

## DISCOURSE PARTICLES IN BIBLICAL HEBREW DIRECTIVES

Alexey LYAVDANSKY

Russian State University for the Humanities

*andurar@gmail.com*

It is not a novelty that discourse structure may be significant to all levels of linguistic description, including phonology and morphology. Discourse analysis is no longer a marginal field of linguistic inquiry, restricted to the interest of small group of enthusiastic researchers. The phrase “discourse-oriented grammar” is a term which may be considered self-understood and even self-explainable. There are a number of grammatical phenomena that may be explored from the point of view of their function in text or discourse. The functions of discourse particles, as the term itself suggests, may be determined *only* as functions within a unit larger than clause. As is the case with wayyiqtol verb form in Biblical Hebrew, the meaning of some discourse particles should be interpreted in terms of a text/discourse type. While wayyiqtol is used almost exclusively in narrative discourse, the Biblical Hebrew particle  $(wə)ʕattā$  mostly appears within the directive utterances (turns) in dialogue. As it was shown earlier,  $(wə)ʕattā$  may certainly be included into the set of Biblical Hebrew discourse markers (particles)<sup>1</sup>. The analysis of  $(wə)ʕattā$  also revealed, that its function is tightly related to the structure of a turn in dialogue:  $(wə)ʕattā$  appears on the border between two discourse units (segments), characterized by different illocutions; it signals a rhetorical relation JUSTIFY<sup>2</sup> between two discourse units<sup>3</sup>. Thus, Biblical Hebrew directive utterances provide a slot for  $(wə)ʕattā$  by way of their discourse structure. The particle  $(wə)ʕattā$  is not the only one used in Biblical Hebrew directive utterances. In this paper I

focus on the discourse structure of Biblical Hebrew directives, which helps to determine functions of a number of Biblical Hebrew discourse particles.

### 1. Discourse particles in Biblical Hebrew

Some of the Biblical Hebrew discourse particles<sup>4</sup> have been treated in quite a number of studies. Most of these studies were generated before the advent of discourse analysis, which came to biblical studies later than it occurred in other fields. That sort of research is full of fruitful insights and useful observations<sup>5</sup>. Much more relevant for the present paper are studies undertaken from the perspective of discourse analysis and the related approaches (conversational analysis, discourse markers research)<sup>6</sup>. As a result of these studies the following list of Biblical Hebrew discourse particles may be adduced: *hen*, *hinne*, *wə-hinne*, *(wə-)<sup>ç</sup>attā*, *wə-hāyā*, *wa-yhi*, *ʔābāl*, *wə-/wa-*. This list may be expanded by an unknown number of items because it is yet to be determined what may count as a discourse particle in Biblical Hebrew. One would ask now: What is understood as a discourse particle in general linguistics? It may be argued that only recently a sort of scholarly consensus on this question has been attained<sup>7</sup>. Nevertheless, there is no certainty that this understanding will not change in the near future, since this field of study is still dynamic and productive. As concerns Biblical Hebrew, nobody as yet tried to answer the question: What is the range of discourse particles in Biblical Hebrew?

In my opinion, there are two main obstacles which prevent us to achieve more tangible results in this particular field. First, two different subfields should be strictly differentiated: 1) discourse particles in dialogue, or, practically speaking, in the direct discourse of Biblical Hebrew narrative; 2) discourse particles in narrative, notably in the narrator's speech. There is no need to defend the opinion that dialogue is the main source of discourse particles and the main subfield of their study. There are other genres and modes of speech in the Hebrew Bible (prophetic speech, liturgical poetry, proverbs and maxims), but, naturally, the usage of discourse particles in them should be described on the basis of a research within confines of the direct speech in narrative. Second, the exploration of discourse particles in Biblical Hebrew, as

in other languages, would be incomplete if it were done only within the frame of form-to function approach<sup>8</sup>, sometimes labeled semasiological approach. The meaning and function of these words cannot be correctly understood without the application of a function-to-form approach, sometimes labeled onomasiological approach. The reasoning from function to form considers all the contexts in which could potentially appear this or that discourse particle. Only this line of investigation may help to determine the proper place of a discourse particle in the system of a language, or understand its place within a set of linguistic expressions with similar functions. In other words, we need not only to explore all the possible usages of a discourse particle; we need to explore also all the possible slots which may be filled by a discourse particle or its synonym.

## 2. Directive utterances and their structure

As is the case with Biblical Hebrew  $(wə)^{\zeta}attā$ ,  $lāken$ , and probably  ${}^{\prime}epo$ , the usage of a discourse particle, at least in some cases, depends on the illocution of the following sentence (discourse unit). Thus,  $(wə)^{\zeta}attā$  usually appears before requests and commands (directives),  $lāken$  tends to be used mostly before God's promises of punishment (commissives), and  ${}^{\prime}epo$  in the majority of cases is placed before questions (interrogatives)<sup>9</sup>. Therefore one of the natural ways to explore the functions of discourse particles in dialogue would be to analyze the structure of utterances characterized by certain illocution.

