SIL Global
Language and Culture Archives

Journal of Translation
ISSN 1558-7282 (online)
https://siljot.org

Towards a Typology of Story Development Marking (Repeatedly Naming the Subject: The Hebrew Equivalent of Greek Δέ)

Stephen H. Levinsohn

Journal of Translation 2 (2), 2006: 31–42.
https://doi.org/10.54395/JOT-D486R

License

©2006, SIL Global

Made available under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0

More resources available at:
https://sil.org/resources/language-culture-archives

Towards a Typology of Story Development Marking (Repeatedly Naming the Subject: The Hebrew Equivalent of Greek Δέ)

Stephen H. Levinsohn[1]

Stephen Levinsohn has a doctorate in Linguistic Science from the University of Reading, England. He and his wife, Nessie, became members of SIL in 1965 and worked with the Inga people in Colombia. The Inga New Testament was completed in 1996. He is an international linguistics and translation consultant for SIL.

Abstract

I argued in Levinsohn 2000a that Ancient Hebrew uses seemingly redundant nouns to refer to active subjects not only in connection with a change of time or location or when the speech or action performed by the subject is to be highlighted, but also to mark story development. Cross-linguistically, development may be marked on two axes: the linkage axis and/or the agent axis. Many verb-final languages mark development along both axes, as do some Bantu languages. Koiné Greek and English mark development primarily along the linkage axis by means of appropriate conjunctions. Ancient Hebrew and other Bantu languages mark development primarily along the agent axis. The paper concludes by considering the implications of these differences for translation.

1. Introduction: Review of Earlier Publications

Cross-linguistically, when the subject remains the same between sentences[2] of a story, the default way of referring to the subject of the second sentence is with the minimum amount of encoding permitted in the language (verb affixation, in the case of Hebrew). See Gen. 22:9b–e, for example, in which the only references to the subject are the third person masculine singular affixes on the verb:[3]

9b	וַיִּ֤בֶן שָׁם֙ אַבְרָהָם֙ אֶת־הַמִּזְבֵּ֔חַ	& Abraham built there the altar
9c	וַיַּֽעֲרֹ֖ךְ אֶת־הָעֵצִ֑ים	& Ø arranged the wood
9d	וַיַּעֲקֹד֙ אֶת־יִצְחָ֣ק בְּנ֔וֹ	& Ø bound Isaac his son
9e	וַיָּ֥שֶׂם אֹת֛וֹ עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּ֖חַ מִמַּ֥עַל לָעֵצִֽים׃	& Ø laid him on the altar on wood.

In many languages, including Ancient Hebrew, the default way of referring to a subject who was the addressee of a speech reported in the previous sentence is also with the minimum amount of encoding permitted in the language. Gen. 22:7c-d illustrates this (see below for discussion of 8a):

7a	וַיֹּ֣אמֶר יִצְחָ֔ק אֶל־אַבְרָהָ֖ם אָבִ֑יו	& Isaac spoke to Abraham his father
7b	וַיֹּ֥אמֶר אָבִ֖י	& Ø said, “My father.”
7c	וַיֹּ֣אמֶר הִנֵּ֔נִי בְּנִ֖י	& Ø said, “Here I am, my son.”

[1] An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Society of Biblical Literature International Meeting in Edinburgh in July 2006.

[2] For Ancient Hebrew and Koiné Greek, I consider a sentence to be a “single independent clause, together with those clauses that are subordinate to it” (Levinsohn 2000b:294).

[3] The symbol ‘&’ is used to represent Hebrew *waw* in the translations into English. The symbol ‘Ø’ indicates that, apart from subject agreement on the verb, there is no overt reference to the subject.

7d	וַיֹּאמֶר הִנֵּה הָאֵשׁ וְהָעֵצִים וְאַיֵּה הַשֶּׂה לְעֹלָה׃	& Ø said, "See, the fire & the wood! & where [is] the lamb for a burnt offering?"[4]
8a	וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָהָם אֱלֹהִים יִרְאֶה־לּוֹ הַשֶּׂה לְעֹלָה בְּנִי	& **Abraham** said, "God will provide the lamb for a burnt offering, my son."

- When *more* coding material occurs than the default rules for a language predict, this typically occurs for one of two reasons (see Levinsohn 2000b:140):
- in connection with a change of time or location ("a new scene"—Heimerdinger 1999:124); or
- to highlight the action or speech concerned.[5]

In Gen. 22:4, for instance, the initial adverbial phrase signals a change of time. It is normal to refer explicitly to the subject in such circumstances, even though it is the same as in the previous sentence.

