SIL Global
Language and Culture Archives

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

The Demonstrative Pronouns □□□ Zeh / □□□□ Zō't / □□□□□□ Ēlleh: Referring Backward or Forward?

Peter Schmidt

Journal of Translation 15 (1), 2019: 1–22.
https://doi.org/10.54395/JOT-6NF34

License

©2019, SIL Global

Made available under Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0

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

The Demonstrative Pronouns זֶה *zeh* / זֹאת *zōʾt* / אֵלֶּה *ēlleh*: Referring Backward or Forward?

Peter Schmidt

Peter Schmidt works with SIL International and is involved in an Old Testament translation project in the Eurasia Area.[1]

Abstract

In some places, it is not immediately clear whether the Hebrew demonstrative pronouns of the זֶה *zeh* paradigm refer backward (anaphoric) or forward (cataphoric). The translator cannot continue without deciding this. Standard resources do not discuss the problem satisfactorily. In this article, an exegetical "checklist" is presented as a guideline for determining the meaning of such pronouns. Then five debatable cases are discussed in detail, with reference to the pertinent literature and including the consequences for translation. The following four points emerge from the investigation: (1) The debatable cases are typically discourse deictic pronouns. These are an element of metadiscourse, and they link paragraphs. (2) General predictions are not possible. Context decides. (3) Nevertheless, there is a higher likelihood for backward-orientation. (4) The translation will guide the reader. Apart from choosing the right demonstrative pronoun, punctuation and layout need attention.

Abbreviations

Translations of the Bible are referenced by the following abbreviations:

CARS	Central Asian Russian Scriptures
CRV	Contemporary Russian version
FRCL	French common language version
GECL	German common language version (Gute Nachricht Bibel)
GEELB	German "Elberfelder Bibel" version
GEHFA	German "Hoffnung für alle" version
KJV	King James Version
NBS	La Nouvelle Bible Segond
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
PDV	Parole de Vie
RSV	Russian Synodal version

1. The Problem

It is a known fact that the Hebrew demonstrative pronouns זֶה *zeh* / זֹאת *zōʾt* / אֵלֶּה *ēlleh* can refer both backward and forward.[2] A demonstrative pronoun that refers to something which has been mentioned **previously** is called **anaphoric**; a pronoun that refers to what **follows** is called **cataphoric**. For the records, we quote one grammar and one dictionary. Joüon and Muraoka (2011:498, §143b) write: "זה can refer to something already mentioned (Gn 2.4; 9.17,19)—anaphoric use—or to something that is about to be mentioned (5.1)—cataphoric use."

HALOT's entry on זֶה mentions both possibilities in the following subentries: "5. זֶה, זֹאת, אֵלֶּה anticipate what follows: אֵלֶּה these are Ex 35:1…—6. זֶה, זֹאת, אֵלֶּה retroactively referring to what precedes: אֵלֶּה these

[1] I gratefully acknowledge that a number of people have helped me to think through the issues that are discussed. Among them are Lénart de Regt, Linda Humnick, Oliver Kröger, Nicholas Lunn, Christian Rapold and Gerhard Tauberschmidt. All errors are mine.

[2] There is, however, confusion in the literature about what is more frequent.

are Gen 2:4; ….”[3] The verse below illustrates the difference. It contains both an anaphoric and a cataphoric demonstrative pronoun.[4]

> Jer 9:24 [MT23]: but let those who boast boast in this *(zō’t)*, that they understand and know me, that I am the Lord; I act with steadfast love, justice, and righteousness in the earth, for in these things *(ēlleh)* I delight, says the Lord.

Translators have to decide what every demonstrative pronoun (DP) refers to. This is especially true in languages that show a clear-cut distinction between anaphoric and cataphoric DPs. Without going into details, let us quote two examples from Diessel (1999:102) to illustrate this [highlighting in the orig.].

a. A: I’ve heard you will move to Hawaii?
   B: Who told you that (*this)?
b. A: Listen to this (*that): John will move to Hawaii.

Diessel remarks: “Note that *this* and *that* are not interchangeable with one another in these examples.”

In order to quote just one example from a non-European language, we refer to Papuan Malay. Kluge says (A grammar of Papuan Malay, 2017:387): “Proximal *ini* ‘D.PROX’ may refer to a preceding statement…or to a following statement…. Distal *itu* ‘D.DIST’ is used only to create a link to a preceding statement.” This means that if *itu* is used in translation, cataphoric interpretation is excluded.

In the majority of cases, the reference in the Hebrew text will be obvious. But there are ambiguous cases too. In this article, we discuss some debatable cases of *zeh*, *zō’t* and *ēlleh* and provide some hints that should help to make the judgement in difficult cases with more certainty.

A grammatical clarification is in place: demonstrative pronouns (DP) are used in at least three different ways. Firstly, they serve to identify people or objects that can be pointed to. In these cases they occur as an element in a noun phrase (adnominally). E.g. the gates of this city, Jer 17:24; the inhabitants of this land, Jer 13:13.

Secondly, they are used to refer to discourse participants or other entities that were mentioned before. E.g. Not like these [i.e. the idols] is the Lord, Jer 10:16; Your iniquities have turned these [i.e. rain and harvest] away, Jer 5:25).

Thirdly, DPs can occur by themselves and refer to the content or meaning of an utterance (so-called **discourse deictic demonstratives**).[5] It is this kind of DP that is the more problematic one for translators, because it may not be immediately clear which utterance is referred to. Thus, an exegetical decision has to be made. The present article is mainly concerned with such cases. (E.g. this is my punishment, Jer 10:19; Have you not brought this upon yourself, Jer 2:17; Hear this, Jer 5:21; in spite of all these [things], Jer 2:34.)

This includes cases where the DP is adnominal, but where the noun refers to an utterance—which might precede or might follow the sentence in question. An example is Jer 13:12 which begins: “You shall speak to them this word.” This sentence is preceded and followed by direct speech, and both of these speeches are introduced by “Thus says the Lord.” So “this word” in v. 12 can theoretically refer to either of them. (For “this word,” see also Jer 5:14 *passim*).[6]

It should also be noted that the singular forms זֶה *zeh* / זֹאת *zō’t* may both be used in a grammatically neuter and semantically abstract sense. For example:

> “This (זֶה) is how you are to make it: …” Gen 6:15
> “This (זֶה) can only be sadness of the heart.” Neh 2:2

[3] Kummerow confirms this and writes in his conclusion (2014:42): “The *zeh* paradigm is a distance-neutral demonstrative…. Members of the *zeh* paradigm are used as a recognitial demonstrative and for cataphoric and anaphoric discourse deixis. In addition, they are used for two anaphoric functions: anaphora to non-topics and for focus anaphora.”
[4] For Biblical quotes in English, the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV) is used everywhere, if not indicated otherwise. Within quotations, all emphases by underlining are mine.
[5] See Diessel (1999:113) for more precise definitions.
[6] The quasi-demonstrative pronoun set הַהוּא *hahû’* etc. is not used for discourse deictic functions. A complete screening of Gen, Num, and Jer 1–20 did not show any such case, and the standard dictionaries and grammars do not present or discuss such examples.

"Do this (זֹאת) and you will live" Gen 42:18
"the stupid cannot understand this (זֹאת):" Ps 92:7 [7]

The same use can be seen with the plural form אֵלֶּה *ēlleh*:

"After she has done <u>all this</u> (אֶת־כָּל־אֵלֶּה *et-kāl-ēlleh*) she will return to me" Jer 3:7
"Why have <u>these things</u> (אֵלֶּה) come upon me?" Jer 13:22

2. Guide for Decision-making

How do we decide whether a demonstrative pronoun (DP) points backward or forward? In order to answer this question, all DPs in Jeremiah 1–20 were examined. This resulted in a list with some factors that lead to a clear decision in favor of one or the other option, and some other factors that are at least worth considering in the decision-making. Examples are included. Much of what is described below will be common sense, but it is here spelled out to raise the awareness of some signals, so that one can systematically look for them. Later, we will apply these questions to some difficult cases.

- If an obvious referent for a DP has already been mentioned and is active in the hearer's or reader's mind, then he will not keep looking for possible other referents. Thus, anaphoric use may be taken as the default. Therefore, when one of the DPs *zeh*, *zō't* or *ēlleh* is encountered in the text, first assume anaphoric use. For example, Jer 5:24 NLT says, "he gives us rain each spring and fall, assuring us of a harvest when the time is right.'" Then, when one comes to v. 25 and reads "Your wickedness has deprived you of <u>these</u> wonderful blessings," the connection is clear, and one does not need to continue the search for a referent that would come later in the text.

  Likewise, in the passage below, it is logical to assume that "these things" refers to what Jeremiah just said, and the way the sentence continues shows that no other interpretation is possible:

  > Jer 20:1–2 NASB: When Pashhur the priest…heard Jeremiah prophesying <u>these things</u>, Pashhur had Jeremiah the prophet beaten and put him in the stocks.

- If anaphoric reference seems questionable or impossible, or if cataphoric reference also seems a good possibility, **define** what **the most likely referents** before and after the pronoun are. Then check the following:

- Take a look at the **layout in the Hebrew Bible**. Is there a ס (Samekh), marking the end of a smaller section ('setuma'), or even a פ (Pe), marking the end of a larger section ('petucha')? These marks are no guarantee, but one indicator for how the text should be broken up. For example, Jer 5:20 is <u>preceded</u> by a ס and has a cataphoric *zō't*. Jer 4:18 is <u>followed</u> by a ס and has an anaphoric *ēlleh*. Jer 14:22 is <u>followed</u> by a פ and has an anaphoric *ēlleh*. If a DP occurs in the last sentence of a paragraph, there is a high likelihood that it is anaphoric. However, the fact that a DP occurs in the first sentence of a new paragraph does not in itself mean that it is cataphoric. It could be a link to the preceding paragraph.

