



Universiteit  
Leiden  
The Netherlands

## The persistence of space: formalizing the polysemy of spatial relations in functional elements

Staps, C.

### Citation

Staps, C. (2024, June 20). *The persistence of space: formalizing the polysemy of spatial relations in functional elements*. LOT dissertation series. LOT, Amsterdam. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3764254>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3764254>

**Note:** To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

# A primer in Biblical Hebrew

---

---

A

Since three chapters in this dissertation discuss phenomena in Biblical Hebrew, this appendix provides the necessary background for readers unfamiliar with this language. For reasons of space only a very brief introduction can be given; reference works can be consulted for more information.

## A.1 Orthography and phonology

Like many other Semitic languages, Biblical Hebrew was originally transmitted in a consonantal script. I take my examples from the Masoretic Text, a standard version of the Hebrew Bible which was vocalized by a group of scholars in the 7<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> centuries of the common era. Occasionally I will remark on alternative vocalizations or textual emendations, but in general I follow the Masoretic Text.

Transliteration in this dissertation follows the guidelines of the *Journal of Semitic Studies*. Tables A.1 and A.2 provide an overview of the consonant and vowel inventories, respectively. Some comments on these tables:

- Since the transliteration follows traditional conventions that may not be transparent to the general reader, phonetic values are provided as well. These follow the Tiberian tradition according to Edzard (2011). Some of the phonetic values are disputed, and in any case they reflect various sound changes after the demise of Biblical Hebrew as a living language. The phonetic values are listed to give the reader some support in pronunciation if desired; the precise phonetic rendering is irrelevant to us here.
- The consonants */k m n p ʃ/* have a different form at the end of a word, extending below the baseline or (in the case of */m/*) closed.
- The consonants */b g d k p t/* are spirantized after vowels, indicated in the transliteration with a macron above or below the letter. In the

א	ʾ	[ʔ]	ח	<i>ḥ</i>	[ħ]	פ	<i>p</i>	[p]
ב	<i>b</i>	[b]	ט	<i>ṭ</i>	[ṭ]	ף	<i>p̄</i>	[f]
ב	<i>b̄</i>	[v]	י	<i>y</i>	[j]	צ	<i>ṣ</i>	[s]
ג	<i>g</i>	[g]	כ	<i>k</i>	[k]	ק	<i>q</i>	[q]
ג	<i>ḡ</i>	[ɣ, ʁ]	כ	<i>k̄</i>	[x, χ]	ר	<i>r</i>	[ʀ, ʁ, ʀ̄]
ד	<i>d</i>	[d]	ל	<i>l</i>	[l]	ש	<i>ś</i>	[s]
ד	<i>d̄</i>	[ð]	מ	<i>m</i>	[m]	שׁ	<i>š</i>	[ʃ]
ה	<i>h</i>	[h]	נ	<i>n</i>	[n]	ת	<i>t</i>	[t]
ו	<i>w</i>	[w]	ס	<i>s</i>	[s]	ת	<i>t̄</i>	[θ]
ז	<i>z</i>	[z]	ע	<i>ʿ</i>	[ʕ]			

**Table A.1** Transliteration and phonetic value of Biblical Hebrew consonants.

א	<i>a</i>	[a(:)]	א	<i>a, Ø</i>	[a, Ø]
א	<i>ā, â</i>	[ɔ(:)]	א	<i>ă</i>	[a]
א	<i>ε</i>	[ε(:)]	א	<i>ě</i>	[ɛ]
א	<i>ē</i>	[e(:)]	א	<i>ǎ</i>	[ɔ]
א	<i>ī, i</i>	[i(:)]			
א	<i>ū, u</i>	[u(:)]			
א	<i>ō</i>	[o(:)]			

**Table A.2** Transliteration and phonetic value of Biblical Hebrew vowels.

Hebrew script the non-spirantized pronunciation is indicated with a dot in the letter.

- The transliteration *y/wh* is used for the divine name יהוה ‘Yahweh’, which is traditionally not pronounced but replaced by *’ădōnāy* ‘my lord’ or *’ēlōhīm* ‘God’.

## A.2 Verbal morphology

Verbal forms are based on a triconsonantal root, which delineates a certain semantic field. Within this field, verbal templates consisting of a vowel pattern and, in some cases, affixes, derive a specific verbal meaning through specifying one of three different types of Aktionsart: simple, pluractional, and causative. The system of verbal templates (also called “stems” or “bin-yanim”) is also used to specify active, passive, reflexive, and middle Voice. As shown in table A.3, not all Aktionsart-Voice combinations are productive in Biblical Hebrew anymore.<sup>1</sup> This table also indicates the glossing abbreviations used for these templates.

	Simple	Pluractional	Causative
Active	Qal (none)	Piel (PLURACT)	Hiphil (CAUS)
Passive	Passive qal (PASS)	Pual (PLURACT.PASS)	Hophal (CAUS.PASS)
Reflexive	n/a	Hithpael (PLURACT.REFL)	n/a
Middle	Niphal (MID)		

Table A.3 Names and glossing abbreviations for verbal templates.

In many cases the meaning of a root in a certain template has lexicalized. In such cases, I will not gloss Aktionsart and/or Voice but simply give an appropriate English translation.

<sup>1</sup> The reflexive Voice of the simple and causative template dropped out of use. Though listed under simple Aktionsart, the niphal is not properly related to any type of Aktionsart and never had parallels in the pluractional or causative templates.

Finite forms are inflected for person, gender (masculine or feminine, except in the first person, which has common gender), and number (singular or plural). There are two main verbal conjugations: a suffix conjugation and a prefix conjugation. The suffix conjugation indicates person, gender, and number using suffixes and marks perfective/gnomic aspect and/or past tense. The prefix conjugation indicates person, gender, and number using both suffixes and prefixes, and marks imperfective aspect, non-past tense, and various modal nuances. Since these conjugations are traditionally called “perfect” and “imperfect”, respectively, I use PFV and IPFV to gloss them. However, it should be kept in mind that they are not pure aspectual forms.

A dedicated conjugation is used to relate sequential events in the simple past in narrative texts. This conjugation, the *wayyiqtol*, consists of a conjunction (*wa-*) followed by an old preterite (*yiqtol*). The conjunction is semantically very light and can be translated as ‘and’, ‘but’, ‘then’, ‘so’, zero, or otherwise, depending on context. I gloss the conjunction in *wayyiqtol* forms as WAYQ and assume a morpheme boundary rather than a clitic boundary after the conjunction.

A less frequent form is *wəqāṭal*, of which the main function is to continue a previous modal form. This form consists of the conjunction *wə-* followed by the form of the suffix conjugation (*qāṭal*), though in some forms the stress shifts. I gloss the conjunction in these forms as WQAT and again assume a morpheme boundary rather than a clitic boundary, to distinguish these forms from regular suffix conjugation forms following a conjunction.

In addition to these four main conjugations, Biblical Hebrew has an imperative for the second person (glossed IMP) and a jussive for the second/third person (glossed JUSS).<sup>2</sup>

There are two types of infinitives. The ‘infinitive construct’ is most similar to the infinitive or gerund in Indo-European languages; it is glossed as INF. The ‘infinitive absolute’ has various uses, the most notable of which is to strengthen a finite form of the same verb in the immediate context. This form is glossed INFABS.

Each verbal template has its own participle form, glossed PTCP. The *qal* template additionally has a passive participle, which is distinct in form but

2 The volitive of the first person exists but does not appear in the examples in this dissertation. The M.SG imperative, marked by  $-\emptyset$ , can be extended with a “paragogic”  $-\ddot{a}$ , which has little semantic value; I treat it as an allomorph of the M.SG.

similar in meaning to the participle of the passive qal. I gloss the passive participle of the qal as *PTCP.PASS* (the participle of the passive qal, which does not appear in this dissertation, would be glossed *PASS.PTCP*).

When pronominal, objects are indicated with suffixes on the verb.<sup>3</sup> On the infinitive construct, a pronominal suffix may indicate both the subject and the object.

### A.3 Nominal morphology

Nouns and adjectives are declined for gender (masculine or feminine) and number (singular, plural, or dual; the latter is of limited productivity). I do not gloss grammatical gender on nouns except where needed to clarify agreement features on verbs and adjectives.

Nominal forms can be in two ‘states’. The absolute state is used in most environments. The construct state is used in possessive constructions to mark possessedness. Nominals in the construct state are immediately followed by their possessor. I gloss the construct state with ‘of’ or ‘-of’, and do not mark the absolute state.