4	בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי וַיִּשָּׂא אַבְרָהָם אֶת־עֵינָיו	On the third day & **Abraham** lifted up his eyes

A seemingly redundant reference to an active subject in order to highlight a speech or action is illustrated above in Gen. 22:8a. Even though Abraham was the addressee of the speech of 7d, and therefore did not need to be named, he is named. The effect is to highlight his speech. This is because its assertion "God will provide" is "the turning point of the story" (Wenham 1994:109, 100), explaining the name of the place "YHWH will see/provide."

I argued in an earlier paper (Levinsohn 2000a) that, statistically, seemingly redundant references to subjects in Ancient Hebrew are significantly more frequent than in most natural languages. This is because such references occur not only in the above two contexts, but also in connection with "*a new step or development in the author's story or argument"* (Levinsohn 2000b:72). In other words, they occur even though the events and speeches concerned take place on the same occasion in the same location[6] and there is no reason to suppose that they have been highlighted.

Heimerdinger (1999:124) captures the developmental idea very well when he says about clauses of Genesis 22 in which Abraham is repeatedly named that they "open a new burst of closely related actions." One function of a development marker is to indicate that the material concerned is **distinctive** (Levinsohn 2000b:72), so Andersen's (1994:106) words are also very apt: "a seemingly redundant unnecessarily repeated subject noun serves to highlight the distinctiveness of an event."[7]

The following chart shows how naming Abraham in Gen. 22:5–6 divides 4–6 into three distinct "development units" (DUs)[8] or separate "bursts of closely related actions," even though the events and speeches concerned take place on the same occasion in the same location.

[4] Acts of speaking may be thought of as speech events, with the reported speech as the object of the verb (here, 'said'). I include the contents of the speech for completeness.

[5] Grice's (1975:45–46) Maxim of Quantity states, "Do not make your contribution more informative than is required." A "deviation from the principle will be felt by the hearer or reader to be significant" (Heimerdinger 1999:224). This paper does not address instances in which an independent personal pronoun is used in addition to subject agreement on the verb.

[6] Such events are typically presented with the *wayiqqtol* form of the verb, which is the "default or unmarked way of presenting storyline events" (Levinsohn 2002:127; see also Cook 2004).

[7] See also Revell (1996:61), who says that one reason for "using a nominal where a pronoun would not be ambiguous" is in connection with the "introduction of a new phase in the action of the narrative." De Regt (1999:20) states that the references to David in 2 Sam. 11:8, 10 "mark off distinct stages of his actions." However, he goes on to explain the phenomenon in terms of highlighting; they "may show a crucial and climactic moment in the text, or indicate that what is about to be said is important or not expected" (p. 96). Since seemingly redundant over-encoding is used cross-linguistically to highlight, this fails to explain the frequency of seemingly redundant subject nouns in Hebrew.

[8] Stirling (2001:14) follows Mandler and Johnson (1977) in using the term "development units" to describe sub-units of narrative episodes. However, I show (Levinsohn 2000b:77) that, at least in Koiné Greek, an episode boundary may occur **within** a DU.

4	בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁלִישִׁי וַיִּשָּׂא אַבְרָהָם אֶת־עֵינָיו	On the third day & Abraham lifted up his eyes
(DU1)	וַיַּרְא אֶת־הַמָּקוֹם מֵרָחֹק׃	& Ø saw the place from a distance.

5	וַיֹּאמֶר אַבְרָהָם אֶל־נְעָרָיו	& **Abraham** said to his young men,
(DU2)	שְׁבוּ־לָכֶם פֹּה עִם־הַחֲמֹור	"You stay here with the ass…"

6	וַיִּקַּח אַבְרָהָם אֶת־עֲצֵי הָעֹלָה	& **Abraham** took the wood of the burnt offering
(DU3)	וַיָּשֶׂם עַל־יִצְחָק בְּנֹו	& Ø laid [it] on Isaac his son,
	וַיִּקַּח בְּיָדֹו אֶת־הָאֵשׁ וְאֶת־הַמַּאֲכֶלֶת	& Ø took in his hand the fire & the knife,
	וַיֵּלְכוּ שְׁנֵיהֶם יַחְדָּו׃	& the two went together.

Whereas a seemingly redundant subject noun is used frequently in Ancient Hebrew to introduce distinct DUs, other languages mark new developments by means of a conjunction or other particle. It is no accident, for instance, that Winer (1882:552) uses "distinct" in his description of the function of Greek δέ, "Δέ is often used when the writer subjoins something new, different and distinct from what precedes" (see further in sec. 2.2). I now turn to a cross-linguistic examination of how story development is marked.