- Does the layout suggest that the verse in question clearly belongs to the preceding or to the following section?[8] For example, Jer 14:17 ("You shall say to them <u>this word</u>:") is the beginning of an indented section. This suggests that "this word" also refers to this very section and is thus cataphoric, although theoretically it could also refer to God's words in v. 16.

- If **the following verse** begins with certain conjunctions or particles that signal the **onset of a new section**, then the DP can hardly refer to that, so it is most likely anaphoric. For example:

  Jer 2:17 followed by וְעַתָּה *wᵊʿattāh* "And now…" in v. 18
  Jer 4:8 followed by וְהָיָה *wᵊhāyāh* "And it will be…" in v. 9

[7] The references are taken from HALOT, subentry # 3 and 4.
[8] The marking of sections by ס (Samekh) and פ (Pe) is the same in BHS and BHQ. However, there is a difference in how BHS and BHQ lay out the text. In BHS, indenting of lines shows the respective editor's understanding of the text division. BHQ imitates Codex Leningradensis more closely.

Jer 9:23 followed by הִנֵּה *hinnēh* "Behold" in v. 24
Jer 13:25 followed by וְגַם־אֲנִי *wᵊgam-ᵃnî* "And also I…" in v. 26.

- See what **the sentence type** signals. For example, it is unlikely that the *kāl-ēlleh* in Isa 45:7 is cataphoric. One reason is that in v. 7 the LORD spoke in the first person, but in v. 8 he turns to the heavens with an imperative ("Shower, O heavens, …"). In Jer 5:21 ("Hear this, O foolish and senseless people, …"), "this" cannot refer backward, because all we find in v. 20 is a call to proclaim something: "Declare this in the house of Jacob, proclaim it in Judah." Both verses together introduce what follows.

- Pay attention to dialogs and other sentence patterns. For example, Jer 9:11 contains a **question**: "Who is wise enough to understand this?" "This" must refer backward; it cannot refer forward, because v. 12 already gives the **answer** ("And the Lord says: Because…"). The same applies in Jer 5:19 and 16:10. Jer 7:22f. has a **not-but sequence**. This contrast makes anaphoric use impossible: "I did not speak to them or command them concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices. But this command I gave them, 'Obey…." Another example is Jer 9:23–24 [MT22–23].

- There are also **comparisons** introduced by כְּ *kᵊ* ("like"). The vast majority of them are anaphoric. For example, Jer 10:16 "Not like these [i.e. the idols in v. 14] is the Lord…."

  Excursus: The combination of כְּ *kᵊ* + *zeh / zō't / ēlleh* occurs 48 times in the Old Testament (with *zeh* 9x, with *zō't* 28x, and with *ēlleh* 11x). These combinations may be rendered with "like," or else with "such a one / such / in this way / such a thing / in this (the same) way.[9] All instances were examined. Out of the 48 cases, there are **only three that are undoubtedly cataphoric**. These are in Gen 45:23, where *kᵊzō't* is followed immediately by a listing, and in Josh 7:20, where Achan introduces his confession with "This is what I did: …" and in Isa 58:5, where the referent is a noun: "Is such the fast that I choose…?" (3Sam 14:13 is difficult.)

- When the DP comes **together with the word** כֹּל ***kōl* ("all")**, this demands as a referent more than one thing or event. Most likely, the reference is anaphoric.

  Excursus: כֹּל *kōl* + the singular DP *zeh / zō't* occurs 28 times. All instances were examined, and the use is almost always clearly anaphoric.[10] The 55 cases of *kōl* + the plural DP *ēlleh* were also examined, with the same result: **Virtually all are anaphoric.** (This includes all the instances in the genealogies of 1Ch. The one in 2Ki 10:9 is an exophoric DP, pointing to something in the real world, not in the speech ("these here"). Ezek 16:30 could be an exception, and Ezek 18:11 is difficult.)

  This makes sense, because for "all this / these" to be meaningful, it helps when the hearer has the things present in his mind already, rather than having to wait for the speaker to itemize them. The verses Zech 8:16–17 may serve as an example. They use both a cataphoric *ēlleh* and an anaphoric *kāl-ēlleh* for referring to the same things:

  > These *[ēlleh]* are the things that you shall do: Speak the truth to one another, render in your gates judgments that are true and make for peace, do not devise evil in your hearts against one another, and love no false oath; for all these *[kāl-ēlleh]* are things that I hate, says the Lord.

- If the DP comes with the **determinate accusative marker** אֵת ***ēt***, one might think that such a phrase can only be used of an object that is already known.[11] But this is not necessarily so, as the case below proves:

  > Lev 11:4 *Liter.:* But this (אֶת־זֶה *et-zeh*) you shall not eat among those that chew the cud or have divided hoofs: the camel, …

  Thus, the presence of אֵת *et* is, by itself, not a strong enough argument for anaphoric use. How frequent cases with cataphoric use are, could not be determined at this time.

[9] HALOT, subentry 16 b.
[10] For a discussion of the debatable instances in Eccl 8:9 and 9:1, see section 3 below.
[11] Cf. Lettinga and von Siebenthal 2016, §641.1, p. 203; Joüon and Muraoka 2011, §125e–i, pp. 414-416.

- Observe the **speech orienters** (speech margins): If the sentence in which the pronoun occurs ends with לֵאמֹר *lē'mōr* (which functions like our colon before direct speech), then the pronoun is cataphoric. For example, Jer 5:20: "Declare this in the house of Jacob, proclaim it in Judah [*lē'mōr* 'saying']: …." In addition to לֵאמֹר *lē'mōr*, or in place of it, there may be other verbs of speaking that, when analyzed, indicate the flow of thought. For example, קרא "proclaim" and אמר "say" in Jer 7:2 (cf. נגד *hi.* "declare" and שׁמע *hi.* "proclaim" in Jer 5:20).

  Remark: The phrase **"this word / these words"** (הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה *haddābār hazzeh* / הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה *haddᵊbārîm ha'ēlleh*), which often occurs in speech orienters, is by itself not unambiguous. It can be both anaphoric (as in Jer 5:14; 7:27) and cataphoric (as in Jer 7:2; 3:12).

- Look whether a similar construction occurs elsewhere in the same book, and see whether the **other occurrences** strongly suggest anaphoric or cataphoric use.

- Are there close **lexical ties**? They may indicate to which part a DP refers. For example, in Jer 3:6 we read: "Have you seen <u>what she did</u>, …?" The reference of the DP in the next verse clearly refers back to this: "And I thought, 'After <u>she has done all this</u>….'" (Cf. also "the earth" in Jer 4:27 and 28, or the mentioning of ruins in Jer 9:10 and 11 [Engl. 11–12].)

- Finally, **intuition** also has a place here. In the practical work, it could help to write out two versions of the same passage, one following anaphoric and one cataphoric interpretation, with different punctuation, indenting and line layout, and then see which reads easier.

3. Discussion of Examples

In what follows we will discuss five cases where the interpretation is controversial: Is the DP anaphoric or cataphoric? The examples were taken from texts that represent a range of genres and periods. In each case, we will discuss the text with the above-listed questions in mind, and consult the Lexham Discourse Hebrew Bible, the Septuagint, the Handbook and some commentaries.

Num 35:24: "judge in accordance with these *(hā'ēlleh)* ordinances"

The whole of chapter 35 is about the cities for the Levites and the asylum cities. The section that speaks more specifically about the asylum cities begins in v. 9. Starting with v. 16, the criteria for distinguishing between a murderer and a manslayer are laid out. Verse 24 reads (NRSV):

> Then the congregation shall judge between the slayer and the avenger of blood, in accordance with <u>these</u> ordinances.

The contrast between anaphoric and cataphoric understanding is seen in comparing, for instance, NIV with NLT:

> NIV: The assembly must judge between him and the avenger of blood according to <u>these regulations</u>.
>
> NLT: If this should happen, the community must follow <u>these regulations</u> in making a judgment between the slayer and the avenger, the victim's nearest relative: [colon!]

This case is different from the following examples in that we do not have an isolated DP, but a DP as part of a noun phrase: עַל הַמִּשְׁפָּטִים הָאֵלֶּה *'al hammišpāṭîm hā'ēlleh* "according to these regulations." However, since the meaning of the noun is uncertain here, the question about anaphoric and cataphoric use is also undecided, just as when the DP occurs by itself.

Analysis:

- Is anaphoric use possible? V. 24 is the apodosis to the protasis in vv. 22/23. Either one has to translate *mišpāṭîm* like this: "then the congregation shall judge…in accordance with these [above-mentioned] <u>facts</u>" (and rescue the slayer). That is not the normal meaning of *mišpāṭ*; or *mišpāṭîm* must refer to some regulation mentioned earlier on, but nothing is in sight. Thus there is reason to consider cataphoric use.

