# Introduction

## 1.1. Introduction

Anyone looking up the meaning of כי אם (*kî ʾim*) in one of the standard lexica will probably find the seemingly endless variety of its supposed meanings perplexing. Certain interpretations are fairly straightforward such as 'that if' in Jer 26:15 (see [3] below), since each of the two particles, כי and אם respectively, are evaluated and translated separately. However, when כי and אם are treated as a single unit, the range of meanings attributed to them ('except', 'unless', 'but', 'but only', 'only', 'surely', and so forth) is hard to make sense of: one is often left wondering how such an array of interpretations can be derived from combining two particles (כי and אם) that in themselves have relatively clear uses.

  This book will focus on passages in which כי and אם are treated as a single unit, examples of what I will call the *Focus* כי אם *Pattern*. Of the 156 occurrences of כי אם in the Hebrew Bible, 118 examples will be analyzed here as examples of the Focus כי אם Pattern on the basis of the following three conditions. (For the moment I leave כי אם untranslated in [1].)

(1)     The Three Requirements for the Focus כי אם Pattern (Gen 15:4)
  (i)   There is a negative sentence before כי אם.
        לֹא יִירָשְׁךָ זֶה כִּי־אִם אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֵּעֶיךָ הוּא יִירָשֶׁךָ
        This one (= Eliezer of Damascus) shall not act as your inheritor; כי אם the one who comes out of your loins (= Isaac), he shall act as your inheritor.[1]
  (ii)  There is a repeated verbal phrase, which occurs both *before and after* כי אם.
        לֹא יִירָשְׁךָ זֶה כִּי־אִם אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֵּעֶיךָ הוּא יִירָשֶׁךָ
        This one shall not act as your inheritor; כי אם the one who comes out of your loins, he shall act as your inheritor.

---

1.   Here and elsewhere in this book all translations of Biblical Hebrew are my own, in consultation with standard translations, unless otherwise noted.

(iii)  There is a change in word order *after* כי אם that indicates focus.

לֹא יִירָשְׁךָ זֶה כִּי־אִם אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֵּעֶיךָ הוּא יִירָשֶׁךָ

This one shall not act as your inheritor; כי אם <u>the one who comes out of your loins, he</u> shall act as your inheritor.

When these three conditions are met, the Focus כי אם Pattern will be schematized into a tripartite structure in which Part A is a negative sentence, Part B is made up of the particle כי in combination with an elided antithetic conditional protasis marked by אם, and Part C consists of an explicitly marked focus construction, as indicated by a change in word order.

(2)     Tripartite structure of the Focus כי אם Pattern (Gen 15:4)

Part A   לֹא יִירָשְׁךָ זֶה
         This one shall not act as your inheritor.

Part B   כִּי־אִם [ יִירָשְׁךָ ]
         If [anyone acts as your inheritor],

Part C   אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֵּעֶיךָ הוּא יִירָשֶׁךָ
         the one who comes out of your loins, he shall act as your inheritor.

I indicate the repeated verbal phrases in gray, the focused element using a <u>thick underline</u>, and the elided material in [square brackets]. When the Focus כי אם Pattern makes use of resumptive elements such as הוא, as we see in Part C of (2), a <u>double underline</u> will be used to mark them.[2]

    In each of the 118 cases that I classify as examples of the Focus כי אם Pattern, כי אם has traditionally been equated with translations such as 'except', 'unless', 'but', 'surely', 'only' and so on. However, the simple application of these dictionary definitions often makes little sense in context and yields an ambiguous or inconsistent interpretation. When analyzed in terms of the Focus כי אם Pattern, it becomes increasingly clear that כי אם is used to generate and organize a contrastive focus construction in Part C, and that it cannot simply be equated with particular translations like 'except', 'unless', 'but' or 'surely'. The analysis of these 118 cases as examples of the Focus כי אם Pattern not only provides a unified way of analyzing the passages themselves but also a clarified interpretation of them as a group. Once these 118 כי אם examples have been presented and analyzed, the remaining thirty-eight examples of כי אם, which

---

2.  A detailed discussion of resumptive elements in the Focus כי אם Pattern may be found in §7.3.1.

do not conform to the Focus כי אם Pattern will also be analyzed, so that the reader can see how the examples of the Focus כי אם Pattern differ from these seemingly analogous cases.

What I term the Focus כי אם Pattern is based on two interrelated working hypotheses: (i) כי is capable of forming a matrix clause; while (ii) the particle אם orchestrates contrastive focus, by introducing an elided antithetic conditional protasis. These two hypotheses are inspired by recent linguistic work on the typology of clausal nominalization in various non-Western languages as well as long-running discussions of contrastive focus and ellipsis. These linguistic theories will be introduced in chapters 1 through 4, but the rest of the book adopts standard philological methods and demonstrates the reality and usefulness of the Focus כי אם Pattern.

## 1.2. Previous Explanations of כי אם

When each component of this collocation—namely, כי and אם respectively—retains its own meaning and is therefore treated independently, כי אם can generate various meanings compositionally. In Jer 26:15, for example, כי is traditionally interpreted as the complementizer 'that', while אם is translated with 'if', marking the protasis of a conditional sentence.[3]

(3)     Jer 26:15 (NRSV)

אַ֣ךְ יָדֹ֤עַ תֵּֽדְעוּ֙ כִּ֣י אִם־מְמִתִ֣ים אַתֶּ֗ם אֹתִי֙ כִּי־דָ֤ם נָקִי֙ אַתֶּ֣ם נֹתְנִ֣ים עֲלֵיכֶ֔ם וְאֶל־הָעִ֥יר הַזֹּ֖את וְאֶל־יֹשְׁבֶ֑יהָ

Only know for certain that (כי), if (אם) you put me to death, you will be bringing innocent blood upon yourselves and upon this city and its inhabitants.

Differences in the analysis of these two particles as separate entities often lead to quite different translations of the same passage, however: NRSV, for example, translates כי אם in Lam 3:32 as 'although', while *HALOT* (471) interprets it as 'but if'.

Far more frequently, כי אם is treated as a unit and various meanings are assigned to the two particles in combination. These meanings have typically been divided into two categories: כי אם with *exceptive* meaning ('except',

---

3.  Here and throughout this book, lexical meanings will be placed in single quotation marks, but translations based on a specific context will appear in double quotation marks.

'unless') and כי אם with *adversative* meaning ('but', 'rather').[4] Genesis 32:27 and Exod 12:9 have often been used as examples, respectively, of the exceptive and the adversative meanings of כי אם.

(4)    Gen 32:27 (NRSV)

לֹא אֲשַׁלֵּחֲךָ כִּי אִם־בֵּרַכְתָּנִי

I will not let you go, <u>unless</u> you bless me.

