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PHONETIC SYMBOLS AND CONVENTIONS OF TRANSLITERATION

1. I have used the I(nternational) P(honetic) A(Alphabet) throughout except for the transliteration of ancient and mediaeval Semitic languages, conventions for which may be found in Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910 (among many others). These should pose no particular problems for the non-Semitist outside of the practice of transliterating the BH postvocalic spirant allophones of $b$, $q$, $d$, $k$, $p$, and $t$ as $⟨b⟩$, $⟨q⟩$, $⟨d⟩$, $⟨k⟩$, $⟨p⟩$, and $⟨t⟩$ respectively, rather than the more widely used (among linguists) IPA symbols $ð/γ$, $ε$, $ɛ$, $ϕ/γ$, and $ơ$ (I have used $f$ rather than $⟨p⟩$). Part of the rationale behind this traditional philological practice is scientific caution: we cannot claim to be sure of the exact phonetic realization of these characters, as the above slashed alternative possibilities indicate. It should be noted that the above bear no etymological relation to PS $⟨t⟩$, $⟨d⟩$, $⟨x⟩$, and $⟨g⟩$, the BH reflexes of which are $⟨s⟩$, $⟨z⟩$, $⟨h⟩$, and $⟨c⟩$ respectively. For PRH and IH, the IPA symbols are used.

2. $⟨c⟩ = IPA /ʃ/, Arabic 'ayn (cation), Hebrew 'ayin (γ), the voiced pharyngeal continuant.

$⟨h⟩ = Arabic چ, Hebrew ך, traditionally transliterated מ, the voiceless pharyngeal continuant.

$⟨y⟩ = IPA /ʁ/, Hebrew 'aleph (ך), Arabic 'alif + hamza (ג), the glottal stop.

$⟨ʃ⟩ = a voiceless apical spirant of uncertain articulation, probably lateral (v. Steiner 1977).
3. Raised vowel-symbol \( \breve{a} \) indicates an ultrashort, epenthetic transition vowel that arises between a stressed long non-low vowel and syllable-final laryngeal-pharyngeal continuant \( \breve{c}, \breve{h}, \) or \( \breve{h} \). Vowels marked with a circumflex accent (\( \breve{i}, \breve{e}, \breve{u}, \breve{o} \)) are written with the matres lectionis (vowel-letters) \( w \) and \( y \) in the consonantal orthography and may be presumed to have been both longer in quantity than, and possibly different in quality from, vowels marked with a macron (\( \ddot{o} \)) (i.e., written without mater lectionis in the consonantal text).

4. I have followed the common modern linguistic practice of marking long vowels in the same way as geminate consonants, by a simple repetition of the same symbol twice, except in the case of Masoretic (Tiberian) Hebrew vocalization where the length is secondary, i.e., results from Hebrew prosody rather than from an etymological (PS) long vowel. The latter vowels are marked with a macron, as qēmas gādōl \( \ddot{a} \) (< PS *\( a \)), hōlām hāser \( \ddot{o} \) (< PS *\( u \)). hōlām māle? \( \ddot{o} \) (v. supra) derives from PS *\( aa \), but is marked with a diacritic, the circumflex accent, rather than doubling of the symbol both because of uncertainty regarding the pronunciation (v. supra), and in order to reflect the philological tradition of indicating the presence of a mater lectionis (in this case, wāw (\( w \))). Another exception is the treatment of BA (2.2.4), for which I have followed Masoretic practice and transcribed qēmas gādōl as \( \breve{a} \), with macron, even though it is often the reflex of PS long *\( aa \) and hence etymological (unlike qēmas gādōl in BH, v. supra). Also, I have followed the transcription practice of Y. Sabar (1976) when quoting him (2.2.4), which entails marking all long vowels with macron regardless of origin. The double-marking of other
long vowels, in PS and elsewhere, is merely a typographical convention and does not imply a theoretical claim regarding the phonological status of long vowels as a sequence of two short vowel-units.

5. Both stress and the Masoretic ti’amîm (accentuation/ cantillation signs- v. fn 32 (Ch. 2)) are marked for (Biblical) Hebrew only when relevant to the discussion.

6. Double-spacing and wavy underlining (a b c) indicate the transliteration of a consonantal text (v. fn 5 (Ch. 1)); in the same spirit, Semitic consonantal verb-roots have usually been double-spaced, to indicate that they do not constitute actual lexemes, but rather more abstract lexico-semantic entities (for an interesting discussion of this, v. Gesenius 1910:99 ff, and 6.2).
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ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

The Evolution of the Hebrew Infinitive, Form and Function: a Diachronic Study with Cross-Linguistic Implications

by

Andrew Jordan Fox
Doctor of Philosophy in Linguistics
University of California, Los Angeles, 1984
Professor Russell G. Schuh, Chair

The standard philological works on Biblical Hebrew and its position within Semitic derive the absolute infinitive (AI) and construct infinitive (CI) from totally independent sources, nominal for the former and verbal (together with imperative and imperfect) for the latter. Herein a novel and radically different etymology is proposed for the Hebrew infinitive(s), deriving both from a single source (the MONOGENETIC HYPOTHESIS): the CI, true to its traditional designation, is taken to be a reanalyzed construct form of the AI, and an ALTERNATIVE DERIVATION SCHEMA is presented to account for this development (Ch. 1).

Evidence for the nominal origin of the CI and its extension from construct to absolute state is adduced on three levels: most specifically, phonological form and syntactic distribution/substitution within Biblical and Post-Biblical Hebrew itself (using the form and
function approach); next, the development of *faCa-al-, etymon of the
AI, and infinitives in general in Semitic/Afroasiatic; finally, cross-
linguistic data on the sources and development of infinitives and their
relationship with imperatives and other irrealis verb forms, with many
close parallels to the alternative derivation, itself examined as a
question of theoretical linguistic interest, leading to the positing
of a universal, unidirectional nominal-verbal cline of diachronic
change through verbalization. Unidirectionality is explored for its
implications both theoretical (the historical evolution of linguistic
forms) and metatheoretical (the primacy of noun versus verb and the
cognitive-perceptual limitations on our understanding of reality im-
posed by the absolute category labels of traditional and formal grammar
as opposed to a more functional, graduated/scalar categorization).
The corollary hypothesis of cyclicity is discussed, putative counter-
examples to the principle of unidirectionality are dealt with, and a
distinction is made between sudden/absolute category switches and
diachronic category shift. An inquiry is framed into the nature of
syntactic categories themselves, and the ARCHICATEGORY is offered as
a mapping function of ahistorical interrelationships between
categories.

Cross-linguistic theory, then, with its broad data-base, informs and
can be utilized by philology to provide a criterion for deciding be-
tween competing etymologies. Conversely, intensive investigation of
a philological problem in a single language may result in substantive
contributions to historical linguistics and morphosyntactic theory
in general.
CHAPTER 1. THE MONOGENETIC HYPOTHESIS AND ALTERNATIVE DERIVATION: ORIGIN OF THE ABSOLUTE AND CONSTRUCT INFINITIVES

1.1 Background: Traditional Terminology

1.1.1 The Biblical Hebrew infinitive forms for the simple pattern of the regular triconsonantal verb\textsuperscript{1}, \( \text{f}^\text{c} \text{O} \) and \( \text{f}^\text{c} \text{O} \), having as they do the synchronic appearance and to some degree the morphosyntactic/distributional behavior of absolute and construct state forms respectively of the same noun\textsuperscript{2} (cf Bergsträsser 1918:61, 84, Joüon 1923:110, Lambert 1946:456, Even-Shoshan 1977:1575), were in fact designated absolute and construct infinitives throughout the traditional literature of Biblical Hebrew grammar up until the late nineteenth century (cf Solà-Solé 1961:71). A most interesting formulation is that of F. Böttcher (1866 v.1: 221, apud Solà-Solé 1961:71), who terms the \( \text{f}^\text{c} \text{O} \) infinitive 'constructus oder nominalis' or simply 'infinitif', the \( \text{f}^\text{c} \text{O} \) infinitive 'absolutus oder verbalis, emphaticus'. His characterization of the construct infinitive (henceforth CI) as 'nominalis' is especially significant in the light of subsequent etymologies deriving \( \text{f}^\text{c} \text{O} \) from a proto-verbal form (1.2).

1.2 Modern Philological Objections

1.2.1 For practical and pedagogical purposes, many teachers and scholars still refer to absolute and construct infinitives, and the modern Hebrew grammatical terms makor mufrad 'separated infinitive' or makor muhlat 'absolute/definite infinitive' and makor nisman 'construct (lit. 'supported') infinitive' or makor natuy 'declined infinitive' (cf Even-Shoshan 1977:1575) are clearly calques of the Latinate terminology.
Since the late nineteenth century, however, standard handbooks of Biblical Hebrew (henceforth BH) grammar have eschewed the designations 'absolute' and 'construct' as both synchronically inaccurate and historically misleading.

1.2.2 Synchronically inaccurate, because the CI does not in fact stand everywhere in the construct state to a following noun or genitive suffix pronoun (subject or object), although it often does (v., among others, Lambert 1946:267; the absolute infinitive (henceforth AI), as a matter of fact, true to its traditional name, takes no affixes and manifests a virtually exceptionless aversion to the construct state – cf. Joüon 1923:3483).

Historically misleading, because the standard etymological derivation of the f̄ disconnective (CI) together with the imperative (m.s. f̄ disconnective) and the imperfect (3d m.s. yif disconnective) from a single Proto-Semitic (verbal) ground-stem *fuCul (var. Cul, fuCul) concomitantly denies any etymological connection whatever between (f̄ disconnective) (CI), and f̄ disconnective (AI); certainly it admits of no possibility that they constitute absolute and construct forms of the same noun. This is because the latter (which is found also in the other Canaanite dialects, cf. Solà-Solé 1961:183, Sec. 3b) is conventionally considered to be a reflex of the Proto-Semitic deverbal noun/nomen agentis formation *faCaal(i).4, 5 Cognates: Arabic faCaal, faCaali, Akkadian faCaal, as Arabic samaaC '(power of) hearing', Saram 'love, love affair', hadaari 'waryness', Akkadian kašaadu 'reach(ing), arriv(al)'. faCaal has also been connected etymologically with Arabic nouns of profession/occupation (nomina
opificum) fa^CCaal (e.g., sabbaaq 'painter', xayyaat 'tailor') and the Ge^Cez (Ethiopic) participle/nomen agentis fa^Caalii/fa^CCaalii (cf Solà-Solé 1961:71). This sense of nomen opificum or agentis is preserved in a considerable number of BH fa^Côl nouns, as ṭâmôn 'master workman', bâhôn 'assayer of metals', ṭâsōq 'oppressor', râzôn 'potentate' (cf Segal 1980:107), and persists through Mishnaic Hebrew (henceforth MH) (perhaps partially due to the influence of Talmudic Aramaic in which the form is very common), together with an instrumental sense. The implication is that the appearance of fa^Côl and fa^Côl to be absolute and construct state nominal forms is either fortuitous or perhaps due to later reanalysis by speakers at some point subsequent to their emergence as grammatical forms in pre-Hebrew (so esp. Bergsträsser 1918:61, 84; cf also Jou.on 1923:110).

1.3 Modern Terminology

1.3.1 As a consequence of this position, scholars from Stade onward (1879:338, apud Solà-Solé 1961:71) have made a point of avoiding the terms absolute and construct infinitive, proposing instead such carefully noncommittal substitutes as Stade's (later adopted by Bauer-Leander 1922 vol. I:261, 319) Starre Infinitiv 'fixed/stiff/rigid infinitive' (AI), clearly a reference to the indeclinable character of the AI, versus Gewöhnliche Infinitiv 'ordinary/usual infinitive' (CI)^6, in reference to the more prototypically infinitive character of the latter^7. Mayer Lambert (1946:261) suggests the rather colorless infinitif premier (AI) and infinitif second (CI). In the same vein, Solà-Solé (1961:71) refers to the two
infinitives as 'A' (CI) and 'B' (AI), reversing the usual order 'pour ne pas présupposer sur la fonction de base de l'infinitif absolu'.

Segert (1966:124), in his review of Solâ-Solé, refers to the traditional terminology as 'gewiss nicht glücklich, doch eingebürgert' but mildly criticizes Solà-Solé's proposed substitute as 'zwar neutral, doch zu vage!', an assessment with which the present writer agrees. As noted before, however, Solà-Solé's proposal is merely the most recent in a near-century of attempts to avoid even suggesting an etymological relationship between AI and CI.

1.4 The Standard Derivation

1.4.1 The standard etymological derivation of the two BH infinitive forms (and cognate forms), then, may be diagrammed as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \ast \text{fa}^\text{C} \text{a} \text{a} \text{l}(i) \\
\text{Sound changes:} \\
\text{1)} \\
\text{2)} \text{below} \\
\text{3)} \\
\text{(AI) fa}^\text{C} \text{O} \text{l} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PS} \ast \text{fu}^\text{C} \text{u} \text{l} \text{(var. f}^\text{C} \text{u} \text{l}, \text{fu}^\text{C} \text{l})^9 \\
\text{Sound changes:} \\
\text{1)} \\
\text{2)} \text{below} \\
\text{3)} \\
\text{(CI) fi}^\text{C} \text{O} \text{l} \text{Imv fi}^\text{C} \text{O} \text{l} \text{Imperf yif}^\text{C} \text{o} \text{l} \\
\text{(suff. f}^\text{C} \text{l}) \text{Imv fi}^\text{C} \text{l} \text{-10) yif}^\text{C} \text{l} \text{-1} \\
\end{array}
\]

Later reanalysis of these two forms as absolute and construct forms of the same noun?

Sound changes (AI):

1) BH stress-shift to ultima: \( \text{fa}^\text{C} \text{a} \text{a} \text{l} \)

2) PS stressed \(*\text{aa} > \text{Comm Can} \, \hat{o}: \, \text{fa}^\text{C} \text{a} \text{a} \text{l} > \text{fa}^\text{C} \text{O} \text{l}^{11} \)

Figure 1 — Standard Etymological Derivation of Biblical Hebrew Absolute and Construct Infinitives (Sheet 1 of 2)
3) BH (tonic and) pretonic lengthening of a in open syllables:

\[ \text{fā'cōl} \]

Sound changes (CI):

1) BH stress-shift to ultima: \[ \text{fu'cul} \]

2) Reduction of unstressed short non-low vowels in open

syllables before stressed syllables: \[ \text{fē'cōl} \]

3) Lowering of stressed short vowels:

\[ \text{fī'cōl} \]

Figure 1 – Standard Etymological Derivation of Biblical
Hebrew Absolute and Construct Infinitives (Sheet 2 of 2)

1.5 Problems with the Standard Derivation

1.5.1 Although this derivation, which appears to have gone essen-
tially unchallenged over the past century, seems well thought-
tout, there are in reality a number of difficulties with it. Chief
among these is the following: while the conventional reconstruction
of the BH AI \[ \text{fa'cōl} \] from PS \[ *\text{fa'caal(i)} \] is quite solid, the putative
derivation of the BH CI \[ \text{fī'cōl} \] from PS \[ *\text{fu'cul} \] is far less so.
Throughout Semitic, infinitives arise out of deverbal nouns/
gerunds\(^{13}\): cf. Lambert 1946:140 n.3, Solé-Solé 1961:1. The latter
expresses this quite clearly and is worth quoting at length:

'Nous appellerons les masaḍar Arabes des "noms d'action", toute en
réservant le terme d'"infinitif" pour le nom d'action qui dans
d'autres langues sémitiques a réussi à devenir forme unique, ayant
pu se dégager parmi les divers noms d'actions proto-sémitiques.
Cela implique l'hypothèse d'une simplification et d'une

---
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spécialization progressive des formes nominales et verbo-nominales. L'arabe, avec sa pluralité de formes, représenterait ainsi une étape antérieure à celle, par exemple, de l'hébreu ... (my italics, except for masdar)

1.5.2 If this is the case, is it not highly questionable to derive the BH \( f\text{C}0\text{l} \) infinitive, whose morphosyntactic behavior is solidly and unquestionably nominal (cf fn 7 (Ch. 1), 2.3, 2.10-11) from what must be assumed to have been a proto-verb form, \( *f\text{u}\text{C}0\text{l} \)? Such a reconstruction claims cognacy of the nouny construct infinitive with the imperative and imperfect, both clear verbal forms. What would the semantic explanation be for reconstructing an 'Ur-form' as the common ancestor of infinitive, imperative and imperfect? Does not so peculiar an etymology, contravening the usual manner by which infinitives develop in Semitic languages, require very strong justification in the form of comparative and internal evidence? And, in the absence of such justification, should such an etymology not be considered extremely dubious, and an account based upon it, suspiciously weak? Compare, again, Böttcher's (1866 V.1:221, apud Solà-Solé 1961:71, quoted supra, 1.1) characterization of \( f\text{C}0\text{l} \) as 'nominalis', Lambart's (1946:140) 'l'Infinitif [construit] est un nom', Bergsträsser's (1918:54) description of its 'in vieler Beziehung rein nominalen Charakter', Gesenius-Kautzsch (1910:122): 'both [infinitive forms] are, strictly speaking, independent nouns (verbal substantives) (Gesenius-Kautzsch's italics), and even the \( f\text{C}0\text{l} \) form's traditional labels 'gerund' (Halkin 1970: v. Lambert 1946:267) and 'verbal noun'.
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1.5.3 I suggest that sufficiently strong arguments for the standard etymology have not been presented in the literature, and that what little data internal to BH seem to point in its favor are in fact quite susceptible to explanation without postulating the standard derivation, and may even be taken as evidence for the alternative hypothesis to be presented below. Above, I have already suggested that the comparative evidence points in a radically different direction from the standard theory. In the later sections of this chapter I shall adduce cross-linguistic evidence to that effect from outside Semitic and even Afroasiatic.

1.6 The Hypothesis

1.6.1 If we wish to hypothesize that the infinitive form f4C̄l does indeed derive from a nominal form, as both its morphosyntactic behavior and the above comparative considerations would indicate, there is an alternative to the standard etymology. This alternative hypothesis might be said to have been foreshadowed by Jouon (1923: 109-110), who at least hints indirectly at the possibility and seems to have been tempted by it, but nevertheless resolutely rejects it in favor of the standard explanation without fully exploring its possibilities. His musings are perhaps worth quoting at length:

'Ces deux formes, qui ont actuellement une certaine ressemblance, n'ont originairement aucun rapport...les deux infinitifs ont l'air d'avoir entre eux la relation qu'il y a, p. ex., entre abs gādōl 'grand' et cst gīdōl-. L'ancienne grammaire, peut-être même la conscience linguistique, semble avoir
admis cette relation comme réelle, d'où les noms infinitif absolu, infinitif construit.\footnote{1}

\footnote{1}Chose curieuse, les deux infinitifs ont en syntaxe des emplois qui répondent assez bien à leurs noms. L'infinitif absolu est employé d'une façon absolue, comme un nom à l'état absolu; au contraire l'infinitif construit peut se construire sur un nom ou un pronom, comme un nom à l'état construit.

1.6.2 In this passage, rather 'curious' in itself, Jouon at once admits that the \(fa^C\hat{o}1\) and \(fi^C\hat{o}1\) infinitives seem to be absolute and construct forms and yet shies away from taking a definite stand as to why. His reference to traditional grammar and the 'linguistic conscience' (presumably Sprachgefühl) hints that the resemblance might be attributed to folk etymology or reanalysis, on the other hand, the footnote immediately following strikes a strangely noncommittal note, as though the phenomenon were simply to be noted, in traditional philological fashion, with no explanation attempted.