- BHS presents these verses as running text without indicating how to break them up.
- Sentence patterns: Vv. 16–21 repeatedly state in the apodoses, that the person in view "is a murderer; the murderer shall be put to death." Thus, we expect a similar closing in v. 24: the verdict and the punishment. Hence it makes sense to take "these ordinances" as an introduction to what the verdict and punishment look like.
- Sentence types: Vv. 25–28 present a rule, and an exception, and a reasoning for handling the case. All this makes sense as continuation of the introduction "according to these regulations." Cataphoric use seems a good possibility.

  On the other hand, one could argue that, after reading vv. 16–21 about the murderer, an obvious contrast is to be expected after vv. 22–23, that is to say the wording "according to these facts" is plain enough.
- The *wᵊ* at the beginning of v. 25 needs explaining. If we suppose cataphoric use, then it is not needed. We would read:

  > Then the congregation shall judge…in accordance with these ordinances: [25] Ø the congregation shall rescue the slayer…

  It is probably this *wᵊ* that leads to a number of interpreters assuming an anaphoric "this," because to us, "And the congregation shall…" sounds like unrelated to what precedes. But this does not have to be so in Hebrew.[12]
- Lexical considerations: For *mišpāṭ*, HALOT offers the following glosses: "1. decision, judgement; 2. dispute, case; 3. claim; 4. measure; 5. law." The term is broad, but none of these glosses make immediate sense if we assume anaphoric use in our verse. One could push the first meaning to get this translation:

  > then the congregation shall judge between the slayer and the avenger of blood, in accordance with this judgement [i.e. the congregation's assessment that the slayer acted unintentionally];

  The word *mišpāṭ* is also used in this chapter in v. 12, but in the sense "trial," and in v. 29 ("These things shall be a statute and ordinance for you"). There, it is also debatable whether we have anaphoric or cataphoric use, but either way *mišpāṭ* refers to legal regulations. The normal use of *mišpāṭ* supports cataphoric use. One would need quite strong arguments to suppose a special meaning here.
- One could analyze the combination *špṭ* + *'al* "judge on" and see which complement this introduces elsewhere, but it is unlikely that the data would be conclusive.
- The Lexham Discourse Hebrew Bible does not mark the pronoun in question as either anaphoric or cataphoric, only as "near distinction." The sentence is displayed as being on the same level as v. 25a and v. 21d ("a murderer"), which does not help to see the relation of v. 24 to either of them.
- In the LXX[13], the present phrase is translated as "…κατὰ τὰ κρίματα ταῦτα, [25] καὶ…." Now ταῦτα by itself is also ambiguous, it can be anaphoric and cataphoric.[14] NETS renders this place as follows:[15]

  > [24] then the congregation shall judge…according to these judgements, [25] and the congregation shall rescue the one that committed murder.

  From the fact that the translators of the LXX into English do not begin a new sentence at v. 25 we can conclude that they favor a cataphoric understanding.

---

[12] The details cannot be investigated here, but just as *wayyiqtol* does not always describe events in strict chronological order, one should not assume that the *weqatal* forms in our passage all express distinct instructions; the instructions may well relate to each other in a general-specific manner (vv. 24–25).
[13] Always quoted by Rahlfs' edition.
[14] See the *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* s.v. οὗτος.
[15] *Septuaginta Deutsch* shows the same understanding.

- The Handbook states:

  > The demonstrative pronoun **these** refers ahead to what is stated in the subsequent verses, so WV [= Willibrordvertaling] translates this whole phrase as "The following rules apply." Compare also "Here are the rules the court must follow" (NIRV) and "in conformity with these laws" (RVC). GNT renders this phrase as "In such cases" (also NJPSV), which refers back to the preceding verses. For the Hebrew word rendered **ordinances** (***mishpat***), see 9.3. In this context it may be rendered "principles" or "procedures."

- Wenham (TOTC, 1981) explains: "It was the congregation's job to decide whether the killing was premeditated or not, *in accordance with these ordinances*, by listening to the evidence of the accused, the avenger of blood and the elders of the city where the death occurred." Apparently, he sees anaphoric use, and interprets "these ordinances" as the criteria that are given in vv. 16–23.

  Milgrom (1990) remarks that the pericope (vv. 24–29) "is framed by the term *mišpāṭ*, 'procedure.'" One could then expect that he sees *mišpāṭ* in v. 24 as being cataphoric, but this is not the case. His translation of v. 24 is unique: "In such cases[!] the assembly shall decide between the slayer and the blood-avenger." The Hebrew word order does not suggest the fronting of the phrase in question. Also, if the meaning of the sentence was to determine that *the assembly* (rather than someone else) should decide, then this rule ought to appear much earlier in the chapter. Milgrom's word choice, "case," however, is covered by the normal meanings of the word *mišpāṭ*, and if it was in a different context, his understanding of *'al* "over such cases" would be worth considering. He does mention the more traditional translation "according to these rules" as an alternative, and would take that as referring to vv. 16–23, i.e. anaphoric.

  Budd (WBC, 1984) translates "in accordance with these ordinances" and comments "i.e. those just cited," without further discussion.

  Ashley's comments (NICOT, 1993) shows the same indifference as many translations. He points both backward and forward:

  > The motive of the killer (whether it was with or without hostility) is what the congregation must decide here. If, on the one hand, hostility can be proved to have existed between the killer and the victim, or if a lethal weapon was used (which, again, shows hostility), then the sentence of v. 19 (cf. vv. 16–18) is carried out. If not, then the procedure summarized in v. 25 and more closely defined in vv. 26–28 comes into play.

Summary: The lack of a clear referent that precedes the DP, and the meaning of *mišpāṭ*, and the sentence patterns in the context suggest **cataphoric use**. Commentators are divided, but do not discuss the matter in detail.

Translation: The majority of English translations are ambiguous or, by their punctuation, suggests anaphoric use (e.g. NIV, NET, REB). NLT, along with KJV, is to be recommended for clearly guiding the reader in the right direction. The *wᵊ* at the beginning of v. 25 should be left untranslated, because "and" would be misleading.

Ezra 7:27: "who put such a thing as this *(kāzō't)* into the heart of the king"

In Ezra 7:11–26 we read the letter that Ezra had received from King Artaxerxes. In vv. 27–28, Ezra praises God for the permission to return to Jerusalem, and for the king's support for the worship at the Temple. Verse 27 says:

> NRSV: Blessed be the LORD, the God of our ancestors, who put such a thing as this *[kāzō't]* into the heart of the king to glorify the house of the LORD in Jerusalem.

This could be read in three ways. In the absence of an English translation that clearly shows *anaphoric* interpretation, we resort to GECL [transl. mine]:

> Gepriesen sei der Herr, der Gott unserer Väter! Er war es, der dem König dies alles ins Herz gegeben hat, um seinem Tempel in Jerusalem Ehre und Ansehen zu verleihen.

> Blessed be the Lord, the God of our fathers! It was he who gave all this into the king's heart, in order that he [i.e. God] would bestow honor and esteem on his Temple in Jerusalem.

Secondly, still assuming anaphoric use, one could also translate:

> Blessed be the LORD, the God of our ancestors, who put such a thing as this into the heart of the king, [with the desire] to glorify the house of the LORD in Jerusalem.

The difference here is that not God, but the king will "glorify" the Temple. God put, as it were, two things into the king's heart: the concrete stipulations in the letter and the abstract goal to glorify the Temple.

Thirdly, if "this" is taken as *cataphoric*, it points to the desire to glorify the Temple:

> "…who put such a thing as this into the heart of the king: [namely] to glorify the house of the LORD."

NLT follows this understanding, although the DP itself disappears in its wording:

> NLT: Praise the LORD, the God of our ancestors, who made the king want to beautify the Temple of the LORD in Jerusalem!

As can be seen from NRSV above—and KJV is similar—some more literal translations suggest anaphoric use, but a degree of ambiguity remains, both regarding anaphoric *versus* cataphoric, and regarding the subject of "to glorify."

Analysis:

- To take the pronoun as anaphoric, referring to Artaxerxes' letter that has just been quoted, makes good sense. But the question is justified as to whether the referent for the DP could be the clause that follows; "like this" would then refer to the desire "to glorify the house of the LORD."
- The combination of *kᵊ + zōʾt* is a kind of comparison, and these are almost always anaphoric (see section 2 above).
- BHS/BHQ show a 'petucha' before and after our verses 27/28, setting them apart from Artaxerxes' letter (written in Aramaic) and the list of returnees that follows. This is logical, but does not help with our question of referents. There is no indentation, or new line begun, in how BHS and BHQ present the text.
- The sentence type "to glorify (the house of the LORD)" is an infinitive construct. Waltke and O'Connor (1990 §36.2.3b) describe a nominal role of the infinitive construct with *lᵊ* as "usually used as a subject in verbless clauses (e.g. *To praise* YHWH is good) or in clauses with *hyh* (e.g. Because from YHWH was *the hardening* (of) their heart)." In our case, this would mean one could possibly translate: "He put this [cataphoric] into his heart: glorifying the house…." However, more typical seems the use of the infinitive construct with *lᵊ* for purpose, result and temporal clauses (§36.2.3c–d).[16] In this place, this would mean a translation like: "He put this [anaphoric] into his heart in order that he would glorify the house…." Even if a cataphoric use were accepted, the background of Ezra's praise is still the letter by Artaxerxes.
- The Lexham Discourse Hebrew Bible (LDHB) does not mark the word *kazoth* at all, not even as "near distinction." It does, however, label the clause "to glorify the house" as an "elaboration." An "elaboration" is defined in LDHB's Glossary as a proposition that "expands on the action of the main verb" and that "follows the clause it modifies." So, LDHB takes "to glorify" as giving details about "put (into the heart)." The definitions in LDHB do not suggest that the proposition "to glorify" expands on the *demonstrative pronoun*. Going by these definitions, LDHB supports the understanding as anaphoric use.
- We still need to ask who the subject of "to glorify" is. Either it is the LORD: the LORD moves the heart of the king in order to glorify his own house. Or it is the king: the king has given Ezra free hand in order to glorify the house of the LORD. Arguably, the first possibility is simpler: the king has

[16] Cf. Lettinga and von Siebenthal 2016, §721.1/4.

given Ezra free hand, but he does not have a personal interest in glorifying the Temple. A minor objection to the LORD being the subject could be that the sentence should then read: "…to glorify his house in Jerusalem," instead of "…to glorify the house of the LORD." But such a meticulous distinction is not required in Hebrew (cf. the use of the third person for the LORD when he is addressed in prayer in the psalms).