2. Language Types and Story Development

Cross-linguistically, it is useful to divide languages into two major types: those in which the verb typically ends the sentence (usually referred to as object-verb or OV languages) and those in which it does not (usually referred to as verb-object or VO languages). See, for example, the discussions in Dryer 1997, Roberts 1997 and Diessel 2001. This division sometimes bears on how languages mark story development, as I show below.

Stories belong to the broad genre of **narrative**, which the Oxford English Dictionary defines as "a spoken or written account of connected events in order of happening." Longacre states that such "events or doings" are typically controlled by an agent (one who performs an action), "with at least a partial identity of agent reference running through the discourse" (1996:9). This leads him to characterize narrative as "+ agent orientation" and "+ contingent[9] temporal succession."

It is not surprising, therefore, to find languages that regularly mark story development along **both** the axes that correlate with these parameters: the "agent axis" that correlates with "agent orientation," and the "linkage axis"[10] that correlates with "temporal succession" (Levinsohn 1976:122). Such languages are most often of the OV type (perhaps, because the information about the nature of the event being described comes so late in the sentence).

2.1 Marking story development in a typical OV language

In Inga (Quechuan, Colombia), which is a typical OV language, the enclitic *–ka* may be attached to two types of expression to signal story development:

- expressions that indicate **temporal succession** or some other relation of the sentence to its context (the 'linkage axis'); or
- expressions that refer to the **agents** who perform the actions of the story (the 'agent axis').[11]

[9] "[S]ome (often most) of the events or doings are contingent on previous events or doings" (Longacre 1996:9).
[10] The term used in Levinsohn 1976 is "agent-action axis."
[11] Occasionally, references to **patients** are marked in the same way in Inga (Levinsohn 1976:132), so it might be preferable to call the "agent axis" the "participant axis."

The absence of *–ka*, in turn, "represents lack of movement with respect to the relevant...axis" (Levinsohn 1976:122).[12]

To illustrate the function of *–ka*, consider the translation into English of an extract from a traditional folktale in Inga narrated by Lázaro Mojomboy Pujimoy (see Longacre and Levinsohn 1978:112).

Ref	Linkage axis	Agent axis	Action
1	At.that.time	mother-in-law-*ka*	went ahead, weeping, to where she had buried the piece of fruit.
2	Arriving-*ka*	Ø	said, "Here is where the child is buried."
3	Thus having.said-*ka*	Ø	fled to hang herself.
4	At.that.time-Ø	father-*ka*	dug up the grave.
5	Removing the earth-Ø	Ø	found just a piece of fruit.
6		Ø	said, "Oh no! Now it's clear to me."
7	Thus having.said-*ka*	Ø	followed her trail.

In the above extract, *-ka* marks the **agents** through whom the story develops: first, the mother-in-law (1–3), then the father (4–7). The presence of *–ka* on the **linkage** axis divides the mother-in-law's actions into three distinct "bursts of closely related actions": her journey to the place of burial (1), her speech (2) and her fate (3). The absence of *–ka* in 4 and 5 "constrains the finding of the piece of fruit not to be viewed as a new development (perhaps because the hearers already know what will be found), but as part of the same" DU (Dooley and Levinsohn 2001:94). A new DU begins in 7, with the father's decision to follow the mother-in-law's trail.

A free translation into English of the Inga rendering of Gen. 22:4–6 illustrates how *–ka* was used there to divide the passage into three DUs.

Ref	Linkage axis	Agent axis	Action
4	When they were now going 3 days	Abraham-*ka*	saw that they had arrived to where the mountain was still far.
5	Then-*ka*	Ø	said to his servants, "You be waiting for me just here with the ass…"
6	Thus having.said-*ka*	Ø	loaded the firewood for the offering on Isaac…

2.2 Marking story development in Koiné Greek and English (VO languages)

Cross-linguistically, the most frequent way of marking story development in VO languages is on the **linkage** axis, by means of conjunctions or "particles associated with the verb phrase" (Dooley and Levinsohn 2001:94). In narrative materials in **Koiné Greek**, the verb often precedes the subject and/or object, so the language may be thought of as VO (Blass, Debrunner and Funk 1961: §472(1)).[13] As noted earlier, δέ is the most common development marker (DM) in Greek narratives.

The following extract from Acts 3 illustrates the use of δέ to mark new developments in a story. "[I]t is very common for the *initial* events of an episode to be linked with καί, even when the sentences contain

[12] I have noted the same system of marking both axes for story development in languages of the Altaic, Munda, Papuan and Tibeto-Burman families, among others.