1.6.3 Pace Jouon, I think we as linguists may hazard the explanation that the \(fi^C\hat{o}1\) infinitive looks like the construct state form of the \(fa^C\hat{o}1\) infinitive because it was indeed historically just that; i.e., that the resemblance of \(fa^C\hat{o}1\) and \(fi^C\hat{o}1\) to absolute and construct state forms of the same noun, dismissed so readily and for so long in the literature as fortuitous, is in fact no coincidence.\footnote{14} As we shall see in Chapter 3, claims about reanalysis may actually be turned against the standard derivation and operate in favor of the alternative explanation. A hypothesis may be constructed which both
accounts for the origin of the CI by connecting it to the AI (thus reducing the number of independent entities/structures under consideration, in conformity with Occam's Razor- v. infra, 1.7) and offers a plausible explanation for the differentiation of the two forms. The AI (fâ'Côl) is solidly reconstructable as a substantiver-nominal form with infinitive and quasi-infinitive/deverbal noun function in other Semitic languages (cf Solà-Solé 1961, and 2.2 for more on this). Such being the case, we may side with the traditional grammarians and take the CI (fâ'Côl) to be the CONSTRUCT STATE FORM OF THE AI, its first vowel reduced to V+âwâ nàC (schwa mobile)\(^{15}\) (and, perhaps, its second vowel reduced from long ô to middle ô)\(^{16}\) because it originally stood in construct to a following (direct) object, the latter constituting a genitival attribute. The li- prefix so commonly found with the CI may be presumed to be a dative-benefactive/allative-goal-purpose marker (v. 2.3). The mechanism or process by which this syntactic change, reanalysis of genitive patient as accusative object, took place, was presumably something like the following:

\[\text{Stage}\]

1) \(\star^{17}\) bâ?-tî li-qâtôl-hâ-?àdam\(^{18}\)
   
   \[\text{came-I to-killing (VN) (of)-the-man}\]

   'I came to (i.e., physically approached the goal of)
   the killing of the man'

2) \(\star^{17}\) bâ?-tî li-qîtôl-hâ-?àdam
   
   \[\text{came-I to-killing (of)-the-man}\]

   id.
Automatic vowel-reduction of verbal noun in construct to following noun (genitive attribute), as a result of the withdrawal of the stress from the now-dependent noun in construct to the following genitive, together with which it now constitutes a single prosodic unit.\textsuperscript{19} Compare \textit{māgōm} 'place', \textit{migōm- (ham-mizbēāh) 'the} place of (the altar)' Gen 13:4.\textsuperscript{20}

\textbf{Stage (cont.)}

3) \[\underbrace{bāʔ-tī}_{\text{came-I}} \underbrace{li-qîtōl-hā-ʔādām}_{\text{to-killing (of) - the man}} \]

\[\text{id.}\]

Regular dissimilation of the first of two reduced vowels to -\textit{i}-, i.e., -\textit{iC}-\textsuperscript{21} \textit{-iC-} (cf Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910:298-99).

4) \[\underbrace{bāʔ-tī}_{\text{came-I}} \underbrace{li-qîtōl}_{\text{to-kill}} \underbrace{ʔēt-ʔē-hā-ʔādām}_{\text{ACC - the man}}\]

'I came to kill the man', i.e., for the purpose of killing the man

\textbf{Reanalysis:} dative-allative preposition (physical goal/direction) + deverbal noun (preceded by verb of physical motion) reinterpreted as infinitive/purpose marker + infinitive.

\textbf{Figure 2} – Genitive-to-Accusative Reanalysis: a Proposed Derivation of the Construct Infinitive from the Absolute Infinitive
1.6.4 In Stage 1), the agent proceeds physically, in a concrete/spatial sense, toward the execution of an action. To this end, the dative-directional preposition li- is prefixed to the 'AI' (at this stage still simply a deverbal noun) with the meaning of movement toward a physical goal or in an actual spatial direction.

1.6.5 Stage 2)\(^{23}\) shows reduction of the first vowel of the 'AI' in accordance with the rules of prosody which obtain in the construct state, as the deverbal noun stands in construct to a following semantic patient coded syntactically as genitive attribute to it. As indicated in 2), the form of the CI which results parallels the construct state form of a noun with the same absolute state form (Heb miṣqal) as the AI.

1.6.6 In Stage 3)\(^{24}\) the prefix vowel shifts to i in accordance with the regular dissimilation process which obtains when two schwas are juxtaposed.

1.6.7 Stage 4) is, of course, the crucial stage, the 'swing-point' of the change. At some point, after the original physical-action/motion interpretation of the construction has become blurred, reanalysis takes place in the minds of pre-BH speakers. A metaphorical extension has occurred from directional to purposive, i.e., from physical movement in a given direction to intent. The syntactic-semantic relations, and consequently the morphology, are redefined: the semantics of physical movement toward a goal having faded into an abstract notion of purpose or intent, the dative prefix-preposition is reinterpreted as an infinitive/purpose marker\(^{25}\) (one might even
say 'grammaticalized', as the infinitive marker has a less concrete-physical and hence less rich lexical content and a more abstract, 'drier' grammatical function than the directional preposition. The erstwhile deverbal noun is reanalyzed as less of a noun and more of a verbal form, i.e., as an infinitive, and the genitive patient is reinterpreted as accusative object. This last is most dramatically demonstrated by the presence of the nota accusativi ḫet, which functions in BH (including E(ary) BH, as in Genesis) as a marker of definite direct objects (accusatives) of a finite verb (cf Hammer-shaimb 1963:85-6 on the n.a. as a useful indicator of verbal function in the BH infinitive). The significance of this development will be discussed further in 2.6 (cf also fn 22 and 2.9).

1.6.8 The phonologically reduced CI with dative-cum-infinitive prefix, no longer felt to be standing in construct, would later have spread through analogy to intransitive verbs and other syntactic environments where no direct object or other genitive attribute followed26,27, such as Gen 1:17: 'he placed them in the heavens li-hā-ṣr ṭē 28 wi-li-mṣol ... 'to give light, and to rule ...' It is to-CAUS-light and-to-rule

interesting to note that a more conservative situation obtains with pronominal suffixes than with full NPs:29 although the CI is, in many cases, no longer in construct to nouns (compare ḫī-hā-'nīāh yhwh in-CAUS-rest God 'when God hath given rest' (Deut 25:19), with unreduced vocalization indicating a form in the absolute state, and 1.2.2), it still stands in construct to pronominal suffixes (i.e., retains construct form) as in ḥā-qîm CAUS-rise 'raise', ḥā-qîm-ō
'his raising' (subject), the latter showing the vowel-reduction characteristic of the construct state. This is noted in Lambert 1946:456: 'Avec le suffix pronominal, l'infinitif était, à l'origine, à l'état construit... (p. 267, Sec 752) (il) peut-être modifié par l'adjonction de sufrixes; il suit alors les règles de la déclinaison des noms...'. In fact, the only synchronic indication to the contrary in BH (and, concomitantly, the only indication that the above reanalysis has taken place) is the analogical change of the first person singular suffix from the genitive -î to the accusative -nî (this is the only morphological distinction between the genitive and accusative systems in BH), and this may be something of a late phenomenon (note the example given by Lambert from one of the later books, Jer 57:7 lî-dôrs-enî to-seek-me (acc) 'to seek me',). This constitutes an index of the verbalization that will be discussed in detail in 2.3 and 4.1.1. -î may furthermore, and quite logically, still be found with subjects (Lambert 1946:140), as pûqîdî punish-my 'mon action de punir' (Ex 32:34). It is surely indicative for our hypothesis that the suffix pronominal system, usually more archaic/conservative (one might even say fossilized in this case - cf fn 29) than the productive NP syntagma across languages, manifests (indeed, one would have to say retains) its genitive (rather than accusative) character more strongly than full NPs when following the CI (this holds also for the nota accusativi òét + suffix pronouns: v. 2.6). 1.6.9 The above statement by Lambert, together with his statement (1946:267, Sec. 751) [l'infinitif] n'est plus (my italics) dans le
rapport de construit à complément', quite clearly implies that the CI
indeed originally was in construct to both pronominal suffixes and
full NP genitive attributes, which fact would seem to be wholly
incompatible with a reconstruction of the CI as proto-verb form. 31
1.6.10 Also beginning at some point subsequent to the reanalysis of
CI as infinitive, the AI underwent a less dramatic but equally sig-
nificant shift in syntactic function, being decanonized from a
fully nominal deverbal noun as in Proto-Semitic to a kind of
detached (absolut(ive)!) adverbial status, with concomitant loss of
certain nominal characteristics, such as the ability to stand in
construct to another noun or itself support another noun in the con-
struct state (cf Ch. 5.1 and Jouon 1923:348, as well as Bottcher's
(1866 v.1:221, in Solà-Solé 1961:71) characterization of the AI as
'verbalis'). This process of decanonization will be treated at fur-
ther length, and from a cross-linguistic point of view, in Ch. 6.
The end result, in any case, is evident: two synchronically separate
infinite formations, neither one a full canonical NP (in the sense
of Hopper and Thompson 1984, and v. Ch. 6), both having arisen
out of the same PS deverbal noun fa\textsubscript{a}aal(i), both constituting
grammatical forms specialized out of the plethora of deverbal nouns
in Proto-Semitic. This explanation, as contrasted with the standard
derivation, conforms well to the usual way in which infinitives
develop in Semitic (cf 1.5), not to mention other language families
(to be discussed in Ch. 5).
1.7 The Alternative Derivation

1.7.1 Figure 3 below is a diagram of the alternative derivation outlined in the preceding section, which claims the AI and CI to be cognate forms. It is to be compared with the standard derivation in Figure 1, of AI and CI from independent sources:

PS DVN *fa\text{c}a\text{i}(i)  
\text{Sound changes:} \ 
\begin{align*}
1) & \text{ Fig. 1} \\
2) & \text{ Fig. 1} \\
3) & \text{ Fig. 1}
\end{align*}

PS Proto-Verb Stem *fu\text{c}u \text{l}  
\text{Sound changes:} \ 
\begin{align*}
1) & \text{ Fig. 1} \\
2) & \text{ Fig. 1} \\
3) & \text{ Fig. 1}
\end{align*}

DVN *fa\text{c}o\text{l} \hspace{1cm} \text{Imv f}\text{c}o\text{l} \hspace{1cm} \text{Imperf yif}\text{c}o\text{l}

\text{AI fa\text{c}o\text{l} \hspace{1cm} CI f}\text{c}o\text{l} \hspace{1cm} \text{Later, perceived formal similarity or identity of CI and Imv leads to reanalysis as same form, based on similar meaning/semantics: both nonfinite verb-forms with irrealsis function (v. 3.2, -3, 5.1 Ch. 6)? Consider: qit\text{\text{"o}}l 'kill!' and qit\text{\text{"o}}l 'kill(ing)'}

\text{*(below) remains archaic/defective in form for irregular verbs}^{32}

\text{*later reanalyzed as a kind of verbal adjective/citation form of the verb; due to this perceived function, 'fills out' its triconsonantal structure and is regularized in form for irregular verbs, on analogy to the perfect.}^{32} \text{ Perhaps even its role as absolute form of CI perceived anew, which would explain any indications that AI-CI relationship is secondary/due to reanalysis (cf Fig. 1, 2.9, 3.3)}

Figure 3 — Alternative Etymological Derivation of Biblical Hebrew Absolute and Construct Infinitives
1.7.2 Figure 3 indicates graphically the preferability, following the scientific criterion of parsimony or simplicity, of a solution which derives the CI from the same source as the AI: why posit an etymologically distinct origin for the CI, said origin constituting an additional and superfluous entity (the proto-verb form *fu\textsuperscript{cul}), when the CI is entirely explicable as a variant of the AI in terms of both form and functions? The natural assumption is clearly that the AI and CI are related; it is the claim that these two manifestly related forms are in fact unrelated (the standard derivation) that must be regarded with skepticism and considered highly unlikely unless supported by massive evidence, which latter is not readily apparent (cf 1.5.2 and below). In other words, not only may the one form be derived from the other via regular phonological processes (as in Fig. 2, and cf 2.2.4), but the synchronic (BH) functions of each are compatible with the two reflexes of a proto-deverbal noun which has bifurcated into dependent infinitive/deverbal noun (CI, v. 2.10-11) on the one hand, and dereferentialized adverbial form/verb form of unspecified tense (AI, v. 1.6.10, 6.1) on the other. Further, the nominal behavior of the CI indicated in 2.10-11 and in 1.3 (fn 4), 1.5.2, 1.6.1, 2.9-11 (ability to stand in the construct state and in prepositional phrases, use as deverbal noun) point more readily to etymological kinship with the Arabic, Akkadian, Ethiopic and Ugaritic nominal pattern (deverbal noun, infinitive, nomen agentis, nomen opificum, participle) fa\textsubscript{c(c)}\textsubscript{aal-} (v. 1.2.2, 2.2), from which the BH AI is derived, than to pure verbal forms.
like the imperfect and imperative. Indeed, one would surely require very strong justification to derive the much more nominal CI, which behaves like a typical infinitive (cf above references), from a proto-verb form while deriving the AI, which cannot stand in the construct state or act as deverbal noun in BH (cf Jouon 1923:348 and other references in 1.3, 1.6.10; significantly, Böttcher (1866, v.1:221, in Solà-Solé 1961:71) goes so far as to name it 'verbalis'!) from a nominal form. The justification for an etymology so contradictory to the morphosyntactic evidence is not apparent in the standard literature (cf 1.5.2, 1.5.3).

1.7.3 It should be noted that both solutions/derivations, standard and alternative, are perfectly regular phonologically and require no actual assimilation of form, not even a minor adjustment of vowel-length either of CI and imperative to each other (the alternative derivation) or of CI and AI (the standard derivation), in order to account for the actual attested BH forms. With regard to this aspect, then, the criterion of simplicity cannot indicate which solution is to be preferred; it is difficult to determine which state of affairs is older, i.e., whether the similarity of form of CI and imperative is etymological (i.e., primary or original) and the AI-CI correspondence due to later reanalysis (i.e., secondary), or the AI-CI correspondence etymological and the similarity of CI and imperative due initially to accidental resemblance and then a later reanalysis and a consequent convergence of form.
Form, then, points decisively in neither direction. With respect to function, however, the BH CI is surely much more compatible with deverbal noun \( f^a_c a_k(i) \) than with proto-verb form \( f^u_C u_l \). Our preference for the alternative derivation, then, has been justified in the preceding paragraph and in 1.6.3, -8, -9, -10, on the grounds of the morphosyntactic behavior of the forms themselves, as well as general simplicity and comparative Semitic considerations; further support for the hypothesis will be presented in Chs. 2 and 5, internal to BH and cognate structures in other Semitic languages in Ch. 2 and cross-linguistic/typological in Ch. 5. Ch. 3 will deal with a number of more complex issues bearing on the hypothesis, Ch. 4 with Post-Biblical Hebrew (henceforth PBH), and Ch. 6 with theoretical implications of the hypothesis.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 1

1. The derived patterns and irregular verbs will be discussed in 3.2, as evidence for the alternative derivation.

2. In the classical Semitic languages and formal-literary registers, the synthetic genitive relationship (the colloquials have for the most part innovated analytic/periphrastic genitives, cf Kaye 1983b) is marked not only on the modifier (genitive case-marking, best preserved in Classical Arabic) but on the 'head' of the genitive construction, the first of the two annexed nouns. Classical Grammar has recognized this phenomenon with the appellation STATE, referring to the head or 'possessed' as being in STATUS CONSTRUCTUS, the modifier or 'possessor' in STATUS RECTUS or ABSOLUTUS. The noun in construct may be referred to as NOMEN REGENS, the noun in the absolute or 'normal' state as NOMEN RECTUM. A noun in the construct state (nomen regens) cannot take nunation or mimation (the indefinite nominal desinences in Arabic and Akkadian), the definite article, pronominal suffixes, or other modifiers/determiners apart from the genitive construction as a whole; it is considered to be defined/modified, per se, by the following genitive attribute, the nomen rectum, and is dependent upon the latter. All NP constituents, then, both follow and modify either the second noun (nomen rectum) or the entire NP construction. In formal terms, this may be diagrammed with the following tree-structure.
On the morphophonological level, the construct state is marked throughout Semitic by phonetic realization of the feminine -t suffix, usually elided in the absolute state (v. 2.2.4: fn 7, 3.4). In BH, aside from feminine -t, the most salient characteristic of the construct state is the specific set of vowel-reductive processes that a lexeme undergoes when it is treated as though it belonged to a single prosodic unit together with a following lexeme, as though it were more a syllable than a separate word, the aforementioned phonetic changes thus constituting, synchronically, a kind of dependency marking (appropriately, the Hebrew term for the construct state, smixut, denotes proximity/density, leaning, support, dependency; nomen regens (construct-state noun) is the nismax, the supported, leaning, dependent, while nomen rectum (absolute-state noun) is the somex, the leaned-upon, supporter, independent). These changes (see Addendum, p. 297) if ever productive for the phonology at large, now specifically characterize and are essentially confined to the construct state, itself reserved almost exclusively for genitive constructions; that is, the construct state structure-pattern has become 'morphosyntacticized'. The two annexed nouns are frequently connected in the Masoretic text by the punctuation marker magêf, a short horizontal line (ــ), as a diacritic or index
of this close syntactic-semantic-phonological liaison (v. fn 17 (Ch. 1)). The resemblance of AI and CI to absolute- and construct-state forms will be explained in detail in 1.6. Their respective functions will be discussed and illustrated in 2.3 and 2.10-11 (CI) and 5.1 (AI).

3. This characteristic of the AI will be accounted for in Sec. 1.6.10. On the other hand, are the rare cases in which the AI serves as nomen rectum to a noun in the construct state really 'suspects ou fautifs' (Joûon 1923:348), or perhaps relics of an earlier period of nominal function before infinitivalization/decanonization (Sec. 6.10) caused the AI to lose certain nominal characteristics, this among them.

4. Compare Bergsträtzer 1918:61; the Hebrew AI fa גּ ol is considered to result from a merger of the two forms combined above with parenthetical notation. Compare also Gesenius 1910:122, Joûon 1923:109. For the reconstruction of fa  as nomen agentis, v. Bauer-Leander 1922:317. The fa גּ  form with geminate second radical mentioned below as occurring in Arabic and Geּ ez has an unexpected outcome in BH, fa גּ (vocalized with q  , v. transcription tables, p. iv). The normal NWS reflex of PS stressed *aa is כ (cf Fig. 1), transliterated in BH with the mater lection- is waw (i) and not the sub-linear vowel-point q ( ). This appears to be due originally to analogical levelling of the singular stem in favor of the more-frequently-used plural stem in which, due to withdrawal of the stress (Hebrew  כָּאָם co'ver) from the syllable in question to the plural ending, the reflex
of *aa is ṃ (with qāmas gādōl, above), not ṃ; i.e., expected *gannōb 'thief' < PS *gan'naab is replaced by back-formation gannāb on analogy to plural gannā'ēm. This paradigm-levelling presumably started in a few lexemes for which the plural was more frequently used than the singular and subsequently spread by virtue of analogy to nearly every member of the fa' <
mišqal (nominal form-class); it is so widespread in BH that survivals of the original, etymologically correct *fa' are quite rare, confined to a few semantically specialized reten-
ton such as gannō? '(of God only) jealous, stern' Josh 24:19, Nahum 1:2, with its sacred connotations (cf Anttila 1972:143, 102, on restriction of archaic forms to specialized or stylistically-marked meanings as a cross-linguistic tendency).

