

Lénart J. de Regt

FLASHBACKS AND OTHER FORMS OF NON-CHRONOLOGICAL ARRANGEMENT IN HEBREW NARRATIVE

1. Introduction

In Philip Kaufman's film adaptation of 1988 of Milan Kundera's *The Unbearable Lightness of Being* Sabina receives a letter with the sad news that Tomas and Tereza have been killed in a car crash. It is only after this that we see in a flashback how they have a good time together in a pub, drink a little too much, climb into the lorry and drive back to the farm. The last thing we see is the road ... This deviation from chronology builds up suspense.

Events in biblical Hebrew narrative texts are not always mentioned in chronological order, either. What are the different ways in which the narrator sometimes deviates from chronology? For what purpose? Why might the narrator have preferred a rhetorical strategy of non-chronological arrangement over the (chrono)logical presentation of events? These questions are not only of interest from the point of view of rhetorical strategy but for Bible translators as well. A translation may have to indicate non-chronological arrangements explicitly if the reader is to appreciate the narrator's rhetorical strategy and at the same time understand the deviation from chronology and the chronological place of the events involved.

This article illustrates the ways in which a narrator can deviate from chronology with a number of examples. It discusses implications for translation as well. The division between types of non-chronological arrangements is largely based on Ska (2000:7-15).

Zevit (1998:15) gives a rather wide definition of the 'anterior construction': *we* + Subject + *qatal* after a past tense verb in the narrative of a preceding clause. But in many instances where this structure occurs, it should not be understood as a pluperfect at all. The examples below show that flashbacks

and other non-chronological arrangement of sentences are not indicated by the type of verb: *wayyiqtol* as well as *qatal* and *yiqtol* are found to occur in such sentences. (Quoted translations have been taken from the NRSV unless specified otherwise.)

2. Types of non-chronological arrangement

Ska (2000) distinguishes between the following non-chronological arrangements.

2.1 Summarizing statements

The narrator devotes only a few words to a long period. Not only *qatal* occurs in such summaries but *wayyiqtol* as well.

He had judged (*qatal* שָׁפַט) Israel forty years. (1 Sam 4:18)

The pluperfect 'had judged' in the English shows that this involves deviation from chronology. This does not imply that the Hebrew *qatal* as such functions as a pluperfect. (Esth 9:24-26a is a summary – starting with a *qatal* – of what went before; its purpose is to explain the meaning and background of Purim.)

So Joshua took (*wayyiqtol* וַיִּקַּח) all that land. (Josh 11:16)

The English 'so' makes it explicit that this is a summary of the conquest, not the conquest itself.

2.2 Anticipations (Prolepsis)

An anticipation mentions the event earlier than where it would fit chronologically. The second part of Exod 3:2 makes it clear that the first part is an anticipation of the event and not yet the event itself, even though both parts of the verse have a *wayyiqtol* form.

There the angel of the Lord appeared (*wayyiqtol* וַיֵּרָא) to him in a flame of fire out of a bush; he looked (*wayyiqtol* וַיִּרְא), and the bush was blazing, yet it was not consumed. (Exod 3:2)

It is only in verses 4-6 that Moses realizes that God appears to him. Gen 18:1 is anticipation as well; Abraham realizes only later who his guest is. These anticipations are a kind of title and have a rhetorical effect: the reader knows more than the character in the text.

2.3 Flashbacks (Analepsis)

A flashback refers to events later than where they would fit chronologically. The result is that the events are mentioned where they are the most effective and relevant to the ongoing narrative.

2.3.1 Flashbacks starting with a *qatal*

A well-known example of such a flashback occurs at the end of Jonah 1:10.

⁹ “I am a Hebrew,” he replied. “I worship (יְיָ) the Lord, the God of heaven, who made the sea and the dry land.” ¹⁰ Then the men were even more afraid (וַיִּירָאוּ), and said to him, “What is this that you have done!” For the men knew that he was fleeing from the presence of the Lord, because he had told (*qatal* הִגִּיד) them so. (Jonah 1:9-10)

Because of the way in which verse 10 has been arranged, the fear (וַיִּירָאוּ) of the men now comes as the direct result of Jonah’s explanation that he worships (יְיָ) the God who made the sea. This highlights the contrast between their genuine awe and Jonah’s worship. The two verb forms are also of the same root. These connections in the text are no longer very clear in a translation like GNB, which reverses the order of verse 10a and verse 10b in an attempt to restore chronological order:

⁹ “I am a Hebrew,” Jonah answered. “I worship the Lord, the God of heaven, who made land and sea.”¹⁰ Jonah went on to tell them that he was running away from the Lord.