- What we find in the LXX is interesting. It reads:

  > Εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, ὃς ἔδωκεν οὕτως ἐν καρδίᾳ τοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ δοξάσαι τὸν οἶκον κυρίου τὸν ἐν Ιερουσαλημ.
  >
  > NETS: Blessed be the Lord the God of our fathers, who in this way put it in the heart of the king to glorify the house of the Lord, which is in Ierousalem.[17]

  The adverb *houtōs* is here used anaphorically.[18] But the subject of "to glorify" is the king. This takes us back to the Hebrew: Does *kāzō't* here mean "something like this" or "in this way"? In principle, the dictionaries include both possibilities.[19]

- The Handbook says, "Here Ezra is saying that it was God who made the king want to take the decisions that are given in the letter as instructions to Ezra and to the king's officials…. Here some languages may say 'who gave the king the thought [to do these things].'" This sounds more like favoring anaphoric use. The subject of "to glorify" is not discussed.

- Keil and Delitzsch (COT) comment: "Hence Ezra…adds a thanksgiving to God for having put such a thing into the king's heart, namely, to beautify the house of the Lord." So they see cataphoric use. Kidner (TOTC, 1979) does not discuss the question. Vom Orde (WSB, 1997) translates with the same sense as GECL above ("…um das Haus Jahwes zu verherrlichen…"), which in German sounds more like the Lord being the subject of "to glorify," but then he comments on the house of Yahweh saying "This is at the core of the help which is granted by Artaxerxes," which sounds more like the king being the subject [transl. mine].[20] Finally, Fensham (NICOT, 1982) properly addresses the question about the subject of "to glorify / adorn":

  > *To adorn* is used in the latter part of Isaiah (55:5; 60:7, 9, 13) as well as in Ps. 149:4. In all these cases the Lord is the subject of the verb. The objects in these sentences are the temple (Isa. 60:7, 13), the people of God (Isa. 55:5; 60:9), and the meek (Ps. 149:4…. The references in Isaiah to the temple are of interest. Is it possible that Ezra, by using the same terminology, wanted to show that the pronouncements of Isaiah were fulfilled?
  >
  > Although the king was instrumental in the adornment of the temple, it was actually God who did it. He is the real subject of the verb "adorn."

Summary: All things considered, it seems easiest to take the pronoun as **anaphoric**, and to see the **LORD as the subject** of "to glorify."

Translation: Some translations vaguely suggest this understanding, but among nine English, three French and three Russian translations none is explicit about it. In contrast, there are three different German ones that clearly reflect this understanding (GECL, GEELB and GEHFA). GEHFA uses a slightly simpler construction than GECL above. A backtranslation is this:

> He moved the king to [issue] this decree, because he wanted to bestow honor and esteem on his Temple.

---

[17] Septuaginta Deutsch: "…der das Herz des Königs in dieser Weise dazu bewogen hat, das Haus des Herrn…zu verherrlichen."

[18] It can be used both anaphorically or cataphorically: Louw and Nida's entries say (61.9–10), "with reference to that which precedes—so, thus, in this way" and "referring to that which follows (compare 61.9)—the following, as follows." The entry in the Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint says: "*so, in this way* (referring to what precedes…; *id.* (referring to what follows)…; *such a thing, such a person*…."

[19] HALOT. Gesenius and Donner 2013.

[20] He also discusses the question as to who is the subject of *ḥesed* in v. 28.

Ps 92:7 [Engl. 6]: "The stupid cannot understand this *(zo't)*"

Psalm 92 is written "for the Sabbath day." The psalmist praises the Lord's deeds. He also considers the destiny of the evildoer. V. 7 [Engl. 6] can be read in two different ways.

In contrast to the other English translations, CEV clearly shows an anaphoric understanding of the DP in v. 7 [6] (as do GECL and GEHFA):

> CEV: [5] You do great things, LORD. / Your thoughts are too deep
> [6] for an ignorant fool / to know or understand.

We quote NASB as an example for the cataphoric understanding that most English translations show.

> NASB: [6] A senseless man has no knowledge, / Nor does a stupid man understand this: [7] That when the wicked sprouted up like grass / And all who did iniquity flourished, / It was only that they might be destroyed forevermore.

Analysis:

- In v. 6 [Engl. 5] the psalmist had just praised the depth of the LORD's thoughts, so when he goes on to say "The dullard cannot know, the stupid cannot understand this" in v. 7 [Engl. 6], this is a logical continuation. "This" is the depth of the LORD's thoughts. Anaphoric use is not problematic. Nevertheless, we keep the possibility of cataphoric use in mind. The referent would then be the whole of v. 8 [Engl. 7] (or even 8ff. [Engl. 7ff]): "though the wicked sprout like grass…, they are doomed to destruction forever." This is also a good possibility: The stupid does not realize that he is doomed to destruction.
- BHS indents v. 6 [Engl. 5], thus subordinating it to v. 5 [Engl. 4]. This is reasonable. V. 7 [Engl. 6] is printed on the same level as v. 5 and v. 8 [Engl. 4/7]. Therefore, it is not clear whether one should take the DP as anaphoric or cataphoric. But since it is not indented compared to v. 6 [Engl. 5], perhaps cataphoric use is suggested.
- Looking at the sentence types, cataphoric understanding of v. 7 [Engl. 6] is slightly preferable: The preceding v. 6 [Engl. 5] expresses the psalmist's personal astonishment. The following v. 8 [Engl. 7] expresses a general truth.
- Another observation is that *zo't* stands in the second line. Perhaps, if it was anaphoric, it should stand in the first line? On the other hand, it comes with the determinate accusative marker אֵת *ēt*. With this, cataphoric use is not impossible (see section 3 above), but anaphoric use is perhaps more likely.
- When we consider the line of thought in the whole psalm, then an anaphoric "this" makes for a more organic development: The psalmist contrasts his own astonishment at God's works with someone who is blind for that, and then he elaborates on that man's destiny. If, in contrast, v. 7 [Engl. 6] should be an introduction to v. 8ff. [Engl. 7ff.], then, again, the אֵת *ēt* is surprising. Also, the thematic change from v. 6 to vv. 7ff. [Engl. 7/8ff.] would be somewhat abrupt; however, that is not impossible in the psalms.
- In the end we ask again: If anaphoric use is possible, are the signals for the reader strong enough to suggest cataphoric use? I think not.
- Lexham Discourse Hebrew Bible marks the pronoun in question as a "forward-pointing reference," and marks vv. 8–10 [Engl. 7–9] as the "target" to which it points (cataphoric use). Unfortunately, there is no comment on this choice.
- The LXX [Ps 91:7] uses ταῦτα, which NETS translates "these things." Nothing indicates whether the reader should take this as anaphoric or cataphoric. By default, he might read it as anaphoric. Septuaginta Deutsch is different here. It translates:[21]

> An unsagacious man will not realize (that), and an unreasonable one will fail to see that.

[21] Orig.: "Ein unverständiger Mann wird (das) nicht erkennen, und ein *Uneinsichtiger* wird das nicht einsehen."

In German, the use of "das (= 'that')" instead of "dies (= 'this')" in both lines strongly encourages anaphoric interpretation, especially since the sentence does not end with a colon.

- The Handbook comments on vv. 6–7 [Engl. 5–6]: "The psalmist speaks particularly of the inevitable punishment of the wicked; they may prosper for a while, but they cannot escape their eventual destruction." So, what is spelled out in vv. 8ff. [Engl. 7ff.], is already summarized in v. 6 [Engl. 5]. Verse 7 [Engl. 6] is the "hinge" for both. We have seen such a use of the DP elsewhere. Although the Handbook makes this connection, in the end it finds the cataphoric translation better:

  > TEV's "This" points to verse 7. However, it is only the colon after "understand" in the second line that signals the beginning of what "This" refers to. RSV has the advantage of keeping **this:** at the end of verse 6. SPCL reduces the two lines to one and says "Only fools cannot understand it," referring back to verse 5. But RSV and TEV make verse 6 point forward to verse 7, which seems better.