5. For accounts of the standard/conventional reconstruction-

6. My preference for the term 'CI' as against these substitutes follows from the theoretical predilection expressed in this chapter. In order, however, to avoid both the potential confusion involved with this dispute over nomenclature and the
appearance of an a priori assumption that the two infinitive forms are related, I shall frequently make reference to 'the f\textsuperscript{*}C\textsubscript{ol} infinitive' in an effort to be perfectly unambiguous.

7. This characteristic of the CI will be noted again further on (1.7.2) as an argument against the standard theory. Gesenius-Kautzsch also (1910:123) refer to the CI as 'the principal form', or 'infinitive simply', and give it precedence over the AI in their verb tables. So also Jouon (1923:109) with 'l'infinitif ordinaire' or simply 'l'infinitif'.

8. The above is somewhat simplified for heuristic purposes, with some collapse of stages; for this reason, the rules are more complex than would be necessary if a complete chronological account were given. For a highly detailed account of these sound changes taking place in the development from reconstructed Proto-Semitic through BH, v. Bauer-Leander 1922: s.v. Lautlehre, Bergsträßer 1918: s.v. Lautgeschichte, and Harris 1941:143-6).

9. It has been suggested (S. Segert, p.c.) that this conventionally reconstructed common verbal ground-stem was in actuality a minimal consonantal stem, the vowels merely constituting epentheses to avoid consonant-clusters ruled out by Semitic phonotactics, which do not permit the juxtaposition of more than two consonants. This may be diagrammed thusly: \( C\textsubscript{1}C\textsubscript{2}V C\textsubscript{3} + \emptyset \) (\( *f^{C}u\textsubscript{1} \) > \( \overline{f^{C}C}\textsubscript{ol} \): no suffix), \( C\textsubscript{1}V C\textsubscript{2}C\textsubscript{3} + \emptyset \) (\( *f\textsubscript{u}^{C}\textsubscript{1} \) > \( \overline{f\textsubscript{u}^{C}}C\textsubscript{1} \): + suffix). This flexible stem, then, underlies the alternations with and without suffix seen in Fig. 1. The
epenthetic quality of the vowel(s) receives confirmation from the minority of verbs which show different thematic vowels < *fiCil, *faCal, corresponding to semantic classes no longer entirely reconstructable (*faCal, however, seems to have been stative-intransitive). Interestingly, vowel-assimilation processes can be observed in both LBH and IH. In LBH, the Septuagint transliterations Σόδωμα (and consequent Latin Sodom) and Γομορρα (Gomorrah) of sidôm and ṣāmōrā show coloring of the originally reduced vowels ą̂ and ą̂ toward the o- quality of the second vowel. In IH, the popular pronunciation of feminine personal name ẓahava 'golden one (fs)' (properly ẓ(i)hava) and plural noun baCayot 'problems' (properly biCayot) are indicative of the same process (with the latter two, analogical influence from the masculine and singular stems ẓahav and baCaya is also a contributing factor.) In fact, one might wish to reconstruct the imperative as *fCul/fCil/fCəl, (cf Joüon 1923:109) without the first vowel, accounting for the first vowel in Arabic ẓufCul, ẓifCil as a prothetic copy-vowel (cf Arabic ẓurdun 'Jordan', BH ẓardēn id., with apparent effect of Arabic vowel-assimilation) and for the ā̂ (<*u) after ẓi in Hebrew imperatives with accusative suffix pronoun such as ẓotlēni 'kill me!', ẓotlem 'kill them!' as resyllabification on analogy to the second vowel of non-suffixed forms (v. infra for this argument with regard to the CI + suffix). (Ease of articulation may be involved here in avoiding
the cluster of *g tôlnî. This is perhaps the real reason for the C₁C₂VC₃- pattern in .si̱āhēm! 'Send them!', rather than the a-quality of the thematic vowel; perhaps the comparative articulatory ease of the sibilant + liquid cluster ʒl- will allow for the retention of the stem form *f tô-l- (i.e., vowel after C₂), whereas the more difficult q t- cluster will not allow for the retention of *f tô-l-, i.e., ʒl- is easier to articulate/pronounce than q t-. The phenomenon of ʒiwā m irā'hef or schwa medium (v. Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910:51, and 3.1) seems to show that the manner of articulation of consonants in a cluster was a factor in the conditioning of vowel-placement in Masoretic Hebrew.) This would also avoid the phonotactics of two identical non-low vowels in succession within a stem, dubious for Semitic (in BH there is a strong constraint against two non-low vowels within a stem except under certain highly specific conditions—v. Bar-Lev 1977, 1978a, b). The (subject) suffix-form of the imperative, fi tô-l-, can then be explained as a mere epanthetic vowel inserted to break up a consonant-cluster. This simplifies considerably the derivation in Harris (1941:144) of *fu tô-l- > fa tô-l-V (through analogy?) > *fa tô-l-V (reduction of unstressed short penults before stressed long vowels) > fa tô-l-V (loss of schwa) > fi tô-l-V (BH *a > i in unstressed closed syllables).

10. Compare fn 9: the i vocalism here results from a separate and later development.
11. The relative order of stress-placement is significant for both AI and CI. In the derivation of the CI, stress-placement (1) must precede both reduction (2) and lowering (3), each of which is conditioned by stress. The relative order of 2) and 3) to each other is not crucial, although one might suppose 2) to have preceded 3). Similarly, in the derivation of the AI, stress-placement (1) must precede both the \( \text{aa} \rightarrow \hat{a} \) change (2) and pretonic lengthening (3), as the latter are stress-conditioned. Again, the relative order of (2) and (3) to each other is not crucial.

12. One should not be confused by the macron here (\( \ddot{o} \)); traditional BH transliteration practice requires it to distinguish this vowel from the still shorter \( \ddot{a} \) (Heb \( \dddot{q} \text{amas} \dddot{q} \text{atan} \)). v. transliteration tables, p. xiii.

13. Also known as nomina actionis or nomina verbi, noms d'action/action nouns, and nomina der Handlung. Arabic terms: ?asmwa\( ^u \) -l\( f \)\( i \)\( i \) 'names/nouns of the verb' and m\( \text{as} \)d\( a \)r\( ^u \)n\( n \) lit. 'source, point of origin' (v. 5.2, Sec. n, Ch. 6.2 for a discussion of how this relates to the claim that the noun is primary), Hebrew \( v \) \( \text{sem-pi} \)\( C \)\( \text{al} \)a 'name/noun of action/activity'.

14. This possibility has in fact occurred to Semitists such as R. Hetzron (p.c.), but does not appear to have been developed.

15. This is the schwa of modern linguistic terminology. The other BH schwa, \( v \)\( w \)\( a \)\( n \)h or schwa quiescens, is merely a mater lectionis for the juncture between a syllable-final consonant and the initial consonant of the next syllable.
16. The vowel of the second syllable is transliterated here as ô rather than Ô because the CI usually appears without mater lectionis (v. transliteration tables, and cf Solà-Solé 1961: 71). Occasionally, however, it is written with mater lectionis, as Ô, and the significance of this orthographic variation for the monogenetic hypothesis will be discussed in 3.1.

17. The first two stages are hypothetical reconstructions, the 'underlying forms' in the derivation of the construction actually found; the sentence as well is a hypothetical example, a model designed for purposes of heuristic/explanatory clarity and hence devoid of confusing and irrelevant low-level phonological clutter. Actual Biblical citations will follow (2.4).

18. The ( ), Hebrew maqqēf or maqāf (actually ~ in the Masoretic text) is itself a BH grapheme or punctuation-mark indicating very close syntactic liaison/corresponding or dependency-cliticization between words, (for example, between negative particle or complementizer and verb, interrogative pronoun and verb conjunction and pronoun or quantifier and noun preposition and object (v. 2.6), with phonological repercussions both segmental and prosodic (v. fn 1, Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910:63 ff). In particular, it frequently indicates the construct state, and will be discussed later (2.9) in connection with the hypothesis. To avoid confusion, therefore, with this highly significant diacritic, I have indicated morpheme-boundary with
a single hyphen (-) to distinguish it from *maqqēf*, which is transliterated as a double hyphen (dash); this is the more necessary as lexemes connected by *maqqēf* are, for the reason indicated above, treated less as individual units and therefore not separated by five spaces between them as are lexemes between which no such state of close syntactic liaison obtains. For purposes of heuristic clarity, I have occasionally used *maqqēf* to mark the construct state even when it does not appear in the Masoretic text, which is somewhat inconsistent in this regard (v. fn 18 (Ch. 1)).

19. Cf Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910:247, Even-Shoshan 1977:1575 for a full account of the vowel changes taking place in nouns in the construct state. The construct form with full NP as genitive attribute is not always the same as the form with genitive pronominal suffixes, although the form would be the same in either case for the above scenario; this will be indicated where relevant. Even-Shoshan, in fact (1977:1575) describes the declension or form (*nītiya*) of the CI as *kašem bīkinuyim* 'like a noun with (genitive) pronominal suffixes'; the alternative derivation works as well or better with genitive suffix pronoun rather than full NP as nomen rectum.

20. In this particular instance, and in general for 'place of-' constructions, the construct state is not marked with *maqqēf* (v. fn 17 (Ch. 1)), perhaps because such constructions were so common as not to require marking.
21. Actually, retention of the original *i (< *a), elsewhere further reduced to schwa mobile (i) (v. fn 14 (Ch. 1), as in the derived patterns nifcal (passive), piCCe (transitive intensive-factitive), hifcil (causative), and hitpaCCe (intensive reflexive), the dative + CI forms of which are respectively lihippaCCe, lifaCCe, lihafcil, and lihitpaCCe (to be discussed in detail in 3.2.1).

22. As the transliteration indicates, the accusative marker ?et does indeed stand in construct—or once did stand in construct; there are indications that a reanalysis has taken place, v. 2.6—to the direct object to which it is cliticized and is consequently reduced from ?et to construct-state ?et and marked with maqaf. The implications of this most significant fact for the hypothesis will be discussed in 2.6.

23. No claim is being made that prefixation of the dative marker is necessarily antecedent to vowel-reduction; stage 1) merely serves the heuristic purpose of showing all structures involved in the change, including li-, at the earliest possible stage, i.e., before vowel-reduction. Actually, construct-state vowel-reduction could easily have occurred before prefixation of li--; there is no necessary causal-temporal relationship.

24. While no order was implied for stages 1) and 2) with respect to each other, stage 3) must follow 1) and 2) in order that both the prefix be present and the second vowel be schwa, to satisfy the conditions for the dissimilation process.
25. 'Gains the function of' would perhaps be more accurate, as ˀli- continues to serve as dative marker elsewhere. Nevertheless, reanalysis has clearly taken place in this syntactic context, as shown by the increasing merger of ˀli- with the CI stem (v. 2.3).

26. Even so, text counts of the early books might well produce some confirmation of the hypothesis.

27. Note that Bauer-Leander's (1922:317) objection to the term 'construct infinitive' is based upon the fact that the CI may occur in the absolute state. This objection holds only if the term is interpreted strictly as synchronic/descriptive rather than diachronic; its use is perfectly legitimate with the understanding that it describes an earlier state of affairs which no longer holds.

28. For the edification of the reader, I have occasionally placed a morpheme-boundary (hyphen) between a derivational morpheme and a lexical stem, as here with the causative prefix hā- (the normally short vowel is lengthened to compensate for the absent weak second radical), and elsewhere with the reflexive prefix hit-; it should be kept in mind that the degree of phonological-morphological (and even semantic) fusion between these derivational prefixes and stems in the verb-conjugations is greater than between most inflectional and even derivational morphemes and their stems in Hebrew. The same caveat regarding the hyphen applies to the dative marker ˀli- + CI stem syntagma, to be discussed in detail in 2.3. Compare also the data on
Jewish Neo-Aramaic fusion of oblique prefix + infinitive (2.2.4).

29. v. Barth (1913) with respect to the relative antiquity of the pronominal system.

30. Interesting, the same holds for BA (v. Rosenthal 1961:54):

\[ \text{li}-\text{hō-}dā\text{c-}∪t\text{-anī} \]
\[ \text{to-CAUS-know-DVN (f)-me (acc)} \]

31. Pace Lambert (1946:267, Sec. 753)'l'Infinitif Second [C.I.]
est formé du même thème que le futur [imperfect] et l'imperatif', unless this is taken merely as a synchronic statement. If the latter, it would in fact accord well with the hypothesis of reanalysis developed in 3.2.

32. These somewhat peripheral aspects of the hypothesis will be discussed in 3.3.
CHAPTER 2. EVIDENCE FOR THE HYPOTHESIS WITHIN
(BIBLICAL) HEBREW AND COMPARATIVE SEMITIC

2.1 Introduction to Chapter 2
Despite the necessarily speculative nature of syntactic reconstruc-
tion, evidence is not lacking for the existence of the structures
posited in the hypothetical early stages of Figure 2 and for the
hypothesis of syntactic change through reanalysis presented above,
which may be designated MONOGENETIC in that it posits a single source
for both infinitives, in contrast to the standard derivation (cf
1.7.2). Such evidence can be found both in general cross-linguistic
historical tendencies and specifically within Comparative Semitic and
(B)H itself. The latter constitute intrasystemic parallels, i.e.,
developments parallel to the alternative derivation of the BH CI
within other areas of the BH/Semitic verbal and other systems. In
this chapter we shall first see if the uses of the reflexes of
*faCaal in other Semitic languages support the alternative hypothe-
sis (2.2), and then examine the evidence internal to BH (2.3-
2.11). Non-Semiticists interested in the cross-linguistic analogues
of the syntactic reanalysis assumed for the hypothesis may proceed
directly to Ch. 5 with no loss of continuity.

2.2 *faCaal- With Dependent Infinitive Function in Other
Semitic Languages
To begin with, it would certainly corroborate the monogenetic hypothesis
if *faCaal- were found in other Semitic languages with dependent infinitive function, constituting documentation of Stage 1, the oldest stage
in the alternative derivation. This indeed seems to be the case. The faCaal deverbal noun/infinitive formation and cognate variants can be found in structures like those posited in Figure 2 or, more generally, with the same syntactic distribution as the BH construct infinitive or any other indices of verbalization (more on this latter aspect in 6.1), in Akkadian, Aramaic, Arabic, Ugaritic and Phonecian/Punic (the latter to be discussed within the broader context of 5.1 and 6.1 (fn 7)).

2.2.1 Classical Arabic

In Classical Arabic (henceforth CA), the faCaalUn form is classified by the traditional grammarians as one of the ?asmaaUn -1fíCí1 (nominative actionis/verbi), also called masdarUn 'source, point of origin' (v. 1.5.1). Although their substantival character is still very much evident in that they are declined with the i'raab (case-endings) and take the indefinite enclitic -n (nunation), these forms, faCaalUn as well as the others, are not infrequently referred to as 'infinitives' in the philological and linguistic literature (cf Wright 1977: vol. i:52B, 109A, 110A ff., vol. ii:53C, and Gordon 1965:79, Sec. 9.25).

faCaalUn, in particular, is often used for abstract concepts (salaamUn 'soundness, peace, safety', samaaCun 'hearing, listening'), and, interestingly, is also the regular masdar of motion verbs such as dhaaab 'going out' = dhabba. The feminine form of faCaalUn, faCaalaUn (jazaalaUn 'abundance', nazaafaUn 'cleanliness'), along with fuCuulaUn, frequently corresponds to stative-intransitive
verbs with Proto-Semitic stative-intransitive thematic vowel u
(fa\textsuperscript{\text{C}}\text{ula}, as jazula, nazufa respectively — v. Wright 1977: vol. i: 113A). fa\textsuperscript{\text{C}}\text{ala}\textsuperscript{\text{t}}\text{un} occurs in CA with even greater frequency than
fa\textsuperscript{\text{C}}\text{al}\text{un} itself (Sola-Sole 1961:14), being one of the five most com-
mon deverbal noun formations for the Arabic simple pattern (Wright 1977: vol. i 112D). Note the Biblical Aramaic adoption of the same
etypon as derived infinitive stem, paralleling the alternative deri-
vation (2.2.4), this fecundity of fa\textsuperscript{\text{C}}\text{ala}^{t-}, then, appears to be
traceable back to an older stage of Semitic.

Most significant for the alternative derivation, however, is the
corroborating provided by adverbial accusative purpose-clauses with
action nouns and active participles in Classical and Modern Literary
Arabic, occurring as they do most commonly AFTER MATRIX VERBS OF
MOTION ('come', 'go', 'arise'— cf 1.6.3-4, 2.4); as Callender
(1975:8 — cf also 5.2, Sec. e of this work) puts it, 'the use of
a verbal noun in the accusative is no doubt an extension of the use
of the accusative to designate the goal [my italics] of the motion,
which would normally be a place', as in ?a-guum-u la-hu
I-rise-INDIC to-him

\begin{align*}
\text{ta}^{\text{C}}\text{ziim-an li- ?ustaad-ii} & \quad 'I stand up to honor my pro-
\text{honǝr(VN)-ACC} \quad \text{to-professor-my}
\end{align*}

essor' (from Wright 1977: vol. ii:62B, who refers to the prefix-
preposition li + pronominal suffix as expressing 'the direction of
the action towards the object' (Fox: 'toward the honoring ...',
which is extended into a sense of purpose-intent, as Callender
(1975:8): 'in order that I might honor...'). The parallel with
the alternative derivation is, needless to say, striking (cf 2.2.1). CA thus provides us with valuable overt morphological corroboration for the alternative derivation which is lacking in BH itself, as the latter has lost the common Semitic/Afroasiatic case-endings almost entirely. 2

2.2.2 Akkadian. The Akkadian fa\textsuperscript{c}a\textsubscript{a}l\textsuperscript{(u)} form, cognate to the AI, like other Akkadian infinitive forms, is still a nominal form which may enter the construct state (Buccellati 1972b:16). It is nevertheless definitely an infinitive in sensu strictu in that it takes accusative suffix pronouns, a verbal morphosyntactic characteristic (Buccellati 1972b:16, and cf 6.1, on the infinitive in general as an intermediate nominal/verbal form), and shows other signs that infinitivalization/verbalization is taking place: in non-finite relative clauses it may follow the relative-determinative pronoun ya, not just fully canonical NPs in the construct state (interestingly it retains the nominal characteristic of inflection in the genitive in either instance, Buccellati 1972a:2), and, further, takes the verbal negative particle lā in such dependent clauses, viz,

\[ \text{Nīnūma ul ụša arād-i} \]
\[ \text{We not REL descend-GEN} \]

'We are not those who may descend, lit., we are not those of descent/descending'

\[ \text{ụšar lā amār-i} \]
\[ \text{Place not see-GEN} \]

'A place one (can)not (normally) see, lit., (a) place of no seeing' (Buccellati 1972a:11),
erset lā tār-i
Land not return-GEN

'The land of no returning' (Aro 1961: Sec. 2.35: p.41, apud Buccellati 1972a:2).

