomenon of predication rather than one of identification or equivalence. The concept of predication includes identification and equivalence, but is a broader category that permits an appositive to describe, characterize, or specify its anchor as any predicate might do.

4. Non-Nominal BH Apposition

Although canonical apposition is considered to be a noun modification strategy, the evidence adduced in the reference grammars, as well as the VP apposition we gave above in (29)-(31) and below in (35), suggest that non-nominal constituents may also be juxtaposed and so parallel NP apposition.

(35) סָﬠַד־ﬠָפָֽר׃ לָאָ֖רֶץ הִגִּ֥יעַ הִשְׁפִּ֛יל הֵשַׁ֥ח חוֹמֹתֶ֗יךָ מִשְׂגַּ֣ב וּמִבְצַ֞ר

וּמִבְצַ֥ר 'and the fortress of the stronghold of your walls he has thrown down, he has brought low, he has thrown to the ground, to the dirt' (Isa 25:12)

In fact, if NRA is a specifying type of coordination, a proposal we briefly mentioned for the tree diagram in (11), then there is no inherent reason to limit NRA to nominal categories.15 PPs in particular are frequently used in ways that are difficult to distinguish from nominal NRA, in both BH and

15Cf. also Demirdache (1991:117), who argues that “any maximal projection can serve as the head of an appositive.”
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English. In BH, we found the following prepositions governing both the anchor and appositive: אֶל (36), את (37), ב (38), מ (39), על (40), and the DOM את (41).

משתמשים בכללים לאלים והעם אל־ישראל׃ (36)
‘I anoint you as king over the people of Yhwh, over Israel’ (2 Kgs 9:6)

ועשה חנורה לא אתו ואתים אַשְׁוּר אשֶר (37)
‘and now make a wager with my lord, with the king of Assyria’ (2 Kgs 18:23)

וַיֹּאמֶר בֵּירְשֵׁלָם וַיִּקָּבֵר וַיִּשְׁלֹהוּ (38)
‘and he was buried in Jerusalem with his fathers, in the city of David’ (2 Kgs 14:20)

וַיִּקְרֶב וַיֵּקְשֶׁת מִקְסַמְתָּו וְלֹא נִמְשָׁל וּלְמֵשֶׁל אָסְר אָסְר (39)
‘and he shall raise some of it in his hand, some of the flour of the grain offering and some of its oil and all the frankincense that is on the grain offering’ (Lev 6:8)

וַיִּקְרֶב וַיֵּקְשֶׁת מִקְסַמְתָּו וְלֹא נִמְשָׁל וְהַשֶּׁמֶן וּמִיַּרְתָּו וּלְמֵשֶׁל אָסְר (40)
‘and some the remainder of the oil that is on his hand, the priest shall put on the lobe of the right ear of the one being cleansed and on the thumb of his right hand and on the big toe of his right foot on top of the blood of the guilt offering’ (Lev 14:17)

וַיֹּאמֶר וַיָּקָם אֲתָר אֱלֹהי אֹתָךְ (41)
‘and he said, “take your son, your only”’ (Gen 22:2)

When examples like these are mentioned in the reference grammars, they are analyzed as nominal appositions of the complements of the prepositions (Waltke and O’Connor 1990:232, §12.3.f). That is, they are discussed in terms of whether the preposition or DOM on the anchor is

---

[16]Example (36) could also be understood in terms of right dislocation, since the complement of the first preposition is a pronoun. However, it seems more likely that this pronoun refers to the מִנְחָה, the food offering, mentioned in the preceding clause, than to the appositive.
repeated or omitted on the appositive. However, this analysis does not address the syntactic position of the second preposition—how can the second PP be taken as a nominal appositive? Rather than attempting to maintain an unmotivated theoretical restriction that anchors and appositives must be NPs, it is more logical and grounded in the data to accept the constituents as they appear—when an anchor is an NP, it is nominal apposition, when the anchor is a PP, it is non-nominal apposition. This follows from both Quirk et al.’s “weak” type as well as the proposal that NRA is a specifying coordination.

