Hakham, A., *Sēfer Tĕhillîm* (Da'at Miqra'), Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook 1979.

_____, *Sēfer 'Iyyôv* (Da'at Miqra'), Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook 1984.

Hartley, J.E., *The Book of Job* (New International Commentary on the Old Testament), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1988.

Herdner, A., *Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques découvertes à Ras Shamra-Ugarit de 1929 à 1939*, Paris Mission: de Ras Shamra 10 1963 (abbreviated as CTA).

Kautsch, E., *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* (ET, A.E. Cowley), Oxford University Press 1910 (abbreviated as GKC).

Kidner, D., *Psalms 1-72* (Tyndale Old Testament Commentary), Downers Grove: InterVarsity 1973.

Koehler, L., and Baumgartner, W., *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (third edition; fascicle 4, J.J. Stamm, ed.), Leiden: Brill 1990.

Kraus, H.-J., *Die Psalmen* (Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament), Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag 1972.

Leupold, H.C., *Exposition of Psalms*, Grand Rapids: Baker 1969 (originally 1959).

Stek, J., "Psalms," in K. Barker, ed., *The NIV Study Bible*.

Waltke, B.K., and O'Connor, M., *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns 1990.

Wyatt, N., "The expression *bĕkôr māwet* in Job xviii 13 and its mythological background," *Vetus Testamentum* 40 (1990), 207-216.

Zar-Kabod, M., and Kil, Y., *Sēfer Mišlê* (Da'at Miqra'), Jerusalem: Mossad Harav Kook 1983.

PHILIP A. NOSS

THE HEBREW POST-VERBAL *LAMED* PREPOSITION PLUS PRONOUN

Discourse Features in the Light of Some African Languages

The author is UBS Regional Translation Coordinator for the Africa Region.

Introduction[1]

The Hebrew *Lamed* preposition plus personal pronoun following a verb has been variously described in the literature.[2]

1 The system of transliteration used in this article is that used in the index of *The Bible Translator*. Literal translations of Hebrew text are mine, standard translations are from the RSV, unless otherwise noted. Unpublished manuscripts are cited by permission of the author.

2 The *Lamed* preposition with pronoun paradigm is the following:

lî	for me	*lânû*	for us
lékâ	for you (ms)	*lâkem*	for you (mpl)
lâk	for you (fs)	*lâken*	for you (fpl)
lô	for him	*lâhem*	for them (mpl)
lâh	for her	*lâhen*	for them (fpl)
		lâmô	for him/them

Translators have sometimes attempted to find an equivalent form, but most often the Hebrew construction is not translated. This article will compare the Hebrew construction with patterns found on the African continent in certain Afro-Asiatic and Benue-Congo languages that may have a similar function. The article will suggest that beyond grammatical analysis, discourse approaches may offer insights into the function of this construction in Hebrew Old Testament text.

Hebrew form

Gesenius used terminology from classical grammar to identify the Hebrew construction of the *Lamed* preposition plus pronoun following a verb as a *dativus commodi* (GKC 381). He further described it as an "apparently pleonastic *dativus ethicus*" (GKC 381). It has been called a "dative of feeling" (BDB 515), Muraoka calls it "centripetal" (1978:497-98), Seow characterizes it as a "redundant dative" (Seow 1987:174), and Waltke and O'Connor describe it as "a special variety of the *lamed* of interest" (1990:208).

The most common and conspicuous occurrence of this construction is with an imperative verb. The pronoun agrees in number and gender with the subject of the verb. While the masculine occurs frequently in both singular and plural number, the feminine singular is also found.

1) Gen 12.1 "leave **for you** (2 ms) country"
"Go from your country."
2) Song 2.10 "arise **for you** (2 fs)"
"Arise, my love."
3) Gen 22.5 "stay **for you** (2 mpl) here"
"Stay here."

Sentences 4-8) below exemplify occurrence with the first person singular and plural pronouns, the third person singular masculine and feminine pronouns, and the third person plural masculine pronoun. No example was found to occur with the third person plural feminine pronoun.