2.2.3 Ugaritic. Segert (1979:5.11-5.12) refers to the AI and CI in Ugaritic as two 'types' of the same 'substantive' verbal noun or infinitive, which turn of phrase cannot, of course, be taken as conclusive in view of the recondite nature of the data, but is still perhaps indicative when coming from one of Segert's linguistic perspicacity and experience with the Ugaritic corpus (I am indebted to him for guiding me to the sources and forms cited in this section). In fact, other than an uncritical acceptance of the conventional explanation of the BH situation (standard derivation of BH AI and CI, i.4) as model, there does not seem to be any motivation whatsoever for considering the Ugaritic AI and CI to be two different etyma; on the contrary, there is every indication that they are simply two different functions of the same substantival infinitive form, as we shall see shortly. The AI (form fa'āal(u)/fu(c)aal(u)) occurs with the same emphatic adverbial function as in BH (v. 5.1, Gordon 1965:79: Sec. 9.27, and below). The CI occurs with prefix-preposition b(a)-'in' (and, occasionally, genitive suffix pronouns) in temporal/circumstantial clauses, as

\[
\begin{align*}
b-n & \quad 5-i^4 \quad c \quad n-h^5 \\
\text{in-lift-GEN eye-her} \\
'& \text{Upon lifting her eyes [she saw]} \end{align*}
\]
b-b k k r t b-d m c n c m n
in weeping of Keret in crying of Nacaman

(...) 'As Keret wept, as Nacaman...shed tears' (Krt: 60-61 — both citations in Gordon 1965:79: Sec. 9.26), and with prefix-preposition 1- 'to' to express purpose, as
n p y-h 1-l h m t-p t h b r l t-h 1-t r m
desire-his to-eat she-open appetite-his to-dine

His desire she opens to eat; his appetite, to dine'
(127:11-12, in Gordon 1965:79: Sec. 9.26). As noted for the BH CI (2.3, 2.11), both syntactic environments are, of course, nominal.

Of key importance to us is 14 [KRT]. 1.38 (v. Whitaker 1972:582: s.v. ū śal) b-s a l k r t '[and he approached] when Keret asked':
in-ask Keret

here the medial radical aleph strongly suggests a vocalization *ŷaʔa₁(u) for the CI, with etymological long vowel like the AI, rather than the conventionally-accepted minimal stem *ŷ(i)ʔ(ī)₁ (v. 1.4, 1.7, and fn 9 (Ch. 1)), and thus jibes well with the monogenetic hypothesis. We are consequently led to question whether, for example, the consonantal skeleton b n ŷ i is not actually to be vocalized *bi-naʔaʔ-ī rather than *bi-n(ī)ŷ(i)ʔ-ī.

More generally, we may mention finite verbal use of the AI in Ugaritic (Segert 1979: Sec. 64.612, C.H. Gordon 1965:80: Sec. 9.29 and p.c. — v. also fn 5 in 6.1 of this work), like the AI in BH (6.1). Of similar significance: an enclitic -m(a) on the infinitive forms in 1 a k m l a k = *lāʔaʔ-a-k-u-m(a) ?i-lʔa-k-u send(ing)-NOM-EMPH I-send-INDIC

37
'I shall surely send', m t m a m t = *moot-u-m(m)a(a) a-muut-u dy(ing)/death-NOM-EMPH I-die-INDIC

'I shall surely die'

(1013:19-20, 2 Aqht:VI:38 respectively, in Gordon 1965:79: Sec. 9.27 — for vocalized forms, v. the vocalized cuneiform texts of Ugaritica vol. 5 (1968: items 131-8)) is probably a marker of predicative or emphatic function (v. Gordon 1965:79: Sec. 9.27, and esp. Gewirtz 1981 with regard to the latter supposition), originally the common Semitic-Afroasiatic NOMINAL marker mīmātion — compare mīmātion in the Ugaritic predicative participal ending — m ff. (s.v. Hervorhebungspartikeln) — thanks to Segert for first pointing this out to me).

2.2.4 Aramaic. Aramaic, Biblical through Modern, provides confirmation for the alternative derivation in several ways. The ground-form or simple pattern pā'cal (equivalent to Hebrew qal, lit. 'light', i.e., simple, pattern pā'cal) shows a dependent infinitive (functional analogue of the BH CI) with an adaption of the CS deverbal noun prefix m- (e.g., miktab7 'write' < √ktb), clearly a secondary form (Rosenthal 1961:45), which takes genitive/accusative suffixes (as lī-mēzy-ēn to-heat-it (gen/acc) 'to heat it' Dan 3:19; this would indicate that the ancient form it replaced was felt by speakers to be nominal9. Precisely the same argument holds with regard to the Aramaized LBH construct infinitives in Ez 17:9 lī-maštā'otāh to lift ACC-her 'to lift her', Nu 10:2
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li-migra\textsuperscript{c} ha\textsuperscript{-}c\textsubscript{ed}\textsuperscript{a} u-li-massa\textsuperscript{c} 11 'et-ha-m\textsubscript{mah}\textsubscript{an}\textsuperscript{-}ot
to call the-congregation and-to-set forward ACC-the-
camp-pl(f) 'to call the congregation and to cause the camps to set forward'

(Brown, Driver and Briggs 1979:85, Jouon 1923:111 the latter pointing out that all other uses of migra\textsuperscript{c} are substantival: 'calling, convocation'), Nu 4:24 li-mass\textsubscript{a}\textsuperscript{l2} to-bear 'to bear (burdens)', a.o.

Still another example of this is found in the late liturgical Hebrew li-madd\textsuperscript{a} t\textcircled{\text{orat-ek}\textsubscript{a}} to-know(ledge) Torah (instruction)-thy (m s) 'to know thy Torah'. A BA infinitive form is even attested with the nominal feature of suffixed definite determiner (Rosenthal 1961:51):

Ezra 5:9
\[\text{man-}\tilde{\text{s}}\text{am li-k\text{o}m t\text{em bayit-\text{a} din\text{a}}}\]
who- put to- you (m pl) 'decree house-DET this

li-mibniy\textsubscript{-}a...
to-build-DET...

'Who gave you a decree to build this house?', lit. '... to the building'.

Here the whole form is in verbal regimen, as evidenced by the fronting of the DO and the attenuated goal-purpose semantics of the complement (physical goal interpretation not possible); this is intriguing in view of the decidedly nominal nature of the infinitive formation (v. 2.4 on 'swing-points').

A relic of the ancient dependent infinitive or CI-form (BA has no analogue of the AI) without the preformative m- is preserved in li-bn\textsubscript{e}, li-bin\textsubscript{e} to-build 'to build' (Ezra 5:3, 13; cf fn 21(Ch. 2)
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as regards such variation in vocalization/syllabification for the BH CI. Rosenthal (1961:51) actually proposes that this form derives from *binaa, a form that looks like faCaal with the first vowel reduced (presumably through stress-reduction, v. fn 6 (Ch. 2)). Although he does not justify this etymology, the implication is perhaps that the attested -ē vocalism results from assimilation in form (i.e., analogy) to the imperfect yibnē (*yibnay) (v. 3.2, where evidence will be presented that the Biblical Hebrew CI has been restructured on analogy to the imperfect). Similarly, the Syriac m-infinitives for all patterns (the m-prefix having spread from the simple pattern throughout the derived patterns, v. infra, p. 2-11) HAVE ADOPTED THE PREFIX-VOWEL OF THE CORRESPONDING (UNAFFIXED) IMPERFECT FORMS (v. Segert 1980:5:47). If he is correct, this would of course constitute strong comparative support for a hypothesis deriving the BH CI, as well, from *faCaal- (the alternative derivation).

In the derived conjugations, -faCaalā (v. transliteration tables, n. 4), the feminine form of *faCaal- found in BH and BA (Barth 1894:87, apud Gesenius 1910:230), hence also a solidly nominal (deverbal noun) form, HAS BEEN ADOPTED AS INFINITIVE STEM, (with the derived verbal prefixes: factitive-intensive, causative, reflexive, etc) as also the feminine causative deverbal noun forms hafCaalā and yafCaalā (v. Rosenthal 1961:45, Bauer-Leander 1962:109, 127). The implications for the hypothesis of these developments, which constitute a near-parallel to the alternative derivation for BH, are clear. Perhaps even more significantly, the feminine construct-state ending -at (v. 14) is actually attested twice (Rosenthal 1961:45), which lends some
support to the analysis that will be suggested in 3.4 with regard to
the genesis of the non-etymological final h/t radical in BH final
weak verbs, the so-called lamed-he (l'h or IIIh)\textsuperscript{15} where a glide was
the original final root-consonant (IIIw/y): namely, that the ana-
logical change involved was inspired by feminine nouns in the con-
struct state. Concomitantly, this will be taken as evidence that
the $\text{f}â\text{C}ô$ infinitive originally stood in construct to its semantic
patient or direct object (v. 1.6, 3.4).

More generally, the very fact that such solid morphological evidence
exists for the BA derived infinitive, etymologically cognate to the
BH AI $\text{fa}â\text{C}ô$ ($\leq^2\text{fa}â\text{aal}$), occurring as DEPENDENT INFINITIVE in the
CONSTRUCT STATE, requires little elaboration as far as its signi-
ficance to the hypothesis is concerned; these forms may be regarded
as indirect (coming from a closely related language) evidence for
the 'swing-point' (v. 2.4) of the reanalysis in BH, forms mani-
festing both the archaic, NOMINAL feature of the erstwhile deverbal
noun in CONSTRUCT, and the innovative VERBAL syntactic function of
dependent infinitive (more on this in 2.4). One of the two, Ezra
4:22 $\text{li-ha-nzâq-at malk-în}$ to CAUS-harm-DVN (f) king-pl 'to the hurt
of kings', is most instructive: note that the genitive modifier
malkîn 'kings' is the semantic patient, as in Fig. 2 (the alternative
derivation), and the sense of the clause is RESULTATIVE
(\textasciitilde purposive).

The more widespread and productive infinitive form for the derived
conjugations in BA is the feminine abstract/deverbal noun construct
suffix $\text{-ût}$ (cf Solà-Solé 1961:130, Rosenthal 1961:45), which has
evidently taken over from the earlier -at. This form occurs only in
construct to a following noun or pronominal suffix; elsewhere, the
apparent back-formation -û appears16. As earlier for -at, this will
be discussed in 3.4 as evidence for the lâmed-hê reanalysis mentioned
above, and consequently for the alternative derivation. Again, the
verbalization of this clearly nominal form into an infinitive proper
constitutes a strong argument in favor of a similar etymology for the
BH CI, as per our hypothesis. An especially nice illustration of
this is Ezra 5:10 lî-hô-dašt-ût-âk17, to-CAUS-know-DVN(f)-thee(ms)
'(in order) to notify thee, (for the purpose of) notifying thee',
with this decidedly nominal form used as DEPENDENT INFINITIVE fol-
lowed by DO (semantic patient) in the form of genitive/accusative
suffix pronoun (cf first paragraph, and 1.6.8-9)!

Similar developments in Syriac: the m- infinitive formation mejCêl
(< BA mifCêl, above) has been adopted into the verba! paradigm; the
originally nominal prefix m- has now spread to the derived patterns

The extant dialects of Eastern (Kurdistani) Neo-Aramaic (also called
Modern Syriac for the Christian dialects, cf Hetzron 1969:112; most
of the following data are from Sabar 1976:XXVI-XXVII, XXXVI,
XXXVIII, XXXIX-XLI) maintain the form f(i)Caala, as ʒ(i)lâma 'peace,
well-being' (cognate to BH šâlôm id., v. Ch. 2), p(i)lâtâ 'go out'.
In the Christian dialect of Urmî (in Azerbaijan, Iran: Hetzron
1969:117-119, 127), f(i)Caala is a (de)verbal noun, a nomen agentis
with no apparent verbal function, takes the feminine ending -ta
(feminine -₅ + demonstrative/determiner -ₐ, v. fn 14, (Ch. 2); also 3.4 for a discussion of Common Semitic feminine -₅, Rosenthal 1961:23, Bauer-Leander 1962:306-9 on Aramaic demonstrative/determiner -ₐ), and shows an apparent further degree of stress-reduction (v. fn 6 (Ch. 2)), the long vowel in the second syllable becoming short ₑ before the consonant-cluster formed by the final root-consonant of the verb and feminine -₅: f(a)₅alta, as in tpaqta 'visit', żarabta 'try'.

In the Jewish dialect of Zakho (Iraqi NA), however, the f(i)₅aala form manifests movement toward the verbal pole (cf 1.6.10, Ch. 6), serving VERBAL/INFINITIVAL, rather than deverbal noun, function in compound tenses. The 'concrete imperfect' (past progressive) consists of 'gerund' (infinitive) + past copula (often omitted in narrative), as

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{u-ʔahnum} & \quad \text{bīzāla} \\
\text{and-they} & \quad \text{(in) go (ing)}
\end{align*}
\]

'and they (were) going', bīzāla 'go' < oblique prefix bī (same as Hebrew, v. 2.3.1) + *?iẓāla 'go' (\sqrt[i]{zī}). The inchoative aspect consists of auxiliary verb \sqrt[v]{pyṣ} 'be, become, continue' for past, the copula for present/imperfect, + infinitive, as

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{plṣ-1e} & \quad \text{bī-mḥasōre} \quad \text{u-bl-bxāya} \\
\text{began-he} & \quad \text{in-sigh (ing) and-in-weep (ing)}
\end{align*}
\]

'He began sighing and weeping',

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ʔawd-1le} & \quad \text{bātāya} \\
\text{one-which/who} & \quad \text{(in) come (ing)}
\end{align*}
\]

'The one which is/has been coming', bātāya 'come' < oblique prefix bī + *?iṭāya 'come' (\sqrt[i]{ṭī}).
A considerable degree of fusion can be seen to have taken place between the oblique prefix and the verb-stem in the case of initial weak verbs (y-/ʔ-), which apparently can no longer occur as bare stem without bI- (cf Sabar 1976:131-132). The parallel with fusion of dative prefix lî- and CI stem during the course of verbalization is striking (v. 2.3). We have here, then, a strong parallel between the development of infinitive/verbal function in f(4)cāala, feminine of fa(c)al-, in both Biblical and Neo-Aramaic, and of the CI in BH. The occurrence of the etymon of the AI in two different stages of a Central Semitic language closely related to BH, in the same syntactic environments (and, in NA, undergoing the same phonological fusion process) as the BH CI, strongly suggests an etymological kinship between AI and CI (the alternative derivation). As in our original development of the hypothesis (1.6, 1.7.2), parallelism of FUNCTION compels the supposition of common origin when the FORMS themselves may plausibly be related through regular and independently-motivated phonological processes, as in Fig. 2.

In sum, then, Aramaic (Biblical through Modern!), can be seen to support the alternative derivation.

2.3 Dative lî-: From Directionality Through Purpose-Intent to Infinitive-Marker

2.3.1 With respect to internal reconstruction, perhaps the strongest argument for the alternative derivation as diagrammed in Figure 2 is as follows: lî-, the dative prefix, is by far the most common preposition to be found with the CI (cf 1.6.3), and the canonical use
of the CI is as dependent infinitive with li-. Gesenius-Kautzsch (1910:348) states that 'By far the most frequent [use] is the connexion of the infinitive construct with li-', and Jouon (1923:362) 'C'est avec la préposition li- que l'infinitif construit est surtout employé.' Not even the oblique (locative-instrumental) prefix-preposition bi- 'in/at, with', occurring with the CI in temporal/circumstantial clauses (2.11), approaches the dative li- in frequency of occurrence with the CI — to the extent that by LBH/MH it not only drives out the other prefixes (v. Ch. 4 and Segal 1980: 165-6), but becomes inseparably fused with the CI as a single grammatical form; the latter can no longer even be used as bare stem without prefix (v. Ch. 4, Segal 1980:98, 103). This is indicated quite clearly by the dages gâl or 'light dagesh (lit. 'stress')' in the first root-consonant of CIs with li- when that consonant is a plain obstruent (Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910:348, fn1): this indicates that in liktôb 'to write', as contrasted with bikítôb 'in writing', kikítôb 'as/when writing', etc, the first syllable is closed, i.e., resyllabification has taken place from the bare CI kitôb, and the infinitive prefix li-+ the first root-consonant of the CI stem (liC-) now comprise a single prosodic unit for the purpose of syllabification. With the other two prefix-prepositions, the original syllable structure of the CI is retained, indicating a lesser degree of morphological fusion with the stem. As Jouon (1923:111-112)
puts it, 'Avec li-, qui est beaucoup plus fréquent devant l'infinitif que bi-, ki-,...la forme aura été sentie comme formant une unité plus étroite.' Compare also lis-pör 'to count' (the hyphen here signifies syllable, rather than morpheme, boundary) as against mi-siför 'from counting' (cf Jouon 1965:113, Halkin 1970:242), and lin-pöl 'to fall' (Ps 118:13) as against bi-niföl 'in falling' (Job 4:13), ki-niföl 'as/when falling' (II Sam 3:34) (Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910:124). Jouon notes (1923:112, fn 2) that, by contrast, the first root-consonant of a substantive in the construct state following li- is always râfe (without dagesh), as bidâbar-, kidâbar-, lidâbar-, 'with, as, to the word of-'.

2.3.2 Also demonstrating this fusion of dative marker and CI stem is BH lexmör 'to say', rather than the expected *le̥xemör (and actually occurring be̥xemör 'in saying', ḫemör 'say') showing monophthongization (presumably preceded by elision of the glottal stop, v. fn 24 (Ch. 2); Jouon (1923:66) refers to this as 'contraction'), a clear phonetic indication of the morphological fusion that has taken place as dative marker develops into infinitive marker. Concomitant with this, of course, is the greater frequency of this form; contrast, for example, the less common lexêkôl 'to eat' Jouon 1923:112, fn 1, 274). Subsequently, in MH, the infinitive is remodeled on analogy to the imperfect (v. 3.2, Ch. 4 for other implications of this fact); the resulting irregular form, łômâr, (cf imperfect yômâr 'he says/will say') long áo (written with mater lectionis wāw) due to the elided glottal stop (cf fn 24 (Ch. 2) and above
2.3.2) is even more clearly a single verbal form that must be lexically specified, the degree of apparent morphological fusion of prefix + stem being roughly comparable to the fusion of stem + suffix in English depth (Sapir 1949:129-130 uses the term 'coalescence').

It is noteworthy that even among the segolate verbs, where the archaic form of the dative marker lā- (cf 2.3.11, 3.2; the lengthening is secondary) is simply prefixed to the segolate deverbal noun stem with no change in vocalization of the prefix, there is evidence of fusion of the lā-CI syntagm into a single grammatical form, viz. the simplification/reduction of the stem ṣāt 'lift, carry', as in Ex 27:7 biṣṣāt 'in carrying', Ex 10:16, 20:31 ūbiṣṣāt 'and in carrying' with the oblique prefix-preposition bi-, into (lā)sēt 'to carry' (Gen 36:7 +) with the dative marker.

2.3.3 What is the reason for this overwhelming preponderance of the dative marker lā- as against the other prefix-prepositions bi- 'in/at, with', kā- 'like, as, when', and nič25, or even the bare CI stem itself for that matter? Why is it that, correspondingly, the CI with dative prefix (as opposed to the other prefixes) seems to occur far less often in construct to a following NP or 'conjugated', that is, in construct to a suffix pronoun, subject or object? Aside from a small number of citations repeated throughout the standard grammars of BH, such as the well known lā-Cōbītānāh ā-lā-sōmīrāh to-work-her and-to-guard-her 'to cultivate her and to guard her' (Gen 2:15), lā- + construct state/conjugated CI seems to be quite rare.
2.3.4 I submit that this 'panchronic' (both synchronic, for BH, and diachronic up through modern IH) predominance of the dative prefix-preposition is no coincidence: it may be explained by the alternative derivation modelled diagramatically in Figure 2, in which the CI is hypothesized to derive not from a proto-verb form (cf 1.1-2) but from a reduced form of the AI, a deverbal noun approached by the subject-agent as a goal or target in the physical/spatial sense. This 'goal' hypothesis constitutes the most natural explanation for the dative marker + CI syntagm \( \text{li-f}^\text{C} \text{d} \) (the existence and predominance of which, conversely, confirm the hypothesis): that it arose out of the dynamics of a syntactic structure like Stage 1 of Figure 2.