The structure of directive utterances in Biblical Hebrew was discussed by J. F. Diehl, but his work is dedicated to the core imperative discourse acts within directive utterances<sup>10</sup>. In this paper I consider the structure of Biblical Hebrew directive utterances as turns in dialogue found in the biblical book of Judges. The preliminary research, made as a preparation for this paper, consisted of the following steps:

1) The direct speech throughout the whole Book of Judges was found and tagged with the labels of conversational analysis: the main task was to determine how many turns and interactions are in the dialogue within the book of Judges. The result of this tagging may be summarized as follows. The direct

speech in Judges comprises 243 turns. The significant part of the turns (100) are single, without an answering turn (f. e. a command without a reaction, as in Jud 1:10f). There are 52 “dialogues”, or “interactions”, consisting of several (from two to eight) turns.

2) All the dialogue turns in the Book of Judges were tagged by illocution tags. Naturally, this procedure is not unproblematic in some cases, especially in cases of indirect illocution. Nevertheless, the tentative results are the following: 94 directive turns, 24 interrogative turns, 18 assertives of different kinds (including exclamations, complaints, etc.), 11 promises (commissives). The rest of the turns are either complex turns, where it is not easy to determine which illocution is dominant, or uncertain cases, usually with indirect illocution<sup>11</sup>.

The main criterion for the directive is the presence of an imperative sentence, or a sentence with other volitive verb forms (cohortative, jussive). Some of the indirect illocutions, f. e. questions with a clear directive communicative purpose (Jud 15:18) were also included. The directive utterance is understood here in the widest sense of this term: “Directive utterances are those in which the speaker tries to get the addressee to perform some act or refrain from performing an act”<sup>12</sup>. This understanding implies that requests, commands, suggestions (proposals), supplications and some other similar utterances are included into directives.

Some of the directives are represented just by one clause or sentence. Within the discourse analysis it is more correct to speak in terms of discourse units, or discourse acts. Discourse acts may be defined as “the smallest identifiable units of communicative behaviour. In contrast to the higher order units called Moves, they do not necessarily further the communication in terms of approaching a conversational goal”<sup>13</sup>. In the following there are the examples of one-clause or one-act directive turns:

(1) *hālok hālākū hāʿešim limšoah ʿālehām mālāk wayyoməru lazzayit molkā ʿālenu*

The trees once went forth to anoint a king over them; and they said to the olive tree, “Reign over us”<sup>14</sup>. (Jud 9:8)

(2) *wayyišlah yišrāʾel malʾākim ʾäl mälāk ʾādom lemor*  
*ʾeʿbārā-nnā bəʾaršākā*

Israel then sent messengers to the king of Edom, saying,  
 “Let us pass, we pray, through your land”. (Jud 11:17)

(3) *wayyomār ləyātār bəkoro*  
*qum hārog ʾotām*

So he said to Jether his firstborn,  
 “Go kill them!” (Jud 8:20)

In the majority of the cases one-clause directive turns do not require a discourse particle to be felicitous requests, commands or the like. Note example (2), where a particle *nā* is placed after the verb. The status of *nā* as a discourse particle is not yet clear and it will be discussed below. The directive turn in (3) strictly speaking is comprised of two imperative clauses. Nevertheless the first verb *qum* should be considered as a dependent member of a serial verb construction. Therefore this two-clause utterance is analyzed as one discourse act. It is also important to note that often the second imperative in this kind of two-clause imperative sentences is connected by the coordinating conjunction *wə-*.

Most of the directive utterances have complex structure: they include a series of clauses with different communicative value. These directives very often welcome discourse particles, which serve as markers, or cues to the structure of these complex turns. Usually the core discourse act, represented by an imperative clause, or a chain of clauses<sup>15</sup>, is accompanied (followed or preceded) by a supportive discourse act<sup>16</sup>, represented by an assertive, or a commissive clause, or a chain of clauses (supportive clauses are italicized in the translation):

(4) *wayyirʾu haššomərim ʾiš yoše min hāʾir wayyoməru lo*  
*harʾenu nā ʾet məboʾ hāʾir wəʾāšinu ʿimməkā ḥāsād*

When the spies saw a man coming out of the city, they said to him,  
 “Show us the way into the city, *and we will deal kindly with you*”.  
 (Jud 1:24)

(5) wayyomär ʔālehām

ridpu ʔaḥāray *ki* nātan yhw ʔāt ʔoybekām ʔāt moʔāb bəyādkām

He said to them,

“Follow after me; *for the LORD has given your enemies the Moabites into your hand*”. (Jud 3:28)

(6) wayyišlah malʔākim ʔāl ʔābimäläk bətormā lemor

hinne gaʔal bān ʔābād wəʔaḥāw bā ʔim šəkāmā wəhinnām šārim ʔāt hāʔir ʔālākā  
*wəʔattā qum laylā ʔattā wəhāʔām ʔāšār ʔittāk wəʔārob baššādā*

He sent messengers to Abimelech at Arumah, saying,

“Look, Gaal son of Ebed and his kinsfolk have come to Shechem, and they are stirring up the city against you. Now therefore, go by night, you and the troops that are with you, and lie in wait in the fields”. (Jud 9:31f)

In (4) and (5) a supportive discourse act follows the core discourse act. In (6) the turn begins with the supportive assertive act, followed by the core imperative discourse act. In order to understand the role of supportive discourse acts in interaction let us remove them in (4–6). What is left, f. e. in (4) and (5), are imperative clauses, which may be used as felicitous commands or requests. The series of clauses which is introduced by the particle *wəʔattā* may count as an autonomous turn in dialogue, or a move, after removal of this particle<sup>17</sup>. It is obvious that the supportive discourse acts, which are italicized in (4–6), are important contributions to interaction: they provide different kinds of motivation for the request in (4) and for commands in (5) and (6). The complexity of the directive turns in dialogue is related to the fact that directives are typical representatives of face-threatening speech acts. In other words, they “threaten the addressee’s negative face, that is, the freedom of action and freedom from imposition”<sup>18</sup>. The supportive discourse acts help the addressee to “save” his face, to feel comfortable fulfilling a request or a command. The motivations, or reasons, are not the only strategies used to produce felicitous directives<sup>19</sup>. Supportive discourse acts are often included into utterances with non-directive illocution, see f. e. a promise in Jud 10:18.