4) Song 4.6 "I will go **for me** (1 s) to the mountain"
"I will hie me to the mountain."
5) 1 Sam 26.11 "and let us go **for us** (1 pl)"
"and let us go"
6) Ex 18.27 "and he went **for him** (3 ms)"
"and he went his way"
7) Gen 21.16 "and she sat **for her** (3 fs) nearby"
"Then she ... sat down over against him"
8) Ex 12.3 "they shall take **for them** (3 mpl)"
"they shall take"

Although occurring very commonly with the imperative, this pattern also occurs in construction with both perfective and imperfective verb forms and with reference to both past and future events, as demonstrated in examples 4-8) above and 13-14) below (cf. GKC 381).

In example 9) the prepositional construction occurs with a participle while 10) exemplifies a rare occurrence of a negative construction.

9) Prov 23.20 "among ones gorging meat **for them** (2 mpl)"
"or among gluttonous eaters of meat"

10) Jer 7.4 "not you trust **for you** (2 mpl) in words"
"Do not trust in these deceptive words"

The construction may occur with non-human as well as human subjects, with inanimate as well as animate subjects.[1]

11) Hos 8.9 "wild ass being solitary **for him**"
"a wild ass wandering alone"
12) Ps 58.8(7) "like waters they flow away **for them**"
"like water that runs away"
13) Song 2.11 "the rain ... he went **for him**"
"the rain is ... gone"
14) Ps 120.6 "too long she lived **for her** *nefesh* of me"
"Too long have I had my dwelling"

The pronoun construction may occur with a single verb in a single command as seen in examples 1-3 above, or it may occur with one of two or more commands expressed in series. It may occur with both of two commands or with each instruction in a set of consecutive commands.

15) Deut 1.40 "turn **for you** (mpl) and set out"
16) Josh 22.4 "return and go **for you** (mpl)"
17) Gen 22.2 "take son ... go **for you** (ms) ... sacrifice"
18) Gen 27.43 "obey my voice, arise, flee **for you** (ms)"
19) Song 2.10 "arise for you (fs) ... come **for you** (fs)"
20) Ezek 5.1 "take **for you** sword..."
"use her **for you**... and shave..."
"and take **for you** scales..."

Although the prepositional construction most often directly follows the verb with which it occurs, it does not always do so. In 9) above it stands in clause final position after the object of the verb.

African language usage

Linguists describing Jukunoid and Chadic languages have written about a grammatical pattern in which a subject referent occurs following the verb. This item has been variously called a "recapitulating pronoun" (Koops and Bendor-Samuel 1974:9-17), a "copy pronoun" (cf. Frajzyngier 1977:73-84), and a "post-verbal subject pronoun" (Koops MS 2).

Although it is true that this pronoun occurs in a position after the verb, it does not merely occur post-verbally. It normally occurs immediately following the verb. Furthermore, it is not a subject pronoun, but it refers to the sentence subject which usually occurs in pre-verbal position. It may reiterate a subject pronoun or it may be a pronoun referent of a proper noun or of a common noun.

In the descriptions of this construction, it is important to distinguish between the obligatory occurrence of the copied pronoun and the optional occurrence. In the obligatory construction, the grammar of the language requires that a subject pronoun occur following the verb even though a subject pronoun or noun may have occurred pre-verbally. In the optional construction, the grammar of the language

1 In Ezek 37.11 "we (bones/corpses/people) are cut off to us" there is an ambiguity in the referent of the pronoun "us". Grammatically, it refers to the persons who are speaking, but the original reference is to bones.

does not require the presence of the pronoun marker following the verb. It is there by the speaker's or the writer's choice. The two constructions may appear to be similar in form, but the one must be analyzed on the level of grammar, the second on the level of discourse. It is the second which is the subject of this article.

In his discussion of "Copy Pronouns in Kuteb Discourse," Koops cites some examples where the repeated pronoun form is grammatically optional (MS 1:4-5):

15) aba shaen-ba basii...
"they refuse-**they** saying..."
"They refused, saying..."

16) een, ba-fu tiri roo
"yes, come-**you** now"
"Okay, come now!"

The form of the pronoun following the verb in the preceding two examples is a suffix that has the same morphological shape as the possessive pronoun and "that is attached to the verb in exactly the same way a possessive pronoun is attached to a noun" (Koops MS 1:2).

Similar post-verbal possessive patterns are found in neighboring languages such as the Ubangian Gbaya (Noss 1981:87-88) and Sango (Samarin 1967:182), and as far afield as Swahili (Ashton 1947:57). [1]

17) mí dé kó'm né tom[2]
"I do **of me** = work"
"I for my part am working."

