

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

Volume 3
P-Z

General Editor
Geoffrey Khan

Associate Editors
Shmuel Bolokzy
Steven E. Fassberg
Gary A. Rendsburg
Aaron D. Rubin
Ora R. Schwarzwald
Tamar Zewi



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2013

© 2013 Koninklijke Brill NV ISBN 978-90-04-17642-3

Table of Contents

VOLUME ONE

Introduction	vii
List of Contributors	ix
Transcription Tables	xiii
Articles A-F	I

VOLUME TWO

Transcription Tables	vii
Articles G-O	I

VOLUME THREE

Transcription Tables	vii
Articles P-Z	I

VOLUME FOUR

Transcription Tables	vii
Index	I

- Talmudic literature*, ed. by Menaḥem Zevi Kaddari and Shim'on Sharvit, 169–174. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press.
- . 1991. *Post-Biblical Hebrew syntax and semantics: Diachronic studies in Hebrew* (in Hebrew). 2 vols. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press.
- . 1998. “On deontic modality in Mishnaic Hebrew”. *Studies in Mishnaic Hebrew* (Scripta Hierosolymitana 37), ed. by Moshe Bar-Asher and Steven E. Fassberg, 197–217. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Khan, Geoffrey. 2006. “Some aspects of the copula in Northwest Semitic”. *Biblical Hebrew in its Northwest Semitic setting: Typological and historical perspectives*, ed. by Steven E. Fassberg and Avi Hurvitz, 155–176. Jerusalem: Magnes and Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Kutscher, Eduard Yechezkel. 1962. “The language of the Hebrew and Aramaic letters of *Bar-Koseba* and its generation, second article: The Hebrew letter” (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu* 26:7–23.
- . 1982. *A history of the Hebrew language*. Ed. by Raphael Kutscher. Jerusalem: Magnes and Leiden: Brill.
- Kurzon, Dennis. 1980. “Iconic syntax in rabbinical codes”. *The Jewish Law Annuals* 3:71–83.
- Mishor, Mordechai. 1983. “The tense system in Tannaic Hebrew” (in Hebrew). PhD dissertation, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Moreshet, Menaḥem. 1983. “The predicate that precedes two subjects in Rabbinic Hebrew with references to Modern Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Hebrew language studies presented to professor Ze'ev Ben-Hayyim*, ed. by Moshe Bar-Asher, Aron Dotan, Gad B. Sarfatti, and David Téné, 359–378. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Oron, Yokheved. 1989. “Nominative פִּנּוּ in Mishnaic Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Studies in the Hebrew language and the Talmudic literature*, ed. by Menaḥem Zevi Kaddari and Shim'on Sharvit, 27–34. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press.
- Pretz, Yitzhaq. 1967. *The relative clause* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv: Dvir.
- Qimron, Elisha. 1983. “The particle לְ in our ancient sources” (in Hebrew). *Hebrew Language studies presented to professor Ze'ev Ben-Hayyim*, ed. by Moshe Bar-Asher, Aaron Dotan, Gad B. Sarfatti, and David Téné. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- . 1992. “Considerations on modal tenses in Mishnaic Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu* 55:89–96.
- Sarfatti, Gad B. 1980. “Determination of fixed phrases formed by means of the construct state in Mishnaic Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Studies in Hebrew and Semitic languages dedicated to the memory of Prof. Eduard Yechezkel Kutscher*, ed. by Gad B. Sarfatti, Pinḥas Artzi, Jonas C. Greenfield, and Menaḥem Zevi Kaddari, 140–154. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press.
- . “The prosodic function of the definite article in Rabbinic Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu* 44:185–201.
- . 1989. “Definiteness in noun-adjective phrases in Rabbinic Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Studies in the Hebrew language and the Talmudic literature: Dedicated to the memory of Dr. Menaḥem Moreshet*, ed. by Menaḥem Zevi Kaddari and Shim'on Sharvit, xx–xxx. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press.
- Segal, Moshe H. 1927. *A grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 1928. “On the structure of oath and vow statements in Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu* 1:215–227.
- . 1932. “The structure of conditional clauses” (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu* 4:191–211.
- . 1936. *A grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv: Dvir.
- Sharvit, Shim'on. 1998. “Infinitival sentences in Mishnaic Hebrew: A syntactic and semantic study”. *Studies in Mishnaic Hebrew* (Scripta Hierosolymitana 37), ed. by Moshe Bar-Asher and Steven E. Fassberg, 336–348. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- . 2008. *Studies in Mishnaic Hebrew* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem: Bialik Institute.
- Waldman, Nahum M. 1989. *The recent study of Hebrew: A survey of the literature with selected bibliography*. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press.

MOSHE AZAR
(University of Haifa, Emeritus)

Syntax: Modern Hebrew

I. INTRODUCTION

Modern Hebrew is a fusion language, including elements from all the historical layers of the language. To quote Ben-Hayyim (1992:59), “nothing in it has died and so there exist—and are in use—different chronological layers side by side, not on top of one another as in languages with a historic continuity”. However, very frequently, in cases in which A' succeeds A of an earlier layer of Hebrew, both A and A' coexist, though differentiated either functionally or stylistically. In addition, apart from recent grammaticalizations and pragmatizations, there are also inherited constructions that are reinterpreted under the influence of similar constructions found in the contact-languages to which Hebrew speakers/writers have been exposed over the more than one hundred years of its existence, especially Slavo-Yiddish at the revival time and English in more recent decades.

Unlike morphology, the syntax of Modern Hebrew is dynamic and subject to rapid changes. The microsyntax (‘internal form’) of Modern Hebrew is Semitic (Goldenberg 1996), though there are a few scholars who contend that it is a distinct Europeanized language

different from its classical Semitic origin (Rosén suggested that it be renamed ‘Israeli Hebrew’). Yet, the macrosyntax displays strong influence of European languages. Its Semitic essence is clearly demonstrated by the use of the pure nominal clause (lacking a copula; → Nominal Clause), word order of determinant noun before determiner (→ Word Order), agreement between noun and adjective (→ Agreement), and the profuse use of the genitive construction of construct state nominals (→ Construct State). Unlike some other spoken Semitic languages (e.g., neo-Aramaic and neo-Ethiopian languages), Modern Hebrew still preserves the inherited (Hebrew, Semitic) patterns of verbs and nouns. Synthetic verb and noun patterns, however, are employed in complementary distribution with analytic constructions comprised of a semantically depleted verb or noun and a nominal adjunct carrying the lexical burden of the expression (Halevy 2000b). Transitivity of unergative/unaccusative (→ Unaccusative) verbs is spreading within present-day Hebrew, while, on the other hand, there is a remarkable expansion of dative constructions (→ Dative).

Modern Hebrew is susceptible to rapid processes of change not only because of its intensive exposure to European languages, but also due to the special circumstances of its relatively recent revival as a medium of everyday and spoken language confronting new semantic and pragmatic needs.

2. DETERMINATION (→ Definite Article)

Modern Hebrew has retained the classical agreement between noun and adjective, including demonstrative modifiers following a head noun, not only in gender and number, but also in definiteness. However, with respect to the marking of definiteness in the construct state there is often inconsistency between normative and casual usage. While in normative usage the definite article is attached only once, to the genitive noun, in colloquial language it may be preposed to the entire construct state, particularly, but not only, in highly lexicalized constructs, e.g., *ha-orex din* ‘the lawyer’, instead of *orex ha-din*; and in the same fashion in some lexicalized

constructs the plural is suffixed to the genitive noun, at the end of the construct form, and not to the construct head noun, e.g., *bar mišvot* ‘parties of Bar-Mitzva’, instead of normative *bne mišva*. In contemporary Hebrew the comparative determiners *יותר/פחות* co-occur occasionally as superlatives (possibly English-induced). As a result, the definite article is not attached to the adjective as normatively required, but is rather preposed as a definite marker of the entire phrase, e.g., *היא אחת* *הישחקניות היותר מוכשרות* *hi axat ha-šaxqaniyot ha-yoter muxšarot* ‘she is one of the most talented actresses’.

A deviation from the classical order of determinate before determiner and from agreement in definiteness occurs in a very limited number of cases, crucially where the determiner is interpreted as a ‘semantic prefix’, e.g., *השחקנית הספק-ילדה ספק-אישה* *ha-šaxqanit ha-safeq-yalda safeq-iša* ‘the semi-child semi-woman actress’; *ההקשר החוץ-לשוני* *ha-beqšer ha-xuš-lešoni* ‘the extra-linguistic context’.

The definite article is encoded in the vocative, e.g., *המורה* *ha-more* ‘Teacher’, *דן היקר* *dan ha-yaqar* ‘Dear Dan’. In colloquial language, however, undetermined vocatives prevail, too (possibly Yiddish/English-induced), e.g., *גברת* *gveret* ‘Miss, Lady’; *נהג* *nehag* ‘driver’; *מותק*, *מה קרה?* *moteq, ma qara?* ‘Sweetie, what happened?’. In the case of inalienable nouns (nouns of appurtenance) the definite article is an impersonal marker which can only be replaced by a possessive pronoun or suffix, e.g., *הלב נשבר* *ha-lev nišbar* ‘one’s heart breaks’. With nouns denoting time the definite article denotes ‘this’, e.g., *הערב* *ha-‘erev* ‘this evening’. In colloquial discourse the definite article serves frequently for emotive meaning, e.g., *האמא הזאת, תמיד מתע-* *ha-‘ima ha-zot, tamid mit‘arevet* ‘That (the) Mum, she always interferes’; *חכם, היוסי הזה!* *xaxam, ha-yosi ha-ze!* ‘That (the-) Yossi is smart!’.

Generic nouns are commonly marked by a neutralized definite article, e.g., *הדת* *ha-dat* ‘religion’. In equational sentences the generic noun may alternatively co-occur in the indefinite form, namely without any special marking, e.g., *פנגווין הוא עוף* *penguin hu ‘of* ‘(the) penguin is a bird’ (→ Generic). Hebrew has only definite articles, hence colloquial language utilizes various devices to denote indefiniteness,

particularly use of the unstressed numeral אחד *'exad* (and respectively in feminine and plural forms) and איזה *'eze* (fs איזו *'ezo*), e.g., פגשתי בחור אחד/איזה בחור *paḡašti baxur 'exad/ze baxur* 'I met some guy' (Agmon-Fruchtman 1982; Wintner 2000; for a generative account see Danon 2001).