For the purposes of the present paper it is important to observe how the supportive discourse acts are combined with the core discourse acts. Setting aside

some significant cohesive devices, f. e. anaphora, I will focus here on lexical cohesion. In all three above examples, clauses or a chain of clauses, constituting a supportive discourse act, are connected to the core discourse act by certain lexical items, which are boldfaced in the Hebrew text of the examples (4–6): a conjunction *wə-* (4), a causal particle *ki* (5), juxtaposed *wə-* and temporal deictic adverb *ʿattā*. Since we are dealing here not only with pure syntactic phenomena, but also with the discourse structure, which is relevant for the purposes of communication, it is reasonable to subsume these lexical connective devices under the term “discourse particles”. According to a number of studies, discourse particles are optional, i. e. they can be omitted. Some authors even argue for optionality as for one of the main characteristics of discourse particles<sup>20</sup>. The following passages demonstrate directive utterances in Biblical Hebrew with the supportive discourse act left unconnected to the core imperative discourse act:

(7) *wattomär dəlilā ʿäl šimšon*

*ʿad hennā hetaltā bi wattədabber ʿelay kəzābim haggidā lli bammā teʿāser*

Then Delilah said to Samson,

“Until now you have mocked me and told me lies; tell me how you could be bound”. (Jud 16:13)

(8) *watteše yāʿēl liqrat sisrā wattomär ʿelāw*

*surā ʿādoni surā ʿelay ʿal tirā*

Jael came out to meet Sisera, and said to him,

“Turn aside, my lord, turn aside to me; *have no fear*”. (Jud 4:18)

The dependant, or supportive nature of the imperative *ʿal tirā* “have no fear” is obvious: it does not constitute the main purpose of this utterance, because Jael does not want Sisera to have no fear, she wants him to enter the tent.

I refrain here from discussing problems related to the identification of directive utterances. Let me just adduce one example of an indirect request by way of series of assertive clauses:

(9) *wattebk ʿešāt šimšon ʿālāw wattomär*

*raq šənetani wəlo ʿāhəbtāni haḥidā ḥədtā libne ʿammi wəli lo higgədtā*

Samson's wife wept before him, saying,  
 "You hate me; you do not really love me. You have asked a riddle of my people, but you have not explained it to me". (Jud 14:16)

Here Dalila tries to force Samson to tell her the answer to the riddle with the help of assertives, supported by crying, – very effective "supportive" communicative strategy, used in requests by children and women. Whereas in this case the directive force of Dalila's assertives is clear, there are more problematic examples: Jud 15:1, 18:18.

### 3. Discourse particles as cues to the discourse structure of Biblical Hebrew directives

In the following I discuss several Biblical Hebrew lexemes and lexicalized phrases, which may be considered as discourse particles, relevant for the discourse structure of complex directive utterances. This is not intended to be an exhaustive treatment of this topic, taking into account the restricted corpus and the format of journal article. So, for example, I do not discuss here some interesting usages of the conjunction *wə-*, which deserve investigation on the broader textual basis<sup>21</sup>.

#### 3.1 *ki*

The subordinating conjunction *ki* poses numerous problems because of the wide variety of its meanings. There are many studies, including a monograph<sup>22</sup>, dedicated solely to the meaning and functions of this particle. The directive utterances in Judges provide quite a few occurrences of *ki*<sup>23</sup>. The particle *ki* may count as a discourse particle only in the cases, described above (§ 2). Naturally, the cases, where *ki* has the meaning of English 'that' (Jud 18:14), should be excluded from the discussion.

The function of *ki* in directives has been demonstrated by example (5), where it introduces a supportive discourse act. Let me adduce more examples of this usage of *ki* in directive utterances:

(10) *wattomär lo*

*håbå llî bəråkå ki ʔäräş hannägäb nətattåni wənåtattå li gullot måyim*

She said to him,

“Give me a present; *since* you have set me in the land of the Negeb, give me also Gulloth-mayim”. (Jud 1:15)

(11) *wayyomaru ʔanše hæʔir ʔål yoʔåš*

*hoše ʔät binkå wəyåmot ki nåtåš ʔät mizbaḥ habbaʔal wə ki kårat hæʔåšerå ʔåšår ʔålw*

Then the townspeople said to Joash,

“Bring out your son, so that he may die, *for* he has pulled down the altar of Baal and cut down the sacred pole beside it”. (Jud 6:30)

It is important to note, that causative *ki* in directives is different from *ki* in the speech of a narrator. Usually narrator’s *ki* clause has to do with a “logical cause of an event or circumstance”<sup>24</sup>, as in:

(12) *wayyešåb hæʔåšeri bæqåråb hakkənaʔåni yošåbe hæʔåråš ki lo horišo*

But the Asherites lived among the Canaanites, the inhabitants of the land; for they did not drive them out. (Jud 1:32)

The speaker, producing directive utterance in dialogue, means something else, when he (she) uses *ki*: he intends to demonstrate to the addressee that the phrase following *ki* is the reason, or motivation of his request as a speech act. These are totally different types of causal relations in text.