(5)    Exod 12:9 (NRSV)

אַל־תֹּאכְלוּ מִמֶּנּוּ נָא וּבָשֵׁל מְבֻשָּׁל בַּמָּיִם כִּי אִם־צְלִי־אֵשׁ רֹאשׁוֹ עַל־כְּרָעָיו וְעַל־קִרְבּוֹ

Do not eat any of it raw or boiled in water, <u>but</u> roasted over the fire, with its head, legs, and inner organs.

When כי אם is treated as a single unit, as in (4) and (5), it can be quite puzzling how meanings such as 'except' or 'but' are derived through the combination of כי and אם.

Various attempts have been made to explain how those meanings are derived from the two particles. Brown, Driver, and Briggs (hereafter BDB) as well as Joüon see כי אם as basically *exceptive* in meaning. They argue that the exceptive meaning is derived from a literal translation of כי אם as 'but if'. In their view, examples such as Gen 32:27 are to be translated as follows:

(6)    Gen 32:27 (BDB)

לֹא אֲשַׁלֵּחֲךָ כִּי אִם־בֵּרַכְתָּנִי

I will not let you go; <u>but if</u> you bless me (sc. I will let you go).[5]

BDB (474) explains that the second clause (כִּי אִם־בֵּרַכְתָּנִי, "but if you bless me") is subordinated to the first clause (לֹא אֲשַׁלֵּחֲךָ, "I will not let you go"), yielding "I will not let you go, except you bless me." Joüon, likewise, suggests that the exceptive meaning is derived from the "transition from the sense of *but if* to that of *If . . . not* (*nisi*)" taking Gen 32:27 as his example: "I will not let go of you, <u>but if you bless me (I will let go of you)</u>" = "I will not let go of you, <u>if you do not bless me</u>" (JM §172c, §173a–b). While both BDB and Joüon go on to argue that the adversative meaning of כי אם is derived from its exceptive meaning, they differ in the precise mechanism that they see operating in such a derivation. BDB (475) argues that the adversative

---

4.  See, among others, BDB 474–75; Van Leeuwen 1973, 42; Schoors 1981, 251–52; Aejmelaeus 1986, 201–8.

5.  I have modernized the translation.

meaning is derived by simply disregarding אם entirely: אם is pleonastic and in this case "the clause is no longer a limitation of the preceding clause but a contradiction of it." Rather than treating אם as pleonastic, Joüon uses the passage in (5), viz., Exod 12:9, to explain how the adversative meaning is derived from the exceptive: he extracts the translation "if it is not" from כי אם in much the same way that Gen 32:27 was dealt with above, and then equates it with "but," classifying it as adversative: "Do not eat anything that is half-cooked or boiled with water, *if it is not (= but)* roasted on fire" (JM §172c, n. 2). In contrast, Schoors (1981, 251–52) describes a process for deriving the exceptive and adversative meanings of כי אם that is, in some sense, the opposite of what BDB or Joüon had proposed. He sees the adversative meaning as the basic meaning of the compound כי אם. Then, equating the adversative meaning of כי alone with that of כי אם, he suggests that אם in itself is entirely pleonastic.

   In the midst of a detailed investigation of the particle כי, Follingstad (2001, 563–66) presents כי אם as instantiating "exhaustive-listing focus," which he sees as a subcategory of "contrastive focus." He explains that "the exhaustive-listing focus is contrastive in that it asserts a correction and replacement value with respect to the exclusion."

(7)    2 Kgs 4:2 (Follingstad)
       אֵין לְשִׁפְחָתְךָ כֹל בַּבַּיִת כִּי אִם־אָסוּךְ שָׁמֶן
       Your servant has nothing in the house <u>except</u> a jar of oil.

(8)    1 Sam 2:15 (Follingstad)
       וְלֹא־יִקַּח מִמְּךָ בָּשָׂר מְבֻשָּׁל כִּי אִם־חָי
       for he will not accept boiled meat from you, <u>but only</u> raw.

According to Follingstad, אֵין לְשִׁפְחָתְךָ כֹל בַּבַּיִת ("Your servant has nothing in the house") in (7) is an example of a "general negation," since it negates all possible objects, while the passage in (8) exemplifies a "specific negation," since it negates only a subset of possible objects—namely, "boiled meat" in contrast with other types of meat. Therefore, the general negation "nothing in the house" in (7) is modified (Follingstad speaks of a "correction") through the use of כי אם into "a jar of oil." In (8), however, a specific element "boiled meat" is negated and replaced by a different type of meat ("raw meat"). Follingstad goes on to argue that a correction in examples like (7) or a replacement in examples like (8) can generate semantic distinctions among the כי אם constructions that correspond to the traditional opposition between exceptive and adversative, even if both of these forms, in his view, belong to the same form of exhaustive-listing focus.

## 1.3. The Focus כי אם Pattern

Before going into the problems with these previous analyses of כי אם as a unit and why the Focus כי אם pattern that I propose here is capable of solving those problems, I first offer in this section a more detailed description of how the Focus כי אם Pattern operates.

### 1.3.1. Change in Word Order in Part C

That the Focus כי אם Pattern regularly indicates the focused material by moving it to the beginning of Part C is made clear if we compare the following two examples of "naming" formulas in Gen 17:5 and Gen 35:10. Both examples deal with name changes and make use of not only the same basic vocabulary, but also the same phraseology. In Gen 17:5, ו acts as a conjunction between the two clauses, while Gen 35:10 uses the כי אם construction that is under discussion here.

> (9)　　Contrast between Gen 17:5 and Gen 35:10
> > (9a)　Gen 17:5[6]
> > וְלֹא־יִקָּרֵא עוֹד אֶת־שִׁמְךָ אַבְרָם
> > Your name shall no longer be called Abram.
> > וְהָיָה שִׁמְךָ אַבְרָהָם
> > ו your name shall be Abraham.
> > (9b)　Gen 35:10
> > לֹא־יִקָּרֵא שִׁמְךָ עוֹד יַעֲקֹב
> > Your name shall no longer be called Jacob.
> > כִּי אִם־יִשְׂרָאֵל יִהְיֶה שְׁמֶךָ
> > כי אם Israel, your name shall be.

Genesis 35:10 in (9b) meets the three conditions that I have listed above in (1): there is a negative sentence before כי אם (לֹא־יִקָּרֵא שִׁמְךָ עוֹד יַעֲקֹב, "Your name shall no longer be called Jacob"); there is a repeated verbal phrase before and after כי אם (יִקָּרֵא שִׁמְךָ, "your name shall be called," and יִהְיֶה שְׁמֶךָ, "your name shall be")[7]; and finally there is a change in word order *after* כי אם that indicates focus (יִשְׂרָאֵל יִהְיֶה שְׁמֶךָ, "Israel, your name shall be"). While Abram's new name אַבְרָהָם ("Abraham") appears in its usual position at the end of the clause (וְהָיָה שִׁמְךָ אַבְרָהָם) in (9a), the change in word order in (9b) indicates that a focus construction of some kind at work: Jacob's new name יִשְׂרָאֵל ("Israel") moves in front of יִהְיֶה שְׁמֶךָ ("your name shall be").