5. Extraposited Apposition

In his linguistic study of relativization, de Vries (2002: 235) suggests that any construction that can be divided into two parts can be extraposited under certain conditions. De Vries does not discuss conditions on the extraposition of appositives, but rather focuses on the extraposition of restrictive relative clauses. We have not seen any clear cases of an extraposited restrictive appositive in BH, but extraposition of an NRA is common, and this would be expected if de Vries’ analysis is correct. Some examples of extraposited appositives in BH follow in (42)-(46).

(42) אֲשֶׁ֥ר הַסֵּ֔פֶר כָּל־דִּבְרֵ֣י אֵ֚ת וְﬠַל־יֹֽשְׁבָ֑יו הַזֶּ֖ה אֶל־הַמָּק֥וֹם רָﬠָ֛ה מֵבִ֥יא הִנְנִ֨י יְהוּדָֽה׃
‘look, I am bringing an evil to this place and on its inhabitants, all the words of the book that the king of Judah has read’ (2 Kgs 22:16)

(43) הַיְבָרֵךְ֮ … וְיִצְחָ֔ק אַבְרָהָ֣ם לְפָנָיו֙ אֲבֹתַ֤י הִתְהַלְּכ֨וּ אֲשֶׁר֩ וַהָֽאֱלֹהִ֡ים אֶת־הַנְּﬠָרִים֒
‘the God that my fathers walked before him, Abraham and Isaac shall bless the boys’ (Gen 48:15-16)

(44) וְשָׂרֵ֣י חֲמִשִּׁ֔ים וְשָׂרֵ֤י מֵא֗וֹת וְשָׂרֵ֣י אֲלָפִ֜ים שָׂרֵ֨יﬠֲלֵיכֶ֑ם רָאשִׁ֖ים אֹתָ֛ם וָאֶתֵּ֥ן לְשִׁבְטֵיכֶֽם׃
‘and I will make them heads over you, leaders of thousands and leaders of hundreds and leaders of fifties and leaders of tens, and officials for your tribes’ (Deut 1:15)

(45) מַלְכ֖וּת מְדִינָ֔ה וּמֵא֙וֹת وְﬠֶשְׂרִ֤ים אֶל־שֶׁ֨בַע אֶל־כָּל־הַיְּהוּדִ֗ים סְפָרִ֜ים וַיִּשְׁלַ֨ח הָאֵ֜לֶּה הַפֻּרִ֨ים אֵת־יְמֵי֩ לְקַיֵּ֡ם וֶאֱמֶֽת׃
‘and he sent letters to all the Jews, to (the) 127 provinces, the
the kingdom of Xerxes — words of peace and truth — to establish these days of Purim’ (Esth 9:30-31)

כָּﬠֲנָ ֑קִֽים׃ וָרָ֖ם וְרַ֛ב גָּד֥וֹל עָמִ֖ים בָ֑הּ יָ֣שְׁבוּ לְפָנִ֖ים הָאֵמִ֥ים’

‘the Emim formerly dwelled in it [the land], a people great and numerous and tall like Anakim’ (Deut 2:10)

Thorion-Vardi (1987) coins the term “ultraposition” for extraposed apposition in BH and presents much important data for the topic. She proposes that two rules govern the extraposition of appositives in BH: (1) the subject and predicate must remain adjacent; and (2) the appositive cannot be inserted until the rest of the clause in which the anchor is found has been completed.17 The only exceptions to Thorion-Vardi’s second rule, that the rest of the clause must be completed before the appositive is inserted, involve clauses with two or more extraposed appositions. Thorion-Vardi identified two examples of this phenomenon in BH, and we add two examples from the data we have already presented:

(47) וֹכְּנָ֥ה בְּנֵי־רְאוּבֵֽן׃ וּבְנֵי־גָּד׃

‘and the sons of Reuben, the sons of Gad, and half of the tribe of Manasseh built there, an altar, by the Jordan, an altar great in (its) appearance’ (Josh 22:10)

(48) וְיִתְּנוּ לְבֵית כָּל־נְשִֽׂיאֵהֶם וְלֵבִ֣ית מַטֶּה מַטֶּ֣ה מֵאִיתָּם וְquences:

‘and take from them, a staff, for each ancestral house, from each of their leaders, for their fathers’ house, twelve staffs’ (Num 17:17)

(49) וְלֹֽא׃ אֲבָ֖כְּבֶֽרֶן מַטֶּ֣ה הָֽאָמָֽה וְלֵבָֽית מַטֶּה מַטֶּ֣ה מֵאִיתָּם מְעָמָֽה נְגַנְּבֶֽה׃

‘and Abram, went up from Egypt, (namely,) he and his wife and all that was his, and Lot (who was) with him, to the Negev’ (Gen 13:1)

17 However, an appositive cannot be extraposed outside of a subordinate clause within which it appears; for example, in (43) the appositive is only extraposed to the end of the relative clause within which it is contained.
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18 The order of the anchors is not necessarily the same as that of the appositives. Though they do appear in the same relative sequence in (45) and (50), that is not the case in (48). In example (48), appositives #2 (לְבֵית אֲבֹתָם) and #3 (מַטֶּהֶם) appear in reverse order from that of their respective anchors, מַטֶּה and אָב לְבֵית. Critically, if we take the Thorion-Vardi’s observation that extraposed appositions must be moved to the right-most edges of their clauses as a grammatical principle in BH, it actually guides our analysis of examples like  (49) and (50). While the locative phrase הַנֶּגְבָּה in (49) and the PP לְשִׁבְטֵיכֶם in (50) might in different contexts be taken as verbal adjuncts for וַיַּﬠַל and וָאֶתֵּן, here they must be extraposed apposites. Both הַנֶּגְבָּה and לְשִׁבְטֵיכֶם follow an extraposed apposition, which by Thorion-Vardi’s principle must be position at the end of its clause. This position for הַנֶּגְבָּה and לְשִׁבְטֵיכֶם indicates that they, too, must be extraposed apposites, modifying the anchors מִמִּצְרַיִם andﬠֲלֵיכֶם, respectively.

More evidence for the extraposition of NRA in BH comes from appositions with a pronominal or null anchor. On the surface it can be difficult to distinguish extraposition from right dislocation in cases where the anchor of the extraposition is a pronoun or is not phonologically present, because they have the same structure: in right-dislocation a pronoun appears in a clause, and a co-referential NP appears at the end of the clause. However, in some cases it is clear that the pronoun is not part of a right-dislocation construction because it refers to a clause-external entity. For example, lists with a “this is ...” introduction, where the demonstrative pronoun זה refers only to the subsequent list, should be

18The appearance of multiple extraposed appositives in the same clause is further evidence against taking such extraposed appositions as free-adjunct or right-dislocation structures (and for the latter, we add also the observation that dislocation overwhelmingly employs a coindexed, “resumptive” pronoun in the core clause, not a full NP).

19Thorion-Vardi (1987:58) groups the phrases differently in (48) and argues that the appositives occur in the same order as their respective anchors.

20We use the term right-dislocation to refer to cases where a NP appears at the right periphery of a clause and a pronoun appears in its expected position in the clause; see Holmstedt 2014b.
taken as right-dislocation (51); but pronouns that refer to a known entity from the preceding discourse should be taken as anchors in an apposition (52).

(51) המלך אשכול נהגיא אשכול מבית הָאֵפָה כָּלָה מְנָחָה תְמוּנָה בַּבֹּקֶר: ‘this is the offering of Aaron and his sons that they shall bring near to YHWH on the day of him being anointed (on the day when he is anointed): a tenth of an ephah of flour, (as) a regular offering; half of it in the morning and half of it in the evening’ (Lev 6:13)

(52) והנה המלך אשכול אשכולﬄי בְּיוֹם לַֽיהוָ֗ה אֲשֶׁר־יַקְרִ֣יבוּ וּבָנָ֜יו אהרן קָרְבַּן זֶ֡ה בָּﬠָֽרֶב׃ ‘and the priest shall take the lamb of the guilt offering and the log of oil, and the priest shall wave them, a wave offering before Yhwh’ (Lev 14:24)

Constructions like (52) can also occur with a null anchor, as in (53).