### 3.2 ʔaḥåre ʔåšår

The prepositional phrase, consisting of the preposition ʔaḥåre and the relative conjunction ʔåšår, is rather rare in Biblical Hebrew. It occurs eight times in the standard text of the Hebrew Bible: Deut 24:4; Josh 7:8, 9:16, 23:1, 24:20; Jud 11:36, 19:23; 2 Sam 19:31. Besides the direct speech in narrative (Josh 7:8, 24:20; Jud 11:36, 19:23; 2 Sam 19:31), it is also used in narrator’s speech (Josh 9:16, 23:1) and in the text of the law (Deut 24:4). In the narrator’s speech it clearly functions as a temporal conjunctive. The interpretation

of *ʔahāre ʔāšār* in dialogue is sometimes problematic, which is seen in the different renderings of this phrase by most authoritative translations: “after”, “since”, “seeing that”, “in spite of”, etc. Here are the two occurrences of *ʔahāre ʔāšār* in Judges, both utterances are directives with a supportive discourse act:

(13) *wattomer ʔelāw*

*ʔābi pāšitā ʔāt pikā ʔel yhwḥ ʕāše li kaʔāšār yāšā mippikā ʔahāre ʔāšār ʕāsā lākā yhwḥ nāqāmōt meʔoyābākā mibbāne ʕammon*

She said to him,

“My father, if you have opened your mouth to the LORD, do to me according to what has gone out of your mouth, now that the LORD has given you vengeance against your enemies, the Ammonites”. (Jud 11:36)

(14) *wayyeše ʔālehām ḥāʔiṣ baʕal habbayit wayyoʕmār ʔālehām*

*ʔal ʔahay ʔal tāreʔu nā ʔahāre ʔāšār bā ḥāʔiṣ hazzā ʔal beti ʔal taʕāšu ʔet hannābālā hazzot*

And the man, the master of the house, went out to them and said to them, “No, my brothers, do not act so wickedly. Since this man is my guest, do not do this vile thing”. (Jud 19:23)

The NRS translation of (13) shows, that the neutral, not expressly causative, interpretation of *ʔahāre ʔāšār* in this passage is not uncommon, cf. some other translations: TNK, EIN, LUT. On the other hand, the interpretation of this phrase as a causative particle is also widespread, f. e. in French translations TOB, BFC, English NJB and German HRD. Taking into account (14) and causative interpretation of *ʔahāre ʔāšār* in Deut 24:4 and in 2 Sam 19:31, the strong argument for the basic causative meaning of *ʔahāre ʔāšār* in dialogue may be advanced. The phrase *ʔahāre ʔāšār* in these contexts is synonymous with the main Biblical Hebrew causative particle *ki*, since it introduces the supportive discourse act, which functions as a motivation for the imperatives in (10) and (11). The only exception to the causative usage of *ʔahāre ʔāšār* in dialogue is Joshua 24:20, where *ʔahāre ʔāšār* marks the concessive relation between two discourse acts. This usage of *ʔahāre ʔāšār* may be compared to the concessive usages of *ki* (Isa 54:10; Jer 14:12)<sup>25</sup>.

### 3.3 (*wə*)*ʕattā*

The temporal deictic adverb *ʕattā* has two main functions, (1) temporal adverbial with the meaning “now”, (2) discursive, which is comparable to English *now*, when it is used as a discourse marker<sup>26</sup>. In most of the cases, where *ʕattā* is used as a discourse marker, it is collocated with the conjunction *wə*-. I have treated elsewhere the discursive function of *ʕattā* in comparison with the Aramaic and Akkadian temporal deictic adverbs used as discourse markers<sup>27</sup>. Probably the most salient feature of the discourse particle (*wə*)*ʕattā* is its position on the border between assertive utterance and directive utterance. Among the 24 usages of *ʕattā* in Judges 12 occurrences are in directives in the position described above, i. e. between assertive and directive. Four more cases of *ʕattā* are apparently discursive, non-adverbial, but not in directives: Jud 9:16; 11:23, 25; 13:12. Most of the discursive *ʕattā* in Judges are preceded by *wə*- and posited at the beginning of a clause; only three discursive *ʕattā* are used without preceding *wə*- (Jud 9:38; 13:12; 16:10), which corroborates the general observation about the correlation between *ʕattā* preceded by *wə*- and its discourse function.

The passage (6) above is a good example of discursive non-adverbial usage of (*wə*)*ʕattā*, which may be easily found in any other book within the Hebrew Bible. Here I will only discuss one problematic passage, whose interpretation is related to the problem of indirect illocution.