6. For the presence of את in Gen 17:5, see the discussion in JM §128b and GKC §121b.
7. The repeated verbal phrases can take exactly the same form as in Gen 15:4 or a different phrase that is semantically equivalent as in Gen 35:10 (for a detailed discussion, see §4.3).

Although most analyses ignore the particle אם in these כי אם constructions, in my view, אם plays the decisive role in organizing the focus structures that invariably appear in the material that follows כי אם: I suggest that אם in the Focus כי אם Pattern regularly introduces a conditional protasis, orchestrating the focus construction that appears in initial position in Part C, although the content of this conditional protasis regularly undergoes ellipsis.[8]

> (10)     Gen 35:10 as a Focus כי אם Pattern
> Part A    לֹא־יִקָּרֵא שִׁמְךָ עוֹד יַעֲקֹב
>           Your name shall no longer be called Jacob.
> Part B    [כִּי אִם [יִקָּרֵא שִׁמְךָ
>           If [your name is called anything],
> Part C    יִשְׂרָאֵל יִהְיֶה שְׁמֶךָ
>           Israel, your name shall be.

In terms of meaning, the elided materials in Part B correspond to an English phrase like "(if) any...," allowing for the possibility that a limited subset of entities (belonging to the same class or type as the negated elements in the clause preceding כי אם) represents a contrast to the negative statement in Part A.

### 1.3.2. Negative Polarity Items (NPIs)

Words that are equivalent to the "any..." in Part B in examples of the Focus כי אם Pattern, such as (2) or (10), are normally termed "negative polarity items" (NPIs) or "free choice items" (FCIs) in discussions of English *any*. Because discussions of NPIs have emerged in the literature on Biblical Hebrew in recent years, I will focus on NPIs rather than FCIs here. In formal terms, NPIs are "words or phrases that cannot occur in simple affirmative clauses, but are grammatical in negative clauses and certain other non-affirmative contexts," such as clauses that include an interrogative or a conditional protasis (Pullum and Huddleston 2002, 834–48, apud Moshavi 2019, 68–70). As we shall see in a moment, this definition of NPIs does not allow for a straightforward identification of NPIs in Biblical Hebrew. Nonetheless, even if NPIs cannot yet be precisely identified in Biblical Hebrew, it is clear that constructions involving negation often show various kinds of morphosyntactic restriction: this is nicely captured in Givón's set of contrastive examples in English (1978, 95–96, apud Horn 2001, 157):

8.  General constraints on ellipsis such as identity and the crucial role of focus have been discussed in detail in Merchant 2001, 10–37 as well as Repp 2009, 42–82. Miller applies these principles of ellipsis to Biblical Hebrew (see Miller 2007, 165–80; 2005, 37–52; 2003, 251–70). I return to the question of how these constraints on ellipsis apply to the Focus כי אם Pattern in §4.6.

(11)     Givón's Examples of the Restricted Distribution of Negation
    (11a)     When John {comes / ?doesn't come}, I'll leave.
    (11b)     When did John {arrive / ?not arrive}?
    (11c)     How did he {do it / ?not do it}?
    (11d)     With what {did he / ?didn't he} cut the meat?
    (11e)     I had the doctor {examine / ?not examine} Mary.
    (11f)     I {want to / ?want not to / don't want to} work.
    (11g)     She was as fast as he {was / ?was not}.
    (11h)     And then {came / ?didn't come} John.
    (11i)     There {stood / ?didn't stand} a man in front of the mirror.

If we contrast the two sentences in (11a), "When John comes, I'll leave" is perfectly fine in both grammatical and pragmatic terms, while "When John doesn't come, I'll leave" is grammatical, but strikes most English speakers as pragmatically odd, hence the preposed question mark. In Horn's landmark *A Natural History of Negation* (2001), examples like this—none involving NPIs—are used to suggest that a wide variety of subtle phenomena (and judgments) come into play, when negation interacts with other elements in a sentence. So, even if we cannot yet precisely define NPIs or similar constructions in Biblical Hebrew, it is still a useful heuristic for exploring analogous constructions in Biblical Hebrew. Several different words in Biblical Hebrew have been suggested as possible NPIs, including איש ('anyone'), מאומה ('anything'), and כל ('all, every, any'), to name just a few.[9]

    We should be careful, however, not to simply assume that NPIs in Biblical Hebrew operate in the same way that they do in more familiar languages like English. There are several differences between Biblical Hebrew and English, particularly in the usage, obligatoriness and meaning of NPIs in these two languages (and it may be necessary to look more closely at the definition of NPIs in Biblical Hebrew in future). It looks like the same words that function as NPIs such as מאומה in (12a) or דבר in (13a) can also occur in affirmative sentences like (12b) and (13b), which is not true of the English equivalents.[10]

(12)     מְאוּמָה
    (12a)     In a negative sentence (Gen 39:6)
        וַיַּעֲזֹב כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־לוֹ בְּיַד־יוֹסֵף וְלֹא־יָדַע אִתּוֹ מְאוּמָה
        He (= Potiphar) left everything that belongs to him in the hand of Joseph. He did not pay attention to <u>anything</u> with him (= Joseph) there.

---

9.  Naudé and Rendsburg 2013, 805–7; Moshavi 2019, 67–90.
10.  For the use of דבר as an NPI, see (21) in §1.3.3.

(12b)    In an affirmative sentence (2 Kgs 5:20)

חַי־יְהוָה כִּי־אִם־רַצְתִּי אַחֲרָיו וְלָקַחְתִּי מֵאִתּוֹ מְאוּמָה

YHWH lives, if I run after him, I will get <u>something</u> out of him.

(13)    דָּבָר

(13a)    In a negative sentence (Esth 2:15)

לֹא בִקְשָׁה דָּבָר

She did not request <u>anything</u>.

(13b)    In an affirmative sentence (1 Sam 14:12)

עֲלוּ אֵלֵינוּ וְנוֹדִיעָה אֶתְכֶם דָּבָר

Come up to us, we will show you <u>something</u>.

This looks unpromising, but as Anastasia Giannakidou makes clear in a 2012 survey, the occurrence of NPIs in seemingly improper contexts has led to a number of redefinitions of where NPIs can occur over the last fifty years.[11] Thus, the fact that (12b) is an oath rather than a descriptive statement or the presence of the prefix (imperfect) conjugation in (13b), equivalent to a future tense in English, would allow for an NPI under newer definitions.[12] Even so, there is no lexical distinction between NPIs and other terms in Biblical Hebrew that would allow for a straightforward paradigm: מְאוּמָה and דָּבָר seem to operate in the same way in both positive and negative sentences, as in (12) and (13). English shows a nice contrast between *anything* and *something*: *anything* can be used in negative or interrogative sentences like "we didn't see anything" or "did you see anything?" in contrast to the use of *something* in "we saw something." In Biblical Hebrew, however, we typically see a single term operating in both of these contexts, as we see in (12) and (13).