---

3 In some conjugations the object suffix can be preceded by an “energetic” *n*, which has little semantic value; I do not gloss this morpheme.



# Index of ancient sources

---

<b>Genesis</b>	16:13, 134, 135n28	26:22, 134, 135n28
1:2, 173	17:5, 134, 135n28	26:24, 138n30
2:16–17, 141	17:15, 134n28, 143n35	26:35, 73n33
2:17, 138n30	17:16, 56n14	27:1, 147
2:23, 134n28	18:2, 126n17, 127	27:36, 155n45, 156
3:1, 132, 133	18:20, 88, 158	29:2, 126n17
3:20, 134n28	18:22, 170n10	29:15, 155n45, 156
4:5–6, 169	18:26, 145	29:32, 134, 135n28
4:25, 134, 135n28	18:28, 47	29:33, 134, 135n28
5:24, 139n31	19:24, 126n19	31:12, 138n30
6:1, 146n38	19:27, 170n10	31:15, 46n4
6:8, 141n33	19:28, 126n17, 126n19	31:19, 149
6:18, 141n33	19:32, 56n14	31:36, 149
8:9, 141n33	21:7, 121n14	31:37, 146n38
8:13, 126	21:12, 138n30	31:49, 135n28, 146
8:21, 121n14	21:16, 139n31	31:52, 131
9:6, 47	21:17, 138n30	32:13, 54
9:11, 48, 71	21:23, 54	32:18, 144
10:25, 134, 135n28, 139n31	21:30, 131	32:25–26, 125
11:9, 134, 135n28	21:31, 134, 135n28	32:29, 134, 135n28, 143n35
12:13, 129	22:13, 126	32:31, 134, 135n28
12:18, 130	24:3–4, 142	33:1, 126n17
12:19, 130n22	24:4, 143n35	34:14, 135
15:8, 67	24:50, 67	35:1, 171n12
15:16, 139n31	24:63, 126n17	35:7, 134, 135n28, 171n12
16:4, 125	25:18, 172n15	35:10, 143n35
16:6, 171	25:21, 139, 139n32	35:17, 138n30
16:10, 54	25:25–26, 135n28	35:18, 135n28
16:11, 134, 135n28	26:8, 126n17, 146n38	37:17, 139n32
16:12, 172	26:13, 132	
	26:20, 134, 135n28	



37:20, 125  
 37:22, 149  
 37:25, 126n17  
 38:16, 121n14  
 40:14, 143n35  
 40:15, 138n30  
 41:36, 45, 52  
 41:45, 170n10  
 41:49, 132, 136  
 41:51, 134, 135n28  
 41:52, 134, 135n28  
 42:4, 139n31  
 42:9–16, 153  
 42:15, 67  
 43:3, 172  
 43:5, 172n16  
 43:14, 171n13  
 43:15, 170n10  
 43:16, 138, 138n30  
 43:21, 146n38  
 44:24, 146n38, 147  
 45:8, 141  
 45:26, 158n49  
 46:3, 71n30  
 47:7, 170n10

**Exodus**

2:15, 171n12  
 2:23, 66  
 3:6, 61  
 7:27, 182n3  
 8:24, 142  
 9:10, 170n10  
 9:11, 170n10  
 9:30, 171n14  
 10:28, 172n16  
 12:23, 182n2, 183  
 12:27, 182n2  
 15:23, 72  
 16:8, 67

17:6, 170n10  
 21:20, 54  
 21:22, 182, 182n4, 189  
 21:35, 182, 182n5  
 32:35, 182n2  
 34:30, 48, 61

**Leviticus**

1:2–3, 145  
 18:23, 170n10  
 21:7, 48  
 26:17, 178n21, 180n23,  
 182n8  
 27:8, 170n10

**Numbers**

3:6, 170n10  
 5:16, 170n10  
 5:18, 170n10  
 5:30, 170n10  
 14:42, 178n21, 180n23,  
 182n8  
 16:9, 170n10  
 27:2, 170n10  
 27:19, 170n10  
 27:21, 170n10  
 27:22, 170n10  
 35:12, 170n10

**Deuteronomy**

1:38, 170n10  
 1:42, 178, 178n21,  
 180n23, 182n8  
 5:5, 171n14  
 19:17, 170n10  
 28:7, 178n21, 180n23,  
 182n8  
 28:25, 178n21, 180n23,  
 182n8  
 29:14, 170n10

**Joshua**

9:13, 66  
 9:24, 171n14  
 10:8, 71n30, 170n10  
 10:11, 44, 52  
 10:29–30, 177  
 10:34–35, 177  
 11:6, 171n14  
 20:6, 170n10  
 20:9, 170n10  
 21:44, 170n10  
 22:24, 66  
 24:5, 182n2  
 32:9, 170n10

**Judges**

1:19, 142, 143n35  
 1:28, 146  
 2:14, 170n10  
 2:16–18, 147  
 2:18, 146n38  
 3:24, 126n17  
 4:3, 139n31  
 4:9, 143n35  
 4:23, 181  
 6:5, 146n38  
 6:6, 66  
 6:7, 146n38  
 6:30, 139n32  
 8:1, 146n38  
 8:28, 181  
 9:19, 63  
 9:43, 126n17  
 9:46–47, 129  
 10:10, 158  
 11:3, 171n12  
 12:5, 146n38  
 13:5, 138, 138n30  
 14:4, 68n28  
 14:17, 135

- 15:2, 130n23  
 16:15, 150  
 16:16, 146n38  
 16:17, 139n31  
 18:9, 137  
 20:32, 178n21, 182n8  
 20:35, 178n21, 179,  
 182n6  
 20:36, 178n21, 182n9  
 20:39, 178n21, 181,  
 182n8  
 21:21, 126n17
- 1 Samuel**
- 1:12, 146n38  
 1:13, 59n17  
 1:16, 61n19  
 1:20, 134, 135n28  
 2:11, 170n10  
 2:18, 170n10  
 3:1, 170n10  
 4:2, 165, 166, 178n21,  
 179, 182n8, 189  
 4:2–3, 189  
 4:3, 178n21, 182n6, 189,  
 190  
 4:10, 178, 178n21, 182n9  
 4:13, 139n32  
 4:20, 138n30  
 6:19, 139n32  
 6:20, 170n10  
 7:7, 171n14  
 7:10, 178n21, 180n23,  
 182n8  
 8:9, 159n50  
 8:18, 66  
 8:19, 140  
 10:1, 155n45, 157  
 10:11, 126n17, 156  
 10:24, 158
- 12:4–5, 131  
 12:5, 130  
 13:19, 139n32  
 14:27–29, 148  
 14:29, 146n38  
 14:30, 132, 133  
 14:39, 138n30, 153n43  
 14:44, 159n50  
 15:7, 172n15  
 15:24, 121n14  
 15:35, 128, 143n35  
 16:1, 136  
 16:7, 138n30  
 16:11, 138n30  
 16:21, 170n10  
 16:22, 170n10  
 17:28, 158n49  
 17:48, 146n38  
 18:12, 171n14  
 18:18, 150  
 18:29, 171n14  
 20:3, 153n43  
 20:12, 153n43  
 20:13, 152n41  
 20:26, 139n31  
 21:6, 133n26  
 21:11, 171n12  
 21:13, 171n14  
 22:22, 146n38  
 23:3, 133n26  
 23:27, 138n30  
 25:28, 159n50  
 25:30, 132  
 25:34, 152n41  
 25:38, 182n26, 182n2  
 26:10, 153n43, 182n2  
 26:15, 137  
 26:16, 153n43  
 28:1, 128
- 28:20, 44, 51  
 29:6, 152n41  
 30:6, 66, 139n32  
 30:12, 139n31  
 30:24, 159
- 2 Samuel**
- 2:17, 166, 178n21, 182n8  
 2:27, 152, 152n41  
 3:9, 152, 153n43  
 3:35, 153n43  
 3:37, 47, 66, 71  
 4:10, 146n38  
 4:11, 146n38  
 6:6, 139n32  
 6:13, 146n38  
 7:1, 146n38  
 7:12, 146n38  
 7:27, 134, 135n28  
 7:29, 44, 51  
 9:1, 132, 155  
 10:15, 178n21, 182n8  
 10:19, 178n21, 182n8  
 11:2, 127  
 12:5, 152, 153n43  
 12:12, 150  
 12:15, 182n2, 183  
 13:2, 139n31  
 13:28, 57, 155n45, 157  
 13:32, 138n30  
 13:34, 126n17  
 14:15, 139n31  
 15:21, 153n43  
 16:11, 133n26  
 17:11, 143n35  
 18:2–3, 132  
 18:3, 121n14, 132  
 18:7, 178n21, 182n8  
 18:24, 126n17  
 19:4, 62n23