(53) והנה המלך אשכול אשכול frivolouslyזֶה הָנִיחֹחַ נִיחֹחַ לְיִהוֹ הַמִּזְבֵּחָה וְלָ קַ֧ח יְהוָֽה׃ ‘and the priest shall set aside from the grain offering its token offering and he will turn (it) into smoke (on) the altar, a fire-offering of an aroma of appeasement for Yhwh’ (Lev 2:9)

In (53), the final phrase stands in apposition to an implied (null) object, which is the offering described in the preceding clause: its memorial offering. It is technically possible that there is no null object and that the final appositive, a fire-offering of an aroma of appeasement for Yhwh, is actually the object of the second clause above. However, three factors argue against this reading. First, such a reading obscures the connection between the two clauses, which is clearer with an appositional reading. Second, such a reading is inconsistent with the typical pattern in the book of Leviticus, where several NPs beginning with אשכול (fire-offering) are clause-final and function as extraposed appositions to some preceding non-null NP. Third, and most importantly, there is an accent on המלךAshkali that marks pausal forms (a D0 accent—an atnakh). As Dresher has argued, a pausal form was used in Tiberian Hebrew at the right-boundary of an

intonation phrase (1994:11-14). The presence of the D0 accent in this unexpected position therefore provides good evidence that this is an extraposed NRA. There is no explanation for the atnah in this position if the final phrase is a the complement of the verb חっとך.\textsuperscript{23}

The above evidence demonstrates that several conditions exist under which NRA can be extraposed in BH, although it appears that restrictive appositives cannot be extraposed. This comports with the evidence of relative clauses (see Holmstedt, in press).

6. Apposition as a Type of Coordination

We have mentioned a number of pieces of evidence that we take in favor of the specifying coordination analysis promoted by de Vries 2002 and illustrated in (11). We will end with another set of data that we take to be strongly suggestive in this regard. Consider example (54)—in 2 Kgs 24:14, we have what would otherwise appear to be a clear case of an appositive of designation.

\begin{equation}
\text{\textit{ﬠֲשָׂ֥רָה הַחַ֗יִל כָּל־גִּבּוֹרֵ֣י | וְאֵ֣ת וְֽאֶת־כָּל־הַשָּׂרִ֞ים אֶת־כָּל־יְ֠רוּשָׁלִַם וְהִגְלָ֣ה דַּלַּ֥ת זוּלַ֖ת נִשְׁאַ֔ר לֹ֣א וְהַמַּסְגֵּ֑ר וְכָֽל־הֶחָרָ֖שׁ גּוֹלֶ֔ה אֲלָפִים}
\end{equation}

and he deported all Jerusalem, [and] all the officials and all the warriors (men of power)—ten thousand captives—and all the artisans and all the metalworkers. Nothing remained except the poor of the people of the land’ (2 Kgs 24:14)

The New Revised Standard Version leaves out all the conjunctions in its translation: “He carried away all Jerusalem, all the officials, all the warriors, ten thousand captives, all the artisans and the smiths. . .” The expected anchor is ירטיליש, and the expected appositive is what follows,

\textsuperscript{22}Some words, including המִזְבֵּחָה, do not have pausal forms, which makes the identification of intonation boundaries difficult. However, D0 accents unambiguously co-occur with pausal forms when pausal forms are possible. Only two D0 accents can appear in a verse; one appears on the final word of the verse, and the other is the atnah. Since there are no pausal forms in Lev 2:9, the only two intonation breaks marked occur at the end of the verse and after hammizbêhâ. This latter division, marked by atnah, would normally appear on the last word of the first clause in a verse containing two separate clauses, but in this verse the end of the first clause is marked with a D1 accent, which does not necessarily occur with a pausal form.