2.3.5 Gesenius-Kautzsch (1910:348) seems to confirm this (although he does not acknowledge the common origin of AI and CI) in stating 'starting from the fundamental meaning of \( \text{li-} \), i.e., direction towards something (his italics), infinitives with \( \text{li-} \) serve to express the most varied ideas of purpose or aim... the original meaning of the \( \text{li-} \) is most plainly seen in those infinitives with \( \text{li-} \) which expressly state a purpose...' Later he uses the expression 'aiming at a definite purpose or turning towards an object.' The citation which follows this statement is in fact a beautiful example not merely of a purpose clause, as the statement would indicate, but of precisely that physical/directional goal sense/interpretation that I have proposed: Gen 11:5... and the Lord came down \( \text{li-r}^\text{C} \text{g} \text{t} \text{et-}\text{h}^\text{C} \text{a} \text{r} \) to-see ACC-the-city 'to see the city',
i.e., the Lord descended toward the goal/end/aim/purpose of (the) seeing of the city. Similarly, Jouon (1923:362) states that "li-
s'emploie avec une valeur forte pour la direction, le but, la
finalité d'une action..." Again, one of the examples given lends itself strongly to the allative physical-goal interpretation: Gen 42:9, in which Joseph accuses his brothers of ulterior motives in their journey to Egypt:

\[ li-r{\hat {\circ }}t \quad ?et-\text{erwat} \quad h\ddot {a}?-\text{ares} \quad b\ddot {a}?-\text{teml}! \]
\[ \text{to-see} \quad \text{ACC- nakedness (of) the- land came-you (m pl)!} \]

'To see the nakedness of the land are ye come (i.e., to spy)!

Further citations which manifest this physical goal/allative sense of main verb + \( li- \) + CI will be adumbrated in 2.4.

2.3.6 The increasing detachment of the CI with dative prefix \( li- \) from construct-state syntactic environments is a sign of its steady evolution from a nominal form into a quasi-verbal form (cf Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910:348, fn 1: "The close union of the \( li- \) with the first consonant of the infinitive...seems to point to the formation of a special new verbal form." The failure of the CI syntagma with \( li- \) to appear in the construct state or conjugated with suffix pronouns (significantly, when it does, the pronoun is usually accusative rather than genitive, a further indication of verbalization - cf. 1.6.8, 2.5, and 4.1.1) constitutes a significant index of its decanonization and dereferentialization (cf 1.6.10, 4.1, 6.1, and Hopper and Thompson 1984), the loss of a canonical nominal characteristic. Throughout the OT, even in the earliest books (Genesis, Joshua,
Judges, Kings II)\textsuperscript{27}, the CI may be found in syntactic contexts where both a) it is in the absolute state, and b) although it is still formally analyzable as the object of prefix-preposition \textit{li}-, the semantics of physical/directional goal is no longer a possible interpretation, having attenuated to a more abstract or metaphorical sense of PURPOSE.\textsuperscript{28,29} One example is the very common formulaic idiomatic 'And the Lord spoke unto X, \textit{lē-?mōr}: 'saying':\textsuperscript{30}. Actually, the to-say:

English absolute clause with participle, 'saying', is not of comparable syntactic function; the BH syntagma can still be interpreted as 'to (the end/purpose of) the saying (of X).' It is clear, however, from the disjunctive (dividing) accents\textsuperscript{31} carried by \textit{lēʔmōr}:\textsuperscript{32}, that even in these early books it has become detached from the construct state, and is no longer felt to stand in construct to the quoted material directly following it in the next passage; if it were, CONJUNCTIVE (connecting), rather than disjunctive, accents would presumably be used (a number of the former, like \textit{maqqēf}, serving to indicate the construct state and other types of close syntactic liaison between words, as, for example, between a preposition and its object, relative pronoun and verb, verb and accusative marker \textit{?et} or an adverbial, two conjoined NPs (v. fn 32 (Ch. 2)). Concomitantly, of course, the physical/directional goal interpretation of the syntagma is no longer a possibility. Further examples of this kind of development from directional to purpose sense in dependent infinitives will be provided in 2.4.
2.3.7 It seems clear that any attempt to account for the origin of the C! that fails to posit the existence, at some early stage in pre-
BH (cf 1.6), of a syntactic structure something like Stage 1 of Fig-
ure 2 will be at a loss to explain why l!-, and not some other pre-
position, was selected as the most common, and later grammaticalized
as the only, prefix-preposition allowed with the C!, as has been
thoroughly demonstrated above. And, most important, implicit in the
acceptance of this derivation of the l!-CI syntagma is the assumption
that l!- must be followed by a substantive, a deverbal noun
(fa\textsuperscript{Caal(i)})\!, and not a verbal form as claimed in the standard deri-
vation, all four prefix-prepositions may in fact be considered
nominal case-marking.

2.3.8 We have been referring (above, and in 1.6.3) to l!- as a
'dative-goal/purpose marker', and the proposed syntactic reanalysis
of 1.6 hinges upon this dual (but manifestly related) semantic
function of l!-. Fortunately for the hypothesis, inclusion of both
dative and purpose functions, which seem to belong to a single seman-
tic domain, in a single morpheme is not uncommon cross-linguistically
(as we shall see in Ch. 5). More specifically, this dual character
of the l!- etymon is attested throughout Semitic.

2.3.9 Especially common in Classical Arabic (v. Wright 1977: v.I:
291C, Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910:349, fn I) are \textsuperscript{Lam}\textsuperscript{Ain}\textsuperscript{Amr} 'the li- of command (imperative)' and \textsuperscript{Allam}\textsuperscript{Ha}\textsuperscript{NaSibatu}, 'the li- governing the subjunctive', with the
consequent meaning '(in order) that, would that, so that', which
may be used \textsuperscript{Liil}\textsuperscript{Lam} as purpose-marker, and \textsuperscript{Lam}\textsuperscript{Lam}
lām<sup>U</sup> - ltaʔkīdī 'asseverative-jussive lām, as in falyaktub, 'May he write!' and lītataqaddī ismuka 'May thy name be sanctified!', lītakun masiʔatuka 'Thy will be done!'. Subjunctive lī- is associated by Wright and the Arab grammarians (Wright 1977: v. I:291C) with the dative preposition (lī-), hence taken by them always to stand for the fuller likay 'so that' or līʔan id. With these last two Classical Arabic subordinators, the dative-purpose character of the lī- is quite clear, something like likay/līʔan 'to so-that'.

2.3.10 In the other Semitic languages, compare Eastern Aramaic. (Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic, Syriac) jussive-emphatic use of lī-, attested as early as Biblical Aramaic: lehewe(ʔ) to-be 'Let it be, may it be!' (Rosenthal 1961:54), at first restricted to the verb-root hwy 'be', later spreading throughout the entire verbal system in Syriac, as in 3 ms lī-qtol to-kill 'May he kill, let him kill!' (phonetic alternant nqtol<sup>33</sup>; MH le-hewey yadu<sup>ac</sup> la-kem to-be known to-you

'May/Let it be known to you!' (probably < TA; perhaps < lī-hewey -- Robert Hetzron, p.c., and c.f. Rosenthal 1961:10); Ugaritic la jussive particle; perhaps MH (< TA) optative particle (ha/u) līwaʔa<sup>34</sup> Q/& if only

'were it so! Oh that...! If only!' (CA līw) is a blend of ha 'the, sentential interrogative' / u 'and, general sentential connective' + lī- dative marker + waʔy reduced copular element (R. Hetzron, p.c.), rather than being a secondary form of optative-counterfactual particle lūʔ (cf Even-Shoshan 1977:587, Jastrow 1903:67). One might even venture to guess that the loss, in Akkadian, of dative *lī- was
due in part to its specialization of function in the optative asseverative particle 

2.3.11 Although the standard literature does not recognize this connection with the dative marker ṭi- (BH ṭi-) assumed by Wright (1977:291C), and instead connects the above jussive-optative ṭi-elements exclusively with the Hebrew (a.o. Semitic) optative particle ṭu (above), this etymology is by no means absolutely certain (above), and even if true might be reconciled with cognacy to dative ṭi- also (again, above): ṭu itself may derive from a compound of dative prefix ṭi- + a reduced copular verbal element -u, i.e., something like to-be 'Be it (so)!', the latter to be found also in the very widespread Semitic internal passive (e.g., BH kātūb, Arabic maktuub 'written (ms PASS ptc)'), Egyptian copula ṭm, and perhaps even in the Common Semitic indicative mood-desinence -u Hetzron 1972, 1973-4, and p.c.). The same use of reconstructed Common Semitic dative particle *ṭa (< ṭi-) may lie behind the initial glide of Gurage (Ethiopic) yāsdār 'he speaks' and Amharic 1 sg jussive ṭinsār 'let me speak' (Wagner 1968:207-215, modified by Hetzron 1976b).

2.3.12 This specifically jussive-subjunctive asseverative-emphatic ṭi- may possibly occur in BH as well, particularly in the book of ṭiḥillîm (Psalms), and P. Haupt (1893, in Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910:349, fn 1) claims that a number of apparent occurrences of infinitive (= dative) marker ṭi- in the books of Proverbs and Esther may in fact be interpreted as emphatic-asseverative ṭi-. One example of the latter is the possible interpretation of Proverbs 19:8 ṭms?,
vocalized limsō? 'to find' by the Masoretes \(^{36}\), as representing an older limsā? \(<^{*} \text{li-} + \text{yimsā}? \) (imperfect) 'that he may find', with emphatic-subjunctive li-. On the other hand, one is tempted rather to interpret the entire syntagma straightforwardly as directional-purposive li- + CI + DO as genitive modifier (cf 1.6.3)\(^{37}\),

\[ \text{somēr} \quad \text{tīḇūnā} \quad \text{li-mūsō? - tōb:} \]
keeping(ptc) understanding (DVN) to-find - good:

'Who keepeth understanding to (the end of) find(ing) good'.

On the other hand, in Proverbs 2:8

\[ \text{li-nōsōr} \quad \text{hōr-ōt} \quad \text{mīspāt, wā-derek} \]
\text{to-guard} \quad \text{path-pl} \quad \text{justice, and-way}

\[ \text{hāsīd-ā-w} \quad \text{yi-smōr:} \]
rightheous-pl-his he-keeps:

'To guard the paths of justice, and the way of his godly ones he keeps'.

(??), it seems clear that the interpretation linsōr \(<^{*}\text{emphatic li-} + (\text{imperfect} \text{yinsōr} \) 'that he may guard' is strongly favored over the infinitive interpretation by the parallel imperfect yīsmōr 'he keeps' in the second colon (half-verse)\(^{38}\).

2.3.13 Significantly, this common imperative-subjunctive-jussive-asseverative-emphatic use of Semitic dative marker li- correlates with imperative use of the infinitive, to which we shall return (5.1) in the course of refuting the standard etymology connecting imperative and infinitive; the thrust of the argument is that imperative use of the dative-infinitive marker, together with other Hebrew, Semitic, and cross-linguistic imperative uses of the infinitive
bespeak a FUNCTIONAL, rather than etymological, connection between 
the two grammatical forms (5.1). In any case, a strong argument has 
been made for the alternative derivation as evidenced by the predom-
inance of the dative marker лежа with the CI (2.3.1, -3, -4, -7), its 
gradual fusion with the CI stem (2.3.1, -2, -6, -7), and the increas-
ing detachment of the entire лежа CI syntagma from the construct state 
(2.3.3, -6).

2.4 Archaisms with Matrix Verb of Directional Movement and Depen-
dent Infinitive as Physical Goal

It was mentioned earlier (2.1, 2.3.5-6) that one type of evidence for 
the alternative derivation in Fig. 2 consists of BH dependent infini-
tive constructions, presumably archaisms, in which 主 Verb + 
лежа CI manifests an ALLATIVE sense, the semantics of physical-
directional movement toward a physical/spatial goal, a place: in 
other words, actual textual occurrences of the kind of structure and 
semantics posited for Stage 3 of Fig. 2. A number of such construc-
tions have already been discussed in the above sections, as well as 
a sentence of the same type in BA (2.2.4); the reader may wish to 
reexamine them. In fact, BH citations exist for quite a range of 
structures of this type, following the diachronic progression from 
Stage 3 to 4 of the alternative derivation (Fig. 2) and beyond, to 
structures which are post-reanalysis (1.6.7-8). In what we presume 
to be the oldest cases, the CI stands in construct to its semantic 
patient/DO with no intervening accusative marker 伶 (v. 1.6.7; 
these will be discussed further in 2.6), and THE MATRIX VERB DIS-
PLAYS A STRONG ALLATIVE-DIRECTIONAL SENSE (cf 2.3.1, -5, where the
antiquity of these semantics for the li- prefix-preposition is discussed. In other constructions, some ambiguity obtains with regard to semantic interpretation; either an allative or a more abstract-metaphorical sense of purpose-intent may be read. These cases, which may or may not show the accusative marker, may be regarded as intermediate or 'swing-points' on the scale, as described in 1.6.7 (cf also 2.2.4) for Stage 4 of the derivation. Finally, there are citations in which the allative interpretation is no longer possible, the sense of the construction having attenuated to the point that it is used in contexts where only the abstract-metaphorical purposive sense can be obtained (again, cf 1.6.7). One might hope to find a correlation between stages of Biblical Hebrew, Early to Late, and progression of the semantic change allative-directional > purpose-intent, and perhaps a text-count might indeed turn up some statistical correlation. The presence, however, of accusative marker ?et, as in

\[
\text{?et-?b?r} \quad \text{to-see} \quad \text{ACC-the-city}
\]

'to see the city'

(2.3.5), is a syntactic indication that the reanalysis is quite advanced (v. 1.6.7, 2.6 on ?et) even in EBH, the oldest attested stratum, and lack of such a correlation could not be taken as decisive counterevidence.

Further examples of all three construction types (in addition to those cited in the above cross-references) are given below, together with some explanation of their relevance to the hypothesis.
1. u-mi-mahēr  hā-ʔelōhîm  l-ā-ʕasēt-ō:
   and-htc-hurry  the-God  to-the-doing (of) -his (its)

   'and God hurries to do it, hastens to the doing of it'

   Gen 41:32

This construction constitutes a crucial example (n.b. from Genesis, one of the earlier books, cf 2.3.6 and fn 33): one of the most archaic-looking that I have come across for the lā-CAI syntagma.

The infinitive marker + dependent infinitive may still be interpreted as directional preposition (cf 2.3) + physical goal/end-point of main verb, which latter is an action verb of directional movement.

Note that the semantic patient/DO is encoded syntactically as genitive suffix pronoun (cf 1.6.8, fn 9 (Ch. 1) and 2.2.4 for the more conservative nature of pronominal suffixes than full NPs, and their use in constructions of this type).

2. wā-ʔēyn  sī  ham-mi-ʔassēf-  ʔotēm
   and-not  man  the-htc-gather-ACC-them

   hab-bayt-ē  lā-ʔun:
   the-house-toward to-lodge:

   'and there was no man to gather them into his house (lit.
   who gathers them) to lodge.'

   Ju 19:15

Here again, the shift from directional preposition + physical goal to infinitive marker + infinitive, i.e., extension from allative to purposive/intentional sense, is plain: 'gather them into his house to[ward] lodg[ing(s)] '->' ... to lodge'. Judges is also one of the earlier books, as supra.
Again from the book of Judges, this citation is of particular importance to the hypothesis. Promptly following a verb-phrase in which ḫanim compels a strong allative-directional interpretation, with the CI as physical goal, we are presented with a bare CI form as gerund in hamot hay-yom 'the encampment of the day'. This syntactic juxtaposition or parallelism (v. Brown, Driver and Briggs 1979:xix, and also 2.3.12, fn 38 (Ch. 2)) strongly indicates that the preceding CI with preposition ḫanim was also felt to be a substantive, which fact is of course incompatible with the standard (verbal) derivation of the CI (1.2.2, 1.4), but welcome corroboration for the alternative derivation.

Note the interesting Jewish Publication Society (JPS) (1977:629) translation of ḫanim 'toward evening'; actually, ḫanim is a synchronically unambiguous infinitive (i.e., verbal) form meaning something like 'to approach evening' (cf. the English idiom!). The judiciously-chosen JPS translation, however, seems to convey a scholarly Sprachgefühl to the effect that Semitic and BH nominal expression of many concepts that are expressed verbally in other language (families) (cf Chs. 1, 2.5, 2.9, 2.11, 5.2, Secs. d, n and 6.2), in addition to the originally directional semantics.
reconstructed for ƚî- (2.3.5), together point to an interpretation of the construction very much in line with the alternative derivation.

4. ...yaćan hit-makker-kā la-ćyāsōt ƚā-rać
...because (of) REFL-devotion-thy (ms) to-do the-evil

bi-ćeyn-ey YHWH...hit-makker la-ćyāsōt
in-eye-s (of) Yahweh...REFL-devoted(he) to-do

ƚā-rać bi-ćeyn-ey YHWH...
the-evil in-eye-s (of) Yahweh...

'...because of the giving-over of thyself to do [that which is] evil in the sight of Yahweh...[he] gave himself over to do [that which was] evil in the sight of Yahweh...'

I K 21:20, 25

Again, the physical interpretation of this is quite clear: the speaker (Elijah) claims that X (King Ahab) gave himself over to Y (the doing of evil); the CI, la-ćyāsōt ƚā-rać 'the doing of evil, to do evil', looks very nouny indeed in this syntactic context. N.b. the direct object is not preceded by accusative marker ʾêt; this usually indicates an older text (1.6.7, 2.6). Interestingly, both occurrences of the li-CI syntagma are marked with conjunctive accents linking them to the following direct object (v. 2.3.6, 2.8).

5. riṣat-raḡl-ayy-ʾīm ƚâ-ha-rać
running (of) foot-dual-pl to-CAUS-evil

'running (of feet) to do evil'

ancient prayer of uncertain provenance (v. Even-Shoshan 1977 s.v. ʾh3ʾr)

This is a beautiful example of the kind of swing or crossover construction referred to earlier, standing midway between an
interpretation involving physical movement in a given direction toward a goal and a purposive-intentional sense. This can be seen very clearly when the following two wh-word questions are posed in order to determine what kind of adverbial the li-PP constitutes:

Running where (i.e., in what direction)? To do evil. Running why (to what purpose)? To do evil.

Items 6-10 consist of other instances of li-CI which may plausibly be interpreted as physical/spatial end-points or goals: note that three of them are from EBH, the early book of Judges (v. 2.3.6, fn 33). As mentioned in fn 40, one cannot deny the possibility of a purposive-intentional reading for these sentences; what is noteworthy about them is the discernable physical/spatial/allative interpretation that lies behind the purposive.

6. way-yâ-gûm-û...li-hâ-qîm-ô min- hâ-?âres:
   and-he-arise-pl...to-CAUS-rise-him from- the-land
   'And they arose...to raise him up from the land'

   II Sam 12:17

Note, again, the presence of pronominal suffix as direct object in this highly conservative syntactic construction (cf item 1).