(15) *wayyišmā məʔod wayyiqrā ʔel yhwh wayyomār*  
*ʔattā nātattā bəyad ʔabdəkā ʔet hattəšivʔā haggədolā hazzot wəʕattā ʔāmut*  
*baššāmā wənāpalti bəyad hāʕārelim*

By then he was very thirsty, and he called on the LORD, saying,

“You have granted this great victory by the hand of your servant. Am I **now** to die of thirst, and fall into the hands of the uncircumcised?”  
 (Jud 15:18)

Samson’s utterance has no imperative or jussive forms, but there is no doubt that he formulates a request for water. The request is indirect, since it is expressed by means of a question. The first clause of Samson’s utterance is supportive: it helps him to formulate more persuasive and probably more miti-

gated request to compare with the bare “Am I to die of thirst and fall into the hands of the uncircumcised?” If we knew nothing about the functions of  ${}^{\text{c}}att\dot{a}$  in dialogue, we would not hesitate to consider its function here as undoubtedly adverbial, which is reflected in NRS translation. It is quite possible that Samson compares his present dire situation with the triumphant victory which happened just before, but does not coincide temporally with the very moment of request. On the other hand, the position of  $w\dot{a}{}^{\text{c}}att\dot{a}$  between assertive and indirect request suggest its interpretation as a discourse marker. If we accept this interpretation, the translation must be corrected: “You have granted this great victory by the hand of your servant. **Now**, am I to die of thirst, and fall into the hands of the uncircumcised?” It is also perfectly legitimate to suppose, that both functions of  $w\dot{a}{}^{\text{c}}att\dot{a}$  coincide in (15)<sup>28</sup>.

### 3.4 $n\dot{a}$

The particle  $n\dot{a}$  is used very often in requests; its most widespread position is after an imperative or cohortative verb, see (2). It is not quite clear that  $n\dot{a}$  may be considered as a discourse particle in modern understanding of this term. There is no doubt though, that  $n\dot{a}$  plays certain function in the communication and its meaning must be understood in terms of pragmatics. Recently  $n\dot{a}$  was treated as a politeness marker<sup>29</sup>, but the evidence is inconclusive. Here I will discuss only that usages of  $n\dot{a}$ , which may possibly be relevant for the structure of a turn in the dialogue. The usages at issue are the occurrences of non-initial  $n\dot{a}$ , i. e. when the imperative clause with  $n\dot{a}$  is preceded by an assertive clause. Among numerous cases of  $n\dot{a}$  in Judges only nine occur in that position: Jud 7:3; 9:38; 10:15; 13:4; 15:2; 16:10, 28; 19:9, 24. In four of these cases the imperative +  $n\dot{a}$  is preceded (Jud 7:3; 13:4; 16:10) or followed (Jud 9:38) by  $(w\dot{a}){}^{\text{c}}att\dot{a}$ , which probably reinforces its interpretation as a discourse marker, because particles with similar function may co-occur or form collocations. Here is one example of  $n\dot{a}$  in the typical slot for a connecting particle:

(16) *wayyomär*  ${}^{\text{c}}\dot{a}bih\dot{a}$

*{}^{\text{c}}\dot{a}mor*  ${}^{\text{c}}\dot{a}marti$  *ki* *š\dot{a}no* *š\dot{a}net\dot{a}* *w\dot{a}{}^{\text{c}}\dot{a}tt\dot{a}n\dot{a}* *nn\dot{a}* *l\dot{a}mere* ${}^{\text{c}}\dot{a}k\dot{a}$  *h\dot{a}lo*  ${}^{\text{c}}\dot{a}ho\dot{t}\dot{a}h$   
*haqq\dot{a}tann\dot{a}* *to\dot{b}\dot{a}* *mimmänn\dot{a}* *t\dot{a}hi*  **$n\dot{a}$**  *l\dot{a}k\dot{a}* *taht\dot{a}h\dot{a}*

Her father said,

“I was sure that you had rejected her; so I gave her to your companion.  
*Is not her younger sister prettier than she? Why not take her instead?*”  
 (Jud 15:2)

This utterance is complex in two respects. First, Samson’s father-in-law explains to Samson why he does not let him into the room of his daughter, Samson’s wife. Then, keeping the floor, he proceeds to complex directive, suggesting Samson another daughter as a wife. The supportive discourse act, introduced by *hālo*, is followed by jussive clause, which is obviously related in a certain way to the preceding clause: the jussive is formulated as a logical conclusion (inference) from “Is not your sister prettier than she?” In other words, Samson’s father-in-law justifies his proposal with the preceding rhetorical question. Since a discourse relation applies here, it is left to decide: is it lexically expressed in this directive utterance, or not? Taking into account previous treatments of *nā*, one may conclude that it does not express or cue any discourse relation. But, as was the case with *wəʿattā* in (15), the position of *nā* may nevertheless suggest its interpretation as a discourse marker, which in fact is attested in one of the authoritative French translations (TOB): “Prends-la **donc** à la place de l’autre!”<sup>30</sup>.