[13] Pre-verbal constituents in Koiné Greek and Ancient Hebrew are insightfully handled by Simon Dik's (1989:363) **P1 P2 V X** template, where position P1 can be occupied by one or more TOPIC constituents (e.g., to signal a switch of topic), and position P2 can be occupied by a FOCUS constituent (to give prominence to the constituent).

distinctive information. This is because the scene needs to be set for the first step or development of the story to occur" (Levinsohn 2000b:73). In this extract, the events of 1–3 set the scene for the episode and are associated together with καί or a relative pronoun. Thereafter, each verse presents a distinct development.

1	δέ	Πέτρος δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης ἀνέβαινον εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἐπὶ τὴν ὥραν τῆς προσευχῆς τὴν ἐνάτην.	Peter & John were going up to the temple at the hour of prayer, the ninth.
2a	καί	τις ἀνὴρ χωλὸς ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχων ἐβαστάζετο,	a certain man lame from birth was being carried in,
2b	ὀν	ἐτίθουν καθ' ἡμέραν πρὸς τὴν θύραν τοῦ ἱεροῦ τὴν λεγομένην Ὡραίαν τοῦ αἰτεῖν ἐλεημοσύνην παρὰ τῶν εἰσπορευομένων εἰς τὸ ἱερόν•	whom they used to place daily at the gate of the temple called the Beautiful Gate so that he could ask for alms from those entering the temple,
3	ὁς	ἰδὼν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην μέλλοντας εἰσιέναι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν, ἠρώτα ἐλεημοσύνην λαβεῖν.	who, on seeing Peter & John about to go into the temple, started asking them for alms.

4	δέ	ἀτενίσας δὲ Πέτρος εἰς αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ Ἰωάννῃ εἶπεν, Βλέψον εἰς ἡμᾶς.	Peter looking intently at him, as did John, said, "Look at us."

5	(δέ)	ὁ δὲ[14] ἐπεῖχεν αὐτοῖς προσδοκῶν τι παρ' αὐτῶν λαβεῖν.	He fixed his attention on them, expecting to receive something from them.

6	δέ	εἶπεν δὲ Πέτρος, Ἀργύριον καὶ χρυσίον οὐχ ὑπάρχει μοι, ὁ δὲ ἔχω τοῦτό σοι δίδωμι•	Peter said, "I have no silver or gold, δέ what I have I give you…"

The LXX[15] happens to use δέ twice in Gen. 22:4–6, but only one of them occurs where Hebrew begins a new DU (at 6a). Instead of beginning 5, the second δέ is at 6c.[16] The resulting DUs are somewhat different from the Hebrew ones.

4	Ø	τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ καὶ ἀναβλέψας Αβρααμ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς εἶδεν τὸν τόπον μακρόθεν	The third day (&!) Abraham, lifting up his eyes, saw the place from a distance
5	καί	εἶπεν Αβρααμ τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ	Abraham said to his young servants…

6a	δέ	ἐλαβεν δὲ Αβρααμ τὰ ξύλα τῆς ὁλοκαρπώσεως	Abraham took the wood of the burnt offering
6b	καί	ἐπέθηκεν Ισαακ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ	Ø laid it on Isaac his son
6c	δέ	ἐλαβεν δὲ καὶ τὸ πῦρ μετὰ χεῖρα καὶ τὴν μάχαιραν	Ø also took the fire in his hand and the knife
6d	καί	ἐπορεύθησαν οἱ δύο ἅμα	the two went together

[14] The combination of the articular pronoun ὁ and δέ indicates that this response is but an "intermediate step" "en route to the goal of the conversation" (Levinsohn 2000b:218).

[15] I am not suggesting for a moment that δέ in the LXX is used to signal perceived DUs in the Hebrew text. I am simply observing that, by rendering *waw* with δέ, its translators may have been reacting instinctively to the discourse significance of the seemingly redundant references to Abraham in this passage.

[16] Non-conjunctive καί does associate 6a–b and 6c–d together, though.

Turning to **English**, both 'so' and 'then' introduce new developments, and modern translations typically use one or the other to mark either 5 or 6 as the beginning of a new DU. Thus, GNB begins 5 with "Then he," whereas NEB begins 6 with "So Abraham."[17] The following adaptation of the GNB would capture the DUs of Hebrew: [18]

4	Ø	On the third day Abraham saw the place in the distance.

5	Then	he said to his servants, "Stay here with the donkey. The boy and I will go over there and worship, and then we will come back to you."

6a-b	So	Abraham made Isaac carry the wood for the sacrifice
6c-d	and	he himself carried a knife and live coals for starting the fire.