7. yâ-sâ-tâ li-yesaïc 43 câmm-kâ,
   went out-thou to-deliver(ance) people-thy,
   li-yesaïc ?et-mïsîhe-kâ...
   to-deliver(ance) ACC- anointed-thy...

   'Thou art come forth for (lit. to, i.e., toward) the deliverance/salvation of thy people, for the deliverance/salvation of thine anointed (one)...'

   Hb 3:13
As above (item 3), note the JPS (1977:1498) translation: 'for the delivery of thy people, --of thine anointed (one)...', as opposed to the expected 'to deliver'. This was doubtless prompted in part by the unusual segholate infinitive formation (v. 3.2.2, 3.4 on segholate verbs and various archaic/unusual infinitive formations in BH), not the regular CI /notification; that the fe'el form is being used more as infinitive than as deverbal noun (i.e., has been verbalized, Ch. 6), is nevertheless clear from both its dependent infinitive function and the following accusative marker 2et, which indicates verbal regimen (1.6.7, 2.6); furthermore, if the form were synchronically in construct to its objects it would be yesa, with e reduced (in this case, lowered and shortened) to e (cf fn 16). Again, however, as for item 3 above, the standard translation dovetails nicely with what we should like to claim is the PROTO-STRUCTURE (as in Fig. 2), that lies behind dependent infinitive use of the =CI syntagma in general and perhaps even this very sentence in particular.

8. way-yē-lēk 2ahārey-hā  li-dabber  Cal- libb-āh
   and-he-go-after-her to-speak upon-heart-her

   li-hā-šib-āh:
   to-CAUS-Return-her:

   'And he went after her to speak to her and to bring
   her back.'

   Ju 19:3

9. way-yā-qūm  lā-leket
   and-he-arise to-go-

   'And he rose to go.'

   Ju 19:5,7,8,9
10. way-ya-sur-û sâm lä-bô?
    and-he-turn aside-pl there to-come
lû-û b-â-gibâ c-û:
    to-spend the night in-the-hill:

    'And they turned aside there, to come and spend the
night in the hill.'

Ju 19:5

11. refuges shall be set up, wi-hâyâ lä-nûs
    and-was to-flee
sâmâ-kol rûseh 46
    there-DIR every-mûrderer:

    'And so shall it be, that every murderer may flee/
take refuge there', lit. 'and-ought to-flee there
every murderer', perhaps originally 'to (in the
direction of) refuge [as a physical place] there'.

Deut 19:3

In this case (n.b. from Deuteronomy, one of the later books), the
li-CI syntagma has wandered from its canonical syntactic environ-
ment: the dependent infinitive has become separated from its
(matrix) subject, which now follows it (after an intervening adver-
bial particle sâmâ '(to) there', which shows that neither is the
CI in construct to its subject). (cf Lambert 1946:267, Sec. 751).
Concomitantly, the purposive sense of li is more developed, although
the older allative-goal sense is still discernable, as glossed above.

12. wi-?îlû hâ-?êhad yûse-yi-ppol wi-?eyn
    and-even the-one that-he-fall and-not
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Šenî lî-hâ-qîm-ô
second to-CAUS-rise-him
-'And even the one that falls and there is none to
raise him up.'

Ecc 4:10

Here, again, a more attenuated, purposive sense is seen: 'no one is
available for the purpose of...etc.'

In sum, then, the syntactic-semantic development involved in the
reanalysis claimed in Fig. 2 is at least to some degree still
traceable/attestable through various stages, from EBH to LBH by
means of actual citations in the text-corpus, the latter repre-
senting a number of points in the progression of the change. The
existence of these constructions may be submitted as solid empirical
corroborations for the hypothesis in general, and in particular for
the stages in the alternative derivation schema of Fig. 2 (cf 2.1).

2.5 A Genitive-To-Nominative/Absolutive Reanalysis in
Biblical Hebrew

It will be recalled from 1.6.8 that Lambert (1946:456) claims the
CI originally to have been in construct to pronominal suffixes (sub-
ject as well as object). In addition, Lambert implicitly claims
that the dependent ('complement') subject of the CI originally stood
in a genitive relation to it when he refers to the reanalysis of
genitive agents of infinitives as equivalent to the subjects of
finite verbs. Under Sec. XCVI, 'relations du complément d'object
et du sujet avec le complément génitif [my italics]', he says: 'le
complément sujet de l'infinitif, que ce soit un nom ou un suffix,
a fini par être traité comme le sujet du verbe personnel. Par suite, d'une part, l'infinitif ne modifie pas sa forme devant un nom, p. ex. 
'ki-hānîf 'ṣēbet as-brandish staff "comme si un bâton brandissait"

Is 10:15 [v. 1.6.5, 1.6.8; were the CI in construct to its following subject 'ṣēbet 'staff', it would be reduced to hānîf; its unreduced form indicates the absolute state, which in turn indicates that the agent-noun following it is no longer felt to constitute a genitive attribute, but has been reanalyzed as some sort of chômeur-like nominative-absolutive case.—Fox]; de l'autre, l'infinitif peut-être séparé du sujet par un autre mot, p. ex.:

\[
\text{li-his- 'sāter ūšām 'pōʻāley ṣēwen to-REFL-concern there doer(ptc)-pl(of) iniquity}
\]

"pour que s'y cachent les artisans d'iniquité" Job 34:22' (cf 2.4, item 11, and Lambert 1946:267).

This genitive-to-nominative/absolutive reanalysis constitutes a parallel case to the genitive-to-accusative reanalysis of the alternative derivation (Fig. 2). My reconstruction of syntagms with semantic patient/direct object, and not subject, as primary is motivated by the development of the li- dative prefix into infinitive marker (2.3): when a (de)verbal noun is being used as dependent infinitive (hence the dative-allative goal-purpose marker, 2.3), the suffix pronoun or genitive attribute is much more likely to be object, the subject of the infinitive much more likely also to be subject of the matrix verb (cf also 2.4). For this reason the alternative derivation in Fig. 2 is formulated with (direct) object, although the CI manifestly stands in construct to subjects as well.
(cf 1.6.8). Interestingly, when the prefix is li-, the CI usually takes accusative suffix pronoun rather than genitive (in contrast to bi-, ki, cf 1.8.3), which may be taken as demonstrating a certain preference for (direct) objects over subjects (cf 4.1.1). It should also be noted that the distinction between these two grammatical roles is not always clear, and an either-or, absolute categorization is really somewhat arbitrary or artificial; compare the traditional philological question (T. Wilbur, p.c.) with regard to the ambiguity of Lat. nominalization amor dei 'love of God': underlying/ corresponding deus amat 'God loves', amatus est a deo 'was/has been loved by God', amatur a deo 'is loved by God' (infinitivus subjectivus), or amat deum '(he) loves God' (infinitivus objectivus)? Semantics, pragmatics and empirical or grammatical (discourse) context play a considerable part in interpreting the precise relationship of the genitive argument to the nominalized verb, including degree of 'agentivity' or 'patientness': as R. Kirsner (p.c.) puts it, such grammatical relations are derived through inference.

2.6 Nota Accusativi ʔēt

It was mentioned in 1.6.7 (v. also 2.9) that the presence of nota accusativi (definite accusative marker/clitic) ʔēt in constructions with CI and direct object may be taken as evidence that the reanalysis we have posited in Fig. 2 has taken place and the erstwhile genitive patient is now accusative object; clearly, a constituent cannot be bound after a clitic. This indeed seems to be the case; however, there is also an intriguing possibility that the CI originally stood in construct to the entire constituent ʔēt + NP,
something like li-rîʔōt - ?et - hā-ʔādām to- (the) seeing (of) - that (demonstrative/deictic) (of) - the-man > li-rîʔōt ?et hā-ʔādām to-see ACC the-man, i.e., that ?et originally marked nominal and not (finite) verbal constructions, only later spreading to finite verbs. There is some evidence for this: maqqēf and conjunctive accents frequently connect the CI and accusative marker, just as both diacritics connect other substantives in the construct state (v. fns 1, 13, and 4.2.3.6). The following citations exemplify this:

Ezek 17:9  
li-māssʔōt ḥēt-āh miś-sorāš-ey-hā:  
to-pluck ACC-her from-root-pl-her:  
'to pluck her up by the roots'.

Here, conjunctive accents connect the CI and nota accusativi (for further discussion of this citation, v. 2.2.4 and Ch. 3).

Gen 4:15  
li-biltī hakkōt - ?ot-ō  
to-without strike (of) - ACC-him  
kōl-mōsʔ-ō:  
every-finder (ptc)-his:  
'Lest any finding him should smite him'.

Here not only does a conjunctive accent on the accusative marker link it to the CI but, additionally, maqqēf stands between them. If true, this need not be held incompatible with the earlier observation regarding the nota accusativi. As delineated in the following paragraph (cf also fn 22 (Ch. 1)), whatever its original relationship to the CI, ?ēt has quite unambiguously been reanalyzed in BH as an accusative marker and hence an index of verbal regimen, used as or more extensively with finite verbs than with the infinitive,
even in EBH (v. 1.6.7). Even so, a text-count might be revealing here; if EBH CI + DO phrases are largely without ṭē, this would of course constitute evidence against the above suggestion. Conversely, if ṭē is comparatively rare in EBH finite verb + DO constructions (v. fn 37 (Ch. 2)), this would be evidence that its later abundance in those constructions followed a reanalysis from nominal to accusative (verbal) marker and subsequent spread from constructions with CI to those with finite verb. Any diagnostic which provides a basis for distinguishing finite verb + DO from CI + DO may be considered evidence against the standard derivation, according to which the CI is verbal in origin, akin to the imperfect and imperative (v. 1.6.9, 1.7.2), and favorable to the alternative derivation and monogenetic hypothesis. The presence or absence of the accusative marker is such a potential diagnostic, and it would be interesting to see if a text-count turned up evidence for the spread of ṭē in either direction, from non-finite to finite constructions or v.v.

Regardless of what the final verdict is on the earliest use of ṭē, it is undeniably of substantival origin, and its following direct object was originally a genitive attribute to which it stood in construct, as indicated both by the maqāf that generally stands between them and by the reductive vowel-change of ṭē to e (v. fn 22 (Ch. 1) and Brown, Driver and Briggs 1979:84-5). Indeed, this is still quite clear with the suffix pronouns (1.6.8), in combination with which the accusative marker/proclitic also takes the more clearly nominal ground-form ṭē/-ṭē, possibly cognate with ṭēt 'sign', the forms with ṭē and e being phonologically reduced (Brown, Driver and
Briggs 1979:84). Additionally, this may explain the interesting fact that only DEFINITE direct objects may be marked with the nota accusativi (cf. 1.6.7, Brown, Driver and Briggs 1979:84), which follows naturally from the fact that in Semitic, only definite nouns may act as nomen rectum (supporting noun), i.e., genitive attribute for another noun in the construct state.

This fact, taken together with the later reanalysis of ?€t as accusative (verbal) marker/proclitic, provide impressive corroboration for the monogenetic hypothesis: the grammaticalization/reanalysis of the originally nominal/substantival, perhaps demonstrative ?€t + following genitive semantic patient as accusative marker/proclitic + direct object, that is from nominal to verbal regimen, and, in addition, that of the substantive kāl 'all' + genitive as quantifier + head noun, lend strong intrasystemic support to a parallel reanalysis of deverbal noun ('AI') following genitive semantic patient as non-finite verb form (CI) + direct object, as claimed in the alternative derivation (Fig. 2). The negative existential quantifier ?eyn (< nominal *?ayn) also seems originally to have stood in construct to its subject, to which it is frequently linked by maqqēf, only later becoming reanalyzed as a grammatical functive (again, v. Ch. 6, fn 5).

2.7 The West Semitic Perfective: A Parallel Noun-To-Verb Development

There is yet another morphosyntactic change, this time in the proto-West Semitic verbal system (of which BH is a daughter language),
which constitutes a highly indicative intrasystemic parallel or analogue to the alternative derivation, hence reinforcing the plausibility of the hypothesis (cf 2.1).

In all Semitic other than East Semitic (Akkadian, which is archaic in this respect), the originally nominal PS/PAA stem *fa₃-al-(a) is adopted as the unmarked past or perfective (tensed) verbal form, as Arabic kataba, Aramaic kitab, BH kātab 'he wrote' (v. Hetzron 1976a:104-5, Moscati et al. 1969:1334: the same stem is also adopted in Ancient Egyptian (Afroasiatic), as the old perfective - v. references in Hodge 1976:58). 50, 51

Only in ES does fa₃-al- retain its nominal character, and even there it is employed with stative-permansive, i.e., quasi-verbal, function. 52

Similarly, the CS verbal noun stem *fa₃-il- is enlisted in Akkadian for the stative verbal tense (Hetzron 1969:21); this same stem is rendered verbal and appears in BH as the oft-designated 'verbal adjective (i.e., stative/change of state verb) formation fa₃-il, which takes subject-pronominal suffixes, as qādēl 'grow (larger)', qātēn 'become small(er)', mālē? '(be) full'. The same holds true for the CS verbal noun stem *fa₃-il-, verbal and adjectival formation fa₃-il in BH (qātēn '(become) small(er)', yākōl 'be able, prevail'); in fact, it can be seen that a number of lexical roots appear in both formations.
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In the innovating WS branch, the erstwhile nominal/stative stem *faC*al- develops a declension/conjugation with subject- and object-pronominal suffixes. The original sense being something like an active participle or agentive nominal predicate' writer of it (are) you' (verbal) preterite 'you wrote it', with reduction of independent subject pronoun to nominative suffix pronoun (after Barth 1894, apud Bauer-Leander 1965:317). In BH, no vowel-reduction takes place in the stem before subject-pronominal suffixes for most persons, as *kātab-ti* wrote-I 'I wrote'. The object pronominal suffixes, however, do trigger reduction of the first stem-vowel, PS a lengthened pretonically in BH, v. Fig.1) to schwa mobile (i) (v. fn 11), exactly as we have posited for the CI in the alternative derivation (Fig. 2): *kātabti* 'I wrote', but *kitabtiw* 'I wrote it/him' (v. Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910, Jouon 1923, Lambert 1946 for verb-tables with object-pronominal suffixes). Compare this with Stages 1-2 in Fig. 2.

These developments in WS and BH, one might even say this single Systemzwang of verbalization manifested variously (2.2.4, Ch. 5), and particularly the parallel reduction of initial perfective stem-vowel before object suffix-pronoun, again may be said to comprise persuasive intrasystemic evidence for the alternative derivation and monogenetic hypothesis. This cross-linguistic aspect will be discussed further in Ch. 5.

2.8 The Participle: A Structural Analog

Perhaps the closest parallel to the alternative derivation within BH itself is the evolution of the other verbal noun, the participle,
from nominal into verbal form (a detailed exposition of which may be found in Gordon 1982); briefly, we may note that the VS > SV shift in Hebrew renders the participle, originally standing after the subject as nominal predicate, susceptible to reanalysis as verb because of its syntactic position. Semantically, a reanalysis of the type \( \text{ȳānā} \) \( k̄ōtēb \ 'I am (a) writer' > 'I am writing', that is equational sentence with nominal predicate into present continuative tense, is quite plausible, and is generally accepted as part of the explanation for this shift. Etymologically, of course, the participle is a substantive, and this is still synchronically transparent in CA, where the participle takes nominal case-marking like any other noun (cf Wright 1977). In BH, however, it has already evolved into an intermediate form (Hebrew beynoni), manifesting both nominal and verbal qualities: essentially, nominal morphology (there are only four forms, masculine and feminine singular and plural, with no distinction between persons—v. Fox (1983b) for a more detailed discussion of this), and occasional verbal semantics (below).

Conservative nominal regimen of the participle may be seen in the following four citations, in all of which it unambiguously stands in construct to the following semantic patient-genitive attribute, parallel to the infinitive in the alternative derivation, as shown by its abbreviated form:

1. Jer 33:22 (cf Gordon 1982: Sec. 2.3.5)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hal-} \text{liwiyy-îm} & \quad \text{mâ-} \text{šārît-ey} & \quad \text{ôt-î} \\
\text{the-Levite-pl} & \quad \text{ptc-server-pl (of)} & \quad \text{ACC-me}
\end{align*}
\]

'The Levites who serve me (lit. the Levites(,)servers of me)'
This participle-in-construct, ipso facto a nominal form, governs a
direct object with nota accusativi, to which it is linked by a con-
junctive accent; this is in line with the hypothesis presented in
2.6 regarding the nominal origin of the accusative marker/clitic.

2. v. 2.4, ex.2

Note maqqēf linking the participle and nota accusativi, as the con-
junctive accent does in item 1, and with the same implications.

3. po>-c'v al-ey ʔāwen
    doer-pl (of) iniquity

    'doers of iniquity'

Job 34:22

4. Ps 137: _yamlānū
    captor(ptc)-pl-us

    'our captors'

Note also the common vowel-reduction of both active participle in
the construct state and CI when the final radical is a pharyngeal:
Al šallē'ān 'send (intensive)', CI šallān, active participle abso-
lute šalē'ān 'sending', construct šalān 'sending of' (v. Jouon 1923:
110).55

Already in BH, however, the participle is undergoing verbalization.
In Fox (1983b), it is shown statistically that participial
clauses are no longer equivalent to non-verbal clauses with respect
to topic continuity. Item 1 in 2.4 also shows this; the word
order renders the translation *'The one who hurries is God to the
doing of it' extremely unlikely. Much more natural is the reading
'And God hurries to do it/to the doing of it', with verbal sense of
the participle. A nice indicator of verbalization-of-participle in
progress may be found in LBH: \( \text{C}^\text{o}\text{'sēni} \) 'my Maker' (Job 31:15, 32:22), \( \text{rō}'\text{ānī} \) 'he who sees me' (Is 47:10). The erstwhile nominal participle takes the verbal accusative suffix \(-nî\) instead of the nominal genitive suffix \(-\text{i}\), found frequently throughout the OT and in subsequent liturgy: \( \text{C}^\text{o}\text{sī} \) 'my Maker', \( \text{rō}^\text{Cī} \) 'my Shepherd' (Ps 23:1 a.o.). The following MH adverbials (retained in AIH) show some continued perception of the participle as nominal, although these were doubtless partially lexicalized even by the time of their earliest attestation: \( \text{bi-nōge}^{\text{ac}} \) (li) in touching (to-) 'in connection with', \( \text{bi-yōd}^{\text{C-im}} \) in-knowing-pl 'knowingly', \( \text{bi-yōge}^{\text{ac}} \) in-errring 'accidentally, unwittingly', \( \text{bi-m-afgi}^{\text{ac}} \) in-pte-importune 'emphatically', \( \text{bi-m-afgi}^{\text{ac}} \) in-participle-surprise 'by surprise', \( \text{bi-m-ēzīd} \) in-pte-scheme 'wilfully, wantonly, maliciously', \( \text{bi-m-itkawwēn} \) in-pte-intend 'intentionally'. Even more to the point is the MH term

\[
\text{nitūr-eys}_{\text{g}}\text{ar-tā}^\text{56}
\]

'guardians(PASS ptc)-pl (of)- city-f.-the',

with the participle as noun standing in construct to its semantic patient-genitive attribute.