### 3.5 *hinne*

The particle *hinne* was considered as a discourse particle in a number of studies. Within the scope of directive utterances it belongs to the same group of particles as *ki*, *ʾaḥāre ʾāšār* and *hālo*. As opposed to *ki* and *ʾaḥāre ʾāšār*, it never appears after the core discourse act in the directive utterance. The following example demonstrates how it is most commonly used in directive turns:

(17) *wattomār dəlilā ʾāl šimšon*

***hinne*** *hetaltā bi wattədabber ʾelay kəzābim ʿattā haggidā nnā li bammā teʾāser*

Then Delilah said to Samson,

“You have mocked me and told me lies; please tell me how you could be bound”. (Jud 16:10)

It is interesting to compare (17) with (7), which is almost identical, since (7) is the same request by Dalila, repeated by her, when Samson refused to reveal her the secret of his force for the third time. I dare say that (17) is the most typical and in a sense neutral formulation of a request: the supportive discourse act is introduced by *hinne*, the core imperative discourse act is introduced by *ʿattâ*. In (17) Dalila is already losing her patience, which is reflected in the reproach, but she still keeps the conventional form of a request. In (7), being already furious with the stubborn Samson, she loses her temper and transforms some formal elements of her utterance: 1) neutral *hinne* is substituted by more forceful *ʿad hennâ*, 2) the particle *ʿattâ* is omitted as probably superfluous in the impatient utterance. Naturally, this interpretation must be tested on more examples, but the context of this episode in Samson’s story supports it.

### 3.6 *hălo*

According to the grammar of P. Joüon and T. Muraoka, the particle *hălo* is comparable in its usage with *hinne*<sup>31</sup>. As opposed to *hinne*, *hălo* within a directive utterance may introduce a supportive discourse act, which not only precedes the core imperative discourse act (Jud 9:38; 15:2), but also follows it (Jud 6:14). Here is an interesting example with two supportive discourse acts, following the core imperative clause:

(18) *wattomär dəborâ ʿel bārâq*  
*qum ki zā hayyom ʿăšār nātan yhw̄h ʿet sisrâ bəyādākâ hălo yhw̄h yācâ*  
*ləpānākâ*

Then Deborah said to Barak,

“Up! **For** this is the day on which the LORD has given Sisera into your hand. The LORD is **indeed** going out before you”. (Jud 4:14)

There are many ways to render a phrase with *hălo*: as interrogative clause, as a clause introduced by assertive particle or adverb (HRD: “Ja, der Herr zieht vor dir her”; TOB: “Oui, le SEIGNEUR est sorti devant toi”; NRS “indeed”); as a clause, introduced by a causative particle (L45: “denn der Herr wird vor dir herausziehen”). Apparently, the clause after *hălo* gives Barak additional

motivation to go to the battle. If it is true, the Luther's translation ("denn") is here closer to the sense than most of the other authoritative translations.

As far as the problem of indirect directives is concerned, there is a very interesting example of a request, expressed by means of an assertive, introduced by *hālo* (Jud 4:6). Or, following more traditional interpretation of *hālo*, it is a rhetorical question. The utterance itself consists of many clauses, but most of the clauses are subordinate to the core assertive/interrogative clause *hālo šiwwā yhwḥ ʔālohe yiśrāʔel* "The LORD, the God of Israel, commands you: ...". Since the notion of a command is included into the propositional content of the clause, the imperative clause may be omitted.

### 3.7 *raq*

The restrictive adverb *raq* is sometimes used in directive utterances, but not all its usages have a bearing on their discourse structure. There are several instances of *raq* within the Hebrew Bible, where it functions as a discourse particle, which introduces a supportive discourse act. One of such examples is found in the book of Exodus:

(19) *wayyomār parʿo*

*ʔānoki ʔāšallah ʔetkām uzəbaḥtām lyhwḥ ʔālohekām bammidbār **raq**  
harḥeq lo tarḥiqu lālakāt haʿtiru baʿādi*

So Pharaoh said,

"I will let you go to sacrifice to the LORD your God in the wilderness, provided you do not go very far away. Pray for me". (Exod 8:24)

There is a strong feeling that such usage of a restrictive adverb may be found in many languages: the clause after *raq* serves as a restriction to the permission, given by Pharaoh. The interpretation of the utterance as a whole is complicated by the presence of the last clause, which is a request. This interesting problem is out of the scope of the present paper. Let us consider the usages of *raq* in directives, which are found in the Book of Judges.

(20) *wayyomār Gidʿon ʔāl hāʔālohim*

*ʔal yiḥar ʔappəkā bi waʔādabbərā ʔ**ak** happāʿam ʔānassā nnā **raq** happāʿam*

*baggizzâ yâhi nâ horâb ʿel haggizzâ ləbaddâh wəʿal kol hâʿârâš yihyâ t̄tâl*  
Then Gideon said to God,

“Do not let your anger burn against me, let me speak one more time; let me, please, make trial with the fleece **just** once more; let it be dry only on the fleece, and on all the ground let there be dew”. (Jud 6:39)

The particle *raq* in this example is not hosted by a clause; its scope is only the adverb. Thus, *raq* in this example, strictly speaking, falls out of the present discussion. Nevertheless, it affects the perlocutionary effect of the directive utterance: *raq*, together with its synonym *ʿak*, is used here as a mitigating device.

(21) *wayyomär hâʿiš hazzâqen*  
*šâlom lâk **raq** kol maḥsorkâ ʿâlây **raq** bârəḥob ʿal tâlan*

The old man said,

“Peace be to you. I will care for all your wants; **only** do not spend the night in the square”. (Jud 19:20)

The core discourse act in this utterance is apparently *kol maḥsorkâ ʿâlây* “I will care for all your wants”, which is commissive (a promise). The directive here fulfills the role of a supportive act: it reinforces the main speech act of promise.