3. THE COPULA

(→ Copula; Nominal Clause; Extraposition)

In Biblical Hebrew 3rd person pronouns in the middle or at the end of a nominal sentence stand for resumptive pronouns of an extraposition construction (used in 3rd person even when the subject is a 1st or 2nd person pronoun). However, due to the weakening of nominal sentences and to the fact that the expressive value of the extraposition is worn out, 3rd person pronouns evolved in Modern Hebrew into agreement markers reinterpreted as copular markers similar to verbal forms in Indo-European languages (Berman and Grosu 1976; Goldenberg 2005; for generative accounts see Doron 1986; Greenberg 2002; 2008), e.g., הנכון הוא ההיפך הוא הנכון *ha-befex hu ha-naxon* 'the opposite is the truth'. Copular markers can be realized with זה *ze* 'it/this', מי *mi* 'who', and מה *ma* 'what', e.g., זהו-זה *zehu-ze* 'that's it' (available only in 3rd person singular); מיהו המבוגר כאן? *mihu ha-mevugar kan?* 'Who is the adult here?'; מהו חופש? *mahu xofeš?* 'what is freedom?'. Modern Hebrew currently employs 3rd personal pronouns for fronting and topicalization, e.g., אני הוא המנהל *'ani hu ha-menahel* 'I (and nobody else) am the manager'. Extraposed constructions with postposed 3rd person independent pronouns (attested in Biblical Hebrew) are rare, e.g., לא הוא כל הנוצץ זהב הוא *lo kol ha-nošeš zahav hu* 'all that glitters is not gold (lit. "not all that glitters gold [is] he")'. In formal language, הנה *hine* (lit. 'here, behold') plus a suffixed pronoun features as copula, e.g., הדיבור הינו מאפיין של *ha-dibur hino me'afyen šel ha-min ha-enoši* 'speaking is a characteristic of the human species'. In colloquial language, noninflected, invariable, זה *ze* 'it (lit. 'this')' features instead of 3rd person copular forms, e.g., (היא) ללמוד זה המטרה *ha-maṭara ze (bi) lilmod* 'the goal is to learn'. Yet, frequently there is a functional distribution between these

semi-copular forms. While 3rd person copular pronouns function as identifiers or classifiers of the subject-noun, *ze* often functions as a comment on the subject-noun (Rosén 1977a:247), e.g., ילדים זה שמחה *yeladim ze šimxa* 'Children are (=means) happiness'.

4. NOMINAL PREDICATES

SUFFIXED WITH A PRONOMINAL SUBJECT

Unlike verbal predicates, the subject of a nominal predicate is not included in it. Nevertheless, in some exceptional cases a nominal predication can co-occur with a suffixed pronominal subject, e.g., as person-like copular, e.g., הינו *hino* / הריהו *harehu* 'he is'; as object-like personal pronoun attached to an existential verboid: ישנם אנשים *yešnam 'anašim* 'there are people' (employed in Modern Hebrew only for 3rd person); and respectively אינך מחובר *'enxa mexubar* 'you are not connected'. Reduced nominal predicates suffixed by possessive pronouns occur occasionally in some restricted forms of one-term sentences (infrequently evidenced in Biblical Hebrew), e.g., אשריך *ašrexa* 'you must be lucky (lit. 'your happiness')'; תקוותי *tiqvati* '(it is) my hope (=I hope)'. In some rare cases the reduced nominal predicate is preceded by ב- *be-* 'in', e.g., ברצוני *bi-ršoni* '(it) is my wish (lit. 'in my desire')'. Reduced predicates suffixed by a 1st person singular pronoun can be encountered in a limited number of participles of Rabbinic Hebrew origin, e.g., דומני *domani* / כמדומני *ki-mdumani* 'it seems to me (lit. 'seem I/as seem I')'. A nominal predication composed of a free personal pronoun followed by a nominal predicate (rare in Biblical Hebrew; Kogut 1993) is unusual, e.g., אני תקווה *'ani tiqva* / כולי תקווה *kuli tiqva* 'I hope/I have hope (lit. 'I am hope' / 'I am all hope')'.

Inherited adverbial gerundives, almost exclusively time adverbials, suffixed by a possessive-like pronominal subject are employed in Modern Hebrew in a very limited fashion and only in formal language and journalistic writing, e.g., בשובו *be-šuvo* 'on his returning (when he returned)'. Construct states with a gerundive head appear almost exclusively in lexicalized phrases, e.g., בבוא היום *be-vo ha-yom* 'when the day comes'.

5. POSSESSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS
AND THE GENITIVE RELATION
(→ Possession; Genitive)

Modern Hebrew is a ‘non-*habere*’ language, with no distinct verb meaning ‘have’ or ‘possess’. To mark possession Hebrew employs an existential predicate, for present tense the verboid *יש* *yeš* (אין *’en* in negative), and inflected *היה* *haya* ‘be’ elsewhere, a dative noun or pronoun marking the possessor, and a noun denoting the possessee, e.g., *יש לי ספר* *yeš li sefer* ‘I have a book (lit. “there is to me [a] book”)’. However, as a presentational noun (non-topical) the syntactic position of the possessee-noun is not clear, as in the definite construction it is typically encoded (in possessive and existential constructions alike) with features normally associated with the object, e.g., *יש לי את הספר* *יש li ’et ha-sefer ve-yeš ’oto gam ba-sifriya* ‘I have (object marker) the book and it (*’et*-direct object pronoun) is also in the library’ (Glinert 1990; Henkin 1994). In colloquial language, there is occasionally a lack of agreement between the existential predicate and the noun, whether representing the possessed object or the subject-argument (Kuzar 2002:343–345).

Possessive datives encoded without the overt existential *יש/היה* *yeš/haya* as commonly used in Biblical Hebrew can be encountered in some special environments, e.g., *היה היה* (*היה היה*) *ve-lo šaloš banot* ‘(Once upon a time there was a king) and he had three daughters (lit. ‘to him three daughters’)’; *לכובע שלי שלוש פינות* *lakova’ šeli šaloš pinot* ‘my hat has three corners (lit. ‘to my hat three corners’)’; *בקשה לי אליך* *baqaša li ’elexa* ‘I have a request of you (lit. ‘a request to me to you’)’. The genitive relation provides Modern Hebrew with a rich and varied set of constructions for expressing the relation between two nouns, or between a noun and its modifier. Modern Hebrew integrates the Biblical annexation in the construct state along with the post-Biblical (Mishnaic) *šel*-phrase and double genitive (→ Construct State; Genitive), e.g., *כרטיס-חבר* *kartīs-ḥaver* ‘member(ship) card’, *חבר של חבר* *kartīs šel ḥaver* ‘a friend’s card/ticket’, *כרטיסו של חבר* *kartīso šel ḥaver* lit. ‘card/ticket of his of a friend’. Modern Hebrew has, however, developed a functional distinction (stylistic, seman-

tic, and sometimes syntactic) between these inherited constructions. The construct state is the bound and lexicalized form, preserved for vocabulary extension by lexicalized compounds, and for annexation of definite nouns and numerals. The analytic *šel*-phrase, on the other hand, is the free construction, the relations between its components more transparent. In colloquial language this construction is preferred particularly, but not exclusively, to express possessive relationships. Nonetheless, it should be stressed that the semantic relationships between the constituents in the genitive construction are very wide-ranging, and that possessiveness is only one of them. Inherited paronomastic constructs, mostly in the plural (like in Rabbinic Hebrew), are utilized for intensification, e.g., *בקולי קולות* *be-qole qolot* ‘very loudly (lit. ‘in/with voices of voices’)’. Definite constructs comprised of an adjectival head (singular or plural) and a construct noun in the plural function as superlative genitives, e.g., *גדולי האמנים* *gdole ha-’omanim* ‘the greatest artists’. In newly emerging compounds with a nominal component reanalyzed as a semantic suffix or prefix, the morphosyntactic properties of the classical construct are not strictly kept, e.g., *בת-חברה/חברת* *ḥevrat/ḥevra-bat* ‘daughter company’, *אב-טיפוס* (*ה*) *(ha-’)av-ṭīpus* ‘(the) prototype’ (Kahana 1998). Analytic *šel*-phrases are currently utilized for metaphorical quantification and qualification, e.g., *גל של קונים* *gal šel qonim* lit. ‘wave of shoppers’; *חומה של שתיקה* *ḥoma šel štiqa* lit. ‘wall of silence’. An innovation of Modern Hebrew (possibly Yiddish- or English-inspired) is the construction of the *emotive genitive*, in which the head noun is an attribute-noun preceding the noun which denotes the owner of the attribute (unlike the usual order of head noun followed by modifier), but the second noun is the one which controls the agreement of the nominal phrase (Halevy 2000a), e.g., *היא מותק של ילדה* *hi moteq šel yalda* ‘she is a sweetie of a girl (lit. ‘sweetness of a girl’)’. Double genitive constructions, with a possessive pronoun agreeing with the adjunct noun and suffixed to the initial head noun, are found only in formal language and denote almost exclusively possessiveness and ownership, e.g., *הודעתו של השר* *boda’ato šel ha-šar* ‘the minister’s announcement’ (Rosén 1977a:149–160, 179–184; Berman 1978:231–323; Azar 1986; Glinert 1989:24–49).

In addition, Modern Hebrew makes ample use of the inherited adjectival constructs. The ‘reversed adjectival construct’ co-occurs in lexicalized expressions, e.g., *ילד קצר ראייה* *yeled qšar re’iya* ‘a shortsighted boy’ (Goldenberg 1996:170–173; Halevy 2000b; for a different perspective see Rosén 1968:98–101); and also adjectival constructs with stative verbs, notably verbs of abundance and wearing/covering otherwise co-occurring with applicative ב- *be-* ‘with’, e.g., *קרקע רוויית מים* *qarqā revuyat mayim* ‘watered/saturated land’; *חייל חבוש* *ḫayal ḫavuš qasda* ‘helmet-wearing soldier’ (Bliboim 2000). Modern Hebrew also has at its disposal, however, the option of encoding adjectival phrases in a head plus adjunct relation, e.g., *שיער קל לסירוק* *šé’ar qal le-seruq* ‘easy-to-comb hair’. Biblical construct states may also stand for periphrastic adjectives, e.g., *בני תרבות* (*’anašim*) *bne tarbut* ‘civilized (people)’, *אשת חברה* *’ešet ḫevra* ‘socialite’ (Goldenberg 1998d).