The sailors were terrified, and said to him, “That was an awful thing to do!” (Jonah 1:9-10 GNB)

For languages in which non-chronological arrangement is difficult to translate, TOB would then seem to offer a better translation model: no restructuring of the order of verse 10a and verse 10b, but no flashback either. Verse 10b is made to be the point where Jonah tells the sailors that he is fleeing from the Lord:

⁹ Il leur répondit: “Je suis hébreu, et c’est le Seigneur Dieu du ciel que je vénère, celui qui a fait la mer et les continents.” ¹⁰ Saisis d’une grande crainte, les hommes lui dirent: “Qu’as-tu fait là!” D’après le récit qu’il leur fit, ils apprirent, en effet, qu’il fuyait hors de la présence du Seigneur. (Jonah 1:9-10 TOB)

A narrative can actually be interrupted by more than one flashback at a time:

Now Samuel had died (*qatal* מָת) and all Israel had mourned for him and buried him in Ramah, his own city. Saul had expelled (*qatal* הִסִּיר) the mediums and the wizards from the land. (1 Sam 28:3)

These pieces of information are given where they are the most effective, reminding the reader that Saul is about to violate his own prohibition. As flashbacks, these sentences serve to ‘set the stage for the conjuration of Samuel’s ghost’ (Alter 2000:172) before his final battle. Samuel’s death was already mentioned in 1 Sam 25:1. A similar flashback occurs in the digression of 2 Sam 4:4, at the point where the reader should understand that there is now no heir or avenger left to the house of Saul:

Saul’s son Jonathan had a son who was crippled in his feet. He was (*qatal* יִנְיָהוּ) five years old when the news about Saul and Jonathan came from Jezreel. His nurse picked him up and fled; and, in her haste to flee, it happened that he fell and became lame. His name was Mephibosheth. (2 Sam 4:4)

To avoid confusion, a translation should show that the sentences involved are actually a flashback. This is often achieved with a pluperfect. The *Gute Nachricht* translation of 2 Sam 17:14 indicates the flashback in a different way: “So sorgte (*qatal* צָנְהָה יְיָהוָה) der Herr dafür, daß der kluge Rat Ahitofels mißachtet wurde”.

Flashbacks serve to add suspense to the ongoing narrative:

Now Jacob did not know that Rachel had stolen (*qatal* נִגְבְּתָם) the gods [...] Now Rachel had taken (*qatal* לָקְחָהּ) the household gods and put them in the camel’s saddle, and sat on them. (Gen 31:32, 34)

Now David had said (*qatal* אָמַר דָּוִד), “Surely it was in vain that I protected all that this fellow has [...] but he has returned me evil for good. God do so to David and more also, if by morning I leave so much as one male of all who belong to him.” (1 Sam 25:21-22)

The narrator could easily have added this to David’s words in verse 13 (“Every man strap on his sword!”) but chose to include them later in the narrative, where they add more suspense to the meeting of David and Abigail (verses 20, 23). In English translation, a pluperfect indicates the flashback in verse 21. In languages without a pluperfect, the non-chronological arrangement will have to be indicated otherwise: “He was still furious: [...]” (NBV); “Shortly before that, David said: [...]”. Without this the reader is likely to think that David is speaking these words to Abigail!

2.3.2 Flashbacks starting with a *wayyiqtol*

The examples below illustrate that flashbacks are not necessarily indicated with a *qatal*. A *wayyiqtol* can occur at the beginning of a flashback as well.

It is at the point where Obadiah is introduced into the Elijah narrative as somebody who ‘revered the Lord greatly’ that an illustration of this is included as a flashback (although this flashback also serves as the background to verse 13, where the information is repeated):

[...] when Jezebel was killing off (וַיְהִי בְהַכְרִית אֵיזָבֵל *wayyiqtol*) the prophets of the Lord, Obadiah took a hundred prophets, hid them fifty to a cave, and provided them with bread and water. (1 Kgs 18:4)

Instead of ‘took’, the pluperfect ‘had taken’ (found in several other translations) indicates the flashback more clearly.