2.3 Marking story development in selected Bantu (VO) languages

Certain Bantu languages mark story development on both the linkage axis and the agent axis. Such is the case in Nyungwe (N40, Mozambique). This is seen in the following extract from an incident which Elidio A. Fombe had been told about and passed on.[19] New developments on the **linkage** axis are introduced with conjunctions such as *ndipo* 'then' (2, 4),[20] whereas a demonstrative (translated *those*, *that*) marks the **agents** through whom the story will develop (3, 4).[21]

Ref	Linkage axis	Agent axis	Action
1	Ø	She (my sister)	said that there was a man who had a radio.
2	***Ndipo***	Ø	told his relatives that, when he died, they must put his radio in his coffin with it playing.

3	When his time to die came,	***those* relatives of his**	warned the undertaker to do what he had told them.
4	***Ndipo*** at night when ***that* undertaker** went to sleep,	[***that* undertaker** —see Linkage axis]	was lifted up, lost in the bush…

In other Bantu languages, however, story development is signalled only on the **agent** axis. Such is the case in Fuliiru (Bantu J, Democratic Republic of Congo), as the following extract from a folktale illustrates (van

[17] NET begins both 5 and 6 with "Then Abraham"!

[18] For a developmental particle associated with the verb phrase, see Dooley and Levinsohn 2001:145–47 (*kàn* in the Nigerian language Tyap). I have also observed the use of an inchoative auxiliary (typically translated 'come') to mark new developments in a number of African languages, including Moroccan Arabic. "Some languages, however, do not have a development marker. Instead, they signal when, for example, a theme-line event is **not** a new development in a narrative, often by means of an associative or additive connective" (Levinsohn 2005 NARR06 sec. 6.5.4).

[19] SIL member David Ker translated and analysed this text and kindly made it available to me.

[20] The following observations about Chewa (Nyanja—Bantu N31, spoken in Malawi, Zambia and Mozambique) probably apply also to Nyungwe. *Ndipo* 'and then' introduces developments that are "more temporally-oriented" (Wendland 1975:57). A related connective, *ndiye* 'and so', often signals "a return to the main event line … after the inclusion of some type of background material" (p. 57) and typically introduces new developments of a predictable nature (p. 58). *Tsono* 'now' introduces developments that are "new, unexpected, or of relatively greater importance" (p. 58).

[21] Lolo (Bantu P30, Mozambique) also marks both axes for story development, as does Chewa (sentences 12 and 77 of the text given by Wendland [1975:69–90] are particularly clear examples).

Otterloo and van Otterloo forthcoming). The story is divided into distinct DUs by references to the cow that include the demonstrative *iyo* 'that'.[22]

Ref	Linkage axis	Agent axis	Action
1	Ø	***Iyo*** *n-gaavu* (that cow)	going, appeared in the forest of the lion.
2	Ø	*In-dare* (the lion)	saw.it
	and		welcomed.it.
3	Ø	***Iyo*** *n-gaavu* (that cow)	was.afraid
	and		said, "O please, comrade, are you going to eat me?"
4	Ø	*In-dare* (the lion)	refused.
5	Ø	***Iyo*** *n-gaavu* (that cow)	neared that lion (***iyo*** *n-dare*)
	and		they.greeted.each.other.
6	However,	*in-gaavu* (the cow)	continued to be very afraid.
7	Ø	***Iyo*** *n-gaavu* (that cow)	said that it would return.

Although there are similarities between Ancient Hebrew and Fuliiru in that both mark story development on the agent axis, it is the presence of the demonstrative that signals the DU in Fuliiru, rather than the use of a name.[23] As Berlin (1983:59–61) has noted, proper names are generally associated with major participants in Hebrew, and Woodson (2005) notes a similar phenomenon in the Greek of Acts. Such an association does not apply to Fuliiru. Indeed, proper names also take a demonstrative in that language in order to signal a DU (e.g., *uyo Bikoba* 'that Bikoba'—Roger Van Otterloo p.c.).

3. More on Ancient Hebrew

In my discussion of the development marker δέ in Koiné Greek, I point out (Levinsohn 2000b:72):

> Some grammarians have defined the conditions under which δέ may be used without explaining why it often does *not* occur even though the conditions are met. For instance, Winer (1882:552) correctly observes, 'Δέ is often used when the writer subjoins something new, different and distinct from what precedes.' However, 'at least a hundred times in Acts, καί introduces a sentence containing something distinctive' … The factor that is missing in Winer's description of the function of δέ is the author's purpose in presenting his material. If δέ is to be used, not only must the sentence contain something distinctive, as defined above; it must also represent *a new step or development in the author's story or argument*.

The same principle applies to Ancient Hebrew. In connection with 2 Kings 1:2–17, De Regt (1999:18) states, "Marking the beginnings of distinct actions with a proper name, though, is not obligatory." De Regt's point is that Ahaziah is only named once in the passage, in 2a ("& Ahaziah fell through the lattice in his upper room in Samaria"). Thereafter, he is never named (see 8b–9a and 13a below), not even in 17 ("& Ø died according to the word of YHWH that Elijah spoke").