Furthermore, while English *requires* NPIs like 'anyone' (often equated with איש) or 'anything' (often equated with מאומה) to be used in negative or conditional clauses, Biblical Hebrew generally does not. The following are contrastive examples in Biblical Hebrew, in which the first of each pair includes an NPI, while the second does not (NPIs are missing from the Biblical Hebrew examples in [14b], [15b], [16b] and [17b]; these missing NPIs are represented

11. Giannakidou (2012, 1672) defines the environments that allow NPIs in terms of non-veridicality: leaving aside the technical definition, this includes constructions involving negation, "imperatives, with modal verbs, subjunctive complements of propositional attitudes, habituals, and disjunctions." See in particular the list of environments in Giannakidou's table 64.1 on p. 1674.

12. Moshavi (2019, 81–82) suggests that positive oaths represent a special context that allows for NPIs, because they are not episodic—in line with more recent definitions—but this depends on how we conceptualize oaths.

in square brackets in the English translations in [14] through [17]), although, as the English translations indicate, English normally requires NPIs in both.[13]

(14)     אִישׁ
    (14a)   Presence of NPI (2 Kgs 23:18)
         אִישׁ אַל־יָנַע עַצְמֹתָיו
         Do not let <u>anyone</u> move his bones.
    (14b)   Absence of NPI (2 Chr 23:6)
         וְאַל־יָבוֹא בֵית־יְהוָה
         Do not let [anyone] enter the house of YHWH.

(15)     כֹּל
    (15a)   Presence of NPI (Lev 18:23)
         וּבְכָל־בְּהֵמָה לֹא־תִתֵּן שְׁכָבְתְּךָ
         You shall not have sexual intercourse with <u>any</u> animal.
    (15b)   Absence of NPI (Neh 2:12)
         וּבְהֵמָה אֵין עִמִּי
         There was not [any] animal with me.

(16)     דָּבָר
    (16a)   Presence of NPI (2 Kgs 4:41)
         וְלֹא הָיָה דָּבָר רָע בַּסִּיר
         And there was not <u>anything</u> bad in the pot.
    (16b)   Absence of NPI (1 Sam 29:7)
         וְלֹא־תַעֲשֶׂה רָע בְּעֵינֵי סַרְנֵי פְלִשְׁתִּים
         You shall not do [anything] bad in the eyes of the lords of
         the Philistines.

(17)     מְאוּמָה
    (17a)   Presence of NPI (Deut 13:18)
         וְלֹא־יִדְבַּק בְּיָדְךָ מְאוּמָה מִן־הַחֵרֶם
         Do not let <u>anything</u> from the condemned things stick to
         your hand.
    (17b)   Absence of NPI (1 Sam 30:22)
         לֹא־נִתֵּן לָהֶם מֵהַשָּׁלָל אֲשֶׁר הִצַּלְנוּ
         We will not give them [anything] from the spoil that we
         have taken.

---

13.  In (14b), (15b), (16b), and (17b), NPIs other than the ones that I specified are possible: for example, מְאוּמָה may have been used instead of דָּבָר in (16b), as we see the occurrence of מְאוּמָה רָע ("anything bad") in Jer 39:12.

In these four pairs of examples, we see how an NPI can either be present or absent in Biblical Hebrew, whereas the corresponding sentences in English require an NPI.[14] Moreover, we also find that the NPIs can be modified in different ways: while the NPI is not accompanied by any modifying elements in (14a), the NPIs in (15a), (16a), and (17a) are modified by different elements: כֹּל in (15a) forms a construct chain with a following noun phrase (בֵּית אָבִי, "my father's house"); דָּבָר in (16a) is modified by an adjective (רָע, "bad"); מְאוּמָה in (17a) is modified by a prepositional phrase (מִן־הַחֵרֶם, "from the condemned things").

### 1.3.3. *Negative Polarity Items in the Focus* כי אם *Pattern*

Because there is still no broad consensus about the definition or use of categories like NPI or similar phenomena in Biblical Hebrew, I am going to use "NPI" as a heuristic term here. The paired examples in (14) through (17) not only show the different uses of NPIs in English and Biblical Hebrew, but also clarify that these uses of NPIs (whether they are present or absent; whether they are modified or not) will become quite important in my interpretation of Part A and Part B in this book. Most importantly, however, these paired examples also make abundantly clear that sentences that would require an NPI or similar element in English frequently make do without an explicit NPI in Biblical Hebrew. English translations of Part B regularly include an NPI, but I do not reconstruct an NPI in Part B in Biblical Hebrew, unless it is explicitly indicated in Part A.[15] In (18), for example, Part B in English requires an NPI such as 'anything' ("If [your name is called anything]"), but I do not reconstruct 'anything' in Hebrew ([כִּי אִם [יִקָּרֵא שְׁמְךָ]).

(18)　Gen 35:10 as a Focus כי אם Pattern (repeated from [10])
Part A　לֹא־יִקָּרֵא שִׁמְךָ עוֹד יַעֲקֹב
　　　　Your name shall no longer be called Jacob.
Part B　[כִּי אִם [יִקָּרֵא שִׁמְךָ
　　　　If [your name is called anything],
Part C　יִשְׂרָאֵל יִהְיֶה שְׁמֶךָ
　　　　Israel, your name shall be.

14. Moshavi's recent paper on מְאוּמָה (2019) suggests that the occurrence of מְאוּמָה in some contexts and not others might result from a difference in pragmatic emphasis, but without co-occurring markers of emphasis or clearly defined pragmatic environments it is difficult to be sure about the emphatic character of מְאוּמָה in Biblical Hebrew.

15. My use of the term "reconstruct" here and later on in this book is not meant as a source-critical statement, but simply refers to filling in elided material so as to clarify a linguistic form and its implications.

The negated elements in Part A often present us with a ready-made set of pos-sible or likely NPIs in Part B, which will be contrasted with other items from the same general class in Part C. In (18), for example, a personal name ( Jacob) is the negated element in Part A, so an NPI only shows up in the English trans-lation of Part B.

There are, however, a number of examples in which NPIs occur in Part A. In (19), for example, the term מְאוּמָה occurs in Part A and might plausibly be interpreted as an NPI, so I reconstruct both the NPI (מְאוּמָה) and the corre-sponding verbal phrase (יָדַע) in Part B, on the basis of what is given in Part A.

(19)    Gen 39:6 as a Focus כי אם Pattern[16]

Part A    וְלֹא־יָדַע אִתּוֹ מְאוּמָה

He (= Potiphar) did not pay attention to anything with him (= Joseph) there.

Part B    [מְאוּמָה אִתּוֹ יָדַע ] כִּי אִם

If [he paid attention to anything with him there],

Part C    [יָדַע אִתּוֹ ] הַלֶּחֶם אֲשֶׁר־הוּא אוֹכֵל

the bread that he was eating, [he paid attention to with him there].