Encoding denominative adjectives with suffix י- *-i* in competition with the classical construct represents a departure from classical Hebrew. Unlike in classical Hebrew where the denominative adjective (→ Adjective) with the suffix י- *-i* mainly indicates ‘someone or a collective of the origin of’, in Modern Hebrew it is employed as a suffix of denominative adjectives indifferent to their meaning, and it has become a major device for denominal adjective formation. Noun phrases with denominative adjectives first deployed in Modern Hebrew at the revival time under the influence of Russian as equivalents to the inherited classical constructs (Rosén 1977a:192; 1977b:118). Contemporary Hebrew, however, has developed a functional differentiation between them and the construct state, e.g., *צוות רפואי* *ševet refu’i* ‘medical staff’ (consisting of various professionals in the medical area) versus *צוות רופאים* *ševet rof’im* ‘physicians’ staff’ (consisting of medical doctors) (Taube 1990). Denominative adjectives of this kind are excluded from predicative position. The semantic and syntactic composition of such phrases is similar to that of phraseological expressions of noun + adjective (Rosén 1977a:83–93; Halevy 1992:531).

Modern Hebrew employs both bound and free possessive pronouns for purposes of stylistic variation or, occasionally, differentiates them semantically, e.g., for distinction between

inalienability (appurtenance) and alienability (non-appurtenance possession) *בשרי* *bšari* ‘my flesh’ versus *הבשר שלי* *ha-bašar šeli* ‘my meat’ (Rosén 1977a:151–153). The possessive dative is currently employed when referring to an affected possessor, crucially of an inalienable object, e.g., *קואב לי הראש* *ko’ev li ha-roš* ‘I have an headache (lit. “aches to me the head”)’.

6. THE FUNCTION OF PRONOUNS

Although insertion of overt pronouns (crucially in 1st and 2nd person) is not necessary with past and future tense forms, they are encoded for expressive purposes, for highlighting the subject (as topic or focus) *ואת—מה את אומרת?* *ve-’at—ma ’at ’omeret?* lit. ‘and you—what do you say?’; *זה אני (ש)ניצחתי* *ze ’ani (še-)nišaxti* ‘it is me who won’; or for marking contrastive subjects, e.g., *אתה דיברת ואני עשיתי* *ata dibarta va-’ani ’ašiti* ‘you spoke and I have done (it)’.

There is a requirement for an explicit 3rd person subject, whether noun or pronoun, much more than in previous layers of Hebrew, e.g., *הוא חבר שלי* *hu be-’oto ḫug* ‘her boy-friend is (lit. ‘he’) in the same department’; notably in topicalization, e.g., *הם תמיד יעמדו לצידנו* *ha-horim—hem tamid ya’amdu le-šidenu* ‘parents—they’ll always be on our side’; by duplication, e.g., *דני הוא הזוכה* *dani hu hu ha-zoxe* ‘Dani (and none else) is (lit. ‘he he’) the winner’; or as a retrospective pronoun *כל אדם והשקפותיו הוא* *kol ’adam ve-hašqafotav hu* ‘each person and his own views (lit. ‘his views he’)’. In some exceptional cases of highly literal register, the 3rd person singular pronoun is employed with an endophoric function (referring to previously mentioned content in the text), e.g., *הוא אשר* *hu ’ašer/še-’amarti* ‘that is what (lit. ‘he that’) I said’. Yet, 3rd person verbal forms are often to be found without an overt pronoun (treated in generative framework as ‘pro-drop’) (→ Pro-Drop), e.g., in both embedded and coordinated clauses *דני ידע שייכשל* *dani yadaš še-yikašal* ‘Dani knew that he would fail (3rd person pro-drop)’; *דני לא למד, ולכן נכשל* *dani lo lamad, ve-laxen niššal* ‘Dani didn’t study and therefore (he) failed (3rd person pro-drop)’; in narrative discourse as a stylistic device for creating continuity, e.g., *עקב אחריה כשיצאה* *’aqav ’aḫareha kše-yaš’a ve-ḫašav ma yomar lah* ‘he followed (3rd person

pro-drop) her when she left (3rd person pro-drop) and he thought (3rd person pro-drop) what he would say (3rd person pro-drop) to her'; and also in relative clauses, e.g., במאמר... להודעה לה... 'in the paper that he introduced (3rd person pro-drop) at the conference he thanked (3rd person pro-drop)...'. 3rd person plural verb forms without the explicit pronoun are currently used to designate impersonality (→ Impersonal Constructions) (Bar 2007).

(Pro)nominal expressions of generic reference in Modern Hebrew can also express impersonal views by using generic nouns and pronouns, e.g., הבנאדם צריך גם ליהנות מהחיים *ha-ben'adam šarix gam lehanot me-ha-šayim* 'a man also needs to enjoy (his) life' (colloquial); or alternatively אנשים צריכים גם ליהנות מהחיים *'anašim šrixim gam lehanot me-ha-šayim* 'people also need to enjoy (their) life'. A generic 2nd person masculine singular pronoun is employed in speech acts expressing advice, instructions, and general truth, e.g., אם אתה בצרה אתה *'im 'ata be-šara 'ata mitqāšer la-šagrirut* 'if you (generic) are in trouble you (generic) call the embassy'.

Apart from lexical, inflected demonstratives (→ Demonstrative Pronouns; Deixis) there is widespread use in the current language of invariable (concordless) זה *ze* 'it' in the following functions: (a) as a pro-copular marker and particularly as a comment on the subject-noun (see above); (b) as a reference to a situation known in the discourse, or alternatively as a conceptually empty pro-subject (expletive), e.g., ככה זה בחיים *kax/kaxa ze ba-šayim* 'it is like that in life'; זה מרגיש נעים *ze margiš na'im* (colloquial) 'it feels good (nice)'; (c) as a means of foregrounding, e.g., רק זה חסר לי, *raq ze xaser li, libyot xole* 'this is what I'm missing (sarcastically), to be ill'; זה זה הוא שניצח *ze hu še-nišeax* 'it is he who won'; (d) in emphatic context, e.g., in exclamatory expressions, like זה-זה סיימנו *zebu-ze siyammu* 'that's it, we've finished'; זה זה משהו משעמם *ze ma-ze meš'adem* 'this is so boring'; and in rhetorical questions, e.g., איך זה (ש)שכחת *ex ze (še)-šaxaxta* 'how did you forget (lit. 'how is it that you forgot)'; (e) in formal register, as part of a temporal adverbial phrase (presumably remnant of an adverbial clause), e.g., זה זמן רב (מי) *(mi)-ze zman rav* 'it has been a long time (since)' (Halevy 2006).

The conventionalized pronominal reciprocal expression (→ Reciprocals) in Modern Hebrew is the Rabbinic Hebrew construction of a doubled demonstrative pronoun זה... זה *ze... ze* 'each other, one another (lit. 'this (ms)...this (ms)')', where the demonstratives are inflected for gender and number. This reciprocal construction is susceptible to mixed gender (e.g., זה זה *ze [ms]... זו zo [fs]...*), though this is frowned upon by 'purists'. The reciprocal expression השני... אחד *'exad... ha-šeni* 'each other, one another (lit. 'the one [ms]...the second [ms]')' (also available in the feminine) is an innovation of Modern Hebrew. In higher registers it may be replaced by משנהו... האחד *ha-'exad... mišnehu* 'each other, one another (lit. 'the one...his second one')' (restricted to masculine singular). The biblical expression רעהו... איש *iš... re'ehu* 'each other, one another (lit. 'a man...his companion')' (available also in feminine singular) represents a higher register (Halevy 2011a; 2011b).

The reflexive pronoun in Modern Hebrew (→ Reflexive) is the grammaticalized inflected noun עצם *ešem* 'self (lit. 'bone')', which came into use in the post-biblical period. Modern Hebrew also encodes reflexivity in the morphological verbal patterns of *hitpa'el* (commonly) and *nif'al* (rarely), as in Biblical Hebrew and unlike in Mishnaic Hebrew, where the reflexive is almost exclusively encoded in the syntactic construction of a transitive verb and inflected reflexive pronoun *ešem* 'self' (→ Binyanim: Modern Hebrew). The functional distinction between reflexives expressed in verbal morphology and in those expressed by syntactic constructions in Modern Hebrew occasionally results in semantic differentiation e.g., מכר עצמו *maxar 'ašmo* '(he) sold himself' versus התמכר *hitmaker* '(he) became addicted'.

7. IMPERSONAL CONSTRUCTIONS (→ Impersonal Constructions)

Impersonalization is associated with agency defocusing and generalization of habitual states of affairs, or, rather, with lack of a distinct (individuated, referential) subject. Different constructions ranging on a descending cline from 3rd person plural active to passive and middle voice are employed for denoting an action of an unspecified agent (Taube 2007; Berman 2011). In addition, there is a paradigm consisting of

different parts of speech for weather, circumstantial ('thetic') predicates, and modal and evaluative predicates of syntactically, morphologically, and lexically mixed groups, lacking pronominal and number marking (known in Hebrew literature as חג"מ *xagam*, an acronym for חסר גוף ומין *xaser guf u-min* 'lacking person and number', suggested by Rosén 1977a:220).

Unlike their restricted occurrence in Biblical Hebrew, impersonal passives in 3rd person singular are common in Modern Hebrew, generally as a more formal alternative to their active-voice plural-verb counterparts. They can be derived from transitive as well as from intransitive verbs, e.g., לא יסולח לו *lo yesulax lo* 'he will not be forgiven (lit. '[it] will not be forgiven to him)'; הוחלט לשנות את החוק *huxlat lešanut 'et ha-xoq* '(it) was decided to change the law' / הוחלט שהחוק ישונה *huxlat še-ha-xoq yešune* '(it) was decided that the law would/will be changed'. In some fixed expressions, such as הוחלט 'decided' above, the impersonal passive preserves the verb-governed preposition, e.g., על הוחלט *huxlat 'al* 'it has been decided upon'.