\textsuperscript{23}For similar use of the accents to guide the parsing of the Masoretic text, see Holmstedt 2014a.
but in the Hebrew, a conjunction intervenes between the two.\textsuperscript{24}

Here are two additional BH examples of NRA with a coordinating conjunction intervenes between the two.\textsuperscript{24}

Here are two additional BH examples of NRA with a coordinating conjunction intervenes between the two.\textsuperscript{24}

(55) גָּמָל אַרְבָּﬠִים מַשָּׂא דַּמֶּ֔שֶׂק וְכָל־טוּב בְיָדוֹ מִנְחָ֤ה וַיִּקַּ֨ח לִקְרָאתוֹחֲזָאֵל וַיֵּ֣לֶךְ 'and Hazael went to meet him, and he took a gift in his hand—

[and] all the best things of Damascus, a load of forty camels’

(2 Kgs 8:9)

(56) אֹתָם מִן־הַנַּ֡חַל׀ חַלֻּ קֵֽי־אֲבָנִ֣ים חֲמִשָּׁ֣ה וַיִּבְחַץ ל֣וֹ בְּיָד֗וֹ מַקְל֖ו וַיִּקַּ֨ח וּבַיַּלְק֖וּ אֲשֶׁ֣ר־ל֛וֹ הָרֹﬠִ֧ים בִּכְלִ֨י 'and he took his staff in his hand, and he chose for himself five smooth stones from the wadi, and he put them in the shepherd’s bag that was his, [and] in the shepherd’s pouch’ (1 Sam 17:40)\textsuperscript{25}

Within the framework of specifying coordination, it seems appropriate also to re-classify uses of Waltke and O’Connor’s “epexegetical waw” (1990:§39.2.4, §33.2.2) as NRA. Waltke and O’Connor classify the epexegetical waw as a conjunction that “may stand before clauses which serve to clarify or specify the sense of the preceding clause.” Since clauses connected by the epexegetical waw have the same structure as the NP and PP apposition we see in (52) and (53) and the semantics are similar, it seems plausible that the epexegetical waw also serves to connect a clausal (CP) appositive, as in (57)-(59). In such cases, the waw should not be translated as “and,” but either omitted altogether or with an appropriate English appositive marker, such as “that is to say” or “in other words” (see above, in [12]).\textsuperscript{26}

\textsuperscript{24}This clause also appears to contain an appositive nested within its anchor, although what anchor is intended for the phrase ten thousand captives is unclear. It may apply only to the warriors, but if it applies to all of the captives, it is nested within its anchor.

\textsuperscript{25}The meaning of הָלָךְ, “shepherd’s pouch,” in 1 Sam 17:40 is uncertain, but in the context, it makes more sense as a gloss of “shepherds’ bag” than as a name for a second, separate place where David put some of his five stones.

\textsuperscript{26}Besides the conjunction waw as a signal for apposition, Zewi (1999) has argued that the third person pronoun may sometimes function as a specifying coordinator (40-45). Examples are those like Gen 36:1 אֱדֽוֹם׃ ה֥וּאﬠֵשָׂ֖ו תֹּלְדוֹת וְאֵ֛לֶּה “This is the line of Esau—that is, Edom” (1999:44). However, we think that Zewi’s data are better interpreted either as the copular use of the pronoun or parentheses, depending on the structures. This does, however, highlight the close relationship of apposition to parenthesis; see Burton-Roberts 1994.
‘indeed, they are a nation lacking sense, [and] there is no understanding in them’ (Deut 32:28)

‘look, his wages are with him, [and] his reward is before him’ (Isa 40:10b)

‘was it not told to my master what I did when Jezebel killed the prophets of Yhwh [and] I hid 150 of the prophets of Yhwh, fifty in a cave, and I provided them (with) bread and water?’ (1 Kgs 18:13)

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, apposition is a complex, multivalent phenomenon with boundaries more blurry than it is usually given credit for. The limitations placed on apposition by the traditional definition do not hold consistently, and BH demonstrates this even more clearly than English. NRA in BH is best understood as broader “predicational” coordination due to its predicative, and especially attributive, uses as well as the extraposition of appositives and the use of the conjunction ו as an appositional signal. Issues that now remain to be investigated are the issue of definiteness agreement between the anchor and its appositive (Is it necessary? Are there patterns?); the use of the demonstrative as the anchor for an appositive (see Holmstedt 2014a for the time being); the nature of apposition in contrast to right-dislocation; and the relationship of apposition to poetic parallelism.
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