Among the 118 examples of the Focus כי אם Pattern, twenty examples seem to explicitly mention an NPI in Part A, as in (19), although the exact number depends on how precisely NPIs are defined. The following table in (20) shows the NPIs explicitly attested in Part A of these twenty examples.

(20)    NPIs Explicitly Mentioned in Part A of the Focus כי אם Pattern

(20a)    כֹּל    Deut 12:13–14; 2 Sam 12:3; 19:29; 2 Kgs 4:22; 5:15; 23:22–23; Ezek 44:9b–16

(20b)    דָּבָר    Amos 3:7; Esth 2:15

(20c)    מְאוּמָה    Gen 39:6, 9; Jer 39:12

(20d)    אִישׁ    Num 26:65, 1 Sam 30:17, 2 Kgs 7:10

(20e)    נֶפֶשׁ    Lev 21:1b–3; 22:6–7

(20f)    אֶחָד    Deut 16:5–6[17]; Dan 10:21

(20g)    מָה    Mic 6:8[18]

The list in (20) is a tentative presentation of different (possible) NPIs used in Part A. Since Part A consists of a negative sentence, it can serve as a rich

---

16. For examples like Gen 39:6 in which the repeated verbal phrase is elided in Part C, see chapter 4 as well as appendix B.

17. See the discussion of Deut 16:5–6 in §4.3.1, where אֶחָד is used as an NPI.

18. For a detailed discussion about the use of מה as an NPI, see §6.6.

domain for studying negative polarity items (what can serve as NPIs and how they are used, for example). It is too early to give a definitive set of occurrences, but this list does provide some directions for future research.

Unlike the examples in (20), many other examples of the Focus כי אם Pattern do not have an explicitly indicated NPI in Part A.

(21)    2 Chr 23:6 as Focus כי אם Pattern
Part A    וְאַל־יָבוֹא
          Do not let (anyone) enter the house of YHWH.
Part B    [כִּי־אִם [יָבוֹא
          If [anyone enters],
Part C    הַכֹּהֲנִים וְהַמְשָׁרְתִים לַלְוִים הֵמָּה יָבֹאוּ
          the priests and ministering Levites, they will enter.

In (21), Part A does not explicitly indicate an NPI, while English translation requires it. In this book, wherever applicable, English translations in which an NPI is expected but not explicitly indicated in the Hebrew in Part A, as in (21), will include NPIs such as '(any)', '(anyone)' or '(anything)' in parentheses.

In the Focus כי אם Pattern, the NPIs in Part A (negative sentence) and in Part B (conditional protasis), whether present or reconstructed, have quite different referential characteristics: in (19), 'anything' (מְאוּמָה) in Part A functions as an NPI in a general negative statement, whereas 'anything' in Part B refers to a specific entity that will reappear under contrastive focus in Part C.[19] Because different elements in Part B systematically parallel explicit materials in both Part A and Part C, we have no explicit examples of NPIs attested in Part B.

## 1.4. Problems with Previous Analyses of כי אם as a Unit

In this section, I first discuss the somewhat arbitrary character of the division between adversative and exceptive uses of כי אם and argue that both adversative and exceptive examples in fact belong to the *single* category of the Focus כי אם Pattern. I then turn to the reanalysis of passages in which the translation value of 'only' is seen as one of the secondary senses of כי אם: in these passages as well I will argue that they can more satisfactorily be explained as examples of the Focus כי אם Pattern.

19.  In this sense, the *anything* that appears in Part B looks more like a free choice item (FCI), but I do not think it is very useful to pursue these distinct interpretations of English *any* here.

Previous researchers have often highlighted the opposition between adversative and exceptive uses of כי אם, particularly in those passages where it was seen as a single discursive entity. For example, Schoors (1981, 251–52) defines the exceptive and adversative meanings of כי אם as follows: "[W]hen an alternative is expressed after a negative clause, we have the simple adversative meaning of כי אם. On the contrary, when the negative clause is of a rather general significance and the next clause introduced by כי אם expresses a specific case that is opposed to this general negative statement, then the exceptive meaning is obvious." Gen 35:10 in (22) and 2 Chr 23:6 in (23) represent typical cases of the adversative and exceptive uses, respectively, of כי אם, according to Schoors's definition.

(22)    Gen 35:10 (NRSV)

לֹא־יִקָּרֵא שִׁמְךָ עוֹד יַעֲקֹב כִּי אִם יִשְׂרָאֵל יִהְיֶה שְׁמֶךָ

No longer shall you be called Jacob, but Israel shall be your name.

(23)    2 Chr 23:6 (NRSV)

וְאַל־יָבוֹא בֵית־יְהוָה כִּי אִם־הַכֹּהֲנִים וְהַמְשָׁרְתִים לַלְוִיִּם הֵמָּה יָבֹאוּ

Do not let anyone enter the house of the LORD except the priests and ministering Levites; they may enter.

The alternative יִשְׂרָאֵל יִהְיֶה שְׁמֶךָ ("Israel shall be your name") in (22) appears after a negative clause לֹא־יִקָּרֵא שִׁמְךָ עוֹד יַעֲקֹב ("No longer shall you be called Jacob"), so according to Schoors, the construction would be adversative. In (23), the negative clause before כי אם is a general statement וְאַל־יָבוֹא בֵית־ יְהוָה ("no one shall enter the house of the Lord"), while the clause after כי אם represents a specific instance (namely, "the priests and ministering Levites" who are allowed to enter the house of the LORD), which is opposed to the general negative statement. So the כי אם in (23) would have exceptive meaning on the basis of Schoors's definition.

In my view, however, (22) and (23) should be classified as examples of a single category: the Focus כי אם Pattern.

(24)    Comparison between Gen 35:10 and 2 Chr 23:6

|  | (24a) Gen 35:10 as a Focus כי אם Pattern | (24b) 2 Chr 23:6 as a Focus כי אם Pattern |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Part A | לֹא־יִקָּרֵא שִׁמְךָ עוֹד יַעֲקֹב  Your name shall no longer be called Jacob. | וְאַל־יָבוֹא בֵית־יְהוָה  Do not let (anyone) enter the house of YHWH. |

|  | (24a) Gen 35:10 as a Focus כי אם Pattern | (24b) 2 Chr 23:6 as a Focus כי אם Pattern |
|---|---|---|
| Part B | כִּי אִם [יִקָּרֵא שִׁמְךָ] If [your name is called anything], | [כִּי־אִם [יָבוֹא If [anyone enters], |
| Part C | יִשְׂרָאֵל יִהְיֶה שְׁמֶךָ Israel, your name shall be. | הַכֹּהֲנִים וְהַמְשָׁרְתִים לַלְוִיִם הֵמָּה יָבֹאוּ the priests and ministering Levites, they will enter. |

In terms of the syntactic or discursive structure of the two passages, it does not matter whether Part A is a general negation, nor whether a specific term is negated in Part A: the crucial point is that Part B in both examples includes an elided antithetic conditional protasis and orchestrates a contrastive focus construction in Part C, as can be seen in (24).