The 3rd person masculine plural of an active-voice verb is the unmarked construction for denoting a depersonalized discourse stance in standard Modern Hebrew. Unlike the impersonal passive and middle voice, 3rd plural impersonals express agentivity, i.e., they refer to the action of a presupposed but indeterminate human agent (Taube 2007:280), e.g., הרסו את הבית *harsu 'et ha-bayit* 'they demolished/destroyed the house' versus הברס הבית *ha-bayit neheras* 'the house was destroyed'. Past tense is associated with more specific information, whereas the use of the timeless or habitual present or of the irrealis mood typically reflects a generalized point of view, e.g., אם שותים לא *im šotim lo nohagim* 'if (when) you drink (3mpl impersonal) you don't drive (3mpl)'.¹

The paradigm of modals and evaluatives (חג"מ *xagam*) is one of the most dynamic and heterogeneous paradigms prevalent in Modern Hebrew. Consider, for example, an evaluative, subjectless, finite verb like מעצבן לחכות *me'asben lexakot* '(it's) annoying to wait'. Some of these predicates take only infinitival complements, e.g., יש להמשיך ב- *yeš lehamšix be-* '(it is) necessary to go on with...', while others take as complement only substantivized -ש *še-* clauses, e.g., ייתכן שאבוא *yitaxen še-avo* '(it is) likely that I'll come'. When the

experiencer role (frequently with evaluatives, rarely with modals) is involved, it invariably appears in the dative חבל לי להפסיד *xaval li lehafsid* '(it's) a pity if I lose (lit. 'pity to me to lose)'. Insertion of non-lexical (expletive) זה *ze* 'it' is confined to more colloquial registers, e.g., זה הרגיש לי מוזר לשמוע את זה *ze hirgiš li muzar lišmoa' 'et ze* 'it felt strange to me to hear that'. A subset of subjectless predicates includes one-term sentences consisting of a noun and suffixed pronoun, e.g., תפקידך לדאוג *tafqidxa lid'og la-seder* '(it's) your duty to worry about (i.e., take care of) order' (Rosén 1977a:218–222; Kuzar 2000).

8. GRAMMATICALIZATION OF FUNCTION WORDS (→ Grammaticalization)

Modern Hebrew has developed pronominal determiners (adjectives) which did not exist earlier and has also reanalyzed some inherited nominal and adverbial adjuncts. The bound accusative 3rd person אותו *oto* (and its other 3rd person counterparts), which functioned in Rabbinic Hebrew as an anaphoric demonstrative pronoun (e.g., אותו אדם *'oto 'adam* 'that man'), has been reanalyzed in Modern Hebrew (possibly under the influence of European languages) as a signifier of intense identification, conveying the meaning of 'that very, self same', e.g., קניתי *qaniti 'oto maxšev* 'I bought the same computer'. The object marker את *'et* may be added regardless of the apparent duplication that results, and even with no definite article -ה *ha-* (the definite article is optional), e.g., קניתי את אותו (ה)מחשב *qaniti 'et 'oto (ha-) maxšev* 'I bought that same computer', and in colloquial usage כמו שלך *kmo šelxa* 'I bought the same computer as yours'. Yet, its original meaning as an anaphoric demonstrative still prevails in the standard written language (Agmon-Fruchtman 1982:20; Glinert 1989:97).

An innovation of Modern Hebrew is the adjective כזה *ka-ze* composed of כ- *ke-* 'as' incorporating the definite article and זה *ze* 'this (one)' (fs כזאת *ka-zot*, cpl כאלה *ka-ele*) meaning 'such' (possibly inspired by European languages), e.g., כזה בית *bayit ka-ze* / בית כזה *ka-ze bayit* 'such a house'. Any preposition can be applied to it, even another כ- *ke-* 'as', which results in duplication (Rosén 1977a:44–53;

Agmon-Fruchtman 1982:78–79, 81–82). In colloquial discourse, noninflected כזה *ka-ze* void of deictic content is employed on the suprasentential level, as a lexical hedge, and as a quotative (Ziv 1998; Maschler 2001).

Another innovation of Modern Hebrew, a result of grammaticalization, is the adverbial כאילו *ke-'ilu* ‘as if, like’, composed of כ- *ke-* ‘as’ and counterfactual אילו *'ilu* ‘if’. Unlike אילו *'ilu*, כאילו *ke-'ilu* does not require a modal tense, e.g., הוא מתנהג כאילו (ש)הוא המנהל *hu mitnabeg ke-'ilu (še-)hu ha-menahel* ‘he is behaving like (lit. ‘as if [that]’) he were (lit. ‘is’) the chief manager’. In colloquial language it is also encountered as an independent clause of sarcastic meaning, e.g., כאילו איכפת לה *ke-'ilu 'ixpat lah* ‘as if she cares’ [~ she doesn’t not care]. כאילו *ke-'ilu* features prominently in some speakers’ colloquial discourse, most frequently for sustaining the speaker-hearer link (similar to ‘like’ in English), especially for hedging, self-rephrasal, focus-marking, and quotation (Maschler 2001; 2009:127–170).

The word בכלל *bi-xlal* lit. ‘in general’ is an example of the pragmatization of an inherited conjunct. In Mishnaic Hebrew it connoted ‘including, inclusive’. In spoken Modern Hebrew it evolved into an emphatic determiner, e.g., as an emphatic negative determiner היא לא יודעת בכלל לשחק *hi lo yoda'at bi-xlal lešaxeq* ‘she doesn’t know at all how to act (theatrical)’. Unlike English *at all*, in colloquial Hebrew it also occurs in positive constructions, e.g., הוא בישראל? לא, הוא בכלל מצרפת *hu bi-xlal mi-šarfat* ‘Is he Israeli? No, he is actually from France’ (Migron 2005).

9. SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

Encoding a relative clause (→ Relative Clause) with a freely movable resumptive (retrospective) pronoun is a notable feature of Modern Hebrew, for example הציור שהתבוננת בו *ha-šiyur še-hitbonanta bo* ‘the painting that you looked at (lit. ‘at it’), or, alternatively, הציור שהתבוננת בו *ha-šiyur še-bo hitbonanta* lit. ‘the painting at which you looked’. The asyndetic construction (lacking formal subordination) הציור בו התבוננת *ha-šiyur bo hitbonanta* represents standard formal language (Reshef 2004). Subject-relatives are occasionally realized with an embedded subject pronoun, e.g., לא מבין גם אתה, שאתה כל כך חכם, *gam 'ata,*

שֶׁ-*ata kol kax xaxam, lo mevin* lit. ‘even you, that you are so smart, don’t understand’. A direct object resumptive pronoun is regularly omitted in Hebrew (it is encoded only in cases where clarity calls for it). However, in some cases even other resumptive pronouns are omitted, in particular time adverbial pronouns (already attested in Biblical Hebrew), e.g., חייבים לפעול לפני שיגיע היום שכבר יהיה *šayavim lif'ol lifne še-yagia' ha-yom še-kvar yihye me'uḥar (bo)* *la'asot mašehu* ‘we should act before we reach the day (on which) it will already be too late to do something’. Infrequently, in casual usage, some other oblique pronouns are omitted, e.g., לא מתאימה השיטה שהשתמשנו (בה) *ha-šita še-hištamašnu (bah) lo mat'ima* ‘the system that we used (it) isn’t appropriate’ (Maschler 2011; for a generative framework Doron 1982; Borer 1984). The Biblical relativizer אשר *ašer* ‘who, which’ features only in higher registers in Modern Hebrew, and so does ה- *ha-* preceding a participle form (in Biblical Hebrew ה- *ha-* is also found, albeit rarely, as a relativizer of verbs in the past form), e.g., הסטודנטים הלומדים כאן *ha-študentim ha-lomdim kan* ‘the students who are studying here’.

Content clauses (→ Content Clause) in Modern Hebrew function in four syntactic roles: subject, predicate, attribute, and object (Biblical Hebrew has no content clauses in the predicate role, while content clauses in the subject and attributive roles are rare), e.g., עובדה *u'uda še-hu lo niḅxar* ‘it is a fact/the fact is that he was not elected’; substantivized predicate clause הבעיה היא שאין הסכם *ha-be'aya bi še-en heskem* ‘the problem is that there is no agreement’. Content clauses of these types are in common use in Arabic-influenced Medieval Hebrew, however, it seems that their modern use was inspired by the contact-languages of revived Hebrew (Zewi 2009).

In standard formal language subordinating -ש *še-* is replaced by כי *ki*, e.g., ראש הממשלה טען כי לא אישר את ההסכם *roš ha-memšala ta'an ki lo 'išer 'et ha-heskem* ‘the Prime minister claimed that he did not approve/had not approved the agreement’. Replacing -ש *še-* by כי *ki* is possible only with a content clause. It is not licensed with a relative clause (Landau 1976; Kogut 1984).

Adverbial clauses are introduced by various function-words (of time, location, manner,

etc.) subordinated by *-š* *še-*, e.g. הוא התקשר אליה אחרי שפגש אותה *hu hitqāšer 'eleha 'aḡare še-pagaš 'otah* 'he called her after (lit. 'after that') he met her'. In standard language in some rare cases the conjunction *-v* *ve-* 'and' is favored over normative *-š* *še-* for subordination, e.g., ואין להשתמש בו מאחר שפג / ופג תוקפו *lehištameš bo me'aḡar še-pag / u-fag toqpo* 'it should not be used since (lit. 'since that' / 'since and') its validity has expired'.

The linking of a subordinate clause to a preceding preposition frequently requires the nucleus of a constituent devoid of semantic content referring to the content of the clause, e.g., cataphoric elements such as כך *kax* 'so', זה *ze* 'this/that', or words with a very general semantic content, such as עובדה *'uḡda* 'fact', e.g., בכך שהסכים *be-xax še-hiskim* 'by having agreed (lit. "in that [he] agreed")'; בגלל העובדה *biglal ha-'uḡda še-hiskim* 'because of having agreed (lit. 'because of the fact that [he] agreed')' (these elements are termed 'space words' in Ornan 1971).