There is one more occurrence of *raq* in a directive utterance within Judges (Jud 14:16), but I now will refrain from interpreting this passage, which apparently has no clear connection to the theme of the paper. I have to conclude that *raq* in the Book of Judges is never used as a discourse particle within an utterance whose core discourse act is directive. Such examples exist in other books of the Hebrew Bible, but apparently this usage of *raq* is rather rare.

#### 4. Conclusion

In the above discussion, I tried to demonstrate various usages of discourse particles in Biblical Hebrew directive utterances (requests, commands etc.). It may be concluded that discourse particles are used extensively in BH directives. The analysis of directive utterances in the whole Book of Judges has proven to be fruitful in revealing important facts about the usage of Biblical Hebrew discourse particles. The list of discourse particles now may be expanded by *ki*, *ʔahāre ʔāšār*, *hālo* and *raq*. The fact that discourse relations, which are usually cued to by lexical items, may be left unmarked, is widely known, but finding such examples is obviously more difficult than studying the usage of a lexeme. Now it is possible to point out a number of directive utterances in Judges, where the discourse relations apply without any lexical marker. Further investigation on a wider textual basis will probably demonstrate more facts about the structure of directive utterances and the functions of discourse particles in it. Nevertheless, I believe that the presented observations constitute a significant step towards a possibly exhaustive treatment of discourse particles in Biblical Hebrew.

#### Abbreviations

BFC	La Bible en français courant
EIN	Einheitsübersetzung der Heiligen Schrift
GBH	Jouion P., Muraoka T. A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. Roma, 1991.
HRD	Die Herder Bibel
L45	Martin Luther, Biblia. Wittenberg, 1545
LUT	Lutherbibel 1984
NJB	New Jerusalem Bible
NRS	New Revised Standard Version
TNK	The TANAKH, a new translation (into contemporary English) of The Holy Scriptures according to the traditional Hebrew text (Masoretic)
TOB	Traduction Œcuménique de la Bible

<sup>1</sup> Lyavdansky A. Temporal Deictic Adverbs as Discourse Markers in Hebrew, Aramaic and Akkadian // *Journal of Language Relationship*. 2010. №3. P. 28. See also, in a slightly different formulation: Wagner A. *Sprechakte und Sprechaktanalyse im Alten Testament* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 253). Berlin, 1997.

<sup>2</sup> The term JUSTIFY belongs to the terminological inventory of Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST). See: Mann B., Thompson S. *Rhetorical Structure Theory: Toward a functional theory of text organization* // *Text*. 1988. № 8 (3). Pp. 243–281.

<sup>3</sup> Lyavdansky A. Temporal Deictic Adverbs as Discourse Markers in Hebrew, Aramaic and Akkadian. P. 28.

<sup>4</sup> The terms “discourse marker” and “discourse particle” in the modern research have almost the same meaning.

<sup>5</sup> See f. e.: Jenni. E. Zur Verwendung von ‘attā “jetzt” im Alten Testament // *Theologische Zeitschrift*. 1972. № 28. Pp. 5–12; Muilenberg J. The Linguistic and Rhetorical Usages of the Particle *ky* in the Old Testament // *HUCA*. 1961. № 32. Pp. 135–60; Jongeling B. *Laken dans l’Ancien Testament / Remembering All the Way... A Collection of Old Testament Studies Published on the Occasion of the Fortieth Anniversary of the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland* / Ed. by B. Albrekton et al. Leiden, 1981. Pp. 190–200.

<sup>6</sup> Garr W. R. *’bl in Biblical Hebrew and Beyond: Part I* // *Babel und Bibel*. 2005. № 2; Miller C. The Pragmatics of *waw* as a Discourse Marker in Biblical Hebrew Dialogue // *Zeitschrift für Althebraistics*. 1999. № 12, 2. Pp. 165–191; Van der Merwe Ch. H. J., Naudé J. A., Kroeze J. H. *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*. Sheffield, 1999.

<sup>7</sup> Schiffrin D. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge, 1987; Schourup L. *Discourse markers* // *Lingua*. 1999. № 107. Pp. 227–265; Fraser B. *Towards a Theory of Discourse Markers / Approaches to Discourse Particles* / Ed. by K. Fischer. Amsterdam, 2006.

<sup>8</sup> Most of the studies of Biblical Hebrew discourse particles pursue this line of investigation: they are usually dedicated to the meanings and functions of one certain linguistic form. They rarely consider the problems of synonymous expressions, or the competition between them.

<sup>9</sup> Lyavdansky A. *Inferential Markers in Biblical Hebrew*, presented in the Linguistics and Biblical Hebrew Section at the Society of Biblical Literature International Meeting, July 2007, Vienna. The inclusion of these three particles into the category of inferential markers will be argued in one of the future publications.

<sup>10</sup> Diehl J. F. *Die Fortführung des Imperativs im Biblischen Hebräisch (Altes Orient und Altes Testament 286)*. Münster, 2004.

<sup>11</sup> As to the reproaches, which are 7, I am as yet not sure to which category they should be ascribed.

<sup>12</sup> Kreidler Ch. *Introducing English Semantics*. London, 1998. P. 189.

<sup>13</sup> Kroon C. *Discourse Particles in Latin: A Study of nam, enim, autem, vero and at* // *Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology*. 1995. № 4. P. 65.