The problem with the traditional distinction between adversative and exceptive uses becomes particularly clear if we turn to a passage such as Ezek 44:22. The interpretation of כי אם as 'only' (or 'but only') has often emerged in earlier investigations, when the traditional distinction between adversative and exceptive fails to produce a coherent interpretation, as we see in (25).

(25)    Ezek 44:22 (NRSV)

וְאַלְמָנָה וּגְרוּשָׁה לֹא־יִקְחוּ לָהֶם לְנָשִׁים כִּי אִם־בְּתוּלֹת מִזֶּרַע בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל
וְהָאַלְמָנָה אֲשֶׁר תִּהְיֶה אַלְמָנָה מִכֹּהֵן יִקָּחוּ

They shall not marry a widow, or a divorced woman, but only a virgin of the stock of the house of Israel, or a widow who is the widow of a priest.

The negated elements in וְאַלְמָנָה וּגְרוּשָׁה לֹא־יִקְחוּ לָהֶם לְנָשִׁים ("they shall not marry a widow, or a divorced woman") are not general, but are specified as certain types of women. In other words, the part before כי אם is a specific negation with the alternative provided after כי אם. Thus, this example has to be classified as an adversative case, according to Schoors's definition. However, the phrase בְּתוּלֹת מִזֶּרַע בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהָאַלְמָנָה אֲשֶׁר תִּהְיֶה אַלְמָנָה מִכֹּהֵן ("a virgin of the stock of the house of Israel, or a widow who is the widow of a priest"), after כי אם, does not form a straightforward alternative relationship with the negated element before כי אם (וְאַלְמָנָה וּגְרוּשָׁה, "a widow, or a divorced woman"), and thus cannot be adversative. The list of women that comes after כי אם consists of Israelite virgins and widows of priests. One could say that the widows of

priests constitute an exception vis-à-vis the ban on marrying widows. At the same time, however, the Israelite virgins cannot be seen as an exceptional type of divorced woman. Rather, Israelite virgins would be in contrast to divorced women (hence, adversative). Here we have a case of apples and oranges: widows of priests are exceptive vis-à-vis widows, but virgins are adversative vis-à-vis divorced women. Given the perfect mixture of the two traditional uses of כי אם in this example, this traditional dichotomy actually tells us little about the כי אם construction itself, and these categories are best seen as a matter of translation technique rather than a real dichotomy in Biblical Hebrew.

(26)     Ezek 44:22 as a Focus כי אם Pattern
Part A   וְאַלְמָנָה וּגְרוּשָׁה לֹא־יִקְחוּ לָהֶם לְנָשִׁים
         A widow, or a divorced woman, they shall not take for themselves as wives.
Part B   כִּי אִם [ יִקְחוּ ]
         If [they take anyone],
Part C   בְּתוּלֹת מִזֶּרַע בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל וְהָאַלְמָנָה אֲשֶׁר תִּהְיֶה אַלְמָנָה מִכֹּהֵן יִקָּחוּ
         a virgin of the stock of the house of Israel, or a widow who is the widow of a priest, they shall take.

When Ezek 44:22 is analyzed as an example of the Focus כי אם Pattern, as in (26), the structure clarifies that the purpose of this discursive unit is to express contrastive focus: the reconstruction of Part B highlights the presence of the contrastive focus construction after כי אם.

In examples (24) and (26), we have seen that the reconstruction of the antithetic conditional protasis in Part B provides a consistent way of analyzing seemingly divergent examples. All of these examples fall into the single category of the Focus כי אם Pattern as long as they satisfy the three conditions in (1).

## 1.5. Contrastive Focus with a Change in Word Order

Since the Focus כי אם Pattern encodes a specific type of focus construction—namely, contrastive focus—in this penultimate section of chapter 1, I would like to return to the definition of contrastive focus as an analytical category. Follingstad (2001, 563–66), correctly in my view, has pointed out that the type of focus that typically occurs following כי אם is basically *contrastive* in meaning, although he suggests that כי אם instantiates a particular subcategory of "contrastive focus"—namely, "exhaustive-listing focus" (see §1.2). Follingstad writes that the "exceptive" use of כי אם can be "identified based on [its]

often distinctive syntactic configuration which includes a preceding negative, the particle אם, 'if' with כי, and typically some form of ellipsis in the כי אם clause. . . . The כי אם exceptive construction can be regarded as a type of contrastive focus with exhaustive exclusion. It not only excludes, it replaces and corrects a presupposition that goes against the exclusion." While Follingstad's discussion is quite insightful in many ways (and the only description of כי אם that substantially anticipates my own interpretation of the construction), one problem with his analysis is that he tends to posit rather precise semantic categories and subcategories without exemplifying or defending these categorizations in detail.[20] In his discussion of contrastive focus, for example, Follingstad posits two distinct subtypes: *replacement focus* and *exhaustive-listing focus*, linking replacement focus to certain uses of כי and exhaustive-listing focus to certain uses of the כי אם construction under discussion here. However, he excludes various examples from both categories largely on the basis of semantic criteria rather than formal syntactic or discursive features. The real problem with such an approach is that it often leads to circular arguments in which the conventional translation of a given passage is used to draw a semantic distinction, the passages are categorized on the basis of the semantic distinction, and then this categorization reaffirms the conventional translation. So caution is in order and formal distinctions in the syntactic and discursive structure of particular examples must outweigh any conventional interpretations or translations.

Clearly, within the broad array of כי אם constructions, the well-known opposition between exceptive and adversative uses of כי אם lies at the heart of these conventional interpretations and Follingstad maintains this opposition intact. However, as I discuss in §1.4 above, the traditional opposition between exceptive and adversative interpretations of the כי אם construction is problematic: there are borderline cases if they are classified using this traditional opposition. Instead of maintaining this traditional opposition, I argue that all כי אם constructions that meet the formal criteria in (1) should be analyzed as examples of the Focus כי אם Pattern. In my categorization of examples of the Focus כי אם Pattern, contrastive focus is recognized on the basis of a change in word order (and not on the basis of a semantic categorization of the kinds of contrast that occur after כי אם).

Kiss has identified a distinctive formal feature of contrastive focus, viz., movement (change of word order), which is in her view a formal property of

---

20. Admittedly, Follingstad's discussion amounts to little more than a short excursus buried in appendix F (2001, 562–68). Nonetheless, since his brief description represents, in my view, the most promising description of the כי אם construction up to now, I necessarily pay particular attention to its infelicities rather than its many strong points.

contrastive focus constructions in widely divergent languages (1998, 245–73). The focus construction in Part C of the Focus כי אם Pattern corresponds well to Kiss's formal criterion for contrastive focus in that the focused element in Part C involves movement and shows contrast with a negated element in Part A. I propose that we link change in word order in the Focus כי אם Pattern to a distinctively contrastive type of focus, along the lines outlined by Kiss.[21] Before turning to the specifics of Kiss's proposal, however, I briefly review the different types of word order change in Biblical Hebrew as well as the subset of these types that appear in Part C of the Focus כי אם Pattern.