Subordinative conjunctions (→ Conjunctions) with *wh*-words (interrogatives), such as איפה *'efo* 'where' and מתי *matay* 'when' are not part of traditional Hebrew syntax (the use of antecedent interrogatives with the subordinator *-š* *še-* is available only for מי *mi* 'who' and מה *ma* 'what'). Instead, nouns which belong to the lexical domain of the interrogative word are preferred, e.g., בשעה *be-š'a še-* 'when, while', במקום *be-maqom še-* 'where'. In colloquial language, however, *-š* *še-* appears also adjacent to adverbial interrogatives. A construction of interrogatives with the subordinator *-š* *še-* and לא *lo* 'no' as a generalizing enclitic devoid of negating meaning is an innovation of Modern Hebrew (probably due to Slavic influence), e.g., לאן שלא נלך יראו אותנו *le-'an še-lo nelex yir'u 'otanu* 'wherever we go (lit. 'wherever we won't go'), they will see us' (Rosén 1977b:73, 229).

10. TENSES

The opposition between the verb forms in Modern Hebrew is essentially temporal (present, past, future), except for the imperative. Past and future tense agree with the grammatical subject in number, gender, and person. Past tense has suffix conjugation (*qaṭal* forms), while future tense has predominantly prefix

conjugation (*yiqṭol* forms). Present tense is construed in the participle form. It agrees with the grammatical subject only in number and gender. Unlike the situation in European languages, the tense system of Modern Hebrew lacks specific forms for expressing relative tenses. Thus Hebrew does not require sequence of tenses, but instead there is embedding of the 'absolute' time of the situation (as opposed to the speaker's situation), e.g., לא יצאתי כי חשבתי *lo yašati ki ḡšaḡviti še-titqāšer* 'I didn't go out because I thought you would call' (Sharvit 2008).

11. THE PARTICIPLE

(→ Participle)

The participle, in both its active and passive forms, though morphologically nominal, is tense-characterized and is not exclusively nominal, though it retains nominal and substantivized functions (for the development of the present tense see Gordon 1982; Zewi and Reshef 2009). Unlike the past and future forms, it is not inflected for person, but for gender and number alone. The tense formed with a participle is unmarked for time and modality (similar to the Greek *aorist*; Rosén 1977b:194–195). It can refer to the speaker's present, but may also refer to the future or past depending on what is implied by the adverbial complement, e.g., מחר אנחנו עוזבים *maḡar 'anaḡnu 'ozvim* 'we are leaving tomorrow'. As a descriptive historical present it features in narrative-historical texts, and in telling jokes, conveying a dramatic, emotional dimension. In spoken language active participles in the impersonal form of the 3rd person plural co-occur frequently in modal functions (→ Optative Expressions).

One of the distinctive features of Modern Hebrew is the remarkable extension of passive participle forms (→ Passive), crucially in the patterns of *mefo'al* and *muf'al*, which refer not to the result of an action, but to the noun associated with the verb, or are denominative in the first place, e.g., תיאור מפורט *te'ur meforaṭ* 'a detailed (=with details) description'; חולצה משובצת *ḡulša mešubšet* 'checkered shirt'. Modern Hebrew also utilizes *mefo'al* and *muf'al* to denote an activity or process that occurs in the present, e.g., הסיסמא מוחלפת כל חודש *ha-sisma muxlefet kol ḡodeš* 'the password is changed every month'. The actional passive participles

of *mefo'al* and *muf'al* are employed to denote deliberate and resultative actions or states, whereas the equivalent forms of middle-passive *nif'al* and *hitpa'el* are employed to denote ongoing actions, and are not marked as deliberate actions (→ Binyanim: Modern Hebrew), e.g., הצבע מתחלף בלילה *ha-ševa' mitxalef ba-layla* 'the color changes at night'. Also, as opposed to other adjectival forms, *mefo'al* and *muf'al* denote the result of an action, e.g., חזק *ḡazaq* 'strong'—מחוזק *mexuzaq* 'strengthened' (Rosén 1956; Doron 1999; Taube 2009).

12. MODALITY AND ASPECT

The loss of Biblical Hebrew morphological distinctions (of the *jussive* and *cohortative*) is compensated in Modern Hebrew by lexical and syntactic means (→ Optative Expressions). Modal ways of expression often interact with the domain of tense/aspect. The common strategy to mark the optative (wish, desire, hope) is by employing the subordinating particle *ש-* *še-* attached to a future form indicating a potential tense, e.g., טוב, שילך *ṭov, še-yelix* 'okay, he may go'. The most common lexical expression for denoting a wish is *הלוואי ש-* *halevay še-* 'were it that' (Rabbinic Hebrew inheritance). The simple future is marked as optative or as a mitigated demand in formal language, e.g., יואל (נא) אדוני לעמוד *yo'el (na) 'adoni la'amod* 'will you, Sir (lit. 'will he, my lord'), be so kind as to stand up'.

In directives, e.g., speech-acts of request, suggestion, instruction, permission, and the like, the infinitive construct (with *ל-* *le-*) is currently employed, e.g., לא להפריע (נא) *(na) lo lehafria'* '(please) do not disturb'; לבוא מחר? *lavo maxar?* 'shall I come (lit. 'to come') tomorrow?'. In some fixed expressions an infinitival form or a nominal form of the verb suffixed with a possessive pronoun denoting the object participant is employed to convey the modal meaning 'I/we want to', e.g., להזכירך *lehazkirxa* 'as a reminder (lit. 'to remind you')'; לידיעתך *li-di'atxa* 'for your information'. Interrogatives such as למה *lama* 'why' followed by a subordinating particle and negator, are employed in spoken language in speech-acts such as giving advice, making suggestions, and posing rhetorical questions, e.g., למה שלא תצא לחופשה? *lama še-lo teše le-xufša?* 'why don't you not take a vacation?'. Participles are also feasible for

expressing modality, e.g., לא נכנסים בלי רשות *lo nixnasim bli rešut* 'you don't (=you should not) enter without permission'. Periphrastic constructions are utilized as well, e.g., employing the composite past tense הייתי אוכל עכשיו *hayiti oxel 'axšav glida* 'I would (like to) eat now an ice cream'. The complex form of היה *haya* 'was' and present participle in expressions such as מעדיף / מבקש / מעוניין / מרוצה *hayiti roše / me'unyan / mevaqeš / ma'adif* 'I would like / be interested / ask / prefer' is common to mark the optative and mitigated requests.

There are also lexico-syntactic constructions for urging or challenging (equivalents to the Biblical Hebrew cohortative), e.g., הבה נלך *hava nexlex* (formal register) or בוא נלך *bo nexlex* 'let's go'; קדימה, הולכים *qadima, holxim* lit. 'forward, going (us)'; לך קדימה, לך *qadima, lex* 'forward march, get going'. Coordinated verbs with an initial depleted motion verb in syndetic (with the conjunction *ו-* *ve-*) or asyndetic construction are another lexico-syntactic strategy, e.g., (ו)תדברו איתו *lexu (ve-)tedabru 'ito* 'go (cpl) (and) talk (cpl) with him'.

Grammatical aspect is inflectionally unmarked (→ Aspect: Modern Hebrew; Aspectual Markers). Thus, Modern Hebrew utilizes the tripartite temporal system for modal-aspectual meanings, usually combined with inherited lexical adverbs. Out of the Rabbinic Hebrew modal-aspectual periphrastic system Modern Hebrew makes extensive use only of היה *haya* 'to be' in the past + present participle. However, whereas in Rabbinic Hebrew this periphrastic construction denotes a state (→ Syntax: Rabbinic Hebrew), in Modern Hebrew it regularly marks the habitual past (besides its modal-counterfactual function). Habitual action may also be expressed, however, by the simple past, e.g., הוא היה מגיע *hu haya magid' / bigid' kol boqer be-'ofanayim* 'he used to arrive every morning with bicycles'. When used with stative verbs, e.g., פחד *paḡad* 'to fear, be afraid', it is interpreted as an actualization of a durative state viewed as frequentative (Boneh and Doron 2008; 2010).

The future form is employed to denote habitual action, subjective assumption, or general truth (typically referring to an indefinite or generic subject), e.g., רק משוגע ימשיך להתעקש *raq mešuga' yamšix lehi'afeš kax* 'only a crazy person would go on insisting like that';

ידוענים—הם ידברו איתך ואחרי דקה ישכחו ממך *yedu'anim—hem yedabru 'itxa ve-²aḡare daqa yiškeḡu mimxa* ‘celebrities—they will talk to you and in a minute they will forget about you’.

In journalese and narrative style, the future form is frequently employed as a relative tense to denote a terminal point in a sequence of events in the past (attested in Biblical Hebrew, but possibly inspired by European languages), e.g., דיבורה היה ישיר ורך, תכונה שרק כעבור דיבורה היא ישיר ורך, תכונה שרק כעבור *diburah haya yašir ve-rax, txuna še-raq ka-²avor šanim 'elmad leḥ²arix* ‘her speaking was direct and tender, a trait which only years later I would learn to appreciate’. The near future is expressed by adverbs, e.g., בקרוב *be-qarov* ‘soon, in a short time’, or by depleted verbs, crucially עמד *amad* ‘to be about to (lit. ‘to stand’)’ and הלך *halax* ‘to be going to (lit. ‘to go’)’ in the participle or past form plus infinitive, e.g., הוא עומד להגיע *hu 'omed leḡia²* ‘he is about to arrive’; הם הולכים לנצח *hem holxim lenaṡeax* ‘they are going to win’. The Rabbinic Hebrew nominal expressions עתיד *atid* ‘future’ and צפוי *ṡafuy* ‘expected’ are employed in formal language to express a forecasted event, e.g., מחר צפוי לרדת *maḡar ṡafuy laredet gešem* ‘tomorrow rain is expected (lit. ‘expected to fall’)’. Periphrastic constructions comprised of a depleted verb and a noun are frequently utilized to connote the lexical character of the action (*Aktionsart*), such as inchoative or ingressive, e.g., נתקף *nitqaf* *ḡarada* ‘got anxious’; העלה אבק *he'ela 'avaq* ‘became dusty’; חטף תנומה *ḡataf tnuma* ‘took a nap’ (calque from Yiddish). Constructions inherited from Rabbinic Hebrew incorporating an infinitival verb adjacent to a finite verb with a lexically adverbial meaning are widespread, typically in literally language, e.g., הרבה לספר *hirba lesaper* ‘used to tell a lot (lit. ‘increased to tell’)’; or with consecutive verbs the first one usually of adverbial meaning, e.g., הוסיף ואמר *hosif ve-²amar* ‘said again (lit. ‘added and said’ = ‘went on saying’)’. Another lexico-syntactic strategy for conveying aspectual meaning is the use of pairs of synonyms or near-synonyms (*hendiadys*), e.g., to denote a perfective/resultative event נעלם ואיננו *ne'elam ve-²enenu* ‘(he) disappeared (lit. ‘[he] disappeared and is not’)’ (Tzivoni 1993a).