## 208 The persistence of space

19:9, 171n12  
19:26, 146n38  
19:27, 139n32  
23:10, 132  
23:19, 155n45, 156

### 1 Kings

1:2, 170n10  
1:28, 170n10  
1:40, 47  
1:50, 172  
2:7, 171n12  
2:15, 68n28  
2:31, 180n24  
3:28, 171n14  
8:33, 178n21, 180n23,  
182n8  
8:50, 171n13  
10:8, 170n10  
11:23, 171n12  
12:2, 171n12  
12:6, 170n10  
12:8, 170n10  
14:12, 178n21, 182n8  
17:1, 170n10  
18:15, 170n10  
19:11, 170n10

### 2 Kings

1:15, 171n14  
3:14, 170n10  
4:12, 170n10  
5:15, 170n10  
5:16, 170n10  
8:9, 170n10  
19:6, 171n14  
25:26, 171n14

### Isaiah

1:29, 62n22  
19:22, 182n26, 182n2

20:5, 62n22  
22:3, 171n12  
26:17, 66  
28:7, 58  
34:7, 64n26  
37:6, 171n14  
48:20, 171n12  
51:21, 56, 71n30

### Jeremiah

1:8, 171n14  
2:36, 62n22  
7:10, 170n10  
12:13, 62n22  
13:16, 182n1  
15:1, 150, 170n10  
15:19, 170n10  
18:20, 170n10  
22:22, 62  
35:19, 170n10  
38:9, 66  
40:10, 170n10  
41:18, 171n14  
42:11, 171n14  
42:16, 66  
46:10, 64n26  
48:13, 62n22  
49:19, 170n10  
50:44, 170n10  
51:46, 61  
52:12, 170n10

### Ezekiel

8:11, 170n10  
16:27, 62n22  
16:29, 65  
16:54, 62n22  
16:61, 62n23  
28:18, 47  
32:4, 64n26  
32:6, 64n26

32:30, 62n22  
36:32, 62n22  
43:10, 62n22  
43:11, 62n22  
44:11, 170n10  
44:15, 170n10

### Hosea

4:19, 62n22  
7:5, 56n15  
10:6, 62n22

### Jonah

1:3, 171n12

### Micah

4:14, 46  
7:16, 62n22

### Zephaniah

3:11, 62n22

### Haggai

1:12, 171n14

### Zechariah

3:1, 170n10  
3:3, 170n10  
3:4, 170n10  
13:4, 62n22  
14:12, 182n26, 182n2  
14:18, 182n26, 182n2

### Psalms

3:1, 171n12  
4:8, 65n27  
27:1, 48  
38:19, 66  
57:1, 171n12  
65:5, 64n26  
69:7, 62  
78:65, 57  
89:24, 178n21, 182n2,  
182n7

89:43, 60n18  
 91:12, 182n1  
 103:5, 64n25  
 104:13, 64n26  
 106:46, 171n13  
 119:116, 62n22

**Job**

1:11, 170  
 2:5, 170n9  
 6:22, 155n46  
 9:15, 150  
 19:22, 64n26  
 29:24, 169n6  
 35:9, 66

**Proverbs**

1:31, 64n26  
 3:23, 182n1  
 5:18, 48n6, 64  
 12:14, 64n26  
 14:10, 73n33  
 14:14, 64n26  
 16:33, 68n28  
 18:20, 64n26  
 24:4, 64n26

**Ruth**

1:6, 139n31  
 1:17, 152n41  
 1:20, 134, 135n28  
 2:22, 132

3:17, 139n31  
 3:18, 138n30  
 4:9, 130

**Ecclesiastes**

5:19, 63  
 6:3, 64, 71n30  
 7:10, 71n30  
 8:12, 171n14  
 12:5, 61

**Lamentations**

3:15, 64n25  
 3:30, 64n25

**Esther**

1:10, 170n10  
 1:10–11, 57  
 4:5, 170n10  
 5:9, 71n30  
 8:4, 170n10

**Daniel**

1:5, 171  
 1:9, 171n13  
 1:19, 170n10  
 2:2, 170n10

**Ezra**

9:15, 170n10

**Nehemiah**

1:11, 171  
 4:8, 171n14

13:28, 171n12

**1 Chronicles**

6:17, 170n10  
 13:2, 68n28  
 16:4, 170n10  
 16:37, 170n10  
 19:16, 178n21, 182n8  
 19:19, 178n21, 182n8

**2 Chronicles**

6:24, 178n21, 180n23,  
 182n8  
 9:7, 170n10  
 10:2, 171n12  
 10:6, 170n10  
 10:8, 170n10  
 13:15, 178n21, 182n6  
 13:20, 182n2  
 14:11, 178n21, 182n6,  
 183  
 18:20, 170n10  
 20:9, 66  
 20:20, 180n23  
 20:22, 178n21, 180n23,  
 182n9  
 20:27, 60n18  
 21:14, 182n26, 182n2  
 21:18, 182n26, 182n2  
 25:22, 178n21, 182n8  
 30:9, 171n13



# Bibliography

---

---

- Al-Adaileh, Bilal A. & Renad Abbadi. 2012. The pragmatic implications of metonymical body-based idioms in Jordanian Arabic. *Argumentum* 8. 73–91.
- Aejmelaeus, Anneli. 1986. Function and interpretation of כִּי in Biblical Hebrew. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105(2). 193–209. DOI: 10.2307/3260389.
- Angelopoulos, Nikos, Chris Collins & Arhonto Terzi. 2020. Greek and English passives, and the role of *by*-phrases. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 5(1). 1–29. DOI: 10.5334/gjgl.1185.
- Asher, Nicholas. 2011. *Lexical meaning in context: A web of words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511793936.
- Auer, Peter. 1998. Zwischen Parataxe und Hypotaxe: ‚Abhängige Hauptsätze‘ im gesprochenen und geschriebenen Deutsch [Between parataxis and hypotaxis: ‘Dependent main clauses’ in spoken and written German]. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 26(3). DOI: 10.1515/zfgl.1998.26.3.284.
- Authier-Revuz, Jacqueline. 1972. Etude sur les formes passives du français [Study on the passive forms of French]. *Documentation et recherche en linguistique Allemande contemporain — Vincennes* 1. 1–145.
- Axel-Tober, Katrin. 2017. The development of the declarative complementizer in German. *Language* 93(2). e29–e65. DOI: 10.1353/lan.2017.0030.
- Bandstra, Barry Louis. 1982. *The syntax of particle ky in Biblical Hebrew and Ugaritic*. Yale University dissertation.
- Bar-Asher Siegal, Elitzur A. 2013. *Introduction to the grammar of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic* (Lehrbücher Orientalischer Sprachen 3). Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Bar-Asher Siegal, Elitzur A. & Nora Boneh. 2020. Causation: From metaphysics to semantics and back. In Elitzur A. Bar-Asher Siegal & Nora Boneh (eds.), *Perspectives on causation: Selected papers from the Jerusalem 2017 workshop* (Jerusalem Studies in Philosophy and History of Science), 3–52. Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-34308-8.
- Barwise, Jon & John Perry. 1983. *Situations and attitudes*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Bate, Danny L. In preparation. Where did *that* come from? The distribution and development of neutral finite complementizers in Indo-European.