### 1.5.1. *Different Types of Word Order Change in Biblical Hebrew*

In recent studies of Biblical Hebrew syntax, four categories have been proposed for descriptions of changes in word order: (i) topicalization; (ii) left dislocation; (iii) right dislocation; (iv) extraposition.[22] These four types are not necessarily tied to focus, although in some cases they certainly can be. In the following, I will briefly review these four types, and then go on to suggest that only the first three types occur in Part C of the Focus כי אם Pattern, where all three serve to express contrastive focus. In (27) through (30), I will underline dislocated elements as well as resumptive elements.

Both topicalization and left dislocation move a constituent to the very beginning of the sentence.

(27)    Topicalization
        אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים הִתְהַלֶּךְ־נֹחַ
        With God, Noah walked. (Gen 6:9)

(28)    Left Dislocation
        (28a)    1 Kgs 22:14
                 חַי־יְהוָה כִּי אֶת־אֲשֶׁר יֹאמַר יְהוָה אֵלַי אֹתוֹ אֲדַבֵּר
                 YHWH lives, what YHWH says to me, that I will speak!
        (28b)    Job 38:29
                 וּכְפֹר שָׁמַיִם מִי יְלָדוֹ
                 And the frost of heaven, who has given birth to it?

---

21.  Moshavi associates the focus construction found after כי אם with a change in word order as well, explaining it as "substitutional focusing," which "replaces an old value for x with a new one" as well as "focus of negation" (2010, 131–32, 136–40, see also my discussion in n. 15 in §4.4).

22.  Miller-Naudé and Naudé 2019; Korchin 2015; Holmstedt 2014. These four categories are widely used in biblical studies (see Naudé 1990 for an early discussion of the key contrast), but recent investigations offer somewhat more complex descriptions that I do not summarize here.

In Gen 6:9 in (27), אֶת־הָאֱלֹהִים is fronted. The major difference between topicalization and left dislocation is that topicalization does not involve a resumptive element that refers back to this dislocated element, as we see in (27), while left dislocation does involve this sort of resumptive element, as in (28). In (28a), the dislocated material (אֶת־אֲשֶׁר יֹאמַר יְהוָה אֵלַ, "what YHWH says to me") is resumed by אֹתוֹ ("that"). In (28b), כְּפֹר שָׁמַיִם ("the frost of heaven") is resumed by a pronominal suffix (וֹ–) at the end of the verb (ילד). The resumptive elements in (28) can be located immediately after the fronted constituent, as in (28a), or later on in the clause, as in (28b).

With right dislocation and extraposition, we turn our attention to the end of the sentence.

(29)    Right Dislocation
  (29a)    Lev 11:4–7
        אַךְ אֶת־זֶה לֹא תֹאכְלוּ מִמַּעֲלֵי הַגֵּרָה וּמִמַּפְרִיסֵי הַפַּרְסָה אֶת־
        הַגָּמָל . . . וְאֶת־הַשָּׁפָן . . . וְאֶת־הָאַרְנֶבֶת . . . וְאֶת־הַחֲזִיר . . .
        Nevertheless, <u>this one</u> you shall not eat among those that
        chew the cud or have divided hoofs, <u>the camel</u> . . . and
        <u>the rock badger</u> . . . and <u>the hare</u> . . . and <u>the pig</u> . . .
  (29b)    1 Sam 5:6
        וַיַּךְ אֹתָם בַּעֳפָלִים אֶת־אַשְׁדּוֹד וְאֶת־גְּבוּלֶיהָ
        And he struck <u>them</u> with tumors, <u>Ashdod and its
        vicinity</u>.

(30)    Extraposition (2 Sam 15:36)
      וּשְׁלַחְתֶּם בְּיָדָם אֵלַי כָּל־דָּבָר אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁמָעוּ
      And you shall send through them to me <u>everything that you hear</u>.

Again, the major difference between right dislocation in (29) and extraposition in (30) is the use of resumptive elements: while (29) includes a resumptive element, (30) does not. The resumptive element אֶת־זֶה ("this one") in (29a) refers to a series of animals which are moved to the end of sentence. Similarly, the resumptive pronoun אֹתָם ("them") in (29b) refers to Ashdod and its vicinity, which is located at the end of the sentence. As was the case with left dislocation in (28), resumptive elements in examples of right dislocation can be either fronted ([29a]) or not ([29b]).

### 1.5.2. *Change of Word Order in Part C*

In Part C of the Focus אם כי Pattern, only the first three types discussed in §1.5.1 actually occur: (i) topicalization; (ii) left dislocation; (iii) right dislocation.

The following examples in (31) through (33) are examples of the Focus כי אם
Pattern that correspond to types (i) to (iii), respectively.

(31)    Gen 35:10 (Topicalization in Part C)

Part A    לֹא־יִקָּרֵא שִׁמְךָ עוֹד יַעֲקֹב
          Your name shall no longer be called Jacob.

Part B    [יִקָּרֵא שִׁמְךָ] כִּי אִם
          If [your name is called anything],

Part C    יִשְׂרָאֵל יִהְיֶה שְׁמֶךָ
          Israel, your name shall be.

(32)    Gen 15:4 (Left Dislocation in Part C)

Part A    לֹא יִירָשְׁךָ זֶה
          This one (= Eliezer of Damascus) shall not act as your inheritor.

Part B    [יִירָשְׁךָ] כִּי־אִם
          If [anyone acts as your inheritor],

Part C    אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֵּעֶיךָ הוּא יִירָשֶׁךָ
          the one who comes out of your loins, he shall act as your
          inheritor.

(33)    Deut 7:2c–5 (Right Dislocation in Part C)

Part A    לֹא־תִכְרֹת לָהֶם בְּרִית וְלֹא תְחָנֵּם וְלֹא תִתְחַתֵּן בָּם בִּתְּךָ לֹא־תִתֵּן לִבְנוֹ וּבִתּוֹ
          לֹא־תִקַּח לִבְנֶךָ
          You shall not make a covenant with them, and you shall not show
          them mercy, and you shall not intermarry with them, your daugh-
          ter you shall not give for his son, and his daughter you shall not
          take for your son.
          (= לֹא תַעֲשׂוּ לָהֶם כֵּן
          You shall not do so to them.)
          . . .

Part B    [תַעֲשׂוּ לָהֶם] כִּי אִם
          If [you do anything to them],

Part C    כֹּה תַעֲשׂוּ לָהֶם מִזְבְּחֹתֵיהֶם תִּתֹּצוּ וּמַצֵּבֹתָם תְּשַׁבֵּרוּ וַאֲשֵׁירֵהֶם תְּגַדֵּעוּן
          וּפְסִילֵיהֶם תִּשְׂרְפוּן בָּאֵשׁ
          thus you shall do to them, their altars, you shall break down, and
          their pillars, you shall smash, and their sacred posts, you shall cut
          down, and their images, you shall burn them in fire.