However, this passage is part of a section in which the prophet Elijah gives judgements against the house of Ahab, and may well be "the first installment of the curse on the house of Ahab" (biblicalstudies.org.uk/article_elijah.html). Of particular note are the three occasions when Elijah is named

[22] Sangu (Bantu G60, Tanzania) is similar.

[23] Cross-linguistically, languages are more likely to use a demonstrative to indicate that the referent **temporarily** displaces the central character ("VIP") of the story (Levinsohn 2005 NARR09 sec. 9.2.1). However, Callow (1974:34) states that, in Shipibo (Panoan, Peru), the combination of a noun and a demonstrative (e.g., "those men") is used in same subject contexts "when there is a development in the situation or activity."

with "a seemingly redundant … subject noun" (4d, 10a, 12a). What the author perceives as new steps or developments, therefore, primarily involve Elijah, not Ahaziah.

3a	וּמַלְאַךְ יְהוָה דִּבֶּר ׀ אֶל־אֵלִיָּה הַתִּשְׁבִּי	& the angel of YHWH spoke to Elijah the Tishbite,
3b	קוּם עֲלֵה לִקְרַאת מַלְאֲכֵי מֶלֶךְ־שֹׁמְרוֹן	"Arise, go up to meet the messengers of the king of Samaria…"

4d	וַיֵּלֶךְ אֵלִיָּה׃	& **Elijah** departed.

…

8b	וַיֹּאמֶר אֵלָיו הַתִּשְׁבִּי הוּא׃	& Ø said, "He is Elijah the Tishbite."
9a	וַיִּשְׁלַח אֵלָיו שַׂר־חֲמִשִּׁים וַחֲמִשָּׁיו	& Ø sent to him a commander of fifty with his fifty.
9b	וַיַּעַל אֵלָיו	& Ø went up to him.
9c	וְהִנֵּה ׀ יֹשֵׁב עַל־רֹאשׁ הָהָר	& behold Ø was sitting on the top of the hill.
9d	וַיְדַבֶּר אֵלָיו אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים הַמֶּלֶךְ דִּבֶּר רֵדָה׃	& Ø said to him, "O man of God, the king has said, 'Come down'."

10a	וַיַּעַן אֵלִיָּהוּ וַיְדַבֵּר ׀ אֶל־שַׂר הַחֲמִשִּׁים	& **Elijah** answered & Ø said to the commander of the fifty,
10b	וְאִם־אִישׁ אֱלֹהִים ׀ אָנִי תֵּרֶד אֵשׁ ׀ מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם	"& if I am a man of God, fire will come down from the heavens…"

The only other seemingly redundant reference in the passage is to the "third commander of 50" in 13c, as he disobeys the king and pleads for his life and that of his men (a twist in the story that the author marks as a new DU):[24]

13a	וַיָּשָׁב וַיִּשְׁלַח שַׂר־חֲמִשִּׁים שְׁלִשִּׁים וַחֲמִשָּׁיו	& Ø returned & sent a third commander of fifty with his fifty.
13b	וַיַּעַל	& Ø went up

13c	וַיָּבֹא ׀ שַׂר־הַחֲמִשִּׁים הַשְּׁלִישִׁי	& **the third commander of fifty** came
13d	וַיִּכְרַע עַל־בִּרְכָּיו ׀ לִנֶגֶד אֵלִיָּהוּ	& Ø fell on his knees before Elijah…

Finally, it would be untrue to claim that Ancient Hebrew NEVER marks story development on the linkage axis.[25] The combination of *wayyȏhî* and an expression that specifies a "particular point in time" is sometimes used to give prominence to "inciting events" (van der Merwe 1999:114) and other particularly

[24] I am grateful to an anonymous referee for pointing out that, whereas the reference to Elijah in 10a occurs between the verbs glossed "& answered" and "& said," the reference to the third commander of fifty in 13 follows both "& went up" and "& came." This indicates that the new development does not occur until he comes to Elijah. See also Judges 20:8.

[25] The *wayiqqtol* form of the verb in Hebrew does NOT mark story development in the sense that the term is used in this paper (to introduce a new or distinctive "phase in the action of the narrative"—Revell 1996:61).

significant developments (Levinsohn 2005 NARR05 sec. 5.4.2).[26] In Gen. 4:1–8, for instance, the combination occurs twice. In 3a, it marks the transition from background information to the first significant event of the story (3b–5a). In 8b, it introduces a climactic event (8c-d).