The narrative of Solomon’s reign ends with accounts of three adversaries: Hadad (1 Kgs 11:14-22); Rezon (verses 23-25) and Jeroboam (verses 26-40). All three passages begin with *wayyiqtol* sentences:

Then the Lord raised up (וַיִּקָּם) an adversary against Solomon, Hadad the Edomite. (verse 14)

God raised up (וַיִּקָּם) another adversary against Solomon, Rezon. (verse 23)

Jeroboam [...] an Ephraimite [...], a servant of Solomon [...] rebelled (וַיִּרְם) against the king. (verse 26)

The words ‘then’ and ‘another’ in the NRSV translation give the wrong suggestion that the three rebellions all took place at the end of Solomon’s reign and are narrated in chronological order. But already the phrase ‘all the days of Solomon’ (verse 25) shows that this is not the case. It seems more likely that the three accounts are only included as flashbacks after the mention of Solomon’s unfaithfulness (11:1-13). The rhetorical and theological effect of this is that the rebellions serve to illustrate that through them Solomon is punished for his sins.

Background information is added to each of these three flashbacks in the form of further flashbacks. Thus verses 15-22 – “For when David was (וַיְהִי בְהִיּוֹת דָּוִד *wayyiqtol*) in Edom [...] but Hadad fled to Egypt [...]” – are a flashback after verse 14, while verse 24 is a flashback after verse 23 and verse 27b starts a flashback after verses 26-27a.

Jonah 3:6-9 is often considered a flashback as well, although few translations go as far as making this explicit:

Jonas Botschaft war nämlich dem König von Ninive gemeldet worden (*wayyiqtol* וַיָּגֵעַ) [...]. (Jonah 3:6 GuNa, similarly GrNB)

For word came unto the king of Nineveh [...]. (Jonah 3:6 KJV)

The renderings ‘war gemeldet worden’ and ‘for’ each highlight the reading of verses 6–9 as a flashback. According to this interpretation the royal decree has to come chronologically before the people’s fasting and their putting on sackcloth (verse 5). It is considered strange for the king to issue a decree to fast if the people are doing this already. However, chronological arrangement appears not to have been the narrator’s primary concern. In its present form the narrative highlights that the Ninevites’ response to Jonah’s message is immediate: they believed God and proclaimed a fast (verse 5). It is parallel to verse 5 that the narrative specifies in verses 6–9 how this happened and that it involved the cattle as well as the people. It is of interest to see that RSV – “Then tidings reached the king of Nineveh” – was revised in NRSV as follows: “When the news reached the king of Nineveh”. NRSV allows for the reading of verses 6–9 as a specific parallel to verse 5.

Another rhetorical effect is that the close parallels between the Ninevites and God in 3:9–10 now occur closely together in the narrative (Woude, van der 1985:50): “God may [...] change his mind (וַיִּנָּחֵם); he may turn (וַיִּשָּׁב)” (verse 9); “how they turned (וַיִּשָּׁבּוּ) [...] God changed his mind (וַיִּנָּחֵם)” (verse 10).

Isa 38:21, 22 form flashbacks that start with a *wayyiqtol*. In the chronology of the parallel text of 2 Kings 20, king Hezekiah still asks for a sign after he has recovered with the help of the figs (2 Kgs 20:7–8). This seems to put Hezekiah in a somewhat negative light. In Isaiah, however, the prophet announces the sign straightaway, without being asked for it (Isa 38:7). At least in Isaiah 36–38 the narrator may well have wanted to present a more positive picture of Hezekiah. He leaves out Hezekiah’s tribute to Sennacherib – which is still mentioned in 2 Kgs 18:14–16 – and includes Hezekiah’s hymn (Isa 38:9–20), which is not mentioned in 2 Kings. In Isaiah 38 the verses that correspond with 2 Kgs 20:7–8 only come at the end of the chapter (Isa 38:21–22). They may actually have been added there by a later hand ‘to supplement Isaiah’s shorter version from 2 Kings’ (Childs 2001:283). In their present position, then, Isa 38:21, 22 form flashbacks that start with a *wayyiqtol*:

Now Isaiah had said (וַיֹּאמֶר), “Let them take a lump of figs, and apply it to the boil, so that he may recover.”²² Hezekiah also had said (וַיֹּאמֶר), “What is the sign that I shall go up to the house of the Lord?” (Isa 38:21–22)

Some translations, for instance GNB and GrNB, place these verses between verses 6 and 7. While this position corresponds with the position of these verses in the parallel text of 2 Kings (20:7–8) and may be more logical chronologically,

it rather spoils the effect that the narrator of Isaiah 38 probably wanted to achieve. It seems better to leave these verses where they are and treat them as a separate paragraph.