- The layout in Keil and Delitzsch's commentary shows anaphoric understanding, without discussion though. Schneider (WSB, 1995) seems to follow this, also without discussion. Kidner discusses the question at hand and says (TOTC, 1975) [English versification]:

  > RSV and NEB insert the word *that*, at the beginning of verse 7, to indicate that what follows is the matter which the 'dull' and 'stupid' (6) never grasp, *i.e.* the short life-cycle of the wicked (7). <u>But their crucial disregard is of God's majesty, the theme of verse 5 to which verse 6 more probably looks back.</u> [*Footnote:* So, among others, Weiser, Gelineau, JB. The interpretation in RSV, *etc.*, rests on the fact that the word *this*, used unqualified at the end of verse 6, almost invariably points forward: *cf., e.g.*, Gen 42:18; 43:11; *etc.* But there are exceptions. Ezek 21:27 mg. (21:32, Heb.) points backward; and examples of a retrospective 'this' compounded with the preposition *bᵊ* or with *bᵊkol* slightly outnumber those that are prospective: see, *e.g.*, Pss. 27:3; 78:32; Isa 5:25. *etc.*; Jer 3:10; Mal 3:10; *etc.*] <u>So verse 7 introduces the doom of the wicked and the eternal triumph of God, as a fresh subject which</u> will now be developed with some of its corollaries.

  Tate (WBC, 1990) translates: "(Only) a dunderhead would not know (this), and (only) a fool would not understand it." and notes: "The pronoun in 7b does double duty." By this remark he must mean that it serves for both line a and b (not that it points both backward and forward). His translation is anaphoric. The question is not discussed. Weber (2016) divides the whole psalm into five stanzas in chiastic structure. Verses 5–7 [Engl. 4–6] make up the second stanza, and vv. 8–10 [Engl. 7–9] the third one. The way his translation reads, he takes the DP as anaphoric. It would, however, not be impossible to keep the chiasm even with a cataphoric DP. Longman (TOTC, 2014) does not discuss the DP.

  Tanner (NICOT, 2014)[22] translates [using English versification]:

  > [5] How great is your work, O Lord; / how deep are your thoughts.
  > [6] A stupid one does not know, / a fool cannot understand <u>this;</u>
  > [7] though the wicked grow like grass / and all the evildoers bloom, / they will be destroyed forever.

  She interprets the DP as anaphoric when she comments:

  > "**6–11** The second section opens with a <u>contrast between God's *deep thoughts* and the knowledge of clueless humans (v. 6)</u>, who cannot see the long view of life. …as in Psalm 1, the foolish way is to give up on God and God's promises. The learned ones declare God's sovereignty (v. 8) and God's eventual triumph over all of the enemies (v. 9)."

  Ross' translation (2016)—"this" with colon—shows cataphoric understanding. He has a footnote about the LXX using the plural ταῦτα and thus showing collective interpretation, but otherwise does not comment on the referent. He only says about the line of thought:

  > Among the plans and intentions of God is the judgment of the wicked who are spiritually ignorant.

[22] In Nancy deClaissé-Walford et al., *The book of Psalms* (NICOT, 2014).

Summary: The great majority of commentaries sees anaphoric use, but most English translations are ambiguous or suggest cataphoric use.

Translation: NET's translation of these verses is an example of how the DP is often translated in a neutral way—neither clearly anaphorically nor clearly cataphorically. The reader is left wondering how it is meant.

> [5] How great are your works, O LORD! Your plans are very intricate!
> [6] The spiritually insensitive do not recognize this; the fool does not understand this.
> [7] When the wicked sprout up like grass, and all the evildoers glisten, it is so that they may be annihilated.

This way, the translation cannot be blamed for being wrong. But it cannot be recommended for being helpful either.

In case one favors cataphoric use, the translation from unfoldingword.org may be considered. They found a creative way of preparing the reader for the cataphoric referent:

> UDB: [6] There are things that you do that foolish people cannot know about, things that stupid people cannot understand. [7] They do not understand that although the number of wicked people increases as blades of grass do and that those who do what is evil prosper, they will be completely destroyed.[23]

If anaphoric reference of the DP is assumed (which is preferable), one could base the translation on CEV, but one could still make use of v. 7 in the above model, because it connects that verse well. For example:

> [5] You do great things, LORD. Your thoughts are very deep.
> [6] An ignorant fool cannot know or understand them.
> [7] He does not understand that although…

Eccl 9:1: "All this *(kāl-zeh)* I laid to heart, examining it all *(kāl-zeh)*"

In ch. 8, Qohelet had wrestled with the enigma of life. "His conclusion is that we must be content not to know everything."[24] Then comes a transition in 9:1. But does it close the earlier thoughts, or begin a new section? The two possibilities of understanding this verse become apparent when we compare, for instance, these two translations:

> NIV: So I reflected on all this and concluded [*omitted:* this] that the righteous and the wise and what they do are in God's hands, …
>
> NET: So I reflected on all this, attempting to clear it all up. I concluded that the righteous and the wise, as well as their works, are in the hand of God; …

For both the first *zeh* and the second *zeh*, anaphoric and cataphoric use are options to consider. In NIV, the first is interpreted as anaphoric and the second as cataphoric; in NET both are anaphoric.

Analysis:

- Does anaphoric use make sense? Yes, one can read it like that, especially if one sees it as referring to the longer passage 8:10–17. But since Qohelet had already come to some result in 8:17, one may ask whether he is not taking up a new topic now, which would mean the *zeh* is cataphoric.
- The אֲשֶׁר *ᵃšer* needs interpreting. It could be a **relative particle** and introduce the content of the second *zeh*, i.e. it could define it. That would mean that we have **cataphoric** use of the DP. This seems easy. But the *ᵃšer* would not really be needed either.

  Suppose we have **anaphoric** use of the DP, then what does the *ᵃšer* do? It would then be a **conjunction**. We expect either a conclusion of Qohelet's reflection, or the start of a new thought. According to HALOT, *ᵃšer* can, among other possibilities which can be ruled out here, introduce

[23] Psalms: translationNotes, found online at https://cdn.door43.org/en/tn/v11/pdf/en_tn_19-PSA_v11.pdf.
[24] Eaton (TOTC, 1983), on 8:17.

speech (e.g. 1Sam 15:20 direct speech; Est 2:10 indirect speech), or give a **reason** (e.g. Gen 30:18; Josh 4:23; 1Ki 15:5; Eccl 8:11 with the rare case of a reason-clause with *ᵃšer* preceding a result-clause with עַל־כֵּן *'al-kēn*).[25] The first possibility is something that Schwienhorst-Schönberger has taken up (see below). If one wants to interpret the verse according to the second possibility, one could say that we have an elliptical construction where we need to add the concluding words "It is (because…)." The *ᵃšer* in Eccl 9:1 might not be used in the most typical way, but the above two possibilities that are documented elsewhere seem to allow for a translation such as:

> All this I laid to heart, examining it all. [I think that / The fact is,] the righteous and the wise and their deeds are in the hand of God; …

This is the tacit understanding in several English translations (e.g. NASB, NIV, GNB).

- We need to determine the relationship between the first and the second *zeh*: The two cola "All this I laid to heart / examining it all" are worded in parallel. Now there can be *development* from the first to the second colon of a parallelism. But as far as I can tell, switching from [anaphoric] "that" to [cataphoric] "this" does not fit any of the three usual categories: It is neither synonymous, nor antithetic, nor synthetic. Therefore, it is hard to justify it. We need to come up with an understanding of the verse that reckons with either anaphoric or cataphoric use for *both* DPs.
- The layout in BHS has chapter 8 ending indented, and chapter 9 starting unindented (this is different in BHQ). At least one can say that 9:1a is *more than a closing remark* for what precedes. But it is possible that it *takes up* what has been talked about, in order to expand on it.
- The *kî* at the beginning of the verse requires interpreting. If it is emphatic, anaphoric use of the DP is more likely. If it is causal, cataphoric use is more likely.
- Another element of interest is the determinate accusative marker אֵת *ēt*. It seems to point toward anaphoric use, but as we have seen above, there is no guarantee.
- What also contributes to the right understanding of the passage is the meaning of the verbs. For the first one ("I took to heart"), the translations agree on using some verb of thinking (e.g. NIV: I reflected). The second one וְלָבוּר *wᵊlābûr* ("and to make clear") is a bit more difficult. Some emphasize the process, some the result: compare "examine / attempt to clear up" (NRSV / NET) *versus* "conclude / understand" (NIV / REB). The sense is quite different: is what follows in the *ᵃšer*-clause Qohelet's problem or his answer?! And in any case, how does this relate to the preceding ch. 8? HALAT and Gesenius and Donner both gloss the verb "prüfen" ("to investigate / to examine") here, but the latter suggests following the Greek reading variant: "u. ich ersah" ("and I saw / realized") (see the commentaries).
- One way of looking at the line of thought is this: At the end of ch. 8, Qohelet had already come to the conclusion:

  > 8:17 (NIV): then I saw all that God has done. No one can comprehend what goes on under the sun. Despite all his efforts to search it out, man cannot discover its meaning. Even if a wise man claims he knows, he cannot really comprehend it.

  He now substantiates his statement. One could amplify the beginning of 9:1 by saying:

  > Think about it some more. I will name more irresolvable problems. I reflected on and examined this fact that the righteous and the wise and what they do are in God's hands [i.e. they are beyond human control], ….

- But we should also take into account a different place. In Eccl 8:9, we have the same phrase *et-kāl-zeh*, and in fact the whole verse reads similarly to 9:1. There also the versions differ in taking this verse as the last one of the preceding section, or as the first one of the following section. In this case the Handbook comes to a different conclusion than at 9:1 (see below). On 8:9 it says:

[25] HALOT, s.v. אֲשֶׁר, B. b/c.