Modern Hebrew employs different morphemes and constructions in conditional clauses

(→ Conditional Clause). The realis conditional is encoded with the conjunction אם *im* ‘if, whether’. When future forms occur in both protasis (conditional) and apodosis (consequent), the reference is to something that may happen; when past forms are employed, the reference is to something that conceivably might have occurred, and when encoded in the present, the referemce is to a general truth. The counterfactual (irrealis) construction is comprised of the conjunction אילו *'ilu* / לו *lu* ‘if’ (negative אילוֹא *'ilule* / לולֹא *lule*) plus simple past in the protasis and composite past tense in the apodosis, e.g., הייתי מספר לך / לו ידעתי, הייתי מספר לך *'ilu / lu yada'ti, hayiti mesaper lexa* ‘if I had known, I would have told you’. A simple past in the apodosis is very rare, and is commonly restricted to the verb יכולתי להפסיד הכול, יכולתי להפסיד הכול *yaxol* ‘can’, e.g., יכולתי להפסיד הכול *yaxolti leḡafsid ha-kol, 'ilu šama'ti be-qolo* ‘I could have lost everything, if I had listened to him’. In less formal language, it is common to use the composite past in both parts of the construction, or even replace the counterfactual conjunction אילו *'ilu* / לו *lu* with אם *im*. Asyndetic pseudo-conditionals of verb-initial order are widely prevalent in juristic register, e.g., ביטל התלמיד את הרשמתו, יקבל *biṡel ha-talmid 'et haršamato, yeqabel 'et kaspō ḡazara* ‘should the student cancel his registration, he will get his money back’ (Bar 2001; 2003).

13. WORD ORDER

In contrast to Biblical Hebrew, which is classified typologically as a Verb-Subject (VS) language, Modern Hebrew has evolved into a Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) language in terms of basic (i.e., unmarked) word order. This change is clearly felt not only in the spoken language, but also in written and formal/literary registers. However, Modern Hebrew allows, and in some cases requires, sentences which are predicate-initial, and like in classical Hebrew, noun modifiers (adjectives, determiners, and noun adjuncts) follow the head noun, and in genitive relation the possessee noun precedes the possessor. VS or rhematic order is generally the unmarked order in the following cases (commonly with indefinite subject and unaccusative verb): (a) existentials: יורד גשם *yored gešem* ‘it is raining’; with verbs denoting

occurrence, e.g., נס קרה *qara nes* ‘a miracle occurred’; statements of existential possession (involving the verboids יש *yeš* and אין *’en*), e.g., יש לי מכונית *yeš li mexonit* ‘I have a car’; (b) assertion of generic situations, e.g., פרצה סערה *parša se’ara* ‘a storm erupted’; (c) assertion of physical conditions, e.g., כואב לי הגב *ko’ev li ha-gav* ‘my back aches’; (d) modal (evaluative/volitive) expressions, e.g., טיפש הוא לא *tipeš hu lo* ‘stupid he is not’; מעניין הסיפור הזה *me’anyen ha-sipur ha-ze* ‘this story is interesting’; (e) phraseological expressions, e.g., דרוש ניסיון *daruš nisayon* ‘experience is required’; (f) phraseological expressions, e.g., אפסה כל תקווה *afsa kol tiqva* ‘all hope was lost’; (g) announcing and setting down rules, e.g., לא יחנה אדם את רכבו ב- *lo yaxane ’adam ’et rixbo be-* ‘a man shall not park his vehicle in...’. Subjects in VS word-order tend frequently to lose subject-verb agreement and nominative case, typically in colloquial speech, e.g., מתאים לך שמלה *mat'im lax šimla* ‘a dress (fs) suits (ms) you’; מגיע לו נשיקה *magia' lo nešiqā* ‘he deserves a kiss (lit. ‘arrives [ms] to him a kiss [fs]’)’ (Kuzar 2002; 2005).

As stated above, like in classical Hebrew, noun modifiers—adjectives, determiners, and noun adjuncts—follow the head noun. In genitive constructions the possessee noun precedes the possessor. A deviation from this order occurs only in new compounds where the first constituent is interpreted as a ‘semantic prefix’ (see §2 above).

Various fronting operations allow for change of focus or topicalization of a non-subject element. Among these marked orders are constructions of extraposition (topicalization, right/left dislocation, → Extraposition) and cleft-sentences (focalization, rhematization) (→ Word Order).

In extrapositional sentences the expressive ‘subject’ (theme) is fronted (Schwarzwald 1976; Bar 2004), e.g., ילדים שגדלים בתנאים כאלה *yeladim še-gdelim bi-tna'im ka-ele ’efšar lehavim ’otam* ‘children who grow up in such conditions—one can understand them’; or in rear extraposition, זה בדם שלו, המוסיקה *ze ba-dam šelo, ha-musiqā* ‘it is in his blood, (the) music’.

For the purposes of extraposition of the lexical component of the predicate Modern Hebrew employs a paronomastic construction of infinitive with ל- *le-* + finite verb (tautological infinitive, Goldenberg 1998c), e.g., לצאת

אבל האוטובוס יצאתי בזמן, *lašet yašati bazman, ’aval ha-’oṭobus ’exer* ‘I left on time (lit. ‘to leave I left’), but the bus was late’. A similar construction of extraposed infinitive prevailed in Rabbinic Hebrew and is widespread in Yiddish (→ Yiddish Influence on Hebrew).

Cleft sentences (→ Cleft Sentence) are common in Modern Hebrew, unlike in previous strata of the language. When the focalized (rhematized) element is a noun it may be preceded by the demonstrative זה *ze* (and its feminine and plural parallels), e.g., זה הנשיא שיקבע *ze ha-naši še-yiqba’* ‘it is the president who will decide’; or it may be followed by a 3rd personal pronoun, sometimes along with a demonstrative pronoun. Otherwise, non-lexical זה *ze* ‘it, this’ is employed, e.g., זה רק בערב שהיא כזאת *ze raq ba-’erev še-bi ka-zot* ‘it is only in the evening that she is like that’. Lack of agreement between the rhematized pronoun and the verb in the substantivized clause occasionally occur, e.g., לא אני זה שהפסיק *lo ’ani ze še-hifsiq* ‘it is not I who stopped (3ms)’. Furthermore, the substantivized clause may be asyndetic, (forming imperfectly transformed cleft sentences, Goldenberg 1998b), e.g., זה אתה ציירת את זה? *ze ’ata šiyarta ’et ze?* ‘is it you (who) painted it?’ (Wertheimer 2001; Bar 2009).

14. NEGATION

(→ Negation)

Whereas in Classical Hebrew the negator of nonverbal predicates is mainly אין *en*, in Modern Hebrew it is standard to use לא *lo*. Only for existentials and possessive clauses is אין *en* obligatory. The choice between לא *lo* and אין *en* before nominals and participles depends on the stylistic level of the text. In highly literary style it is not recommended to use the compound form of אין *en* + personal pronoun, e.g., הוא איננו *hu ’enenu / ’eno ba-bayit* ‘he is not (3ms) at home’, but rather its bare form, e.g., אין *en hu ba-bayit*. The canonical negator in modals is אל *al*, e.g., אל תלך *al telex* ‘don’t go’; אל נשכח *al niškaḥ* ‘let us not forget’; or אל לנו לשכוח *al lanu liškoax* ‘we (dative) should not forget’, and rarely in nominal form אל דאגה *al de’aga* ‘no worry (= ‘don’t worry’)’. However, לא *lo* and אין *en* are also present in modals, e.g., אין להיכנע *še-lo tā’ez* ‘don’t you dare’; אין להיכנע *en lehikana’* ‘we should not surrender/give up’. Additionally, there are negated verbs in the

future that have evolved into modal expressions, e.g., *לא ייאמן* *lo ye'amen* 'unbelievable' (Glinert 1982; Tzivoni 1993b).

A notable feature of Modern Hebrew is the use of doubly negated constructions, crucially with originally positive nouns which evolved into negative expressions. Such are: *כלום* *klum* 'nothing (lit. 'something')', *אף פעם* 'af *pa'am* 'never (lit. 'even once')', *אף אחד* 'af 'exad 'nobody (lit. 'even one')', and their cognates. The above negative noun phrases interact with the canonical negators, e.g., *אף אחד לא בא* 'af 'exad *lo ba* 'nobody came (lit. 'nobody did not come')'. The response in an exchange such as *כלום ב: מה עשית? א: ma 'asita? B: klum* (instead of *כלום לא lo klum*) 'A: What have you done? B: Nothing' is thus considered as an elliptical negation (Levy 2008). In negative polarity contexts with indefinite nouns the construction may imply 'not even', e.g., *לא הבנתי מילה* *lo bevanti mila* 'I didn't understand (even) a (single) word' (literal reading 'I didn't understand a word') (Sharvit 2008). Illogical negation is occasionally realized elsewhere as well, e.g., *עד שלא תשלם לא תיכנס* 'ad *še-lo tešalem lo tikanēs* 'you won't get in unless you pay (lit. 'until you won't pay you won't get in')'. Modern Hebrew is thus considered a 'negative concord' language. Slavo-Yiddish influence is a possible explanation for this shift in Modern Hebrew (Altbauer 1964:2–4).