1a	וְהָאָדָם יָדַע אֶת־חַוָּה אִשְׁתּוֹ	Adam lay with his wife Eve,
1b	וַתַּהַר	& Ø (Eve) became pregnant
1c	וַתֵּלֶד אֶת־קָיִן	& Ø gave birth to Cain.
1d	וַתֹּאמֶר קָנִיתִי אִישׁ אֶת־יְהוָה׃	& Ø said, "I have brought forth a man with the help of YHWH."
2a	וַתֹּסֶף לָלֶדֶת אֶת־אָחִיו אֶת־הָבֶל	& Ø later gave birth to his brother Abel.
2b	וַיְהִי־הֶבֶל רֹעֵה צֹאן	& Abel was a shepherd,
2c	וְקַיִן הָיָה עֹבֵד אֲדָמָה׃	& Cain was a tiller of the ground.[27]

3a	וַיְהִי מִקֵּץ יָמִים	***Wayyəhî*** in the course of time
3b	וַיָּבֵא קַיִן מִפְּרִי הָאֲדָמָה מִנְחָה לַיהוָה׃	& Cain brought some of the fruits of the soil as an offering to YHWH
4a	וְהֶבֶל הֵבִיא גַם־הוּא מִבְּכֹרוֹת צֹאנוֹ וּמֵחֶלְבֵהֶן	& Abel also brought fat portions from some of the firstborn of his flock.
4b	וַיִּשַׁע יְהוָה אֶל־הֶבֶל וְאֶל־מִנְחָתוֹ׃	& YHWH looked with favor on Abel and his offering,
5a	וְאֶל־קַיִן וְאֶל־מִנְחָתוֹ לֹא שָׁעָה	& on Cain and his offering Ø did not look with favor.

5b	וַיִּחַר לְקַיִן מְאֹד	& **Cain** was very angry,
5c	וַיִּפְּלוּ פָּנָיו׃	& his face was downcast.

6–7	וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה אֶל־קָיִן לָמָּה חָרָה לָךְ	& YHWH said to **Cain**, "Why are you angry?..."

8a	וַיֹּאמֶר קַיִן אֶל־הֶבֶל אָחִיו	& **Cain** spoke to his brother Abel.

8b	וַיְהִי בִּהְיוֹתָם בַּשָּׂדֶה	***Wayyəhî*** while they were in the field,
8c	וַיָּקָם קַיִן אֶל־הֶבֶל אָחִיו	& Cain attacked his brother Abel
8d	וַיַּהַרְגֵהוּ׃	& Ø killed him.

4. Conclusion and Application to Translation

This paper has shown that the means whereby developments in a story are marked vary with the language. Some primarily mark developments along the linkage axis, others primarily along the agent (participant)

[26] Van der Merwe's article includes a valuable summary of previous observations about *wayyəhî* plus a temporal expression. For example, he notes Schneider's (1982:251–52) claim that such expressions "provide the bridge between the introduction and the main section of narrative" (p. 89) and "highlight the main event(s) of a narrative" (p. 90).

[27] Since 2c, 4a and 5a contain no "seemingly redundant" references to participants, I have arbitrarily included them in the same DU as the sentence with which they contrast (2b, 3b and 4b, respectively).

axis, others again along both. The following table summarizes the primary means of marking story development in Inga (Quechuan—OV), Koiné Greek and English, the Bantu languages Nyungwe and Fuliiru, and Ancient Hebrew.

axis marked: languages (VO unless otherwise stated):	Linkage	Agent
Inga (OV), Nyungwe	yes	yes
Koiné Greek, English	yes	---
Fuliiru, Ancient Hebrew	---	yes

The question remains as to why such variations occur. I have already suggested that OV languages like Inga may mark both axes because the information about the event being described comes so late in the sentence. It does not surprise me that Bantu languages like Nyungwe and Fuliiru mark development on the agent axis, as topic is such an important concept in these languages (placing the subject after the verb is a means of indicating that the subject is not the topic ["detopicalization"—Lambrecht 2000:667]). Finally, it could be argued that the severely limited number of coordinating conjunctions found in Ancient Hebrew leave little choice but to mark story development on the agent axis—though that does leave begging the question as to WHY so few co-ordinating conjunctions are found in Ancient Hebrew!

The variations in the way that developments in a story are marked in different languages have significant implications for translation. To signal new developments naturally when translating from Ancient Hebrew into English, for instance, one would expect many of the seemingly redundant references to subjects to be replaced by 'then' or 'so'. When translating into a Bantu language such as Fuliiru, however, such references are likely to be retained, perhaps with the addition of an appropriate demonstrative. As for OV languages and other Bantu languages such as Nyungwe, seemingly redundant references to subjects in Ancient Hebrew may call for appropriate marking on both the linkage axis and the agent axis, as the Inga example shows (sec. 2.1).