- Beal, Joan. 1988. Goodbye to all 'that'? The history and present behaviour of optional 'that'. In John Honey & Graham Nixon (eds.), *An historic tongue: Studies in English linguistics in memory of Barbara Strang*, 49–66. London: Routledge.
- Beavers, John. 2011. On affectedness. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 29(2). 335–370. DOI: 10.1007/s11049-011-9124-6.
- Benigni, Antonella. 1999. The Biblical Hebrew particle ׀ from a discourse analysis perspective. *Zeitschrift für Althebraistik* 12(2). 126–145.
- Biberauer, Theresa. 2017. Factors 2 and 3: A principled approach. *Cambridge Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 10(3). 38–65. DOI: 10.5565/rev/catjl.219.
- Bicknell, Belinda Jean. 1984. *Passives in Biblical Hebrew*. University of Michigan dissertation.
- Bierwisch, Manfred. 1999. How much space gets into language? In Paul Bloom, Merrill F. Garrett, Lynn Nadel & Mary A. Peterson (eds.), *Language and space*, 31–76. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/4107.003.0004.
- Boas, Hans Christian. 2003. *A constructional approach to resultatives* (Stanford Monographs in Linguistics). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1972. *That's that* (Janua Linguarum 155). The Hague: Mouton.
- Brasoveanu, Adrian & Donka F. Farkas. 2007. Say reports, assertion events and meaning dimensions. In Gabriela Alboiu, Andrei A. Avram, Larisa Avram & Daniela Isac (eds.), *Pitar Moș: A building with a view. Papers in honour of Alexandra Cornilescu*, 175–196. Bucharest: Editura Universității din București.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2013. *By* phrases in passives and nominals. *Syntax* 16(1). 1–41. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9612.2012.00171.x.
- Büring, Daniel. 2003. On D-trees, beans, and B-accents. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26(5). 511–545. DOI: 10.1023/A:1025887707652.
- Charnavel, Isabelle. 2017. Non-at-issueness of *since*-clauses. *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 27. 43–58. DOI: 10.3765/salt.v27i0.4127.
- Chen, Rong. 1990. English demonstratives: A case of semantic expansion. *Language Sciences* 12(2–3). 139–153. DOI: 10.1016/0388-0001(90)90009-6.
- Cheshire, Jenny. 1996. That jacksprat: An interactional perspective on English *that*. *Journal of Pragmatics* 25(3). 369–393. DOI: 10.1016/0378-2166(95)00032-1.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Churchland, Paul M. 1986. Some reductive strategies in cognitive neurobiology. *Mind* 95(379). 279–309. DOI: 10.1093/mind/XCV.379.279.
- Claassen, Walter T. 1983. Speaker-oriented functions of *kî* in Biblical Hebrew. *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 11. 29–46.
- Clark, Herbert H. 1996. *Using language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511620539.

- Clark, Herbert H. & Richard J. Gerrig. 1990. Quotations as demonstrations. *Language* 66(4). 764–805. DOI: 10.2307/414729.
- Clédat, Leon. 1900. “De” et “par” après les verbes passifs [“De” and “par” after passive verbs]. *Revue de philologie française et de littérature* 14. 218–233.
- Çokal, Derya, Patrick Sturt & Fernanda Ferreira. 2014. Deixis: *This* and *that* in written narrative discourse. *Discourse Processes* 51(3). 201–229. DOI: 10.1080/0163853X.2013.866484.
- Colasanti, Valentina & Martina Wiltschko. 2019. Spatial and discourse deixis and the speech act structure of nominals. In *Proceedings of the 2019 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistics Association*, 1–14. <http://hdl.handle.net/2262/100137> (28 August, 2023).
- Collins, Chris. 2018. Is the passive *by*-phrase an adjunct? <https://lingbuzz.net/lingbuzz/004032>.
- Conklin, Blane. 2011. *Oath formulas in Biblical Hebrew* (Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 5). Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Copley, Bridget & Heidi Harley. 2015. A force-theoretic framework for event structure. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 38(2). 103–158. DOI: 10.1007/s10988-015-9168-x.
- Copley, Bridget & Heidi Harley. 2022. What would it take to tame the verbal Hydra? <https://bcopley.com/wp-content/uploads/What-would-it-take-to-tame-the-verbal-Hydra-2022.pdf> (28 August, 2023).
- Corne, Chris. 1995. Nana k nana, nana k napa: The paratactic and hypotactic relative clauses of Réunion Creole. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 10(1). 57–76. DOI: 10.1075/jpcl.10.1.03cor.
- Coventry, Kenny R., Berenice Valdés, Alejandro Castillo & Pedro Guijarro-Fuentes. 2008. Language within your reach: Near–far perceptual space and spatial demonstratives. *Cognition* 108(3). 889–895. DOI: 10.1016/j.cognition.2008.06.010.
- Croft, William. 2012. *Verbs: Aspect and causal structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199248582.001.0001.
- Cruschina, Silvio & Eva-Maria Remberger. 2017. Before the complementizer: Adverb types and root clause modification. In Martin Hummel & Salvador Valera (eds.), *Adjective adverb interfaces in Romance* (Linguistics Today 242), 81–109. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/la.242.04cru.
- Dahood, Mitchell. 1965. *Ugaritic-Hebrew philology. Marginal notes on recent publications* (Biblica et Orientalia 17). Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Dahood, Mitchell. 1966. *Psalms I, 1-50* (Anchor Bible Series 16). Garden City, NY: Anchor Bible.
- Dahood, Mitchell. 1968. *Psalms II, 51-100* (Anchor Bible Series 17). Garden City, NY: Anchor Bible.



- Dahood, Mitchell. 1970. *Psalms III, 101-150* (Anchor Bible Series 17A). Garden City, NY: Anchor Bible.
- Dancygier, Barbara & Eve Sweetser. 2000. Constructions with *if*, *since*, and *because*: Causality, epistemic stance, and clause order. In Elizabeth Couper-Kuhlen & Bernd Kortmann (eds.), *Cause, condition, concession, contrast: Cognitive and discourse perspectives* (Topics in English Linguistics 33), 111–142. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110219043-006.
- Davis, Anthony R. 2011. Thematic roles. In Claudia Maienborn, Klaus von Stechow & Paul Portner (eds.), *Semantics*, vol. 1, 3 vols. (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 33), 399–420. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. DOI: 10.1515/9783110226614.399.
- De Vos, Mark. In preparation. An unexpected asymmetry between *because* and *for* causal adjuncts.
- Dehé, Nicole & Anne Wichmann. 2010. Sentence-initial *I think (that)* and *I believe (that)*: Prosodic evidence for uses as main clause, comment clause and discourse marker. *Studies in Language* 34(1). 36–74. DOI: 10.1075/sl.34.1.02deh.
- Delsing, Lars-Olof. 2010. Exclamatives in Scandinavian. *Studia Linguistica* 64(1). 16–36. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9582.2010.01168.x.
- Den Boon, Ton & Ruud Hendrickx (eds.). 2015–2017. *Dikke Van Dale Online*. <https://www.vandale.nl>.
- Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, function, and grammaticalization* (Typological Studies in Language 42). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.42.
- Diessel, Holger & Michael Tomasello. 2001. The acquisition of finite complement clauses in English: A corpus-based analysis. *Cognitive Linguistics* 12(2). 97–141. DOI: 10.1515/cogl.12.2.97.
- Dirven, René. 1995. The construal of cause: The case of cause prepositions. In John R. Taylor & Robert E. MacLaury (eds.), *Language and the cognitive construal of the world* (Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs 82), 95–118. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110809305-95.
- Dor, Daniel. 2005. Toward a semantic account of *that*-deletion in English. *Linguistics* 43(2). 345–382. DOI: 10.1515/ling.2005.43.2.345.
- Doron, Edit. 2020. The causative component of psychological verbs. In Elitzur A. Bar-Asher Siegal & Nora Boneh (eds.), *Perspectives on causation: Selected papers from the Jerusalem 2017 workshop* (Jerusalem Studies in Philosophy and History of Science), 395–416. Cham: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-34308-8.
- Dowty, David. 1989. On the semantic content of the notion of ‘thematic role’. In Gennaro Chierchia, Barbara Hall Partee & Raymond Turner (eds.), *Properties,*