18) mbi yí ti mbi pepe
"I want **for me** not"
"As for me, I don't want (it)."

19) Wamekwenda zao.[3]

---

1 Ashton notes that a similar construction is found in Shona and she cites J. O'Neill's *A Shona Grammar*, p. 162 (1947:58).

2 In Gbaya as in Sango (Samarin 1967:182), an alternate form includes a nominal as a filler object for the possessive construction. In Gbaya the inclusion of this explicit nominal reduces focus on the actor and heightens focus on the action.

mí dé mo kó'm né tom
"I do thing of me = work"

A similar construction occurs in the pidginized variety of Fula that is spoken as a trade language in northern Cameroon and Chad. It is apparently a grammatical borrowing from the first language of the speakers. The following example was given by a Musey person of western Chad (personal communication: Rev. Hamtangou Marc 11-11-93):

min kam, mi yaha huunde am
"I however, I will go thing of me"
"I will go (regardless of what others do)."

3 The Swahili of Eastern Zaire uses both the possessive construction and a reflexive verb pattern, and it sometimes uses both to place emphasis on the actor in contrast to other potential actors (personal communication: Swahili translator, Rev. Waso, 29-09-93).

mimi nitauza yangu
"I'm going to buy for my part (even if you don't)."
akajiendea
"He went himself/He went off."
mimi sitajikulia (yangu)
"I won't eat (it, even if others do)."
mimi nitajiuzua yangu
"I'm going to buy for my part (even if you don't)."

"they have gone **theirs**"
"They've gone off."

Any pronoun, including the logophoric, may occur in this position in each of these languages. The construction may be used with various verb forms, including both imperative and indicative moods and a variety of tenses. It may occur in either positive and negative sentences, and in declarative and interrogative sentences, as appropriate in the context.

Analysis

The morphological form of the Hebrew construction is readily apparent. It is the *Lamed* preposition to which is suffixed a personal pronoun that is in agreement with the sentence subject. This construction normally occurs immediately following a verb, and the verb is most commonly an imperative. Therein lies the problem in analysis. There is no apparent grammatical reason for the construction to be used, and there is no ready semantic explanation. Because of the form of the construction, it is associated with the *dativus commodi/incommodi* and the *dativus ethicus* on the general level of meaning, while being characterized as "apparently pleonastic" and "redundant".

Gesenius' early explanation of the form seems to be essentially one of emphasis, "to give emphasis to the significance of the occurrence in question *for* a particular subject" (GKC 381). This is interpreted in light of the dative, but the two *dativi* of Greek and Latin specify a recipient of advantage and disadvantage for the person on behalf of whom an act is performed (cf. Goodwin and Gulick 1956:245-246), and this person is usually someone other than the subject. The following Latin example is an exception:

20) cave tibi
"take care **to you**"
"Take heed for thyself."

In Brown, Driver and Briggs, we find some refinement of Gesenius' emphasis "*for* a particular subject." They state that the *Lamed* preposition is (1980:515)

> used reflexively, throwing the action back upon the subject, and expressing with some pathos the interest, or satisfaction, or completeness with which it is (or is to be) accomplished.

Muraoka further develops this idea by calling it "centripetal". He writes (1947:497):

> Basically, it serves to convey the impression on the part of the speaker or the author that the subject establishes his own identity, recovering or finding his own place by determinedly dissociating himself from his familiar surrounding.

Several examples from Old Testament text reveal the importance of this element of identity and distinction of person. In example 1) cited above, the command is the well-known call of Abram to leave his land to go to a new land that will be revealed to him. By saying "for you", the command specifies that Abram is being called apart from all those around him. He is being separated from all those who did not receive the call of God.

Example 22) below also expresses a call, this time addressed to the community of Israel. They are instructed that each man is to take "**for them**" a lamb. The

command is exclusive, setting apart the families of the people of Israel from those around them who are not called to share in the festival of the Passover.

21) Gen 22.5 "stay **for you** here with the donkey and I
and the boy we will go over there"

In example 22), the contrast is made explicit. Abraham instructs his servants that they are to stay where they are while he and the son go on. There is a distinct contrast between two groups of people, on the one hand, the servants, and on the other hand, the father and son.