Some other examples of a flashback starting with a *wayyiqtol* are Exod 11:1-3 (Regt, de 2004:87-90), Num 1:48-53 (which gives an explanation for verse 47), Judg 11:1b-3a and 2 Sam 12:26-31.

2.4 Digression and resumption

A digression does not carry forward the chronological order of events but mentions an aside which is important to the narrative at that point.

¹⁹ Now there was no smith to be found (*yiqtol* וְיָמָצָא) throughout all the land of Israel; for the Philistines said (*qatal* אָמְרוּ), “The Hebrews must not make swords or spears for themselves”; [...] ²² So on the day of the battle neither sword nor spear was to be found (*qatal* וְלֹא נִמְצָא) in the possession of any of the people with Saul and Jonathan [...]. (1 Sam 13:19-22)

The first sentence starts the digression, in which verses 19b-21 form a flashback. NIV shows this by translating ‘the Philistines had said’ (instead of ‘said’). The information of the digression is repeated and integrated into the narrative in verse 22 (resumption).

2.5 Overlapping parallels

An episode may be narrated by means of more than one account. Such accounts may overlap partially (hence the term *tilted parallel*). In such instances, the overlap is also chronological (whether partial or total). The different accounts highlight different aspects of the same episode in the narrative.

The Lord said to Moses, “[...] Go up to a land flowing with milk and honey; but I will not go up among you, or *I would consume you on the way, for you are a stiff-necked people.*” When the people heard these harsh words, they mourned, and no one put on ornaments. (Exod 33:1-4)

For the Lord had said (*wayyiqtol* וַיֹּאמֶר) to Moses, “Say to the Israelites, ‘*You are a stiff-necked people; if for a single moment I should go up among you, I would consume you.*’ So now *take off your ornaments,* and I will decide what to do to you.’ ” Therefore the Israelites *stripped themselves of their ornaments*, from Mount Horeb onward. (Exod 33:5-6)

On the face of it, the second account (verses 5-6) duplicates the first, especially vv. 3-4. However, in comparison with verses 1-4 the account of verses 5-6

stresses that Moses is to say these words to the Israelites and that the taking off of ornaments is a divine instruction. After verse 4 – ‘no one put on ornaments’ – the point of the second parallel (verses 5-6) must be to explain why the people did not put on ornaments. If we read verses 1-4 and 5-6 in this way as parallel accounts, the duplications are no longer puzzling.

Thus there is no need to conclude that the text reverses the chronology in that the injunction to remove the jewellery (verse 5) comes after the Israelites already did this. (In verse 4 it does not say that the Israelites removed them; they did not put them on.) And that means that there is no need to treat verses 5-6 as a flashback, as the KJV, NRSV and other translations do: ‘For [...] had said’. The alternative rendering, which hints that verse 5 is the beginning of a (partial) parallel (also chronologically), is found in NJB and NBJ: “Yahweh then said to Moses” / “Alors Yahvé dit à Moïse”.

Jonah 4:3-4 and 8-9 suggest that this chapter consists of parallels as well.

“And now, O Lord, please take my life from me, for it is better for me to die than to live.” And the Lord said, “Is it right for you to be angry?” (Jonah 4:3-4)

[...] “It is better for me to die than to live.” But God said to Jonah, “Is it right for you to be angry about the bush?” And he said, “Yes, angry enough to die.” (Jonah 4:8-9)

NRSV translates verses 5-6 as follows:

Then Jonah went (*wayyiqtol* וַיֵּצֵא) out of the city and sat down east of the city, and made a booth for himself there. He sat under it in the shade, waiting to see what would become of the city.