- types and meaning*. Vol. 2: *Semantic issues* (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 38–39). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-009-2723-0\_3.
- Dowty, David. 1991. Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67(3). 547–619. DOI: 10.1353/lan.1991.0021.
- Dowty, David. 2003. The dual analysis of adjuncts/complements in Categorical Grammar. In Ewald Lang, Claudia Maienborn & Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen (eds.), *Modifying adjuncts* (Interface Explorations 4), 33–66. De Gruyter Mouton. DOI: 10.1515/9783110894646.33.
- Edzard, Lutz. 2011. Biblical Hebrew. In Stefan Weninger (ed.), *The Semitic languages* (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 36), 480–514. De Gruyter Mouton. DOI: 10.1515/9783110251586.480.
- Elsness, Johan. 1984. *That* or zero? A look at the choice of object clause connective in a corpus of American English. *English Studies* 65(6). 519–533. DOI: 10.1080/00138388408598357.
- Etxepare, Ricardo. 1997. *The grammatical representation of speech events*. University of Maryland dissertation.
- Etxepare, Ricardo. 2010. From hearsay evidentiality to samesaying relations. *Lingua* 120(3). 604–627. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2008.07.009.
- Evans, Nicholas. 2007. Insubordination and its uses. In Irina Nikolaeva (ed.), *Finiteness: Theoretical and empirical foundations*, 366–431. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Farkas, Donka F. & Kim B. Bruce. 2010. On reacting to assertions and polar questions. *Journal of Semantics* 27(1). 81–118. DOI: 10.1093/jos/ffp010.
- Fillmore, Charles. 1968. The case for case. In Emmon Bach & Robert T. Harms (eds.), *Universals in linguistic theory*, 1–90. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Foley, William A. & Robert D. Van Valin. 1984. *Functional syntax and universal grammar* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 38). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Folli, Raffaella & Heidi Harley. 2008. Teleology and animacy in external arguments. *Lingua* 118(2). 190–202. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2007.02.004.
- Follingstad, Carl M. 2001. *Deictic viewpoint in Biblical Hebrew text: A syntagmatic and paradigmatic analysis of the particle כִּי (ki)* (Journal of Translation and Textlinguistics). Dallas, TX: SIL International.
- Gaatone, David. 1998. *Le passif en français* [The French passive] (Champs Linguistiques). Paris: Duculot.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. 1910. *Gesenius' Hebrew grammar*. Emil Kautzsch & Arthur Ernest Cowley (eds.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Ginzburg, Jonathan. 1996. Dynamics and the semantics of dialogue. In Jerry Seligman & Dag Westerståhl (eds.), *Language, logic, and computation*, vol. 1 (CSLI Lecture Notes), 221–237. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Gordis, Robert. 1943. The asseverative kaph in Ugaritic and Hebrew. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 63(2). 176–178. DOI: 10.2307/594125.
- Gougenheim, Georges. 1938. *Système grammatical de la langue française* [Grammatical system of the French language]. Paris: d'Artrey.
- Grice, Paul. 1989. *Studies in the way of words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gross, Walter. 1991. Satzfolge, Satzteilfolge und Satzart als Kriterien der Subkategorisierung Hebräischer Konjunktionalsätze, am Beispiel der ׀-Sätze untersucht [Sentence order, clause order, and sentence type as criteria for the subcategorization of Hebrew conjunctive clauses, studied using the example of ׀-clauses]. In Walter Gross, Hubert Irsigler & Theodor Seidl (eds.), *Text, Methode und Grammatik: Wolfgang Richter zum 65. Geburtstag* [Text, method, and grammar: Wolfgang Richter on his 65th birthday], 97–119. St. Ottilien: EOS Verlag.
- Grosz, Barbara & Yael Ziv. 1998. Centering, global focus, and right dislocation. In Marilyn A. Walker, Aravind K. Joshi & Ellen F. Prince (eds.), *Centering theory in discourse*, 293–308. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gruber, Jeffrey. 1965. *Studies in lexical relations*. Indiana University dissertation.
- Gutiérrez-Rexach, Javier. 2001. Spanish exclamatives and the interpretation of the left periphery. In Yves D'hulst, Johan Rooryck & Jan Schroten (eds.), *Romance languages and linguistic theory 1999* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 221), 167–194. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/cilt.221.07gut.
- Gzella, Holger. 2008. Zum periphrastischen Infinitiv in Genesis viii 5 [On the periphrastic infinitive in Genesis 8:5]. *Vetus Testamentum* 58(4). 469–479. DOI: 10.1163/156853308X312717.
- Haber, Esther. 2009. Significance of the interchanging of the mono-consonantal prepositions in Biblical Hebrew: Rabbinic and comparative Semitic evidence. *Maarav* 16(1). 29–37. DOI: 10.1086/MAR200916103.
- Hallman, Peter. 2021. On passive and perfect participles. In Kleantes K. Grohmann, Akemi Matsuya & Eva-Maria Remberger (eds.), *Passives cross-linguistically: Theoretical and experimental approaches* (Empirical Approaches to Linguistic Theory 17), 64–97. Leiden: Brill. DOI: 10.1163/9789004433427.
- Halpern, Joseph Y. & Judea Pearl. 2005. Causes and explanations: A structural-model approach. Part I: Causes. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 56(4). 843–887. DOI: 10.1093/bjps/axi147.

- Hardy, Humphrey Hill II. 2022. *The development of Biblical Hebrew prepositions* (Ancient Near East Monographs 28). Atlanta, GA: SBL Press.
- Harley, Heidi. 2011. Thematic roles. In Patrick Colm Hogan (ed.), *The Cambridge encyclopedia of the language sciences*, 861–862. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hasselbach, Rebecca. 2007. Demonstratives in Semitic. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 127(1). 1–27. JSTOR: 20297208.
- Hernanz, M. Lluïsa. 2007. From polarity to modality. Some (a)symmetries between *bien* and *sí* in Spanish. In Luis Eguren & Olga Fernández Soriano (eds.), *Coreference, modality, and focus: Studies on the syntax-semantics interface* (Linguistics Today 111), 133–169. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/la.111.08her.
- Hill, Virginia. 2012. A main clause complementizer. In Lobke Aelbrecht, Liliane Haegeman & Rachel Nye (eds.), *Main clause phenomena: New horizons* (Linguistics Today 190), 279–296. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/la.190.12hill.
- Hoffmann, Sebastian. 2005. *Grammaticalization and English complex prepositions: A corpus-based study* (Routledge Advances in Corpus Linguistics 7). London: Routledge.
- Holmstedt, Robert D. 2010. *Ruth: A handbook on the Hebrew text* (Baylor Handbook on the Hebrew Bible). Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.
- Hooper, Joan B. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1973. On the applicability of root transformations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 4(4). 465–497. JSTOR: 4177789.
- Hopper, Paul J. 1991. On some principles of grammaticization. In Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization*. Vol. 1: *Focus on theoretical and methodological issues* (Typological Studies in Language 19), 17–35. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.19.1.04hop.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56(2). 251–299. DOI: 10.2307/413757.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. 2nd edn. (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139165525.
- Huddleston, Rodney & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/9781316423530.
- Ingason, Anton Karl, Iris Edda Nowenstein & Einar Freyr Sigurðsson. 2016. The Voice-adjunction theory of agentive ‘by’-phrases and the Icelandic impersonal passive. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 97. 40–56.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1996. The architecture of the linguistic-spatial interface. In Paul Bloom, Mary A. Peterson, Lynn Nadel & Merrill F. Garrett (eds.), *Language and*

- space, 1–30. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/4107.003.0003.
- Jenni, Ernst. 1992. *Die hebräischen Präpositionen* [The Hebrew prepositions]. Vol. 1: *Die Präposition Beth* [The preposition beth]. 3 vols. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Jenni, Ernst. 2000. *Die hebräischen Präpositionen* [The Hebrew prepositions]. Vol. 3: *Die Präposition Lamed* [The preposition lamed]. 3 vols. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Jones, Ethan C. 2018. More than “before”: Semantics and syntax of לְפָנַי. In Ethan C. Jones (ed.), *The unfolding of your words gives light: Studies on Biblical Hebrew in honor of George L. Klein*, 217–232. University Park, PA: Eisenbrauns.
- Jones, Ethan C. 2020. Middle and passive voice: Semantic distinctions of the niphāl in Biblical Hebrew. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 132(3). 427–448. DOI: 10.1515/zaw-2020-3004.
- Jouitteau, Mélanie. 2004. Gestures as expletives: Multichannel syntax. In Vineeta Chand, Ann Kelleher, Angelo J. Rodríguez & Benjamin Schmeiser (eds.), *WC-CFL 23 proceedings. Proceedings of the 23rd West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 422–435. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press. <https://shs.hal.science/halshs-00605736> (28 August, 2023).
- Joüon, Paul & Takamitsu Muraoka. 2006. *A grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2nd edn. Rome: Gregorian & Biblical Press.
- Jungbluth, Konstanze. 2003. Deictics in the conversational dyad: Findings in Spanish and some cross-linguistic outlines. In Friedrich Lenz (ed.), *Deictic conceptualisation of space, time and person* (Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 112), 13–40. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/pbns.112.04jun.
- Kadmon, Nirit. 2001. *Formal pragmatics: Semantics, pragmatics, presupposition, and focus*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Kajzer-Wietrzny, Marta. 2018. Interpretese vs. non-native language use: The case of optional *that*. In Mariachiara Russo, Claudio Bendazzoli & Bart Defrancq (eds.), *Making way in corpus-based interpreting studies* (New Frontiers in Translation Studies), 97–113. Singapore: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-981-10-6199-8\_6.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2006. ‘... *That* is the question’: Complementizer omission in extraposed *that*-clauses. *English Language and Linguistics* 10(2). 371–396. DOI: 10.1017/S1360674306001961.
- Kaltenböck, Gunther. 2009. Initial *I think*: Main or comment clause? *Discourse and Interaction* 2(1). 49–70.
- Katz, Graham. 2003. Event arguments, adverb selection, and the Stative Adverb Gap. In Ewald Lang, Claudia Maienborn & Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen (eds.), *Modifying adjuncts* (Interface Explorations 4), 455–474. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110894646.455.