> Summarizing his observations is typical of the method Qoheleth uses. **All this** refers to the various situations listed in the previous verses, especially from verse 5, where a descriptive section commences. Rather than the Hebrew collective **this**, the context suggests "these" as a better translation in many languages.
>
> TEV links verse 9 with the following verses rather than with what has come before. We believe the evidence suggests that verse 9 continues section 8.1–8 rather than beginning a new section. This verse contains important key terms and themes from the previous passage: the word "time," the root "evil," and most importantly the word *shalat* "have power over." Therefore we suggest there should be no section heading before verse 9; it should come before verse 10.

- This is also in line with what we said in section 2 above: that DPs with *kōl* are virtually always anaphoric. Eccl 8:9 and 11:9 would be very exceptional if they were not. (But, given the character of the book, that is possible.)
- Lexical ties: The topic of 8:10–17 and 9:1–6 is largely the same: injustice. (GNT even groups the two sections under the same section heading.) The righteous and the wicked are compared in 8:14, and the good man and the sinner in 9:2.
- LDHB marks both *zeh* as "near demonstrative." This does not answer our question.[26] What is of interest though is that it marks the line "and to examine all (of) this" as "elaboration." By definition, elaboration is "adding to the information already given to fill it out"[27], and: "Elaboration always follows the clause it modifies." (Also, within the elaboration, the *ᵃšer*-clause is marked as a "sub-point.") Most likely this means that LDHB takes the second *zeh* in the same sense as the first.
- The LXX reads:

  > Ὅτι σὺν πᾶν τοῦτο ἔδωκα εἰς καρδίαν μου, καὶ καρδία μου σὺν πᾶν εἶδεν τοῦτο, ὡς οἱ δίκαιοι καὶ οἱ σοφοὶ καὶ ἐργασίαι αὐτῶν ἐν χειρὶ τοῦ θεοῦ, ….

  NETS translates:

  > For all this I gave to my heart, and my heart saw all this: how the righteous and the wise and their deeds are in the hand of God; ….

  The colon and the continuation with "how" indicate cataphoric interpretation, at least of the second DP; and there is no indication that the first should be read differently.[28] The Grk. ὡς begins an object clause,[29] rendering the Heb. *ᵃšer* with its relative clause. Thus the LXX reads both DPs as cataphoric.
- The Handbook says on the *kî*: "An introductory particle such as "Now" or "Yes" may be appropriate." Then the question about the DPs is properly addressed:

  > **All this** is a difficult phrase to interpret. Does it refer back to what has just been said (for example, 8.16–17)? Or does it refer forward to the problem that is about to be presented? Qoheleth uses the demonstrative **this** in both ways elsewhere, so either is possible. A further complication is that the same phrase occurs again in the next clause **examining it all** (literally "to examine all this"). Do the two phrases refer to the same thing or to different things? Some versions interpret the first **all this** as referring more generally to what comes before, and the second as referring to what follows. JB says, for example, "For I have reflected on all this, and have come to understand that…." TEV, TOB, and FRCL give similar translations. Studying the context, however, we note that the expression occurs in a chiastic or A-B-B'-A' structure.
  >
  > This suggests that both **all this** phrases refer to the same thing. Here then they refer forward to the observation being made. **NJV** seems to take this approach and attempts to preserve the chiastic pattern: "For all this I noted, and I ascertained all this: that the actions of even the

[26] Although 9:1 starts with *kî*, the verse is not indented under the preceding verse; their relationship is not clear. Verse 2 is again on the same level.
[27] Lexham Propositional Outlines Glossary, s.v.
[28] The same is conveyed in Septuaginta Deutsch: "Denn auf all dies richtete ich mein Herz, / *und mein Herz sah* all dieses, / dass die Gerechten und die Weisen / und ihre Tätigkeiten in der Hand Gottes sind."
[29] Cf. the Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint s.v.: "*that* (object cl.) 1 Sm 13.11."

> righteous and the wise…." In most languages, such a sentence is considered too repetitive. If this is the case the two clauses can be combined: "Here is what I decided to examine …" or "I set my mind to study the following problem:…."

- Keil and Delitzsch devote a whole page to the current questions. Their translation and comment are as follows (supporting cataphoric use):

> "For all this I brought to my consciousness, and all this I sought to make clear to me, that the righteous, and the wise, and their deeds, are in God's hands: …." With *kî* follows the verification of what is said in 8:17b, ….

Eaton (TOTC, 1983), Stoll (WSB, 1993), Longman (NICOT, 1998) and Krüger (BKAT, 2000) also translate adopting cataphoric use of both DPs. Ringgren and Zimmerli (ATD, 1962) follow the Greek reading variant and does the same. They all do so without further discussion. On the other hand, Hertzberg (KAT, 1963) opts for the double *zeh* being anaphoric, "wie üblich" ("as is usually the case").

Schwienhorst-Schönberger (HThKAT, 2004)[30] presents a different view. To begin with, he sees a fictive dialog and takes "the righteous and the wise and their works are in God's hands" as a statement which Qohelet quotes and counter-argues. He thinks (441; cf. also note on 440) [translation mine][31]:

> The first half of v. 1aα 'yes, all that I took to heart' is probably to be understood anaphorically, referring to the result of the preceding discussion (8:10–15/16–17): the concept of a 'deed-consequence connection' cannot claim universal validity (8:10–14) and a wisdom which raises a claim of all-encompassing knowledge of reality is out of reach for human-beings (8:16f.). It is at this status of the discussion that the first half of v. 1aα ties in. Qohelet takes this insight to heart, in order to then turn to a further theme, which the second half of v. 1aα hints at: 'in order to examine all this (what follows)'.[32]

Summary: Whether anaphoric or cataphoric, the two *zeh* have to be the same. The *kî* and the [a]*šer* can make sense in both hypotheses. The lexical ties also work both ways.

After 8:17 one does not expect a second conclusion. This speaks for cataphoric use. The LXX reads this way, as do the Handbook and the majority of commentaries.

But DPs with *kōl* are almost always anaphoric. Eccl 8:9 and 9:1 can also be read that way.

What can be said is that—like some of the other examples under discussion—Eccl 9:1 has the role of a hinge verse, taking up the previous topic and beginning an expansion of it.

As to the question whether the sentence "the righteous and the wise and their works are in God's hands" is the problem or the answer, perhaps one could even say it is a bit of both: It is an insight that Qohelet has, but it is one that he struggles with.

Translation: We still favor anaphoric use, because we count that as the default, and it proves workable in other debatable cases. See NET quoted above. But cataphoric use cannot be ruled out. If that is favored, NLT offers a pronounced way of rendering the *kî*: "This, too, I carefully explored: …." See also NJV, quoted in the Handbook. Among nine English, three German, three French and three Russian translations that were

[30] He translates: "Ja, all das (bisher Erörterte) nahm ich mir zu Herzen, um all das (Folgende) zu überprüfen: / Die Gerechten und die Weisen und ihre Werke sind in der Hand Gottes."

[31] *Orig.:* "Dabei dürfte die erste Hälfte von V 1aα »ja, all das nahm ich mir zu Herzen« anaphorisch zu verstehen sein und sich auf das Ergebnis der vorangehenden Diskussion (8,10–15.16–17) beziehen: Das Konzept eines Tun-Ergehen-Zusammenhangs kann keine universelle Gültigkeit beanspruchen (8,10–14) und eine Weisheit, die einen Anspruch auf umfassende Erkenntnis der Wirklichkeit erhebt, ist für den Menschen unerreichbar (8,16f.). An diesen Stand der Diskussion knüpft die erste Hälfte von V 1aα an. Kohelet nimmt sich diese Einsicht zu Herzen, um sich im Folgenden einem weiteren Thema zuzuwenden, worauf die zweite Hälfte von V 1aα verweist: »um all das (Folgende) zu überprüfen«."

[32] For a full evaluation of Schwienhorst-Schönberger's view, one would also have to take a closer look at his understanding of the fictive dialog, and of the phrase "being in the hand of God."

checked, there are only two—NLT and the Russian Synodal—that clearly show cataphoric use, although most commentaries take that view.

Jer 18:13: "Who has heard the like of this *(kā'elleh)*?"

Jer 18:1–12 tells the story about how Jeremiah is sent to the potter's house. At the end, the LORD tells Jeremiah to warn the people; at the same time he predicts that it will be useless:

> [11] Now, therefore, say to the people of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem: …Turn now, all of you from your evil way, and amend your ways and your doings. [12] But they say, "It is no use! We will follow our own plans, and each of us will act according to the stubbornness of our evil will."

Then we come to the sentence that contains a DP:

> [13] Therefore thus says the LORD: Ask among the nations: Who has heard the like of this? The virgin Israel has done a most horrible thing.

This is a showcase verse for the question: What is meant by "this"? In order to show the two options, we also quote vv. 14–15.

> [14] Does the snow of Lebanon leave the crags of Sirion? Do the mountain waters run dry, the cold flowing streams? [15] But my people have forgotten me, they burn offerings to a delusion; ….

The "this" in v. 13 is either anaphoric, referring to "the stubbornness" in v. 12, or it is cataphoric, referring to the fact that "my people have forgotten me" in v. 15.