In (31), Part C includes an example of topicalization: "Israel" is positioned
before the verb. Part C in (32), however, shows left dislocation, since "the one
who comes out of your loins" has been moved to the beginning of the clause

and there is also a resumptive element, הוא. The right dislocation example in
(33) might seem too complicated at the moment, but I will explain it in detail
in chapter 5. To mention only what is immediately relevant to our discussion
here, the fronting of כּה in Part C acts as a resumptive element that refers to the
right dislocated material at the end of the sentence ("their altars . . . in fire").
So, we see that three of the four types of word order change in Biblical Hebrew
also occur in Part C of the Focus כי אם Pattern.

The surprising thing about changes in word order in Part C is that while
resumptive elements in the left dislocation or right dislocation examples can
be located relatively freely in the sentence in other contexts, those that occur
in Part C of the Focus כי אם Pattern are *always fronted* (see [32] and [33]).
To reiterate, the syntactic possibilities are heavily restricted in Part C of the
Focus כי אם Pattern and *even the resumptive elements are necessarily fronted*: not
only the focused elements, but also the resumptive elements are followed by
the repeated verbal phrases in Part C. It is noteworthy that the last category
([iv] extraposition) does not occur in the examples of the Focus כי אם Pattern,
presumably because it does not involve fronting and is therefore excluded
from the construction. I argue that the distinctive aspect of word order change
in Part C of the Focus כי אם Pattern is tied to contrastive focus, rather than
other purposes. In §1.4, I discussed the role that Part B plays in anticipating the
focus construction in Part C. Combined with this particular role of Part B in
the tripartite structure of the Focus כי אם Pattern, the heavily restricted syntax
in Part C serves to clearly mark contrastive focus. While Part A and Part B
are each playing their own crucial role in bringing about contrastive focus in
Part C, if we only look at Part C itself, the contrastively focused element is
consistently indicated by movement.

### 1.5.3. Contrastive Focus

Among the many discussions of contrastive focus, Kiss's proposal is known
for the centrality that movement plays in its definition of contrastive focus.
Her discussion of contrastive focus is basically in agreement with Follingstad's
description of the semantics of כי אם, but adds an important formal dimen-
sion to his definition of contrastive focus. According to Kiss (1998, 245–73),
there are two basic types of focus: *informational* as opposed to *identificational*
focus.[23] Since she explicitly equates the latter type (identificational focus)
with the widely used category of *contrastive focus,* I will simply use the

---

23.  What Kiss terms "identificational focus" should not be confused or conflated with "iden-
tificational" or "informational" as used by Shimasaki and his predecessors (Shimasaki 2002, 7–9,
37–39).

opposition between *informational focus* and *contrastive focus* to describe her work. Kiss defines informational focus, for example, as the phrase in a sentence that answers a wh-question like *who* or *what*. In (34), the underlined word "John" is informationally focused.

(34)    A: Who ate the apple?
         B: John ate the apple.

In some languages, such as English, informationally focused elements move to the same position in a sentence that is usually occupied by a wh-word. Biblical Hebrew also seems to use movement to indicate that a given phrase is the informationally focused element (see, for example, Gen 29:4; 2 Sam 1:8; Judg 1:1–2; 6:29).[24] Kiss is primarily interested, however, in defining contrastive focus and argues that contrastive focus exhibits not only a specific semantic profile cross-linguistically, but more importantly that there are also formal similarities between contrastive focus constructions in otherwise widely divergent languages.

   In formal terms, Kiss argues that contrastive focus always involves movement of the focused element to the beginning of the clause or, in languages like English, even the formation of a cleft sentence:

(35)    It was a hat that Mary picked for herself. (Kiss 1998, 250)

In this example "hat" has been moved out of its usual position in an ordinary descriptive sentence like "Mary picked a hat for herself" and appears, instead, at the beginning of the clause in the form of a cleft sentence. Kiss sees the sentence in (35) as "adequate to describe a situation in which Mary chose one from among various pieces of clothing; it expresses that of the pieces of clothing present in the domain of discourse, she picked for herself a hat, *and she did not pick anything else*" (1998, 249, italics added). This informal description of the meaning of contrastive focus is shared by nearly all descriptions of the phenomenon; however, it is Kiss's limitation of contrastive focus to constructions that involve *movement* of the contrastively focused material into a new position in the sentence that sets her definition of contrastive focus apart from others.

   The most common way of marking contrastive focus in Biblical Hebrew seems to be through a change in word order, typically movement of the focused material to clause-initial position. The focus construction in Part C of the Focus כי אם Pattern corresponds well to Kiss's formal criterion for

---

24.  Shimasaki (2002, 56–57) explains 2 Sam 1:8 and Gen 29:4 as "predicate focus," while Judg 1:1–2 and 6:29 are classified as "argument focus" constructions.

contrastive focus in that the focused element in Part C involves movement (even including the movement of resumptive elements) and shows contrast with a negated element in Part A. For example, in Gen 15:4 in (32) אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֵּעֶיךָ, "the one who comes out of your loins," in Part C is fronted, together with its resumption (הוּא), and at the same time it stands in explicit contrast with זֶה ("this one") in Part A.

## 1.6. Plan

The rest of the monograph proceeds as follows. Chapters 2–4 explain the Focus כי אם Pattern in greater detail and justify its formal structure in terms of other syntactic and discursive patterns in Biblical Hebrew. Chapter 2 will discuss the role of כי in the Focus כי אם Pattern as a nominalizer that forms stand-alone nominalizations on the basis of my earlier work (Park 2015, 2016). Chapter 3 will discuss the ellipsis of the material following אם in the Focus כי אם Pattern. Chapter 4 will deal with the Focus כי אם Pattern in both its full and reduced forms. The next four chapters (chapters 5–8) then elaborate on certain special features of the Focus כי אם Pattern: examples of the construction that use right dislocation, as in (33), are covered in chapter 5; in chapter 6, I discuss examples in which the negation in Part A is expressed in different forms, such as with a rhetorical question; chapter 7 looks at cases that involve multiple-focus constructions in Part C; chapter 8 deals with examples such as Gen 32:27, in which verbs in suffix conjugation are focused, taking on the role of a precondition. In chapter 9, I will discuss all the remaining כי אם examples that do not belong to the Focus כי אם Pattern. Chapter 10 will suggest some other possible examples of the Focus כי אם Pattern, in which אם or כי are not explicit. Then I will draw some conclusions in chapter 11. Appendices A and B schematize each and every example of the Focus כי אם Pattern (118 examples) in the Hebrew Bible, while appendix C includes all other occurrences of כי אם that do not belong to the Focus כי אם Pattern (thirty-eight examples).