- Kayne, Richard S. 2014. Why isn't *this* a complementizer? In Peter Svenonius (ed.), *Functional structure from top to toe*, vol. 9 (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures), 188–231. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199740390.003.0007.
- Kimron, Elisha. 1980. שמות רוחות השמים במקורותינו הקדומים [The names of the cardinal directions in our ancient sources]. *Beit Mikra* 26(1). 41–47. JSTOR: 23503942.
- Kirsner, Robert S. 1979. Deixis in discourse: An exploratory quantitative study of the Modern Dutch demonstrative adjectives. In Talmy Givón (ed.), *Discourse and syntax* (Syntax and Semantics 12), 355–375. Leiden: Brill. DOI: 10.1163/9789004368897\_016.
- Kocher, Anna. 2022. *Complementizers on edge: On the boundaries between syntax and pragmatics in Ibero-Romance* (Open Romance Linguistics 1). Berlin: Language Science Press. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.6907848.
- Krapova, Iliyana. 2010. Bulgarian relative and factive clauses with an invariant complementizer. *Lingua* 120(5). 1240–1272. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2009.08.002.
- Kraska-Szlenk, Iwona. 2014. Semantic extensions of body part terms: Common patterns and their interpretation. *Language Sciences* 44. 15–39. DOI: 10.1016/j.langsci.2014.02.002.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1996. Severing the external argument from its verb. In Johan Rooryck & Laurie Zaring (eds.), *Phrase structure and the lexicon* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 33), 109–137. Dordrecht: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-015-8617-7\_5.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 2000. Building statives. In Lisa J. Conathan, Jeff Good, Darya Kavitskaya, Alyssa B. Wulf & Alan C. L. Yu (eds.), *Proceedings of the twenty-sixth annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 385–399. Berkeley, CA. DOI: 10.3765/bls.v26i1.1131.
- Kratzer, Angelika, Luigi Rizzi, Roberta Pires de Oliveira, Ina Emmel & Monica Deitos Stedile. 2020. Informal formal conversation on syntax-semantics. In Roberta Pires de Oliveira, Ina Emmel & Sandra Quarezemin (eds.), *Brazilian Portuguese, syntax and semantics. 20 Years of Núcleo de Estudos Gramaticais*, 7–29. John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/la.260.01kra.
- Krüger, Thomas. 2004. *Qoheleth: A commentary* (Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible). Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.
- Kuteva, Tania, Bernd Heine, Bo Hong, Haiping Long, Heiko Narrog & Seongha Rhee. 2019. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/9781316479704.
- Lakoff, George & Mark Johnson. 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

- Lakoff, Robin. 1974. Remarks on 'this' and 'that'. In Michael W. La Galy, Robert A. Fox & Anthony Bruck (eds.), *Papers from the tenth regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society*, 345–356. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Landman, Fred. 2000. *Events and plurality* (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 76). Dordrecht: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-011-4359-2.
- Lasnik, Howard & Mamoru Saito. 1991. On the subject of infinitives. In Lise M. Dobrin, Lynn Nichols & Rosa M. Rodriguez (eds.), *Papers from the 27th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. Part one: The general session*, 324–343. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Ledgeway, Adam. 2011. Subject licensing in CP: The Neapolitan double-subject construction. In Paola Benincà & Nicola Munaro (eds.), *Mapping the left periphery: The cartography of syntactic structures*, vol. 5 (The Cartography of Syntactic Structures), 257–296. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199740376.001.0001.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2014. *Voice and v: Lessons from Acehnese* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 69). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/9780262028141.001.0001.
- Levinsohn, Stephen H. 2011. קָרַח and קָרַח: Limiting and countering. *Hebrew Studies* 52. 83–105. DOI: 10.1353/hbr.2011.0023.
- Lewis, David K. 1969. *Convention: A philosophical study*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lewis, David K. 1973a. Causation. *The Journal of Philosophy* 70(17). 556–567. DOI: 10.2307/2025310.
- Lewis, David K. 1973b. *Counterfactuals*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Lipiński, Edward. 2001. *Semitic languages: Outline of a comparative grammar*. 2nd edn. (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 80). Leuven: Peeters.
- Littlemore, Jeannette. 2019. *Metaphors in the mind: Sources of variation in embodied metaphor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/9781108241441.
- Locatell, Christian S. 2017. *Grammatical polysemy in the Hebrew Bible: A cognitive linguistic approach to כִּי*. University of Stellenbosch dissertation.
- Locatell, Christian S. 2020. Temporal conjunctions and their semantic extensions: The case of כִּי in Biblical Hebrew. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 65(1). 93–115. DOI: 10.1093/jss/fgz040.
- Mackie, John L. 1965. Causes and conditions. *American Philosophical Quarterly* 2(4). 245–264. JSTOR: 20009173.
- Maes, Alfons, Emiel Kraemer & David Peeters. 2022. Explaining variance in writers' use of demonstratives: A corpus study demonstrating the importance of discourse genre. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 7(1). DOI: 10.16995/glossa.5826.

- Maienborn, Claudia & Johanna Herdtfelder. 2017. Eventive versus stative causation: The case of German causal *von*-modifiers. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 40(3). 279–320. DOI: 10.1007/s10988-016-9201-8.
- Malle, Bertram F. & Joshua Knobe. 1997. The folk concept of intentionality. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 33(2). 101–121. DOI: 10.1006/jesp.1996.1314.
- Mannati, Marina. 1970. Sur le sens de *min* en Ps iv 8 [On the meaning of *min* in Ps. 4:8]. *Vetus Testamentum* 20(3). 361–366. DOI: 10.1163/156853370X00390.
- Martin, Fabienne. 2005. Genitives of substance and locative verbs in French. In Jiyoung Kim, Yury A. Lander & Barbara H. Partee (eds.), *Possessives and beyond: Semantics and syntax* (University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 29), 411–426. Amherst, MA: GLSA Publications.
- Martin, Fabienne & Florian Schäfer. 2013. On the argument structure of verbs with mono- and bi-eventive uses. In Shayne Sloggett & Stefan Keine (eds.), *Proceedings of the 42nd meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, 297–308. Amherst, MA: Graduate Linguistic Student Association.
- McCarthy, Dennis J. 1980. The uses of *w<sup>e</sup> hinnēh* in Biblical Hebrew. *Biblica* 61(3). 330–342. JSTOR: 42706879.
- Meyer, Esias E. 2001. The particle ׀, a mere conjunction or something more? *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 27(1). 39–62.
- Michaelis, Laura. 2001. Exclamative constructions. In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language typology and language universals*, vol. 2, 2 vols. (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 20), 1038–1058. Berlin: De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110194265-016.
- Michotte, Albert. 1946. *La perception de la causalité* [The perception of causality] (Etudes de Psychologie 6). Louvain: Editions de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie.
- Miller, Cynthia L. 2003. *The representation of speech in Biblical Hebrew narrative: A linguistic analysis* (Harvard Semitic Monographs 55). Boston: Brill.
- Moltmann, Friederike. 2007. Events, tropes, and truthmaking. *Philosophical Studies* 134(3). 363–403. DOI: 10.1007/s11098-005-0898-4.
- Moody, Raymond. 1972. Portuguese prepositions: Some semantic categories. *Luso-Brazilian Review* 9(1). 36–71. JSTOR: 3512838.
- Morrill, Glyn V. 1994. *Type logical grammar: Categorical logic of signs*. Dordrecht: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-011-1042-6.
- Moshavi, Adina. 2009. Two types of argumentation involving rhetorical questions in Biblical Hebrew dialogue. *Biblica* 90(1). 32–46. JSTOR: 42614874.
- Muilenburg, James. 1961. The linguistic and rhetorical usages of the particle ׀ in the Old Testament. *Hebrew Union College Annual* 32. 135–160. JSTOR: 23524614.