Analysis:

- To begin with, anaphoric use is possible. The question "Who has heard the like of this?" makes sense as a reaction to the brazen statement in v. 12. But since many translations are ambiguous, we have identified the content of v. 15 as another potential referent for "this."
- In BHS, vv. 13–17 are set apart from the rest by indentation. They are also marked as a *setuma* of its own, with a ס (Samekh) before and after it. This could mean that the BHS editor, and the Masoretes, take the DP as cataphoric, because it stands in the introductory lines to a new paragraph. But one can argue for the opposite too: The DP picks up the end of the last paragraph.
- The DP is part of a question. Therefore it is connected to v. 14, which continues to ask questions. These point to v. 15 with a kind of answer. Looking at it this way, the question with the DP can be taken as cataphoric. Again, on the other hand, the DP comes with a *kᵊ* and expresses a kind of comparison. As we have seen above, they are almost always anaphoric.
- The conjunction לָכֵן *lākēn* "therefore" at the beginning of the verse links it tightly to the previous text. This speaks for anaphoric use of the DP. See also Jer 5:14 which shows similarities to 18:13, and where the DP is definitely anaphoric.
- Line b of v. 13 says "Israel has done a most horrible thing." Does this help with deciding? To "*do* a horrible thing" fits better with "they burn offerings" in v. 15 than with "But they say, 'It is no use!'" of v. 12. But then again, the "hearing" of line a fits better with the speech of v. 12.
- The Lexham Discourse Hebrew Bible does not decide between anaphoric or cataphoric use of the DP. In the hierarchy, the question "Who has heard the like of this?" is on the same level with v. 13b and v. 14a, which also does not help to decide the matter.
- The LXX shows the following translation of the verse:

  > διὰ τοῦτο τάδε λέγει κύριος Ἐρωτήσατε δὴ ἐν ἔθνεσιν Τίς ἤκουσεν τοιαῦτα φρικτά, ἃ ἐποίησεν σφόδρα παρθένος Ισραηλ;

  NETS translates:

> Therefore this is what the Lord says: Do ask among nations: Who has heard such horrible things which Virgin Israel did exceedingly?[33]

This can be read anaphorically, but then there is a certain mismatch (intended?) between "We will play the man" (as NETS translates v. 12) and the "Virgin Israel" in v. 13.

- The Handbook advocates cataphoric use, but acknowledges the problem with a referent that is at first unknown. It says:

> **The like of this** is followed by a general statement (**The virgin … horrible thing**), and then what this means is spelled out in verses 15–16a. The problem faced by the reader (especially the hearer) is that the connection may not be immediately and easily made. We may translate the last part of this verse, for example, "Ask all the nations if they have ever heard of a nation doing such a horrible thing as Israel has done?"

- Keil and Delitzsch assume anaphoric use when they comment on vv. 12–13: "Such obduracy is unheard of." They say further: "In vv. 14f. the public conduct is further described; …." We agree with them in that assuming an anaphoric use of the DP does not mean that the same topic cannot be elaborated on in the following text. Harrison (TOTC, 1973) does not address our question, nor does Thompson (NICOT, 1997), although his layout supports taking the DP as cataphoric. Drinkard (WBC, 1991) translates "who has heard (words) like these?" and comments:

> The implied answer is "No one." Yet the details are not given. No horrible thing has yet been described. The style is intended to build anticipation…. The exceedingly "horrible thing," *ša ʿᵃrurit*, is assonant with *šᵊrirût*, "stubbornness" of v. 12 and may serve to link the two sections.

It is not clear why what has been said in v. 12 would not count as a "horrible thing." But the last remark about the assonance is a keen observation; it actually supports the interpretation of the DP as anaphoric, which Drinkard does not opt for. Fischer's explanation (HThKAT, 2005) is also based on cataphoric use. He prints the translation of "this" with following colon, suggesting that it refers just to the immediately following clause ("The virgin Israel has done a most horrible thing."). And according to his commentary, v. 15 is the "explanation of what exactly makes up this abhorrent behavior" (582). He also speaks of the suspense in v. 14.

- There are similarities between the present passage and Jer. 2:8–13, as commentators point out (with *kāzō't* in 2:10 and *'al-zō't* in 2:12; cf. also Jer 30:6). Many of the above considerations apply there too. Regarding Jer 2:10, the Lexham Discourse Hebrew Bible (LDHB) does make a choice by indicating a "forward-pointing reference." That is, the DP "point[s] ahead to a target that has not yet been introduced." We mentioned that such suspense can be a problem to the reader. However, LDHB assesses this positively when it explains in the glossary: "The effect of using the forward-pointing reference is to attract extra attention to the target."

Summary: Anaphoric use of the DP is a good possibility. In addition, *elleh* comes with *kᵊ* in front of it, and such phrases are almost always anaphoric. Cataphoric use of the DP would mean that the reader is kept in suspense through v. 14 until the referent for "this" appears in v. 15. There are some things that can be said in favor of this interpretation, but overall the signals are not strong enough to eliminate the anaphoric reading, which is the simpler one.

Jer 18:13 is an example where Diessel's description (1999:102) is absolutely fitting: "Being thematically associated with both the paragraph that precedes and the paragraph that follows, the demonstrative creates an overt link between two discourse units." In v. 13, the LORD reacts to the people of Judah's statement in v. 12, referring to it with "the like of this." Then he expands on his question with more questions in v. 14, and in v. 15 he describes the "horrible thing" in a new way.

---

[33] *Septuaginta Deutsch* matches this in its rendering in the FN, which follows Ra: "Deshalb, *dies* spricht der Herr: Fragt doch unter den Völkern: 'Wer hat solcherlei Schauderhaftes gehört, das die Jungfrau Israel ganz oft machte?'" (The main text follows Gö).

Translation: The English translations are ambiguous, but—going by the outline and by the word choice of "this" over "that"—seem to lean to a cataphoric understanding (e.g. NIV and NET: anything like this). **We prefer the wording of NLT and GNB ("such a thing"), because it is more likely understood as referring back.**

The German translations are ambiguous. Three French translations all use "pareil / pareilles" ("similar / the same / such"), thus suggesting anaphoric use—although a degree of unclarity remains (NBS: qui a jamais entendu pareilles choses? / FRCL: on n'a jamais entendu raconter rien de pareil! / PDV: Est-ce que vous avez déjà entendu des choses pareilles?).

The Russian versions also encourage anaphoric reading, without being absolutely clear: RSV ("слыхал ли кто подобное сему?") with its antiquated pronoun *сему*, and a 2008 edition, *Bibliya*, using the more contemporary *этому*, both say 'this'. CARS ("слышал ли кто-нибудь о подобном?") goes into the same direction with an equivalent for 'the like'. The CRV ("кто слыхал о таком?") uses an equivalent for 'such / something like that'; but with a blank line between vv. 12 and 13, the DP gets removed from its anaphoric referent.

Many translations set vv. 13ff. apart. As to **section headings**, most English translations and three Russian ones do not have one here. In contrast, GNB, three French and three German ones put one in front of v. 13. NRSV stands alone with placing it in front of v. 12. This links v. 12 and v. 13 more tightly, but separates God's call in v. 11 from the people's answer in v. 12. In this instance it is perhaps better not to provide a separate section heading, in order not to detach the DP in v. 13 from its referent in v. 12.

Results

- Out of the five debatable cases, according to our analysis, the first one shows cataphoric use of the DP, while all the others show anaphoric use, with the last two being less certain than the others.
- Lexham Discourse Hebrew Bible, although designed to show discourse features, did not help much in deciding between anaphoric and cataphoric use. Even if a choice is made, the resource does not provide any reasoning.
- The Septuagint was of little help, because often its rendering of the DP is as ambiguous as the Hebrew text.
- The Handbook series usually discusses the matter, although not always in depth.
- As to the commentaries and translations, they show a great deal of uncertainty about the issue. In Num 35 and Ezra 7, we could not follow the majority. In Ps 92, most commentaries lean toward anaphoric use, most translations show cataphoric use. In Eccl 9, it is the other way round. In Jer 18, the majority of commentaries support cataphoric use, the opinions represented in the translations vary.

4. Findings & Conclusions

Deciding between anaphoric and cataphoric meaning

- **Frequency:** Purely statistically, in an initial screening of all occurrences of *zeh / zō't / ēlleh* in the corpus Jeremiah 1–20, the clearly **anaphoric cases were more frequent** (ca. 21). But the cataphoric cases were so numerous (ca. 8) that they cannot be classified as exceptions.[34] Ca. 7 cases were judged unclear and debatable.[35]
- **Predictability:** predictions as to whether *zeh / zō't / ēlleh* function anaphorically or cataphorically cannot be made. **The question needs to be decided on a case-by-case basis.**

[34] Regarding the occurrences of the *zeh* paradigm in the Pentateuch, Kummerow (2014:35) assigns an anaphoric discourse deictic function to 35% of them, and a cataphoric one to 22%.
[35] Only abstract DPs were considered; adnominal DPs were not included, except for those that stand in combination with the noun דָּבָר, "word / matter."

- **Criteria:** Any clues from the context need to be taken into account. This includes potential referents for "this," paragraph markers, sentence patterns, the use of the demonstrative pronouns together with כְּ *kᵊ* and with כֹּל *kōl* elsewhere, speech orienters, lexical ties and similar constructions elsewhere in the same book. We refer the reader back to the list of questions in section 2 above.