15. 'FREE' DATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS (→ DATIVE)

Modern Hebrew exhibits traits of a dative-oriented language (Berman 1982:35). This is manifested by an expansion of 'free' (non-valence, non-lexical) dative clitics deployed for creating greater affective closeness between hearer, speaker, and the message. Most conspicuous is the use of ethical dative pronouns that are not co-referential with any argument in the sentence (absent from other periods of Hebrew, and most likely due to Yiddish influence), e.g., *לנו הילד חלה* *ha-yeled xala lanu* 'the child got sick on us (lit. 'to us')'; and likewise the use of the subject co-referential dative pronoun, e.g., *לה יום אחד היא פשוט נסעה* *lo yom 'exad hi pašut naš'a lah* 'one day she just (simply) left (lit. 'to her') [-fancy that! / at her leisure]'. Both are non-lexical dative pronouns functioning on the suprasentential (pragmatic, illocution) level

(Halevy 2007; Al-Zahre and Boneh 2010). The modern usage of the subject-coreferential dative pronoun is most likely a reinvention of the construction found on a limited scale in Biblical Hebrew. Presumably, like the ethical dative, it spread into Modern Hebrew through the Yiddish-Slavic substrate languages of the first generation of speakers of Modern Hebrew. Due to similar motivation is the increasing preference for possessive datives employed to mark the speaker's stance regarding the effect on the possessor, e.g., *נכנסו לה לחדר* *nixnesu lah la-xeder* 'they entered into her (lit. 'entered to her') room [-she didn't want them to]'. Noteworthy is also the preference for dative marking of the experience role, e.g., *נמאס לנו* *nim'as lanu* 'we are sick of (it) (lit. 'loathsome to us')'. The preference for dative marking is often so strong that the ordinary non-dative option seems the marked one, having a somewhat different interpretation. Furthermore, as in many European languages, in the unmarked word order there is a preference for dative-first ordering, unlike in Classical Hebrew (Mishor 1994).

16. CHANGES IN VALENCY AND CASE-MARKING OF ROLE-PARTICIPANTS

Unergative and unaccusative verbs are occasionally subject to transitivization in standard Modern Hebrew depending on the vantage point from which the event is presented, e.g., *האגם שחיתי את האגם* *šaḥiti 'et ha-'agam* 'I swam the (whole) lake' (versus *באגם* *ba-'agam* 'in the lake'); *השחקן בעט את הכדור* *ha-šaḥqan ba'aṭ 'et ha-kadur la-š'a'ar* 'The player kicked the ball into the goal' (versus *בעט ב-* *ba'aṭ be-* 'kicked at'). Transitivization of unergatives/unaccusatives is amply attested in commercial advertising, e.g., *טסים אל על* *ṭasim 'el 'al* 'flying EL AL' (instead of *באל על* *be-'el 'al* 'with EL AL') (Borochofsky 1988:21–26).

Modern Hebrew admits diathesis alternations in case-marking or semantic arguments of a verb which leave the form of the verb unchanged, but add to or change the meaning of the verb. The case alternation of accusative (*את* 'et/Ø) and non-accusative *ב-* *be-* 'in' is maintained especially, but not only, in verbs of contact by motion, e.g., *דן משך בחבל* *dan mašax ba-xevel* 'Dan pulled on the rope' (versus

את החבל 'et ha-xevel 'the rope'). The alternative construction with -ב be- 'in' is the 'marked' one. It invokes a view from within, marking the action as intensive and intentional, or rather as imperfective and partitive. Furthermore, this construction is a morphosyntactic device to induce a metaphorical reading, e.g., אור השמש אור היכה בפניו 'or ha-šemeš hika be-fanav 'the sun light struck his face' (Halevy 2007a).

A locative alternation is maintained in 'spray' / 'load' verbs, e.g., דן ריסס צבע על הקיר / ריסס דן ריסס צבע את הקיר בצבע dan rises 'et ha-ševa' 'al ha-qir / rises 'et ha-qir be-ševa' 'Dan sprayed the color on the wall / sprayed the wall with color'. The 'marked' construction is the one with the location as a direct object complement, implying a holistic effect (Halevy 2008b).

Modern Hebrew also retains the Biblical locative alternation of 'swarm' / 'drip' and related verbs of abundance, e.g., / הנהר שרץ תנינים / תנינים שרצו בנהר ha-nahar šaraš taninim / taninim šaršu ba-nahar 'the river swarmed with alligators / alligators swarmed in the river'. In the initial subject-location alternate, which is the 'marked' construction, the indefinite complement (the agent) is realized in the accusative-adverbial case, similar to the *tamyiz* in Arabic (accusative of specification or limitation). Namely, it specifies the subject-location in terms of the content or substance that is applied to it (Halevy 2008a).

The prepositions על ידי 'al yede / בידי b-ide 'by' introduces an agentive complement in the passive construction (this preposition is not found in this function in previous strata of Hebrew) in contrast to governed prepositions, which do not precede agentive complements, e.g., הזמרת אקורדיוניסט על ידי שירתה לווטה באקורדיון ha-zameret luwta 'al yede 'aqordyonist 'the singer was accompanied by an accordionist' versus שירתה לווטה בנגינה באקורדיון širatah luwta bi-ngina be-'aqordyon 'her singing was accompanied by the playing of an accordion' (Taube 1996).

REFERENCES

Agmon-Fruchtman, Maya. 1982. *A question of determination: Determinative and delimitative categories in Israeli Hebrew* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv: Papyrus.

Altbauer, Moshe. 1964. "New negation construction in Modern Hebrew". *For Max Weinreich on his seventieth birthday: Studies in Jewish languages, literature and society*, ed. by Lucy S. Dawidowicz and Max Weinreich, 1–5. The Hague: Mouton.

- Al-Zahre, Nisrine and Nora Boneh. 2010. "Coreferential dative constructions in Syrian Arabic and Modern Hebrew". *Brill's Annual of Afroasiatic Languages and Linguistics* 2:248–282.
- Armon-Lotem, Sharon, Gabi Danon, and Susan Rothstein (eds.). 2008. *Current issues in generative Hebrew linguistics*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Azar, Moshe. 1976. "Ha-smixut ha-pruda ve-ha-smixut ha-kfula ba-'itonut ha-yomit" (in Hebrew). *Ḥeḡer ve-'iyun be-madd'e ha-Yahadut: Sifrut, Miqra ve-lašon*, ed. by Efrat Carmon, 9–26. Haifa: University of Haifa.
- Bar, Tali. 2001. "Expression of temporality, modality and perfectivity in contemporary Hebrew conditionals as compared with non-conditionals". *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 91:49–83.
- . 2003. *If, conditional sentences in contemporary Hebrew: Structure, meaning, and usage of tenses*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- . 2004. "Extrapolation in Modern Hebrew". *Folia Orientalia* 40:23–39.
- . 2007. "On pronouns in Hebrew verbal sentences". Bar and Cohen 2007, 257–275.
- . 2009. "On cleft sentences in contemporary Hebrew". Goldenberg and Shisha-Halevy 2009, 337–355.
- Bar, Tali and Eran Cohen (eds.). 2007. *Studies in Semitic and general linguistics in honor of Gideon Goldenberg*. Münster: Ugarit Verlag.
- Ben-Ḥayyim, Ze'ev. 1992. "An ancient language in a new reality" (in Hebrew). *The struggle for a language*, 36–85. Jerusalem: The Academy of Hebrew Language (originally published in *Lěšonenu la-'Am* 4 [1956]).
- Berman-Aronson, Ruth. 1978. *Modern Hebrew structure*. Tel-Aviv: University Publishing Projects.
- . 1979. "Form and function: Passives, middles, and impersonals in Modern Hebrew". *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 5:1–27.
- . 1982b. "Dative marking the affectee role: Data from Modern Hebrew". *Hebrew Annual Review* 6:35.
- . 2011. "Revisiting impersonal constructions in Hebrew: Corpus-based perspectives". *The typology of impersonal constructions*, ed. by Andrej Malchov and Anna Sierwieska, 323–355. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Berman-Aronson, Ruth and Alexander Grosu. 1976. "Aspects of the copula in Modern Hebrew". *Studies in Modern Hebrew syntax and semantics*, ed. by Peter Cole, 265–284. Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Bliboim, Rivka. 2000. "Adjective annexation and its equivalents". *Lěšonenu* 63:81–106.
- Boneh, Nora and Edit Doron. 2008. "Habituality and habitual aspect". *Theoretical and crosslinguistic approaches to the semantics of aspect*, ed. by Susan Rothstein, 321–347. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 2010. "Modal and temporal aspects of habituality". *Syntax, lexical semantics, and event structure*, ed. by Malka Rappaport-Hovav, Edit Doron, and Ivy Sichel, 338–363. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Borer, Hagit. 1984. "Restrictive relatives in Modern Hebrew". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2:219–160.
- (ed.). 1986. *The syntax of pronominal clitics*. New York: Academic Press.
- Borer, Hagit and Joseph Grodzinsky. 1986. "Syntactic cliticization: The case of Hebrew dative clitics". Borer 1986, 175–217.
- Borochofsky, Esther. 1998. "Šarim 'ašma'ut (singing independence): From indirect complementation to direct complementation" (in Hebrew). *Hebrew Linguistics* 43:15–28.
- Danon, Gabi. 2001. "Syntactic definiteness in the grammar of Modern Hebrew". *Linguistics* 39:1071–1116.
- Doron, Edit. 1982. "On the syntax and semantics of resumptive pronouns". *Texas Linguistic Forum* 19:1–48.
- . 1986. "The pronominal copula as agreement clitic". Borer 1986, 313–332.
- . 1999. "The passive participle" (in Hebrew). *Hebrew Linguistics* 47:39–62.
- . 2000. "Word order in Hebrew". *Studies in Afroasiatic grammar*, ed. by Jacqueline Lecarme, Jean Lowenstamm, and Ur Shlonsky, 41–56. The Hague: Holland Academic Publishers.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1990. "The role of Russian and Yiddish in the making of Modern Hebrew". *Poetics Today* 11:111–130.
- Giora, Rachel. 1982. "Seder ha-milim ba-mišpaṭ ve-yaxaso 'el ha-ṭext". *Iyunim be-ṣefer ha-šiax* (in Hebrew), ed. by Shoshana Blum-Kulka, Yishai Tobin, and Raphael Nir, 263–301. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Giv'on, Talmy. 1976. "On the VS order in Israeli Hebrew: Pragmatics and typological change". *Syntax and semantics*, ed. by Peter Cole, 231–248. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Glinert, Lewis. 1982. "Negative and non-assertive in Contemporary Hebrew". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 45:434–470.
- . 1989. *The grammar of Modern Hebrew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1990. "Yeš and yeš lo in formal contemporary Hebrew—Subject or object?" (in Hebrew). *Hebrew Linguistics* 28–30:207–212.
- Goldenberg, Gideon. 1996. "Ha-ʿIvrit ke-lašon Šemit xaya". *Ha-lašon ha-ʿIvrit be-bitpatxutah u-v-bitxadšutah*, ed. by Joshua Blau, 148–190. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.
- . 1998a. *Studies in Semitic linguistics*. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- . 1998b. "Imperfectly transformed cleft sentences". Goldenberg 1998a, 116–122 (originally published in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies Jerusalem, 127–133*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1977).
- . 1998c. "Tautological infinitive". Goldenberg 1998a, 66–122 (originally published in *Israel Oriental Studies* 1 [1971]:36–85).
- . 1998d. "Attribution in Semitic languages". Goldenberg 1998a, 46–65 (originally published in *Orientalis antiquae philologie et linguistique* 5–6 [1995]:1–20).
- . 2005. "Pronouns, copulas and a syntactical revolution in Neo-Semitic". *Studi afroasiatici: Contributi presentati all'XI incontro italiano di linguistica camito-semitica (Bergamo, 5–7 giugno 2003)*, ed. by Allesandro Mengozzi, 243–257. Milan: Franco Angeli.
- Goldenberg, Gideon and Ariel Shisha-Halevy (eds.). 2009. *Egyptian, Semitic and general grammar: Workshop in memory of H. J. Polotsky*. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.
- Gordon, Amnon. 1982. "The development of the participle in Biblical, Mishnaic and Modern Hebrew". *Afroasiatic Linguistics* 8:121–166.
- Greenberg, Yael. 2002. "The manifestation of genericity in the tense aspect system of Hebrew nominal sentences". *Themes in Arabic and Hebrew syntax*, ed. by Jamal Ouhalla and Ur Shlonsky, 267–298. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic.
- . 2008. "Predication and equation in Modern Hebrew (nonpseudocleft) copular sentences". Armon-Lotem, Danon, and Rothstein 2008, 161–196.
- Halevy, Rivka. 1992. "Free and restricted adjectives in contemporary Hebrew" (in Hebrew). *Language studies* 5–6, ed. by Moshe Bar-Asher, 521–536. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- . 2000a. "Functional changes of šel phrases in contemporary Hebrew" (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu* 63:61–80.
- . 2000b. "Complementary distribution of single versus expanded lexical units in Modern Hebrew: Reflections on the character of contemporary Hebrew" (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu* 63:294–309.
- . 2006. "The function of nonlexical ze in Contemporary Hebrew" (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu* 68:283–308.
- . 2007a. "Transitive verbs with non-accusative alternation in Hebrew: Cross-language comparison with English, German and Spanish". *Trends in linguistics: On interpreting construction schemas, from action and motion to transitivity and causality*, ed. by Nicole Delbecque and Bert Cornillie, 61–102. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 2007b. "Indirect' adjective + noun construct phrases in contemporary Hebrew" (in Hebrew). *Šā'are lašon*, ed. by Aharon Maman, Steven E. Fassberg, and Yohanan Breuer, vol. 3, 96–116. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute.
- . 2007c. "The subject co-referential l- pronoun in Hebrew". Bar and Cohen 2007, 299–321.
- . 2007d. "Functions of infinitival forms in Modern Hebrew". *Hebrew Linguistics* 60:63–80.
- . 2008a. "Case alternations in swarm-class verbs in Hebrew and the meaning of Tamyiz". *Language studies* 11–12, ed. by Steven E. Fassberg and Aharon Maman, 89–105. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- . 2008b. "The 'load'/'spray' alternation in Hebrew" (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu* 71:181–201.
- . 2011a. "Reciprocal constructions in Hebrew: Between syntax and lexicon" (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu* 73:401–422.
- . 2011b. "The grammaticalization of bipartite reciprocal markers in Hebrew". *Hebrew Studies* 52:265–272.
- Henkin, Roni. 1994. "Yeš lo 'et ze: Do existence and possession 'subjects' really take the accusative in Hebrew". *Hebrew Linguistics* 38:41–54.
- Kaddari, Menachem Z. 1984. "A morpho-syntactic phenomenon in Modern Hebrew journalese"