- Muraoka, Takamitsu. 1985. *Emphatic words and structures in Biblical Hebrew*. Jerusalem: The Magnes Press.
- Næss, Åshild. 2007. *Prototypical transitivity* (Typological Studies in Language 72). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.72.
- Neeleman, Ad & Hans van de Koot. 2012. The linguistic expression of causation. In Martin Everaert, Marijana Marelj & Tal Siloni (eds.), *The Theta System: Argument structure at the interface* (Oxford Linguistics), 20–51. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199602513.003.0002.
- OED Online*. 2021. Oxford University Press. <https://www.oed.com/>.
- Oeming, Manfred. 2006. שָׁכַר. In G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren & Heinz-Josef Fabry (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, vol. 15, 16 vols., 1–5. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- Palancar, Enrique L. 2002. *The origin of agent markers* (Studia Typologica 5). Berlin: Akademie Verlag. DOI: 10.1524/9783050081410.
- Park, Grace J. 2016. Stand-alone nominalizations formed with *ʾšer* and *kí* in Biblical Hebrew. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 61(1). 41–65. DOI: 10.1093/jss/fgv030.
- Partee, Barbara H. 1997. Genitives: A case study. In Johan van Benthem & Alice ter Meulen (eds.), *Handbook of logic & language*, 464–473. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Pearl, Judea. 2000. *Causality: Models, reasoning, and inference*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/S0266466603004109.
- Peeters, David, Emiel Krahmer & Alfons Maes. 2021. A conceptual framework for the study of demonstrative reference. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 28(2). 409–433. DOI: 10.3758/s13423-020-01822-8.
- Pérez, Carlos Muñoz & Matías Verdecchia. 2022. Information-based “island effects” in Spanish clausal doubling. Paper presented at the 45th Generative Linguistics in the Old World colloquium (GLOW 45), Queen Mary University of London, 27–29 April.
- Pesetsky, David. 1995. *Zero syntax: Experiencers and cascades*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Poschmann, Claudia. 2008. All declarative questions are attributive? *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 22. 247–269. DOI: 10.1075/bjl.22.12pos.
- Primus, Beatrice. 2016. Participant roles. In Nick Riemer (ed.), *The Routledge handbook of semantics* (Routledge Handbooks in Linguistics), 403–418. London: Routledge.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 2006. Phrasal prepositions in a civil tone. In Mark Liberman & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.), *Far from the madding gerund and other dispatches from Language Log*, 41–45. Wilsonville, OR: William, James & Co.

- Pylkkänen, Mariliina. 1999. On stativity and causation. In Carol L. Tenny & James Pustejovsky (eds.), *Events as grammatical objects: The converging perspectives of lexical semantics and syntax*, 417–445. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing arguments* (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 49). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Radden, Günter. 1985. Spatial metaphors underlying prepositions of causality. In Wolf Paprotté & René Dirven (eds.), *The ubiquity of metaphor: Metaphor in language and thought* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 29), 177–207. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/cilt.29.10rad.
- Rappaport Hovav, Malka & Beth Levin. 2001. An event structure account of English resultatives. *Language* 77(4). 766–797. DOI: 10.1353/lan.2001.0221.
- Redslob, M. Gustavus Mauritius. 1835. *De particulae Hebraicae ׀ origine et indole* [On the origin and nature of the Hebrew particle ׀]. Leipzig: Weinedel.
- Ringgren, Helmer. 2001. ׀amad. In G. Johannes Botterweck, Helmer Ringgren & Heinz-Josef Fabry (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the Old Testament*, vol. 11, 16 vols., 178–187. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- Rissanen, Matti. 1991. On the history of *that*/zero as object clause links in English. In Karin Aijmer & Bengt Altenberg (eds.), *English corpus linguistics: Studies in honour of Jan Svartvik*, 272–289. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Ritter, Elizabeth & Martina Wiltschko. 2019. Nominal speech act structure: Evidence from the structural deficiency of impersonal pronouns. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics/Revue canadienne de linguistique* 64(4). 709–729. DOI: 10.1017/cnj.2019.10.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar: Handbook in generative syntax* (Kluwer International Handbooks of Linguistics 1), 281–337. Dordrecht: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8\_7.
- Roberts, Craige. 2012 [1996]. Information structure in discourse: Towards an integrated formal theory of pragmatics. *Semantics & Pragmatics* 5(6). 1–69. DOI: 10.3765/sp.5.6.
- Roberts, Ian. 2019. *Parameter hierarchies and Universal Grammar* (Rethinking Comparative Syntax). Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780198804635.001.0001.
- Roberts, Ian & Anna Roussou. 2003. *Syntactic change: A minimalist approach to grammaticalization* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 100). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO978051486326.

- Rodriguez, Daniel L. 2017. *אחר, מן/לפני, and תחת: An embodied cognitive approach to the Biblical Hebrew prepositions*. University of Stellenbosch dissertation.
- Rooryck, Johan. 2003. The morphosyntactic structure of articles and pronouns in Dutch. In Jan Koster & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Germania et alia: A linguistic webschrift for Hans den Besten*. Groningen: University of Groningen.
- Rooryck, Johan. 2019. 'Recycling' evidentiality: A research program. In Metin Bağrıaçık, Anne Breitbarth & Karen De Clercq (eds.), *Mapping linguistic data: Essays in honour of Liliane Haegeman*, 242–261. Ghent.
- Rosenbaum, Peter Steven. 1965. *The grammar of English predicate complement constructions*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.
- Ross, John Robert. 1970. On declarative sentences. In Roderick A. Jacobs & Peter S. Rosenbaum (eds.), *Readings in English transformational grammar*, 222–277. Waltham, MA: Ginn and Company.
- Schoors, Antoon. 1981. The particle כִּי. *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 21. 240–276. DOI: 10.1163/9789004494039\_017.
- Seppänen, Aimo, Rhonwen Bowen & Joe Trotta. 1994. On the so-called complex prepositions. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 29. 3–29.
- Slooman, Steven A., Philip M. Fernbach & Scott Ewing. 2012. A causal model of intentionality judgment. *Mind & Language* 27(2). 154–180. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-0017.2012.01439.x.
- Sollamo, Raija. 2003. The passive with an agent in Biblical Hebrew and its rendering in the Septuagint. In Martin F. J. Baasten & Willem T. Van Peursen (eds.), *Hamlet on a hill: Semitic and Greek studies presented to professor T. Muraoka on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday* (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 118), 617–629. Leuven: Peeters.
- Sornicola, Rosanna. 1996. Alcune strutture con pronome espletivo nei dialetti Italiani meridionali [Some structures with expletive pronouns in Southern Italian dialects]. In Paola Benincà, Guglielmo Cinque, Tullio de Mauro & Nigel Vincent (eds.), *Italiano e dialetti nel tempo: Saggi di grammatica per Giolio C. Lepschy* [Italian and dialects over time: Essays in grammar for Giolio C. Lepschy], 323–340. Rome: Bulzoni Editore.
- Spang-Hanssen, Ebbe. 1963. *Les prépositions incolores du français moderne* [The colorless prepositions of Modern French]. Copenhagen: University of Copenhagen dissertation.
- Speas, Peggy & Carol Tenny. 2003. Configurational properties of point of view roles. In Anna Maria Di Sciullo (ed.), *Syntax and semantics*. Vol. 1: *Asymmetry in grammar* (Linguistics Today 57), 315–344. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/la.57.15spe.