The pragmatic function of discourse deictic demonstratives

All the debatable instances that we discussed were discourse deictic demonstratives: "this" refers to an utterance and its content.[36] (This utterance can be a statement by the writer himself, or one that he quotes.) The writer says something *about* it. The fact that a demonstrative pronoun is used to refer to what was said, or will be said, shows that the author (or speaker) takes more of an outsider's or observer's perspective. Where the demonstrative pronoun is used, the writer (speaker) "does something" with the utterance that is in view. He puts it into perspective, applies it, assesses its content, or calls on the reader (hearer) to do so. Using the demonstrative pronoun is a way of connecting with the reader (hearer). We have here an **element of metadiscourse**:

- In Num 35:24, the Lord instructs the Israelites to **refer to a certain set of rules** when deciding on the destiny of an asylum seeker.
- In Ezra 7:27, Ezra **praises** the Lord for the **blessings that are apparent in the stipulations in the king's letter**. Immediately he goes on to point out what higher purpose all this will serve: the glorifying of the Temple.
- In Ps 92:6 [MT7], the psalmist acknowledges **the Lord's profound thoughts** and then shifts his attention to the stupid one who does not understand them. The psalmist and the stupid person that he has in mind relate differently to the works and thoughts of the Lord. They **make the psalmist sing, whereas the stupid does not even "see" them**.
- In Eccl 9:1—no matter whether we have anaphoric or cataphoric use—Qohelet tells his readers what he has been doing (or will be doing) with **the observations that he describes**: **he reflects on them**.
- In Jer 18:13, the question "Who has heard the like of this?" **challenges the hearers to evaluate**, as it were, **the statement that reveals stubbornness**.

The demonstrative pronoun can also be a signal that what has been said will be re-phrased or that more will be added to it (as in our last three examples). It has thus the function of linking paragraphs in the discourse, and occurs in "hinge verses" (further examples are Jer 4:18; 9:11 [Engl. 12]; 10:19).

This is also the reason why readers of the translated texts do not always perceive that it makes a big difference whether one reckons with anaphoric or cataphoric use. In some sense, both the preceding and the following paragraph talk about the same thing. But this is no excuse for the translator. He has to make the line of thought transparent. It is, in fact, the function of the demonstrative pronoun to do exactly this: To guide the reader (hearer) in a transition of the discourse. Therefore the reader is not served well with ambiguous texts. They take more effort to be understood. And the sense will be different, at least in nuances.

Translation

- After the exegetical decision between anaphoric and cataphoric use has been made, one has to find the **appropriate demonstrative pronoun** in the receptor language.

  One way of achieving clarity is to be **"overly explicit"** in the word choice (rather than only saying "this").

  For anaphoric use, this could include phrases like "what I just said / as mentioned above."

[36] As stated before, Num 35:24 with its adnominal DP is an exception, but because the noun refers to an utterance, there is little difference to the other cases.

For cataphoric use, phrases like "the following / the…below" can be explored (E.g., in Jer 11:6, NET uses the phrase "the following words"; in Num 35:24 one could say "these regulations below.")

- Attention should also be given to the **punctuation. The choice between a** period and a colon makes all the difference in how the reader's interpretation is guided. Ideally though, the text should also be readily understandable to those who only listen to the text being read out.
- Finally, since demonstrative pronouns occur not infrequently at paragraph boundaries, the **layout** deserves some thought. **Blank lines, section headings and indenting** can assist the reader in understanding the relationship between paragraphs and between various utterances of different people.

References

Ashley, Timothy R. 1993. *The Book of Numbers*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament (NICOT). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bratcher, Robert G., and William D. Reyburn. 1991. *A Translator's Handbook on the Book of Psalms*. UBS Handbook Series (Handbook). New York: United Bible Societies.

Budd, Philip J. 1984. *Numbers*. Word Biblical Commentary (WBC) 5. Waco: Word Books.

Craigie, Peter C., Page H. Kelley, and Joel F. Drinkard. 1991. *Jeremiah 1–25*. Word Biblical Commentary (WBC) 26. Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

deClaissé-Walford, Nancy L., Rolf A. Jacobson, and Beth LaNeel Tanner. 2014. *The Book of Psalms*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament (NICOT). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

de Regt, Lénart J., and Ernst R. Wendland. 2016. *A Handbook on Numbers*. UBS Handbook Series (Handbook). Miami: United Bible Societies.

Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, Function, and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Eaton, Michael A. 1983. *Ecclesiastes: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (TOTC). Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.

Fensham, F. Charles. 1982. *The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament (NICOT). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Fischer, Georg. 2005. *Jeremia 1–25*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament (HThKAT). Freiburg: Herder.

Gesenius, Wilhelm. 2013. *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*, Eighteenth Edition, edited by Herbert Donner. Berlin: Springer.

Harrison, Roland Kenneth. 1973. *Jeremiah and Lamentations: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (TOTC). Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.

Hertzberg, Hans Wilhelm. 1963. *Der Prediger*. Kommentar zum Alten Testament (KAT). Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.

Joüon, Paul, and Takamitsu Muraoka. 2011. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Third reprint of second edition, with corrections. Rome: Gregorian and Biblical Press.

Keil, Carl Fredrich, and Franz Delitzsch. 1989. *Commentary on the Old Testament* (COT) in 10 volumes. (Original volumes in three editions 1861–1888.) Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.

Kidner, Derek. 1975. *Psalms 73–150: A Commentary on Books III–V of the Psalms*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (TOTC). Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.

Kidner, Derek. 1979. *Ezra and Nehemiah: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (TOTC). Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.

Kluge, Angela. 2017. *A Grammar of Papuan Malay*. Studies in Diversity Linguistics 11. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann Jakob Stamm, editors. 1967–1995. *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (HALAT), in 5 volumes. Leiden: Brill.

Kraus, Wolfgang, Martin Karrer et al, editors. 2009. *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Krüger, Thomas. 2000. *Kohelet (Prediger)*. Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament (BKAT). Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

Kummerow, David. 2014. Anaphora and deixis in Tiberian Hebrew: Semantically mapping the case for a distance-neutral demonstrative. *HIPHIL Novum* 1:1–53.

Lettinga, Jan P., and Heinrich von Siebenthal. 2016. *Grammatik des Biblischen Hebräisch*, Second edition. Giessen: Brunnen Verlag.

Light in the East. 2008. *Библия* (Bibliya). Synodal translation, revised edition.

Longman, Tremper. 1998. *The Book of Ecclesiastes*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament (NICOT). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Longman, Tremper. 2014. *Psalms: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (TOTC). Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity.

Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nida, editors. 1989. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. New York: United Bible Societies.

Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie. 2003. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Marcus, David. 2006. *Biblia Hebraica Quinta, Fascicle 20: Ezra and Nehemiah* (BHQ). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Milgrom, Jacob. 1990. *Numbers: The Traditional Hebrew Text with the New JPS Translation*. JPS Torah Commentary. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.

Newman, Barclay M., and Philip C. Stine. 2003. *A Handbook on Jeremiah*. UBS Handbook Series (Handbook). New York: United Bible Societies.

Noss, Philip A., and Kenneth J. Thomas. 2005. *A Handbook on Ezra and Nehemiah*. UBS Handbook Series (Handbook). New York: United Bible Societies.

Ogden, Graham S., and Lynell Zogbo. 1997. *A Handbook on Ecclesiastes*. UBS Handbook Series (Handbook). New York: United Bible Societies.

Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, editors. 2007. *New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under that Title* (NETS). Albert Oxford University Press.

Rahlfs, Alfred, editor. 1935. *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt.

Richardson, Mervyn Edwin John, translator and editor. 1994–2000. *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (HALOT, English Translation of HALAT). Leiden: Brill.

Ringgren, Helmer, and Walther Zimmerli. 1962. *Sprüche/Prediger*. Alte Testament Deutsch (ATD). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Ross, Allen P. 2011, 2013, 2016. *A Commentary on the Psalms* in 3 volumes. Kregel Exegetical Library. Grand Rapids: Kregel.

Runge, Steven E., and Joshua R. Westbury, editors. 2014. *Lexham Discourse Hebrew Bible* (LDHB). Bellingham, Washington: Lexham Press.

Schenker, Adrian. 2004. *Biblia Hebraica Quinta, Fascicle 18: General Introduction and Megilloth* (BHQ). Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Schneider, Dieter. 1995. *Das Buch der Psalmen*. Wuppertaler Studienbibel (WSB). Wuppertal: Brockhaus.

Schwienhorst-Schönberger, Ludger. 2004. *Kohelet: Übersetzt und ausgelegt*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament (HThKAT). Freiburg: Herder.

Stoll, Claus-Dieter. 1993. *Der Prediger*. Wuppertaler Studienbibel (WSB). Wuppertal: Brockhaus.

Tate, Marvin E. 1990. *Psalms 51–100.* Word Biblical Commentary (WBC) 26. Dallas: Word Books.

Thompson, John A. 1997. *The Book of Jeremiah*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament (NICOT). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

UnfoldingWord. n.d. *Psalms*. Available online at https://cdn.door43.org/en/tn/v11/pdf/en_tn_19-PSA_v11.pdf.

vom Orde, Klaus. 1997. *Die Bücher Esra und Nehemia*. Wuppertaler Studienbibel (WSB). Wuppertal: Brockhaus.

Waltke, Bruce K., and Michael Patric O'Connor. 1990. *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

Weber, Beat. 2016. *Werkbuch Psalmen II: Die Psalmen 73 bis 150*, Second revised edition. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Wenham, Gordon J. 1981. *Numbers: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries (TOTC). Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press.