- (in Hebrew). *Hebrew Computational Linguistics* 22:47–50.
- Kahana, Chaim. 1998. “The semantic prefixes of Modern Hebrew” (in Hebrew). PhD dissertation, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Kogut, Simcha. 1984. *Content clauses: Their nature and constructions*. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- . 1993. “Alternative usage of independent and suffixed personal pronouns to express possession in Biblical Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Studies in Bible and Exegesis* 3:401–411.
- Kuzar, Ron. 2000. “‘Ašre ha-ma’amin and similar constructions in the different phases of Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Hebrew Linguistics* 46:55–67.
- . 2002. “The simple impersonal construction in texts represented as colloquial Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Speaking Hebrew: Studies in the spoken language and in linguistic variation in Israel (Téuda 18)*, ed. by Shlomo Izre’el, 329–352. Tel-Aviv: Tel-Aviv University.
- . 2005. “The contribution of the pattern of existential sentence to existential meaning” (in Hebrew). *Language studies* 10, ed. by Steven E. Fassberg and Aharon Maman, 101–112. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Landau, Rachel. 1976. “Mišpaṭ ha-ziqa u-mišpaṭ levay ha-toxen le-sugav ba-‘Ivrit šel yamenu”. *Biqoret u-faršanut* 7–8:132–136.
- Levy, Alissa. 2008. “Hebrew negative polarity items—šum and ‘af”. *Current issues in generative Hebrew linguistics*, ed. by Sharon Armon-Lotem, Gabi Danon, and Susan Rothstein, 313–336. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Maschler, Yael. 2001. “Veke’ilu haragláyim sh’xa nitka’ot bifnīm kaze (‘and like your feet get stuck inside like’): Hebrew kaze (‘like’), ke’ilu (‘like’), and the decline of Israeli dugri (‘direct’) speech”. *Discourse Studies* 3:3, 295–326.
- . 2009. *Metalanguage in interaction: Hebrew discourse markers*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- . 2011. “On the emergence of adverbial connectives from Hebrew relative clause constructions”. *Constructions: Emerging and emergent*, ed. by Peter Auer and Stefan Pfänder, 293–331. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Melnik, Nurit. 2006. “A constructional approach to verb-initial constructions in Modern Hebrew”. *Cognitive Linguistics* 17:153–198.
- Mignon, Hagit. 2005. “Expressions similar to Hebrew bixlal”. *Linguist List* 16.
- Mishor, Mordechai. 1994. “The order of the objects ‘oto and lo” (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu la-‘Am* 55:147–156.
- Muchnik, Malka. 1989. “Expressions of tense, mood and aspect in Modern Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Hebrew Linguistics* 27:29–54.
- Ornan, Uzzi. 1971. “Hebrew grammar: Syntax”. *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, vol. 8, 142–175. Jerusalem: Encyclopaedia Judaica.
- Reshef, Yael. 2004. “The Modern Hebrew asyndetic relative clause: The rise of a new syntactic mechanism”. *Folia Linguistica Historica* 25:115–134.
- Rosén, Haiim B. 1956. “The mefu’al pattern in Israeli Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu* 20:139–148.
- . 1968. “Adjectival compounds and complex adjectives in Israeli Hebrew”. *Bar Ilan volume in humanities and social sciences, decennial volume 2*, ed. by Menachem Z. Kaddari, 98–105. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer.
- . 1977a. *Ivrit tova*, 3rd edition. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer.
- . 1977b. *Contemporary Hebrew*. The Hague: Mouton.
- . 1982. “‘Aspeqim be-xequer seder xelke ha-mišpaṭ ba-‘Ivrit ha-Yišre’elit ha-ktuva” (in Hebrew). *Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies: Division D*, 43–49.
- Rubinstein, Eliezer. 1968. *The nominal sentence: A study in the syntax of contemporary Hebrew* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad.
- . 1970. *The verb phrase* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad.
- Sharvit, Yael. 2008. “Hebeṭim šel ha-semantiqa šel zman ha-neṭiya ba-‘Ivrit ha-modernit”. *Theoretical Hebrew linguistics*, ed. by Galia Hataav, 139–162. Jerusalem: Magness.
- . 2008. “Bare minimizers”. Armon-Lotem, Danon, and Rothstein 2008, 293–312.
- Schwarzwald, Ora. 1976. “Regarding the grammaticality and creation of extrapositional sentences” (in Hebrew). *Bar Ilan Annual* 13:321–340.
- Taube, Dana. 1990. “On denominal adjectives with the suffix ‘- in Modern Hebrew”. *Studies in Hebrew and other Semitic languages presented to Chaim Rabin*, ed. by Moshe Goshen-Gottstein, Shelomo Morag, and Simcha Kogut, 117–132. Jerusalem: Akademon.
- . 1996. “Agent complement in passive constructions in Modern Hebrew”. *Israel Oriental Studies* 16:113–130.
- . 2007. “Impersonal and passive constructions in contemporary Hebrew”. Bar and Cohen 2007, 277–297.
- . 2008. “The functional distribution of the pronouns hu and ze in cleft sentences in Contemporary Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu* 70:533–552.
- . 2009. “Passive participle in Modern Hebrew”. Goldenberg and Shisha-Halevy 2009, 317–336.
- Tzivoni, Lea. 1993a. “Means of expressing perfect, iteration, continuation and tense in written Israeli Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu* 56:55–87.
- . 1993b. “Negation in Israeli Hebrew” (in Hebrew). PhD dissertation, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- Wertheimer, Ada. 2001. “More thoughts about cleft sentences” (in Hebrew). *Hebrew Linguistics* 49: 21–34.
- Wintner, Shuly. 2000. “Definiteness in the Hebrew noun phrase”. *Journal of Linguistics* 36:319–363.
- Zewi, Tamar. 2008. “Content clauses in Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu* 70:627–657.
- Zewi, Tamar and Yael Reshef. 2009. “The active participle and temporal expressions in Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu* 71:315–344.
- Ziv, Yael. 1995. “Me’anyen ha-sefer ha-ze Interesting this book: A special construction in spoken Hebrew” (in Hebrew). *Hebrew Linguistics* 39:29–39.
- . 1998. “Hebrew kaze as a discourse marker and lexical hedges: Conceptual and procedural properties”. *Discourse markers: Description and theory*, ed. by Andreas H. Jucker and Yael Ziv, 203–221. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

RIVKA HALEVY

(The Hebrew University of Jerusalem)