In IH, the participle has split into isomorphic nominal and verbal forms, the former functioning as (lexicalized) regular nouns, the latter assuming the function of a present tense (v. Gordon 1982, who refers to this as 'polarization'). The following three sentences offered by Gordon (1982) aid us in tracing the historical development of the increasingly verbal participle on this 'cline' from noun to verb (the 'cline' concept will be examined further in Ch. 6):
1. Literary-Classical or Archaizing IH (\* BH):

\[\text{nìcar-im} \text{ hovfs-ey} \text{ kip-ot} \]
\[\text{boy-pl} \text{ wearer(ptc)-pl (of) cap-pl} \]

'boys wearing skullcaps' (Gordon 1982, App., Sec. 3 (pp 83-4))

Here, as in the earlier citations from BH, the construct state form clearly and unambiguously indicates that the participle is acting as a noun.

2. Colloquial \[\text{nìcar-im} \text{ ye-hovs-im} \text{ kip-ot} \]
\[\text{boy-pl} \text{ REL-wear-pl} \text{ cap-pl} \]

'boys that/who wear skullcaps'

Here, by contrast, the plural participle hovfsim, although the nominal plural marker -im remains, is entirely verbal in its present tense function. This is indicated by both the relative marker ye 'that/who' and the fact that the participle does not assume construct state form, as it would have to if the following noun were a genitive attribute to it. Instead, its unchanged absolute state form with suffix -im shows that kipot 'skullcaps' is being treated as accusative, as direct object, in verbal rather than nominal regimen.

3. \[\text{*nìcar-im} \text{ hovfs-im} \text{ ye1 kip-ot} \]
\[\text{boy-pl} \text{ wearer(ptc)-pl (of) cap-pl} \]

? 'boys, wearers of skullcaps'

The above phrase is ungrammatical because of a stylistic clash: the use of the participle as noun in a parallelistic relative clause is literary and correlates with the morphological/inflectional expression of possession, the construct state, not the lexical/analytical
convention with ʾšel 'of' 57 of colloquial IH. This ungrammaticality confirms that the participle is a verbal and not a nominal form in colloquial IH by demonstrating that it cannot take the genitive marker ʾšel. Similarly, the oddness of

also ʾanu mi-qabl-ey-ha
we ptc-receive-pl(of)-her(gen)

'we receive/welcome her'

(correct form mi-qabl-im ʾot-a) points up the impossibility of

ptc-receive-pl ACC-her

treating the form poʾšel in IH as noun instead of verb: poʾšel,

unlike a true participle, can no longer take genitive suffix pronouns in colloquial IH (compare earlier references to declension with genitive-accusative suffix pronouns as a nominal feature of the BH CI and other Semitic dependent infinitives).

Again, compare the tension between AIH

hem ʾšomr-ey ʾšabat
they keeper(ptc)-pl(of) sabbath

'They (are) keepers of the Sabbath'

(participle as noun in the construct state), nominal sentence, and colloquial

hem ʾšomr-im ʾet ʾšabat
they keep-pl(ACC) Sabbath

'They keep the Sabbath'

(participle as present tense verb form, verbal sentence). A nice example of hypercorrective nominal syntax of participle in IH in a context where verbal use would unmistakably be more appropriate:

'From the moment that they pass, by one way or another, the line of houses,
They are not trespassers.

(Ron Halamish, Hamvaker, 17 June 1983), a nominal sentence, instead of expected

They are not trespassing.

Both nominal negator ?eyn (instead of verbal lo?) and construct state before gyiv, (instead of the absolute state that has become the sign of the participle-as-present-tense, above) are the indices of nominal syntax.

Givón's (1977:209) use of the preposition kal 'upon' with participle, as in

(They) guard/are guarding (lit. watch over) the city'

is a similar indicator of verbal regimen; the classical-literary (AIH) form would be somr-ey ha-ar guardian(ptc)-pl(of)- the-city 'The guardians of the city', with the participle in construct form; compare liturgical noten ha-tora giver(ptc)(of)- the-Torah 'Giver of the Torah'.

The verbal status of the participle in IH becomes even clearer when we note that it is now negated by the finite verbal negative particle lo? rather than the nominal negative particle ?eyn (cf English no vs. not). Another indication of verbalization: in the medial weak (II w/y) verbs, the feminine singular present tense (historical
participle) takes penultimate (verbal) rather than ultimate (nominal) stress in colloquial IH, presumably on analogy to the otherwise isomorphic third feminine singular preterite; 'gara, for example, is therefore now morphologically ambiguous: '(she) lived' or '(I, you (f.s.), she) live(s)'. This intriguing split of the participle into two isomorphs with 'polarized' (Gordon 1982) functions, verbal and nominal, will be discussed further in Ch. 6 with respect to the relative positions of participle and infinitive on the N-V cline.

It can be seen, then, that the historical development of the BH participle provides solid confirmation of the plausibility of the alternative derivation of the BH CI, both in its earlier nominal regimen with semantic patient as genitive attribute, in its later evolution into verbal regimen, and even in its split into nominal and verbal functions (compare the split (Fig. 3) of pre-Heb DVN *fa^c^ol into the more nominal AI and increasingly verbalized CI (2.3, 4.1.1). The latter constitutes still another aspect of the Semitic-Afroasiatic Systemzwang of verbalization mentioned in 2.7 and earlier sections, to be enlarged upon in Ch. 5.

2.9 Extension of Construct-State to Absolute State in Hebrew

The conventional reconstruction of the CI (1.2, 1.4), claiming as it does cognacy of the CI (fa^t^ol) with the imperative and not with the AI (fa^c^ol), is consequently compelled to attribute the formal similarity of CI and AI to later reanalysis (1.2, 1.4, 1.7). If, however, this were the case, one must ask why the CI does not stand everywhere in the construct state; were its apparent kinship to the AI in fact due to reanalysis, one would expect its use as construct
form of the AI to be widespread and productive, rather than archaic and fossilized (v. 2.4, 2.10). The fact that the opposite obtains would seem to indicate that the formal resemblance of AI and CI is archaic, i.e., etymological, rather than innovative. 

There is further evidence that this is the case, some of which has already been touched on. Even when a direct object is present, both the frequent absence of maqqēf and the presence of the nota accusative have been mentioned as showing that the CI is no longer felt to stand in construct to the object, but rather shows verbal regimen (1.6.7, 2.3, 2.6). In connection with this, it is instructive that many cases occur in the later books of fixed/lexicalized expressions, originally in the construct state but now no longer marked by maqqēf (while maqqēf is still used to mark the construct state in other instances in the same books), such as bin-e yādām son-pl(of) Adam 'men', bin-e yi'srā'ēl son-pl(of) Israel 'Israelites', gīḇūl-ōt ġamm-îm border-pl(of) nation-pl '(the) borders of the nations' in Dt 32:8 and YHWH šīḇā'ōt 'Lord of Hosts [God]' in Jer 25:28.

Strengthening the analogy between these other NPs and the CI + attribute phrases is the presence of conjunctive accents in both cases, linking the above reanalyzed nouns-in-construct to their following attributes and the reanalyzed CIs to their following subjects or direct objects, showing continued close syntactic liaison between former nomina regens and rectum (Hebrew nismax and somex). This attenuation of the construct state in LBH would certainly seem to support the monogenetic hypothesis: (later) extension of the originally construct-state CI to absolute state (and concomitant verbal
regimen) fits right into the framework of the alternative derivation, whereas the conventional reconstruction and standard derivation must posit a highly unusual development (for Semitic-Afroasiatic, and perhaps cross-linguistically—v. 3.12, 6.1) in precisely the opposite direction, from verb form to construct-state noun (cf 1.5). Yet another fact which may argue against the standard derivation, with its implications of reanalysis, is the existence of a number of final weak CIs (1"h or IIIw/y) which occur with the absolute state endings -ô or (intensive) -ê (cf Jouon 1965:348), not construct-state -ôt. These are probably instances of hypercorrection, i.e., substitution of an AI-like form still felt to be related to the CI, or archaisms. If archaisms, clearly, they constitute support for the monogenetic hypothesis. If hypercorrective forms, proponents of the standard derivation might claim them as evidence for their concomitant reanalysis linking the AI and CI. It is therefore crucial to note that such a reanalysis would have to have linked CI to AI as the construct-state form of the latter.

In other words, any derivation of the two BH infinitives must come to grips with their formal resemblance to absolute and construct-state forms, respectively, of a single noun (1.2); implicitly rejecting the claim of the monogenetic hypothesis that this was the original state of affairs, the standard derivation must needs posit reanalysis into this state of affairs. Hence, given the hypothesis of reanalysis, the only explanation for the fact that the CI appears to be a reduced form of the AI (1.2, 1.6) is that it has been reanalyzed as the construct-state form of the latter. But if this were the case, why should the
purportedly reanalyzed CI take an absolute-state, and not a construct-state form? Why does it so rarely show maqqēf, index of the productive construct state (Ch. 1, fn 13), before a direct object? This in fact shows, as other evidence did above, that the CI is not (synchronously) perceived, in BH, as standing in construct. Consequently, one must be skeptical of a hypothesis claiming reanalysis into this state, unless one is willing to accept the rather dubiously complex and weakly-supported chronology of separate origin of AI and CI, convergence through reanalysis at some early (probably pre-textual) point, and subsequent obscuring of the reanalysis (cf fn 61).

A perhaps significant parallel to the spread of CI from construct-state to non-construct-state environments (cf 2.3) may be found in the extension of context forms to pausal position in BH, replacing the older, phonologically fuller pausal forms (Bauer-Leander 1965:360). In both cases, a phonologically reduced form of restricted distribution is generalized and extended analogically to new syntactic environments, ultimately replacing the more archaic complete forms. The context forms actually replace the older, longer pausal forms, which ultimately disappear in IH except for a few lexicalizations. Although the CI does not actually replace the AI in its canonical emphatic adverbial function, the latter eventually disappears altogether, leaving the CI as the sole form with infinitive function (cf Chs. 1, 4). Perhaps the most persuasive evidence in favor of the alternative derivation is the repeated extension, throughout all stages of Hebrew, of
construct-state nominal forms to absolute-state syntactic environments, that is from syntactic dependence to independence. The following paragraphs are devoted to examples of this.

1. Five cases in BH where the nominal or CI shows the final weak ending -t (v. 2.2.4, 3.4), rendering especially clear and incontrovertible its origin as a construct-state form: $\text{ḥasōt-}$ ((hal-) laylā) splitting (of)–((the) night) 'midnight' (Ex 11:4, Ps 119:62), the CI occurring in BH as a noun only in construct to the following semantic patient/genitive attribute laylā, spreads in MH to the absolute state, occurring independently without the nomen rectum. The spreading of a CI form from the archaic-looking syntagma CI + DO (cf 2.10) to absolute-state environments through ellipsis (omission) of an unmarked, hence unspecified direct object (cf Anttila 1972:138, Phillips 1979, Fox 1980) constitutes an impressive parallel to the alternative derivation of the li-CI syntagma. Note also MedH bābat 'pupil (of eye)', an ellipsis from BH bābat–ayin pupil-cs(of) –eye 'pupil of the eye' (absolute state bāba) (cf Even-Shoshan 1977 s.v. אֶל), as kāmā bābat like pupil 'like a pupil' (Dunash, sfr 13 zemer lašabbāt 'A Bundle of Song for the Sabbath'). BH margilōt (hamittā) 'foot/feet (of the bed)', clearly a reduced and hence construct-state form, appears in early citations in construct to mittā 'bed' or to a suffix pronoun, as late as MH (e.g., Talmud Yerushalmi, Tractate Bārakhōt 6:4 margilōt hamittā), later spreading to absolute-state syntactic environments with the omission of the nomen regnum. Finally, BH mi-qisā-t 'part of, a little', transparently the construct-state form of qāśā 'edge, end' from-edge-f cs
with ablative prefix, meaning literally 'From the end/edge of', is found extensively in construct to genitive attribute/suffix pronoun in LBH/MH, as in Dan 1:2...

\[\text{ū-mi-qîsât kîlêy bēyt- hā-'êlôhîm:}\]

'And a part of the sacred vessels of the Temple'

Other stations show detached adverbial, absolute-state use:

MH safrâ șimînî 56:2

\[\text{timmîʔ-tā miqîsât wi-tîhar-tā mi-qîsâ-t}\]

defiled-you(ms) somewhat and-purified you(ms) somewhat

'You have somewhat defiled and somewhat purified'.

Similarly, șinât 'sleep' (described by Even-Shoshan 1977:1395 as a 'secondary form' (curat-mîšne) of șenâ id., is identical to the construct form of the latter except for the lengthened second vowel, which signals, in this case, a noun in the absolute state (v. fn 2 (Ch. 1), 1.6.3, fn 11 (Ch. 2), and Even-Shoshan 1977:1575).

Similarly, ellipsis of the nomen rectum as early as LBH/MH has brought about the names of the Biblical books șimôt 'Exodus (lit. (the) names of)' from the initial sentence of that book,

\[\text{wa-ʔelle șim-ôt bîn-êy-ışrâʾēl}\]

and these name-pl(of) son-pl(of)—Israel

'And these are the names of the sons of Israel'; and mišîlêy 'Proverbs (lit. (the) proverbs (of))' from

\[\text{mišîl-êy șîlômō ben-dāwîd}\]

proverb-pl (of) Solomon son (of)—David

'the proverbs of Solomon, son of David'.
TA frequent use of the originally construct-state masculine plural noun-form ending in -ēy as absolute-state masculine plural (replacing BA -ēn: cf Rosenthal 1961:23), as kōl ŋidir-ēy all vow-pl (of) 'All (the) vows (of)' (name of a MedH prayer, after the first line), and LBH nonce forms which appear to be of the same type, as Ḫašrēy (X) 'happy (is X)', may represent similar processes, with the elided nomen rectum no longer recoverable.

One might well hypothesize that the initial extension of the li-CI syntagma from construct-state to absolute-state environments (cf particularly 1.6.8, also 2.3) resulted from such ellipsis of an unmarked and hence unspecified genitive attribute, something like

\[
\begin{align*}
&*li-ktōb \text{ miktāb} \\
to-write letter
\end{align*}
\]

'to write a letter (lit. to write a writing)' > 

\[
\begin{align*}
&li-ktōb \\
to-write
\end{align*}
\]

'to write'.

A model like the latter is the more plausible because of the BH (and other Semitic) literary device of FIGURA ETYMOLOGICA (also called PARONOMASIA or COGNATE OBJECT), which function the AI serves as emphatic adverbial (v. 5.1).

Along the same lines as ḥāsōt (above), one cannot but suppose that BH ligraʔṭ 'towards, in front of' (< li- 'to, toward' + DVN of √qrʔ/y 'meet') was originally a construct nominal form, as indicated by the final -t (above), later becoming uncoupled or detached from strict construct-state use. As this indicates, BH/Semitic
prepositions are of substantival provenance (cf Diakonoff 1965:59), and there are several more whose feminine ending \(-t\) renders particularly evident their construct origin. \(bēynōt\), a variant of \(bēyn\) 'between', appears in the earliest citations to be a feminine plural noun standing in construct to a following prepositional object, as Ju 11:10

\[
\begin{array}{l}
YHWH \ yi-hiye \\
\text{Yahweh he-is} \\
\hline
\hline
\text{has-some-} & \text{thē-hearer (ptc)} & \text{btw-fpl-us(gen)}
\end{array}
\]

'The Lord shall be witness between us'.

Later its object is preceded by dative marker \(lî\) (cf 2.3) (as well as itself optionally taking ablative prefix \(mi\)-), which indicates unambiguously that preposition and object are no longer perceived as nomina regens and rectum (\(somex\) and \(nismax\)), although close syntactic liaison is still indicated by a conjunctive accent on \(bēynōt\): Ezek 10:2

\[
\begin{array}{l}
bō? \ ?el-bēynōt \\
\text{come to-between} \\
\hline
\hline
\text{l-ag-galgal...} & \text{to-the-wheel...} & \text{[and fill your hands with coals of fire]}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{l}
mīb-bēynot \\
\text{from-between} \\
\hline
\hline
\text{l-ak- kirub-} & \text{im} & \text{to-the-cherub-pl}
\end{array}
\]

'Come in between the wheelwork...from between the cherubim'.

cf. The parallel and cognate development in Nigerian Arabic (Kaye 1980:115) \((am)\ bēnāāt\ 'between', with f. pl. ending \(-āt\).

Similarly, the BH preposition-in-construct \(zūlāt\) 'except (for)' as in IIK 24:14

\[
\begin{array}{l}
lō? \ ni-s?ar \\
\text{no} \\
\hline
\hline
\text{zūla-t} & \text{dalla-t} & \text{cam-hā-āres:} & \text{PASS-leave other=cs poor-cs people (of)-the-land:}
\end{array}
\]

'None remained save the poorest of the people of the land',
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is employed in MedH as a substantive in the absolute state

haz-zulat
the other

'the other one'.

Possibly the BH 

[bosmat] 'perfume', a feminine proper name, is of the

same type. The two etymologically substantial prepositions 

mip-pin-ey
from-face-plcs 'from the face of, in front of', and MedH 

mip-pi?a-t
from-side-fcs 'from the side of' have both undergone semantic fading/

dereferentialization (cf fn5 (6.1)) and grammaticalization into con-

junctions meaning 'because (of)', in which non-canonical nominal uses

they are no longer perceived as being in construct; already in BH

this is shown most clearly when the incremented preposition is fol-

lowed by the complementizers 

[yaszer] and 

[se], as

mippia-t ý se-hak-kol b-ô hû dâbêq
because that-the-all in-it he(is) sticky

'because everything in it is sticky'

(Abraham Ibn-Ezra, visôd morà ('The foundation of Fear') 12, Ex 19:18

mippiney ý yaszer yarad ³alâ-w YHWH b-ê?eš
because that descended upon-him Yahweh in-the-fire

'Because Yahweh descended upon him in the fire'.

Finally, one may note 

[ahar-ey] 'afterwards' in

wî- ?ahar-ey (,) ki-kîlôt hak-kol
and-after-pl (of) (,) as-destruction (of) the-all

'And afterwards, during the destruction of all'

('Lord of the World' MedH poem ëàdon çolâm by Shlomo Ibn-Gvirol

11th Century Spain)
Morphologically, ?ahārēy 'after' is a masculine plural noun in the construct state. Here, however, it is being used in the absolute state, asynedetically, as an adverbial (cf fn 5 in 6.1).

2. At another remove from the object of our study but indicative nevertheless is LBH/MH extension of the construct-state absence of definite article on the nomen regens (the first noun — v. fn 2 (Ch. 1)) to noun + adjective constructions, e.g.,

\[ (*\text{hā}) \overset{\text{Colām}}{\text{hab-bā}}, \quad \text{the world to come}, \]
\[ \text{(the) world the-coming} \]

\[ (*\text{hā}) \overset{\text{yēser}}{\text{hā-raś}} \]
\[ \text{(the) spirit the-evil} \]

\[ (*\text{hā}) \overset{\text{ayin}}{\text{hā-raś}} \]
\[ \text{(the) eye the-evil} \]

Here a feature of the construct state is extended analogically to nouns in the absolute state (the heads of the attributive NPs) because of surface resemblance of the structure to a construct-phrase with nomina regens and rectum.