22) Ex 12.3 "that they take for them each lamb"

The two examples which follow occur in the text as a pair, the first representing the command that is given to Ezekiel, the second emphasizing the fact that Ezekiel fulfilled the command.

23a) Ezek 12.5 "dig **for you** through wall"
"Dig through the wall"

23b) Ezek 12.7 "I dug **for me** through the wall"
"I dug through the wall"

In the African context, Ashton gives a full paradigm of Swahili forms and observes that the pattern is used "to give force to the meaning" (1947:57). Samarin is more specific. He relates the pronoun to the subject and calls it a "subject intensifier" (1967:182). In Gbaya usage, the comparable construction also places the accent upon the person who acts, placing his action in contrast or opposition to that of those about him.

If the emphasis is not only upon the subject as actor, but also in contrast to other possible actors, it becomes apparent that a larger discourse structure must be taken into consideration than the sentence alone. In his discussion of the Kuteb copy pronoun, Koops states that the various participants in a folktale must be considered, and in conversation, relationships between speaker and addressee or between speaker and some third party must be taken into account (MS 1:4). He offers an analysis of the copy pronoun in terms of four functions: contradiction, contrast, completion and contrary expectation. In an endnote, he offers a fifth possible function, that of deliberateness (MS 1:16). These functions all relate to the information the narrator or speaker wishes to convey to the audience or the listener.

The following examples from the Sango drafts of the New Testament New Reader Portions 1 and 2 reveal the contrastive function of this item:

24) Me Jesus angba ti lo na Zerusalem, si ala hinga ti ala pepe.
"but Jesus remained for him in Jerusalem, but they knew for them not"
"the boy Jesus stayed behind in Jerusalem. His parents did not know it" (Lk 2.42).

25) Azuife aba ti ala atene...
"the Jews saw for them said..."
"The Jews believed that... (i.e. in contrast with other people)"

In an article entitled "Focus in Vute", Thwing and Watters adapt a definition offered earlier by Ray Jackendorff. They define focus as follows (1987:101):

> Focus: that information in an utterance which the speaker believes, assumes or knows that the hearer does not share with him/her.

I would like to suggest that the post-verbal copy pronoun described by Koops and the Hebrew *Lamed* post-verbal preposition plus pronoun may be analyzed as representing contrastive subject focus. It is noteworthy that the verb retains focus of its own by virtue of the fact that the construction under consideration is part of the predicate.[1]

This would explain the emphasis noted by early writers and it provides an explanation for the interpretation given by Muraoka. However, rather than merely being an impressionistic semantic explanation, it is functional and this helps to provide explanations of problems.

26) Job 39.4 "they leave and they return not **for them**"
"they go forth, and do not return to them."

In the above example, RSV and NRSV understand the referent of the final preposition plus pronoun construction *(lâmô)* to be a third person plural noun, which is interpreted to be the mothers of the young mountain goats. GNB and a number of other translations simply say, "they don't come back."

If the *Lamed* preposition plus pronoun is understood as a contrastive focus marker, its function is to establish an implicit contrast. The context is one of argument and the Lord gives an example from nature. Citing the mountain goats, he says that when the young leave, they do not come back. Implicitly, others may come back again, but there is a finality to the example of the mountain goat that is being alluded to in this text.

27) Job 3.14 "the ones building ruins **for them**"
"those building ruins for them"
"who rebuilt ruins for themselves."

A Handbook on the Book of Job discusses various interpretations of the *Lamed* preposition as it occurs in this verse (1992:80-81). It may indicate that the kings and rulers built palaces for themselves or for their own pleasure. However, if it is understood to signal contrastive focus, the speaker is contrasting the builders with his own humble state. For their part, they were able to build palaces, or ruins. If he were dead, he says, he would enjoy the rest of those who were well off.

28) Ezek 18.31 "get **for you** new heart"
"and get yourselves a new heart and a new spirit"

It may be interesting to ask what is the function of the *Lamed* preposition in this frequently quoted verse. Is it a *dativus commodi* or is it a marker of contrastive focus? If it is the latter, it establishes an implicit contrast between the House of Israel and other peoples. After a series of instructions regarding sin and transgression, the striking command is given, "get for you a new heart and a new spirit." The focus may not be as much on "you" as recipient as on "you" as actor.

