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Juncture (prosodic)

Prosodic juncture concerns the compartmentalization and partitioning of syntactic entities in spoken discourse by means of prosodic marking. The suprasegmental intervals that are the building blocks of the resulting prosodic structure have been termed ‘intonation units’ (Chafe 1994), ‘intonation(al) phrases’ (Gussenhoven 2004), ‘intonation-groups’ (Cruttenden 1997), ‘tone groups’ (Halliday and Matthiessen 2004) and ‘breath groups’ (Grice 2006:778). Izre’el (2005) has suggested that the intonation unit (IU) encapsulates the basic structural unit of spoken Modern Hebrew, with IU Complex (or Utterance) as a hierarchically higher unit. The definition of such IUs remains debated. It seems commonly accepted that IUs are defined by internal criteria (e.g., a “coherent intonation contour” in Chafe 1994; Izre’el 2005; cf. Ladd 1986) as well as by prosodic boundary phenomena (“external criteria” in Cruttenden 1997).

Some descriptions of prosodic structure argue that the IU should be defined and analyzed within a hierarchical framework, which is termed the prosodic hierarchy, with smaller prosodic units combining into larger ones (Ladd 1986; Nespor and Vogel 1986). More recent theories of prosody are found in Ladd (1996) and Gussenhoven (2004). Currently, the most widespread phonological framework for rep-
resenting prosodic structure is the \textit{autosegmental-metrical framework} (Pierrehumbert 1980; Beckman and Pierrehumbert 1986; Ladd 1996). For examples of literature applying this framework to Tiberian Hebrew, see Dresher (1994) or DeCaen (2005; 2009). The major tool for applying the autosegmental-metrical framework is ToBI (Tones and Break Indices; Beckman and Hirshberg 1994; Beckman and Ayers 1997). For applications of this tool to Modern Hebrew, see for example the work of Hila Green (e.g. Green and Tobin 2008; 2009).

The boundaries of IUs may be cued by such prosodic phenomena as \textit{final lengthening} (inter alia, Wightman et al. 1992), \textit{domain initial strengthening} (Keating et al. 2003), \textit{assimilation resistance} (Nespov and Vogel 1986), \textit{pitch movements} (Cruttenden 1997:34; Ladefoged 2006), \textit{fast initial speech} (`anacrusis' in Chafe 1994:59 and Cruttenden 1997:32) or \textit{pause} (Cruttenden 1997:30). The occurrence and the prominence of the cues signaling prosodic juncture differ per language. There is a wide range of studies into the acoustic correlates of IU boundaries in Modern Hebrew. Work on elicited speech (Lauffer 1987; 1996) suggests the following hierarchy of boundary cues: pitch reset $>$ cross-boundary change of speech rate $>$ pause. An investigation into spontaneous Hebrew has shown that speech rate should be placed higher in the hierarchy: final lengthening $>$ pitch reset $>$ pauses $>$ fast initial speech (Amir et al. 2004; Izre’el 2009). In a subsequent study fast initial speech was clustered together with final lengthening into a single rhythm cue high up in the hierarchy (Silber-Varod and Amir unpublished). Other studies no longer deal with initial rush and consider only the left side of the boundary domain, that is the boundary cues at the end of an IU (e.g., Silber-Varod 2011). The characteristics of the most frequently occurring IU boundary in planned Modern Hebrew speech have been found to include three boundary cues: an ‘up-down’ pitch reset pattern (i.e., rising tone at the end of an IU and a transition downwards to the onset of the following IU), final lengthening and pause (Silber-Varod and Kessous 2008).
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Juridical Hebrew

1. Terminology and Classification

Juridical formulas are syntactic structures in which legal, moral, or religious laws are couched. Alt’s classic study (Alt 1966) differentiated between two major types of juridical formulations in Hebrew, ‘casuistic’ and ‘apodictic’, distinguished by a combination of stylistic markers and content. Casuistic laws present a hypothetical case and are framed in the conditional mode. Laws which are not casuistic are apodictic. However, as Laserre (1994:xxi) has pointed out, the apodictic category groups together too many linguistic types to be useful; these include negative and positive commands, participial and relative clauses, and curses.

Still, it is possible to differentiate between two categories of legal formulations on the basis of syntactic structure. Some laws describe a situation or a potential case, and then stipulate a legal consequence; others instead state positive or negative commands or permissions. For the first type the term ‘casuistic’ can be retained; the second type will be referred to as an ‘order’, a term which subsumes affirmative commands, negative commands (prohibitions), and permission.

2. Juridical Language of the Bible

Most of the Bible’s casuistic laws are arranged in what are called ‘codes’: the Covenant Code (Exod. 20.19–23.33), the Priestly Code (Exod. 25–31; 34.29–Lev. 16; and parts of Numbers), the Holiness Code (Lev. 17–27), and the Deuteronomy Code (Deut. 12–26). Casuistic laws in the Hebrew Bible are most often formulated as conditional sentences. The condition clause (protasis) in such laws is commonly introduced by the particle יִהְיֶֽה (yihiyeh) ‘when’, or equivalents, e.g., אִם (im) ‘and if’. If another, subordinate case is adjoined to the law, it is introduced by לַֽךְ (lakach) ‘then’, or equivalents, e.g., או (o) ‘or’, והָיָֽה (wehayyah) ‘and if’ or ‘when’. If the second or third party is involved, the consequence clause can be a participle, e.g., הָאָֽתָּה (hatah) אֶל (el) ‘unto you’ or קִי (ki) ‘attā...