- Stalnaker, Robert. 1978. Assertion. In Peter Cole (ed.), *Pragmatics* (Syntax and Semantics 9), 315–332. New York, NY: Academic Press. DOI: 10.1163/9789004368873\_013.
- Stalnaker, Robert. 2002. Common Ground. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 25(5/6). 701–721. JSTOR: 25001871.
- Staps, Camil. 2018. A case study of reciprocal middles in Biblical Hebrew: The niph'al of ׀׀׀. *Orientalia* 87(2). 159–183.
- Staps, Camil. 2022. *Lipnē* 'in the face of': A Locative preposition with a threatening connotation. *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 22(1). 1–24. DOI: 10.5508/jhs29582.
- Staps, Camil. 2023a. *Uses of Biblical Hebrew ׀ bə and ׀ min in Genesis, Exodus, Joshua, Samel, Ruth, Ecclesiastes, and Esther* [data set]. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.8314905.
- Staps, Camil. 2023b. *Uses of Biblical Hebrew ׀ kī in Genesis, Judges, Samuel, and Ruth* [data set]. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.8314818.
- Staps, Camil & Martijn Beukenhorst. 2024. Semantic properties of prepositions: The distinction between causal *min* 'from' and *bē* 'in'. *Brill's Journal of Afroasiatic Languages and Linguistics* 16(2). DOI: 10.1163/18776930-01602002.
- Staps, Camil & Johan Rooryck. 2023. The interpretation of [+distal] in demonstratives and complementizers. *Linguistics* 61(5). 1195–1231. DOI: 10.1515/ling-2022-0178.
- Staps, Camil & Johan Rooryck. 2024. Formalizing spatial-causal polysemy of Agent prepositions. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 17(4). DOI: 10.3765/sp.17.4.
- Stirling, Lesley & Rodney Huddleston. 2002. Deixis and anaphora. In Rodney Huddleston & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.), *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*, 1449–1564. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/9781316423530.018.
- Storms, Godfrid. 1966. *That*-clauses in Modern English. *English Studies* 47. 249–270. DOI: 10.1080/00138386608597258.
- Straub, Sylvia A. 1974. The passive prepositions *de* and *par*. *The French Review* 47(3). 583–593. JSTOR: 387100.
- Strauss, Susan. 2002. *This, that, and it* in spoken American English: A demonstrative system of gradient focus. *Language Sciences* 24(2). 131–152. DOI: 10.1016/S0388-0001(01)00012-2.
- Strecker, Ivo. 1993. Cultural variations in the concept of 'face'. *Multilingua* 12(2). 119–142. DOI: 10.1515/mult.1993.12.2.119.
- Suñer, Margarita. 1981. *Por* vs. *de*: Agential prepositions? *Hispania* 64(2). 278–283. DOI: 10.2307/341864.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1988. Force dynamics in language and cognition. *Cognitive Science* 12. 49–100. DOI: 10.1207/s15516709cog1201\_2.

- Testen, David. 1998. The derivational role of the Semitic N-stem. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 88. 127–145. DOI: 10.1515/zava.1998.88.1.127.
- Thompson, Sandra A. 2002. “Object complements” and conversation. Towards a realistic account. *Studies in Language* 26(1). 125–163. DOI: 10.1075/sl.26.1.05tho.
- Thompson, Sandra A. & Anthony Mulac. 1991. The discourse conditions for the use of the complementizer *that* in conversational English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 15. 237–251. DOI: 10.1016/0378-2166(91)90012-M.
- Thorion, Yochanan. 1984. *Studien zur klassischen hebräischen Syntax* [Studies on Classical Hebrew syntax] (Marburger Studien zur Afrika- und Asienkunde: Serie B, Asien 6). Berlin: Dietrich Reimer.
- Trotzke, Andreas & Xavier Villalba. 2021. Expressive insubordination: A cross-linguistic study on *that*-exclamatives. In Andreas Trotzke & Xavier Villalba (eds.), *Expressive meaning across linguistic levels and frameworks*, 108–120. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/os0/9780198871217.003.0006.
- Tsoulas, George. 1996. The nature of the subjunctive and the formal grammar of obviation. In Karen T. Zagana (ed.), *Grammatical theory and Romance languages: Selected papers from the 25th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL XXV), Seattle, 2–4 March 1995* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 133), 293–306. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/cilt.133.23tso.
- Tsumura, David T. 2014. Textual corruptions, or linguistic phenomena? The cases in 2 Samuel (MT). *Vetus Testamentum* 64. 135–145. DOI: 10.1163/15685330-12301140.
- Tyler, Andrea & Vyvyan Evans. 2003. *The semantics of English prepositions: Spatial scenes, embodied meaning and cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511486517.
- Ukosakul, Margaret. 2005. The significance of ‘face’ and politeness in social interaction as revealed through Thai ‘face’ idioms. In Robin T. Lakoff & Sachiko Ide (eds.), *Broadening the horizon of linguistic politeness* (Pragmatics & Beyond New Series 139), 117–125. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/pbns.139.11uko.
- Van der Merwe, Christo H. J. 1993. Old Hebrew particles and the interpretation of Old Testament texts. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 18(60). 27–44. DOI: 10.1177/030908929301806002.
- Van der Merwe, Christo H. J., Jacobus A. Naudé & Jan H. Kroeze. 2017. *A Biblical Hebrew reference grammar*. 2nd edn. London: T&T Clark.
- Van Wolde, Ellen. 2009. *Reframing biblical studies: When language and text meet culture, cognition, and context*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Van Wolde, Ellen. 2019. The niphāl as middle voice and its consequence for meaning. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 43(3). 453–478. DOI: 10.1177/0309089217743160.

- Van Wolde, Ellen. 2021. *Nif'al* verbs in the book of Genesis and their contribution to meaning. In *New perspectives in Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew* (Cambridge Semitic Languages and Cultures 7), 431–454. Open Book Publishers. DOI: 10.11647/OBP.0250.15.
- Vardi, Ruti. 2015. Favor: A construction of affection in Biblical Hebrew. *Hebrew Studies* 56(1). 49–69. DOI: 10.1353/hbr.2015.0025.
- Visan, Florentina. 2000. The nature and status of exclamatives in Chinese. University of Bucharest unpublished manuscript.
- Vriezen, Theodorus C. 1958. Einige Notizen zur Übersetzung des Bindewortes *Kī* [Some notes on the translation of the connective *kī*]. In Johannes Hempel & Leonhard Rost (eds.), *Von Ugarit nach Qumran* [From Ugarit to Qumran] (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 77), 266–273. Berlin: De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783112314982-022.
- Waltke, Bruce K. & Michael Patrick O'Connor. 1990. *An introduction to Biblical Hebrew syntax*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Walzer, Michael. 1992. The idea of holy war in ancient Israel. *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 20(2). 215–228. JSTOR: 40015152.
- Watts, J. Wash. 1964. *A survey of syntax in the Hebrew Old Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans.
- Weinert, Regina. 2012. Complement clauses in spoken German and English: Syntax, deixis and discourse-pragmatics. *Folia Linguistica* 46(1). 233–265. DOI: 10.1515/flin.2012.8.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1988. *The semantics of grammar* (Studies in Language Companion Series 18). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/slcs.18.
- Williams, Alexander. 2015. *Arguments in syntax and semantics* (Key Topics in Syntax). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9781139042864.
- Williams, Ronald J. 2007. *Williams' Hebrew syntax*. John C. Beckman (ed.). 3rd edn. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Yaguchi, Michiko. 2001. The function of the non-deictic *that* in English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 33(7). 1125–1155. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-2166(00)00045-X.
- Yap, Foong Ha, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona. 2011. Introduction: Nominalization strategies in Asian languages. In Foong Ha Yap, Karen Grunow-Hårsta & Janick Wrona (eds.), *Nominalization in Asian languages* (Typological Studies in Language 96), 1–57. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.96.01yap.
- Yu, Ning. 2001. What does our face mean to us? *Pragmatics & Cognition* 9(1). 1–36. DOI: 10.1075/pc.9.1.02yu.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella & Paul Portner. 2003. Exclamative clauses: At the syntax-semantics interface. *Language* 79(1). 39–81. DOI: 10.1353/lan.2003.0105.

- Zevakhina, Natalia. 2013. Syntactic strategies of exclamatives. *Eesti ja Soome-Ugri Keeleteaduse Ajakiri. Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 4(2). 157–178. DOI: 10.12697/jeful.2013.4.2.09.
- Zumthor, Paul & Walther von Wartburg. 1947. *Précis de syntaxe du français contemporain* [Syntax of contemporary French]. Bern: Francke.
- Zwarts, Joost & Yoad Winter. 2000. Vector space semantics: A model-theoretic analysis of locative prepositions. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information* 9(2). 169–211. DOI: 10.1023/A:1008384416604.