As a feature of discourse, the contrastive focus marker functions to mark shifts in the action. Gen 12.1 cited above (1), signals a major thematic development in

1 To heighten the contrast and sharpen the focus, the post-verbal possessive may be front-shifted in Gbaya.
mí té ba kó'm
"I will take of me"
"I'll take for my part (even if you/he/she/they won't)."
kó'm mí té ba
"of me I will take"
"As for me, I will take (it/some)."

the story of Abram and indeed in the story of Israel. Likewise, in Ex 12.3 (22), a major thematic development occurs, that of the sacrifice of the Pascal Lamb.

In 1 Sam 26.11 a shift in the action takes place when David could have killed King Saul. Although his companion Abishai urges him to kill Saul, David refuses. He commands Abishai to take Saul's spear and water jar, "and let us go **for us**." It is a command that joins David and his companion in a single act which will take them away from Saul, leaving him unharmed.

The distinction between a dative of interest and the contrastive focus marker is one of the more difficult nuances to sort out. The verb "to take" (*lkh*) when it means "to marry" implies personal interest as in Gen 6.2, "and they took for them(selves) wives." However, in the following example the *Lamed* preposition may very well be the marker of contrastive focus.

29) Gen 4.19 "and he took **for him** Lemek two women"
"and Lamech took two wives"

The preceding account has been genealogical in nature, but with the statement of Lamech's marriage, there is a change in the discourse. Genealogy turns to narrative, as the phenomenon of polygyny is introduced into the Sacred Story.

In the book of Ruth, the *Lamed* preposition occurs twice, both in the same event in the story.

30) Ruth 4.6 "redeem **for you** you"
"Take my right of redemption yourself."

31) Ruth 4.8 "buy **for you**"
"Buy it for yourself."

At the climactic peak of the story of Ruth, the *Lamed* preposition construction is used to focus on the contrast between the person who has the right of redemption and the person who wishes to redeem the widow and the property. The first occurrence is heightened by the addition of the free pronoun "you" following the suffixed pronoun,[1] while the second is the simple imperative plus the prepositional construction. In both cases, the speaker draws a contrast between himself and Boaz, excluding himself completely from the transaction.[2]

On the level of style, it may be noted that when the *Lamed* preposition occurs in certain combinations of pronoun and verb, there is a repetition of sounds that lends an element of alliteration. The most obvious examples are the masculine imperatives of the verb "go" in the combinations *lek lēkâ* and *lēkû lâkem*.[3]

Translation problems

Grammarians and translators are in general agreement that the *Lamed* preposition construction is "often not expressible in English" (BDB 515; cf. Seow 1987:174). Lambdin is categoric in stating that it "has no translation value in English" (1971:146). Looking at a variety of English and French Scripture translations, it is clear that this item has not been consistently translated. While English translators may simply omit it, French translators frequently use the pattern *s'en aller* when

1 The free subject pronoun may occur initially preceding the imperative, as in Gen 6.21 and Ezek 4.1, or after the focus construction as here in Ruth 4.6.

2 The problem of translation of these verses is discussed in de Waard and Nida (1990:98, 100), although this focus element is not specifically noted. Instead, they propose that in 4.8, the command be interpreted as the granting of permission.

3 This pattern has been depicted as idiomatic usage (see Muraoka 1974:498, fn 2).

the verb is "to go". At other times, they use the reflexive form, *ne vous livrez pas*, as Old English used to say *trust ye not* (KJV Jer 7.4).

32) Gen 22.2 "and go **for you** to land the Moriah"
"and get thee into the land of Moriah" (KJV)
"and go to the land of Moriah" (RSV, NRSV, GNB)
"va-t'en au pays de Morija" (LS)
"Pars pour le pays de Moriyya" (TOB)
"va dans le pays de Moria" (FC)

33) Gen 22.8 "God will provide **for him** the lamb"
"God will provide himself a lamb" (KJV)
"God will provide himself the lamb" (RSV)
"God himself will provide the lamb" (NRSV)
"God himself will provide one" (GNB)
"God will see to the sheep" (NJV)

In the case of the African structures under discussion here, the question of translation is equally problematic. When used with the verb "go", Ashton compares it to the English "to go off, to be off" (1947:57). Samarin speaks about it semantically and says that "it is functionally equivalent to the English expressions subject + *himself*, or *as for* + subject" (1967:182).