⁶ The Lord God appointed a bush, and made it come up over Jonah, to give shade over his head, to save him from his discomfort (מְרִעָתוֹ); so Jonah was very happy about the bush. (Jonah 4:5-6)

The rendering ‘then’ suggests that NRSV treats verses 5-11 as chronologically coming after verses 1-4. The phrase ‘to save him from his discomfort’ (verse 6) indeed presupposes Jonah’s displeasure in verse 1. But if verses 5-11 are in their chronological position, the phrase ‘waiting to see what would become of the city’ (verse 5) seems strange (unless this means that Jonah remains obstinate and simply refuses to accept the outcome). Surely Jonah knew already what became of the city! He already complained in verses 1-4 about the outcome! This is why some translations treat verse 5 as the beginning of a flashback:

Now Jonah *had left* the city and found a place east of the city. He made a booth there and sat under it in the shade, until he should see what happened to the city. (Jonah 4:5 NJPS)

But although this translation may solve the problem of the chronological order between the verse 5 and what precedes, it creates another problem. Where would the flashback end? Would it end with verse 9? But not only verse 9 refers to the bush; verse 10 does this as well. Are all of verses 5-11 then to be considered part of the flashback (and chronologically to occur before verses 1-4)? This remains unclear, since chronological arrangement appears not to have been the narrator's primary concern. Instead, the parallel accounts in verses 1-4 and verses 5-11 overlap, highlighting different aspects of the same episode in the narrative. In other words, verse 5 is the beginning of a tiled parallel which also lends more weight to the Lord's question in verse 4. For this reason a translation of verse 5 should not suggest chronological sequentiality ('Then [...] said') or a flashback ('had said'). NIV and REB indeed leave this out: "Jonah went out [...]."

The episode of the crossing of the Jordan in Josh 3:17-4:18 is narrated by means of overlapping parallels as well. This comes after the summarizing statement – "The people crossed over (*qatal* עָבְרוּ) opposite Jericho" – in 3:16.

First parallel:

Josh 3:17 people crossing over; priests standing in the river
 4:1-8 twelve stones *out of* Jordan to the camp
 4:9 Joshua: twelve stones *in* the Jordan

Second, tiled, parallel:

4:10-13 armed people *and* priests crossing over
 4:14 Joshua: exalted

Third, tiled, parallel:

4:15-18 priests coming out: the waters return

Syntactically, it is of interest that two of these three accounts start with a *wayyiqtol*: עָמְדוּ in 3:17; עָמְדוּ (qotel) in 4:10; וַיֵּאמֶר in 4:15. The first account focuses on the stones as a sign, the second focuses on the army (including the Reubenites, Gadites and the half-tribe of Manasseh), the third focuses on the priests.

Another example in Joshua of tiled parallels occurs in chapter 10 (Ska 2000: 10): verses 16-28 come as a tiled parallel to verses 7-15. When did Joshua return to the camp at Gilgal? This return to Gilgal is mentioned in Josh 10:15 as well as 10:43 (at least in the Masoretic Text). 10:15 is odd in the context. Makkedah is part of the battle scene not only in verse 10 but in verse 17 (and verse 28) as well. It is indeed the same battle: "Pursue your enemies [...] Do not let them enter their towns" (verse 19). After this the army returns "to Joshua in the camp

at Makkedah" (verse 21). But according to verse 15 Joshua is already supposed to arrive at Gilgal. At first, the description of the battle closes with 10:15. It is difficult to explain the presence of 10:15 otherwise. It seems that 10:16-28, 29-43 – the rest of the battle (near Makkedah) and the conquest of southern cities – are another, particular tradition that was also brought into the text. Now that 10:15 (and 10:43) is part of the text (at least in the Masoretic text, not in the Septuagint), NRSV is a good translation model to follow.

Meanwhile, these five kings fled (*wayyiqtol* וַיִּנָּסוּ) and hid themselves in the cave at Makkedah. (Josh 10:16)

But even if we would not treat 10:15 and 10:43 as part of the text, we would still have to say that verses 16-28, 29-43 are a second, parallel, battle account, since verses 12-14 already form the dramatic end of the battle and imply that the battle is over. The kings' flight in verse 16 seems repetitive: the flight was already implied in verse 10. (Alternatively, verses 16-28, 29-42 continue what is then the same account, coming logically after verse 11, while verses 12-14 are a dramatic interruption of the actual account of the battle.)

2.6 Different threads

In the above examples there is still only one narrative thread. But occasionally two narrative threads alternate and are interwoven in a single plot. Examples are Genesis 37–38–39 (Joseph–Judah–Joseph) and 1 Sam 2:12-3:1 (Ska 2000:11). 1 Sam 2:12-17; 22-25; 27-36 are about Eli's sons, while 2:18-21; 26; 3:1 deal with Samuel. This alternation of narrative threads serves to highlight the contrast between Eli's sons and Samuel.