Similar adjustments are to be expected when translating from a language like Koiné Greek that typically marks story development on the linkage axis to one in which development is marked either on the agent axis (e.g., Fuliiru) or on both axes (e.g., Inga, Nyungwe). What translators should NOT be doing is reproducing the seemingly redundant subject references of Ancient Hebrew in languages that do not mark story development in that way.

References

Andersen, Francis I. 1994. Salience, implicature, ambiguity, and redundancy in clause-clause relationships in Biblical Hebrew. In Robert D. Bergen (ed.), *Biblical Hebrew and discourse linguistics,* 99–116. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Berlin, Adele. 1983. *Poetics and interpretation of Biblical narrative*. Sheffield: Almond Press.

Blass, F., A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk. 1961. *A Greek grammar of the New Testament*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Callow, Kathleen. 1974. *Discourse considerations in translating the Word of God*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

Cook, John A. 2004. The semantics of verbal pragmatics: Clarifying the roles of *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal* in Biblical Hebrew prose. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 49:247–73.

Diessel, Holger. 2001. The ordering distribution of main and adverbial clauses: A typological study. *Language* 77(30):433–55.

Dik, Simon. 1989. *The theory of functional grammar. Part I: The structure of the clause.* Dordrecht, Providence, R.I.: Foris.

Dooley, Robert A., and Stephen H. Levinsohn. 2001. *Analyzing discourse: A manual of basic concepts*. Dallas: SIL International.

Dryer, Matthew S. 1997. On the six-way word order typology. *Studies in Language* 21(2):69–103.

Grice, H. Paul. 1975. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J. L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and semantics III. Speech acts*, 41–58. New York: Academic Press.

Heimerdinger, Jean-Marc. 1999. *Topic, focus and foreground in Ancient Hebrew narratives.* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 295. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Lambrecht, Knud. 2000. When subjects behave like objects: an analysis of the merging of S and O in sentence-focus constructions across languages. *Studies in Language* 24 (3):611–82.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. 1976. Progression and digression in Inga (Quechuan) Discourse. *Forum Linguisticum* 1(2):122–47.

———. 2000a. NP references to active participants and story development in Ancient Hebrew. *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session*, Volume 44. Online at http://www.und.edu/dept/linguistics/wp/2000Levinsohn.PDF.

———. 2000b. *Discourse features of New Testament Greek: A coursebook on the information structure of New Testament Greek.* 2nd edition. Dallas: SIL International.

———. 2002. Review of Heimerdinger, 1999. *Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics* 14:126–47.

———. 2005. *Self-instruction materials on narrative discourse analysis*. Online at https://mail.jaars.org/~bt/narr.zip.

Longacre, Robert E. 1996. *The grammar of discourse*. 2nd edition. New York: Plenum.

———, and Stephen H. Levinsohn. 1978. Field analysis of discourse In Wolfgang U. Dressler (ed.), *Current trends in textlinguistics*, 103–22. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Mandler, J., and N. Johnson. 1977. Remembrance of things parsed. *Cognitive Psychology* 9:111–51.

de Regt, Rénart. 1999. *Participants in Old Testament texts and the translator: Reference devices and their rhetorical impact*. Assen, The Netherlands: Van Gorcum.

Revell, E. J. 1996. The designation of the individual: Expressive usage in Biblical narrative. *Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology* 14. Kampen, The Netherlands: Kok Pharos.

Roberts, John R. 1997. The syntax of discourse structure. *Notes on Translation* 11(2):15–34.

Schneider, W. 1982. *Grammatik des Biblischen Hebräisch. Ein Lehrbuch*. München: Claudius Verlag.

Stirling, Lesley. 2001. The multifunctionality of anaphoric expressions: a typological perspective. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 21:7–23.

van der Merwe, Christo H. J. 1999. The elusive Biblical Hebrew term *wayyðhî*: A perspective in terms of syntax, semantics and pragmatics in 1 Samuel. *Hebrew Studies* 40:83–114.

van Otterloo, Roger, and Karen van Otterloo. forthcoming. *The Kifuliiru language*. Dallas: SIL International.

Wendland, Ernst R. 1975. Lexical recycling in Chewa discourse. *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota Session* XIX:28–92.

Wenham, Gordon J. 1994. *Genesis 16–50*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 2. Dallas, TX: Word Books.

Winer, G. B. 1882. *A treatise on the grammar of New Testament Greek*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

Woodson, Julie Katherine. 2005. *The discourse function of the Greek article: A consideration of its use with common personal nouns in Acts*. M.A. dissertation. Dallas: Dallas Theological Seminary.