The exegetical problems discussed earlier (26-28) become translation problems, because the translator must determine which choice to make. But even if the analysis of contrastive focus is accepted, how to translate it is not necessarily clear in English or French. At least in English, contrastive focus of this nature may be most often marked by emphatic stress.[1] In 33) above, the final version is the most accurate if it is read with the right intonation. The subject of the sentence, "God", needs to be emphasized, placing him in contrast to other possible sources of the lamb.

Languages which do have equivalent constructions may well be able to mark the element of contrast and the thematic shifts that accompany it in the original text. The Musey translation team from Chad translated Gen 27.43 as follows:[2]

34) "and rise flee **for you** to Laban" (Heb)
col kolo pii tuə̂ ki man vi wayanna Laban
"arise up flee go away of-you to your uncle Laban"
"for your part, arise, flee and go to your uncle Laban"

The instruction given to Jacob by his mother sets him apart from Esau. He is to leave the home and go *for his part* to her brother Laban in Haran, and so the story of Jacob takes a new turn.

Conclusion

It seems clear that the *Lamed* preposition plus pronoun pattern is a productive construction in Old Testament Hebrew. On the basis of the evidence, one can conclude that it may well have occurred with all pronouns. It does occur with a variety of verbs and with a variety of verb forms; it occurs in both positive and negative sentences. It also occurs in a variety of texts, both narrative and poetic, in

1 A fairly accurate, although formally unacceptable, English equivalent might be found in the expression, "let's us **go**!"

2 For examples from the Kuteb NT translation, see Koops MS 2:10-14.

both direct and indirect quotation. Its role in discourse is one of marking contrastive focus, and that contrastive focus may have a thematic function in the development of discourse. As shifts in focus are identified, as character role is defined, it becomes clearer how the story is being told and therefore how it should be told in translation.

The evidence therefore seems quite clear that the *Lamed* preposition plus pronoun construction should not be ignored merely because of the difficulty of translating it into Indo-European languages. This is rather an example of where functional equivalence may be quite relevant, where the translator may very well take a cue from the form of the source text in attempting to express and communicate the original message.

Bibliography

Ashton, E.O, *Swahili*. London: Longman's 1947.

Brown, F., with S.R. Driver and C.A. Briggs. (new ed. 1980). *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon.* Lafayette: Associated Publishers and Authors 1907. Cited as BDB.

Even-Shoshan, Abraham, ed. *A New Concordance of the Bible.* Jerusalem: "Kiryat Sefer" Publishing House, Ltd. 1990.

Frajzyngier, Zygmunt. "On the Intransitive Copy Pronouns in Chadic" in *Studies in African Linguistics, Supplement 7* 1977, 73-84.

Gesenius, Wilhelm and Emil Kautzsch. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar,* translated by A.E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon 1910. Cited as GKC.

Goodwin, W.W. *Greek Grammar*, rev. C.B. Gulick. Boston: Ginn and Co. 1930, 1956.

Koops, Robert. n.d. "Copy Pronouns in Kuteb Discourse." Ms. Cited as MS 1.

Koops, Robert. n.d. "Jukunoid Post-verbal Subject Pronouns." Ms. Cited as MS 2.

Lambdin, Thomas O. *Introduction to Biblical Hebrew*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons 1971.

Marchese, Lynell. "On Assertive Focus and the Inherent Focus Nature of Negatives and Imperatives: Evidence from Kru" in *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 5.2. 1983, 115-129.

Muraoka, T. "On the So-called *Dativus Ethicus* in Hebrew" in *Journal of Theological Studies* 29. 1978, 495-98.

Noss, Philip A. *Grammaire Gbaya.* Meiganga: Centre de Traduction Gbaya 1981.

Reyburn, William D. *A Handbook on The Book of Job.* New York: United Bible Societies 1992.

Samarin, William J. *A Grammar of Sango.* The Hague: Mouton and Co. 1967.

Seow, Choon Leong. *A Grammar for Biblical Hebrew*. Nashville: Abingdon Press 1987.

Thwing, Rhonda and John Watters. "Focus in Vute" in *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 9.2. 1987, 95-121.

Waard, Jan de and Eugene A. Nida. *Manuel du traducteur pour le livre de Ruth*, adap. by René Péter-Contesse. Stuttgart: Alliance Biblique Universelle 1990.

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