- <sup>14</sup> All the translations in the examples are according to New Revised Standard Version (NRS).
- <sup>15</sup> Clause combining in Biblical Hebrew in certain cases is treated as clause chaining: Longacre R. E. Sentences as combinations of clauses // Language typology and syntactic description. 1985. Vol. II: Complex constructions. P. 285, fn. 6.
- <sup>16</sup> My analysis and terminology is based on a model of discourse structure proposed by Kees Hengeveld and Lachlan Mackenzie: Hengeveld K, Mackenzie L. Functional Discourse Grammar: a typologically based theory of language structure. Oxford, 2008. I follow the terminology of K. Hengeveld and L. Mackenzie with only two exceptions: instead of the term “Subsidiary Discourse Act” I use the term “supportive discourse act”, and instead of the term “Nuclear Discourse Act” I use the term “core discourse act”.
- <sup>17</sup> Discourse particles are sometimes considered as autonomous linguistic expressions, not included into the sentence, but there are many authors who include these particles into the sentence, or the discourse segment: Fischer K. Introduction / Approaches to Discourse Particles. P. 8.
- <sup>18</sup> Kohnen T. Directives in Old English: Beyond politeness? / Speech acts in the history of English / Ed. by A. H. Jucker, I. Taavitsainen. Amsterdam, 2008. P. 27.
- <sup>19</sup> Redeker G. Coherence and structure in text and discourse / Abduction, Belief and Context in Dialogue. Studies in Computational Pragmatics / Ed. by W. Black and H. Bunt. Amsterdam, 2000. P. 14.
- <sup>20</sup> See f. e. Schourup L. Discourse markers.
- <sup>21</sup> Note the example (4), where *wə-* appears in a position typical for a discourse particle.
- <sup>22</sup> Follingstad C. M. Deictic Viewpoint in the Biblical Hebrew Text. Dallas, 2001.
- <sup>23</sup> There are 105 *ki* in Judges; among them 54 are in the direct speech, including 23 occurrences in the directives.
- <sup>24</sup> GBH. § 170 da.
- <sup>25</sup> GBH. § 171 b.
- <sup>26</sup> Aijmer K. Now may we have a word on this: the use of now as a discourse particle / Corpus linguistics: hard and soft / Ed. by M. Kyto. Amsterdam–Atlanta, 1988.
- <sup>27</sup> Lyavdansky A. Temporal Deictic Adverbs as Discourse Markers in Hebrew, Aramaic and Akkadian. Online source: [http://ivka.rsuh.ru/binary/79202\\_70.1300717498.03588.pdf](http://ivka.rsuh.ru/binary/79202_70.1300717498.03588.pdf). I do not give here references to the previous studies of *(wə)ʕattā*, which may be found in that article.
- <sup>28</sup> For another example of double-duty *(wə)ʕattā* and for references to analogous examples in other languages see: Lyavdansky A. Temporal Deictic Adverbs as Discourse Markers in Hebrew, Aramaic and Akkadian. P. 86.
- <sup>29</sup> Wilt T. A Sociolinguistic Analysis of *na'* // Vetus Testamentum. 1996. № 46. Pp. 237–55; Shulman A. The Particle *na'* in Biblical Hebrew Prose / Hebrew Studies. 1999. № 40. Pp. 57–82.
- <sup>30</sup> I admit, that the usage of *donc* in this translation may not be considered as a rendering of *nā*.
- <sup>31</sup> GBH. § 164 d.

### Abstract

Discourse particles in Biblical Hebrew are a relatively recent subject of study. It is yet to be determined, which linguistic expressions in Biblical Hebrew should be counted as discourse particles, or discourse markers. Moreover, the functions of already known discourse particles in Biblical Hebrew were not properly assessed. The present paper is focused on the functions of discourse particles in Biblical Hebrew directive utterances (requests, commands, suggestions, permissions). The study was carried out on the basis of the analysis of all directive utterances (directive turns in dialogue) within the biblical Book of Judges. Contrary to the previous studies of Biblical Hebrew discourse particles, the attention is drawn not only to the functioning of a certain particle (form-to-function approach), but the attempt is made to determine a slot, which may be filled with a particle or its synonym, or left unfilled (function-to-form approach). The functional slots for discourse particles are created by discourse structure of a turn in dialogue. Most of the directive utterances in dialogue are composed of the core discourse act(s), represented by imperative clause(s), and the supportive discourse act(s), usually represented by assertive clause(s). Discourse particles are put either before the core discourse act in the directive utterance, or before the supportive discourse act. The main part of the article is dedicated to the analysis of seven discourse particles used in Biblical Hebrew directive utterances: *ki*, *ʔaḥāre ʔāšār*, *(wə)ʕattā*, *nā*, *hinne*, *hālo*, and *raq*. The result of the study shows, that some of these particles may be grouped together as synonyms, because they are used in the same positions: *ki* and *ʔaḥāre ʔāšār*; *(wə)ʕattā* and *nā*; *hinne* and *hālo*. On the other hand, they are not absolute synonyms, which is exemplified by the contrastive analysis of *ki* and *ʔaḥāre ʔāšār*. Since the particle *raq* is used rarely as a discourse marker, the examples in the Book of Judges are not sufficient to formulate even a preliminary conclusion. The status of *nā* as a discourse particle is not yet clear; the question needs further investigation. The results of this study are preliminary and will be tested in a future publication, based on a broader source material.