3. Concluding Remarks

Flashbacks and other non-chronological arrangement of sentences are not indicated by the type of verb: *wayyiqtol* as well as *qatal* and *yiqtol* are found to occur in such sentences. *Wayyiqtol*s at the beginning of a flashback or other non-chronologically placed part of the narrative do not present the event as non-sequential: the 'temporal overlay' with what precedes has been left 'grammatically unmarked' – i.e., not marked by a *qatal* – in order to pragmatically make the event a 'normal' part of sequential narrative (Buth 1994:142, 148). These *wayyiqtol*s can still be regarded as sequential in (at the beginning of) a stretch of narrative text (de Regt 2008:80); any past perfect meaning is only contextual in Hebrew (Cook 2004:261).

Why would the narrator have preferred a rhetorical strategy of non-chronological arrangement of events? Such events are now mentioned where they are the most effective and relevant to the ongoing narrative. Anticipations allow the reader to know more than the character in the text. The flashbacks in 1 Sam 28:3 remind the reader that Saul is about to violate his own prohibition. Similarly, Obadiah's saving of a hundred prophets is mentioned at the point where Obadiah is introduced into the narrative and is about to meet Elijah (2 Kgs 18:4). Flashbacks serve to add suspense to the ongoing narrative (Gen 31:32, 34; 1 Sam 25:21-22). The three accounts of Solomon's adversaries are only included as flashbacks after the mention of Solomon's unfaithfulness (11:1-13). The rhetorical effect of this is that the rebellions serve to illustrate that through them Solomon is punished for his sins. For Jonah 1:10a to come directly after verse 9 and highlight the contrast between the sailors and Jonah, verse 10b has to come later as a flashback.

Jonah 3:5 is placed before the more specific parallel of verses 6-9, thus highlighting that the Ninevites' response to Jonah's message is immediate: they believed God and proclaimed a fast (verse 5). The tiling of parallel accounts of the same episode is a way to highlight different aspects of this episode in the narrative (Exod 33:1-6; Josh 3:17-4:18; Joshua 10; Jonah 4). In 1 Sam 2:12-3:1 the alternation of different narrative threads serves to highlight the contrast between Eli's sons and Samuel.

A translation will have to show which passages are placed non-chronologically, certainly in languages that have a past perfect form. A so-called literal translation would mislead the reader.

References

Translations:

- | | |
|------|--|
| GNB | Good News Bible (Second edition 1994) |
| GrNB | Groot Nieuws Bijbel (1996) |
| GuNa | Gute Nachricht (1997) |
| KJV | King James Version (1611) |
| NBJ | Nouvelle Bible de Jérusalem (1998) |
| NBV | Nieuwe Bijbelvertaling (2004) |
| NIV | New International Version (1978) |
| NJB | New Jerusalem Bible (1985) |
| NJPS | New Translation of the Jewish Publication Society (1985) |

NRSV	New Revised Standard Version (1989)
REB	Revised English Bible (1989)
TOB	Traduction Œcuménique de la Bible (Nouvelle édition revue 1994)

Alter, R. (2000). *The David Story: A Translation with Commentary of 1 and 2 Samuel*. New York: Norton.

Buth, R. (1994). 'Methodological Collision between Source Criticism and Discourse Analysis: The Problem of "Unmarked Temporal Overlay" and the Pluperfect/Non-sequential *wayyiqtol*', in: R.D. Bergen (ed.), *Biblical Hebrew and Discourse Linguistics*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 138-154.

Childs, B.S. (2001). *Isaiah* (The Old Testament Library). Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Cook, J.A. (2004). 'The Semantics of Verbal Pragmatics: Clarifying the Roles of *wayyiqtol* and *weqatal* in Biblical Hebrew Prose', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 49, 247-273.

Regt, de, L.J. (2004). 'Signs of Redactional Development in Some Old Testament Texts and the Translator', *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 30, 81-97.

Regt, de L.J. (2008). 'Hebrew Verb Forms in Prose and in Some Poetic and Prophetic Passages: Aspect, Sequentiality, Mood and Cognitive Proximity', *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 34, 75-103.

Ska, J.L. (2000). *"Our Fathers Have Told Us": Introduction to the Analysis of Hebrew Narratives* (Subsidia Biblica 13). Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico.

Woude, van der, A.S. 1985. *Jona/Nahum* (De prediking van het Oude Testament). Nijkerk: Callenbach.

Zevit, Z. (1998). *The Anterior Construction in Classical Hebrew*. (SBL Monograph Series 50). Atlanta: Scholars Press.