3. IH is rife with cases where a noun, formerly in the construct state, is reanalyzed as an independent syntactic unit with consequent broadening of its distribution; this process is facilitated in IH by the increasing restriction of the construct state to classical-literary Hebrew (AIH) and its replacement in the grammatical competence of native speakers of the lower colloquial registers by various analytical constructions with the genitive marker `el (2.8) or certain other particles (cf Rosén 1977). This is evident with 'bimkom 'instead' (adverb), where vowel-reduction from absolute-state ma'kom
'place' distinguishes the construct-state form. Note also the shift to penultimate stress, which feature characterizes an entire series of prepositions-turned-adverbs in colloquial IH (both prepositions and adverbs are grammatical functives (GFs)—v. 6.1, fn 5). In the case of 'bimkom, and also 'agav ' incidentally', and 'kodem ' firstly', detachment from the construct state and generalization to absolute state is concomitant with dereferentialization from preposition to adverb. In fact, another such penultimate-stressed adverb, li-'havdim ' on the contrary (lit. to-differentiate)' is a li-CI syntagma: this constitutes some indirect but intriguing support for the hypothesis that li-CI may have spread to intransitive syntactic positions following ellipsis of unmarked objects, much as 'bimkom, 'agav, and 'kodem have been generalized from prepositional to adverbial syntax through detachment from their (prepositional) objects.

In \( \text{vlost-riv}\text{ey (v}\text{ca}) \)
three(of)-qtr-pl(of) (hour)

'three quarters (of an hour), forty-five minutes',

ellipsis of \( \text{v}\text{ca} \) 'hour' yields a construct-state form, riv\text{ey} 'quarters of' (≠ absolute-state riv\text{cim} 'quarters'), employed without following nomen rectum. Although I cannot attest to uses where inclusion of the ellipsed constituent is no longer possible, the evident lexicalization-in-process of \( \text{v}\text{vlost-riv}\text{ey} \) as a fixed expression in its own right renders such distribution extremely probable in the near future, if it has not already occurred. A similar open but interesting case is the mathematical/scientific expression
'divided by, plotted against', as in

\[ \text{tdir-ut xel-key-zman} \]
\[ \text{frequent-\text{DN} part-pl(of)- time} \]

'frequency plotted against (lit. parts of) time'; it seems clear that the construct form xelkey– has become a fixed expression, certainly that the slot following it is much less tightly connected to it than is normally the case with nomina regens and rectum, and one can easily see the possibility of extension to non-construct-state syntactic environments.

Further examples from IH: construct-state dafnot used as absolute-state (≠ normative absolute-state dfanot), possibly on analogy to the expected plural of defna 'laurel, bay, woman's name'.

A particularly interesting case of construct-state form extended to absolute state through expressive ellipsis may be found in the slangy reply to the question 'What's new?' Answer:

\[ \text{kol min-ey} \] \[ \text{(dvarim, cinyanim, etc). all kind-s(of)} \] \[ \text{(things, events, etc)} \]

Obviously inclusive but interesting: speakers of Yiddish and various Eastern European languages, journeying to Palestine in the late 1940's, omitted the somex, leaving the nismax (which has the same form in construct state as in absolute state) in

\[ ?erec (yisra?el) \] \[ 'Palestine' \]
\[ land(of) (Israel) \]

(I.F. Stone, Underground to Palestine).
This also may be considered extension of a form from the construct state to absolute state through ellipsis.

The author, a non-native speaker of IH, has become aware of not one but several cases in which he has himself incorrectly generalized a construct-state form to the absolute state simply because that particular lexeme occurs far more commonly in construct to certain nomina rectum, or in the plural (in which similar reductive changes take place) than in the absolute state singular. Such cases are: *zkuk 'in need of' (correct absolute-state form ẕakuk) from, e.g.,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{people-pl} & & \text{need-pl} & & \text{to-help(DVN)} \\
\text{?anaš-im} & & \text{zkuk-im} & & \text{lī-ezra}
\end{align*}
\]

'people (who are) in need of help',

*nciq 'representative' (nacig; cf construct singular and plural nciq-, nciqey-, even absolute-state plural nciqim), due to influence of nciq- yisrae?l 'the representative of Israel' etc, *hadra 'glory, magnificence' (hadara), from

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{glory-cs(of)}-\text{holiness} \\
\text{hadra-t-kodesh}
\end{align*}
\]

'glory of holiness',

*hegyon 'logic' (higayon), on the analogy of hegyoni 'logical', with derivational suffix (cf 1.6.8 on the similarity of forms in the construct state and with pronominal suffixes). There are, of course, other items ripe for such analogical errors, as sarid 'remnant', whose absolute and construct plural forms s̱rid-im and s̱rid-ev— are
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infinitely more common than the singular, leading one to expect a back-formation *srid (absolute state) one of these days. This process, whereby a more commonly/frequently-occurring construct-state form takes over the distributional domain of the erstwhile absolute-state form through analogical replacement, may provide some additional insight into the spread of the originally construct-state CI, once bereft of nomen rectum through ellipsis, to syntactic environments where no genitive attribute could possibly follow (cf 1.6.8 and 2.8.4, example 11).

In sum, considerable evidence can be shown to argue for the alternative derivation and against the reanalysis-hypothesis of the standard derivation. Such evidence is found both in the synchronic non-construct status of the CI in BH and in similar processes of detachment from the construct state that various types of substantives have undergone throughout all stages of Hebrew.

2.10 Additional Archaisms With CI As Noun in Construct to DO

Sine Nota Accusativi

In 2.4 (v. also limsō-ṭōb in 2.3.12 and fn 37 (Ch. 2)), we referred to presumed archaisms in which the CI stands as a nominal, substantive in construct to its semantic patient/DO with no intervening nota accusativi ṭēt, as per the alternative derivation. Here we present three more such constructions, two without the dative marker (from the early book of Genesis, cf 2.4) and one with. They are given here rather than in 2.4 because the main thrust of that section was the
original allative-directional sense of the li- prefix-preposition, not the absence of nota accusativi:

1. Gen 4:12 lôʔ- t-ô-sêf têt-kôh-âh l-âk...
   not- she add giv(ing of)-strength-her to-you...
   'She shall not again give (lit. add the giving of) her strength to you'
   Note maqqêf as an index of the construct state (fn 18 (Ch. 1) and passim).

2. Gen 2:9 wi-šê had-daš-at tôb wâ-râš:
   and-tree (of) the-knowledge- f (of) good and evil:
   'And the tree of the knowledge of good and evil'

   and-was if he-refuse-pl
   já-qahat- hak-kos... 'And it shall be, that to-tak(ing of)- the-cup...
   should they refuse to take the cup...'

2.11 The Nominal Character of The CI

The nominal character of the CI is manifest in a number of ways, some of which were noted earlier (cf esp. 1.7.2). In this section the topic will be treated at further length.

Perhaps the simplest indication of nominal character is the employment of the bare CI stem as substantive with gerundive/deverbal noun function, in all three cases (nominative, genitive and accusative– v.

Bergstrassser 1918:54), as in Eccl 3:4

\[
\text{cēt} \quad \text{siṭôd} \quad \text{wi-cēt} \quad \text{riqōd}
\]

Time(of) mourn and-time(of) dance

'a time for mourning and a time for dancing'.
Other examples are *pirōs* 'outbreak', *canānot* 'singing' (πιελ*cc*el (intensive pattern), with geminate second radical (v. 3.2); orthographically homonymous but etymologically unrelated to *canānot* 'torture' (below), and *vārēt* 'service' (also πιελ*cc*el.61 cf Lambert 1946:267)).

Like other substantives, they may take genitive attributes, both full NPs and suffix pronouns, (the Hebrew term for the latter is *vēm-happōcal bakkinnūyīm*) as *pogidî* 'my (act of) punishing' Ex 32:34 and Is 58:5

\[\text{vōm} \quad \text{canānot} \quad βαδάμ \quad nafṣ-\text{ô} \]
\[\text{day(of) torture } \text{man } \text{soul-his}\]

'A day for man to afflict his soul'.

The use of CI in temporal/circumstantial (adverbial) clauses as genitive with prepositional prefixes (and optional genitive suffix pronouns or full NPs), a gerundive, almost (present) participial function (cf 6.1), is also nominal syntax62: Deut 6:7

\[\text{bi-šibt-kā} \quad \text{bi-bêyt-kā} \quad u-bi-lekt-kā \quad b-ad-derek} \]
\[\text{in-sit(ting)-your(ms) } \text{in-house-your and-in-go(ing)-your}\]
\[\text{u-bi-šokb-kā} \quad \text{u-bi-qûm-'eka} 63: \]
\[\text{in-the-way and-in-ly(ing)-your and-in-ris(ing)-your}\]

'When thou sittest in thy house and when thou goest upon the way, and when thou liest down and when thou risest up'.

The nominal interpretation is particularly evident in Deut 19:4

\[\text{bi-bili- da} \quad \text{in-without- know(ledge) 'unwittingly (lit. without knowing/knowledge)'. Again, its use with the preposition ki-}\]
'like/as, when' often lends itself clearly to nominal-substantival interpretation, as Ps 103:11 ki-ğibəh ʾyāmāyım like-height(of) heaven-pl 'wie das Hochsein des Himmels' (cf Bauer-Leander 1965:360). Impressive confirmation that this position does indeed constitute nominal syntax for the CI is the number of clearly deverbal nouns (nomina actionis), mostly feminine singular, with precisely the same syntactic distribution; substitutability with other nouns is hence numbered among the criteria by which the CI may be characterized as nominal. These will be discussed in 3.4 because of their significance to the corollary hypothesis presented there involving final weak verbs. One masculine deverbal noun-like formation employed with this kind of infinitival function following a prefix-preposition deserves mention here: item 7 in 2.4, li-yešaʾc 'to save/deliver': although manifesting the verbal(ized) features adumbrated in that section (dependent infinitive function, nota accusativi, absolute-state form), the evident origin as segholate deverbal noun of a form with syntax parallel to the CI (and rather archaic syntax at that, like that posited in Fig. 2−v. 2.4) is indicative of similar nominal origin for the CI. This holds true whatever the antiquity of the form (below we discuss such constructions in AIH). Significantly, CA and MSA also employ deverbal nouns (maṣaʿādir) in this syntactic position, including faʿalaʿun, as bi-dahaab-ii in-departure-my '(up)on my departure, when I depart(ed)'. This wide-spread Semitic, and particularly Arabic, tendency to use gerundive nominalizations rather than finite verbs in circumstantial/subordinate clauses whenever possible⁶⁴ (compare Literary Arabic laītaʾaṣiʿr-ii if only
knowledge—my 'If I only knew') manifestly correlates with a more nominal kind of non-finite verb form (the CI); also, being a deeply conservative characteristic in Semitic, it argues strongly against the derivation of the CI from a proto-verb form together with imperative and imperfect; the alternative derivation (1.6) is far more plausible, given both this nominalizing characteristic so common in Semitic and the concomitant path of development/evolution that is usual for Semitic infinitives (1.5, v. also Ch. 5).

This nominalizing tendency still reigns in modern IH classical-literary style⁶⁵: note

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kidai} & \quad \text{li-xa} \quad \text{ciyun-xa} \quad \text{b-a-sefer} \\
\text{worth} & \quad \text{to-you(ms)} \quad \text{examination-your(ms)} \quad \text{OBL-the-book}
\end{align*}
\]

'It is worth it to/for you to examine the book (lit. (it) is worth (it) to you your examination of the book' (publisher's blurb),

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{li-zeruz} & \quad \text{msira-t} \quad \text{mixtay-xa} \\
\text{to-acceleration(of)} & \quad \text{sending-fcs letter-your}
\end{align*}
\]

'to (the purpose of) the acceleration of the sending of your letter' (inscription on aerogram),

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ki-basis} & \quad \text{li-hemsex} \quad \text{pilult-am} \\
\text{like-basis} & \quad \text{to-continuation(of) activism-their}
\end{align*}
\]

'as a basis for the continuation of their activism' (Israeli activists bulletin); for this last, compare the most idiomatic English translation 'from which to continue their activism'.

Note also the example in fn 29 (Ch. 2), with agentive noun (historically a participle) after li- of purpose/intent (in this case, destiny); compare the most natural/idiomatic English translation 'I raised you to be the shield...' or '...to shield the nation'. The possibility
of substituting a deverbal noun/gerund such as cyun 'examination', zeruz 'acceleration', hemsex 'continuation', and magen 'shield' for the corresponding infinitives after the dative prefix indicates that the infinitive is still perceived as nominal in the more conservative literary register, and that at least in this literary dialect (AIH), the same forces which originally brought about the development of the li-CI syntagma (the alternative derivation scenario in Fig. 2, 1.6: dative/allative preposition > goal-purpose marker > infinitive prefix, deverbal noun > infinitive) are still quite alive and productive (compare Modern Literary Arabic in 2.2.1; this and parallel developments in other languages will be discussed further in Ch. 5. This nominal-subordinate-clause feature in turn seems to be relatable to a Semitic 'noun-basedness', on which more in 5.2 Sec. n, and 6.2. Yet another parallel indicating that the CI is still perceived as a substantive in BI is provided by the subclass of segholate verbs. The segholate CI is a substantive, a deverbal noun to which the infinitive prefix has been attached on analogy to the CI of regular verbs (cf Gesenius 1910:195, Joüon 1923:276), the comparative lateness and secondariness of this development being shown by the total lack of fusion between prefix and stem (more on this in 3.2.2). When constructed with genitive suffix pronoun, this segholate stem manifests its substantival character clearly by undergoing internal vowel changes identical to those that take place in concrete segholate nouns (cf Even-Shoshan 1977:1575), viz.: Concrete Noun CI
\[
\text{Abst st } \text{be\text{\textregistered}ed} \text{'apparel'} \quad \text{redet} \text{'descend(ing) descent'}
\]
in cs to GEN \text{big(i)d-}^{68} \text{ rid(i)t-} \text{'his descent/}

sf pm 'his apparel' descending'

Given that these substantival segholate infinitive stems are of later origin than the regular CI stem, their employment in the same syntax as the regular CI is a clear indication that the latter was still perceived as nominal (else it could not act as a model for the analogous segholate CI) at that point in pre-BH when the segholate stems were first enlisted in such constructions.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 2

1. The hyphen here indicates neither morpheme- nor syllable-boundary, but is rather a convention, when transliterating Classical Arabic into the Roman alphabet, for marking ellipsis of the initial vowel of the definite article al- (here the hyphen does indicate morpheme boundary when preceded without pause by a word ending in a vowel.

The superscripting of the īraab, Common Semitic/Afroasiatic word-final case-marking vowels -u (nominative), -ā (accusative), and -ī (genitive) and indefinite nominal marker -n (Arabic tanwiin 'nūnation') constitute another such convention. The same practice has been followed for Akkadian and Ugaritic (in 2.2-3).

2. With the exception of certain lexicalizations and textual archaisms.

3. As with Akkadian, the -u is most probably nominative case-marking; it is found specifically when the AI is employed as cognate emphatic adverbial. The gemination may indicate correspondence with the factitive-intense verb-conjugation (Hebrew pḭCC̱el, CA fa̰C̱ala) (cf Ugaritic (and Common Semitic) intensive infinitive/deverbal noun fḭC̱uul, adopted in LBH and MH as the infinitive corresponding to pḭCC̱el, and note also BH gannaʔ, gannaʔy, 'be jealous, envy' (Even-Shoshan 1977:1203-1204)), or simply an orthographic device to ensure
full pronunciation of the short vowel in the first syllable, vulnerable to stress-reduction in NW Semitic languages (Stanislav Segert, p.c.). The geminate second radical may not even necessarily be connected directly with the intensive conjugation; compare the geminate second radical in Arabic and Ethiopic nomina opificum/nomina agentis and participial forms, cognate to fa\(C\)aal- (1.2).

4. Note genitive case-ending -\(i\): the Ugaritic CI displays the nominal characteristic of appearing in all three (Common Semitic/Afroasiatic) cases nominative, genitive and accusative (v. Segert 1979:64.631).

5. The wavy underlining is a traditional Semitic philological device for indicating that the writing system of the text being transliterated is primarily consonantal/syllabic, i.e., one in which the vocalism is represented incompletely or not at all. To further stress the distinction between this kind of transliteration and that of a text with a more complete phonemic/alphabetic system, I have double-spaced each character.

6. PS (and CA) *fa\(\text{C}\)ala, with final -\(a\) lost in NWS and initial \(a\) lengthened pretonically in BH (v. Bauer-Leander 1965: Sec. Lautlehre), and reduced to \(i\) in BA through general reduction of short vowels in open unstressed syllables (v. Rosenthal 1961:10, Bauer-Leander 1962:66-7).

7. Compare fn 11, and li-madda\(C\) below.
8. Bauer-Leander (1962:127) puts this in an interesting way: 'Da
der Inf. zugleich Nomen- und Verbumform ist, nimmt er, wie im
Hebr. [v. 1.6.8–A.F.], sowohl Poss.- als auch Obj.- Suffixe
an...'. Buccellati (1972:16) notes the same characteristic to
hold for the Akkadian infinitive fa^caal-, cognate to the BH AI
(v. 1.2.2), and Segert for Syriac (1980: Sec. s, 5-37, 5.47)
and Ugaritic (1979: Sec. s, 5-11-12), both of whose infinitives
related, except for the Syriac simple pattern, to the BH AI
he places within the verbal paradigm. In 5.2 it will be sug-
gested that this common morphosyntactic characteristic even
among non-cognate Semitic infinitives (BH, Akk *fa^caal- ≠
BA *mif^caal) may constitute one aspect of the Semitic (Afro-
Systemzwang mentioned near the end of this section.

9. It has been suggested to me (S. Segert, p.c.) that this might
indicate the converse, that the older form was felt to be too
verbal for an infinitive, and for this reason a nominal pre-
fix was needed. This implies that infinitives, at least in
Semitic (v. fn 8, and later this section), are generally felt
by naive speakers to be an inherently quasi-nominal category
frame regardless of which particular form happens to fill the
slot at any given stage of the language, something like any
given spot on a waterfall or riverbed. I agree, in fact, with
this concept (which will be explored further in Ch. 6), and
do not feel it to be incompatible with the alternative deriva-
tion. If, according to our hypothesis, the BH CI is undergoing
verbalization, we may suppose that its BA cognate counterpart did the same (as, indeed, shown in this section), ultimately bringing about its replacement by a fresh form whose nominal character was still apparent. The question of how far an infinitive may ultimately advance on the N-V cline before this happens will be discussed in 6.1.

10. There is actually justification for an additional morpheme-boundary here between the ʔ and the ō, with implications for the hypothesis, and this will be discussed in 3.4.

11. The short ā (patah) rather than long qānas (ā) is a mark of the infinitive; the corresponding substantive would be *massāc (v. Jouon 1923:111, 234). It might be suggested that this is an indication of the construct state, the normal unmarked situation for a transitive dependent infinitive of substantival origin (cf 1.6.8), but this is not certain, as a very general verb ~ ā, noun ~ ā correspondence holds in BH and is sufficient to explain the facts (cf Jouon 1923:111, 234). This very correspondence may, however, itself be of interest as an index of verbalization of the infinitive (v. Ch. 6, where an attempt will be made at compiling a cross-linguistic list of such indices).

12. Long ā due to elided glottal stop, cf fn 40.

13. Both of these forms, ḫālā and hafālā, are later borrowed into MH from TA as deverbal nouns (e.g., MH ḥazārā 'return, repetition', (the short ā is an allophone of i lowered by the preceding pharyngeal ū), dirāsā 'homiletic, sermon', pirācā
'riot' sidāgā 'justice'—note semantics of nominal unitatis, which fact is indicative of their nominal origins. This will be discussed further in 4.1.2.

14. In general, the PS feminine noun ending *-at > -a(h) across Semitic, including (Biblical) Hebrew, (Biblical) Aramaic, and (Classical) Arabic, with the original feminine -t (cf Diakonoff 1965:73) surfacing only when the noun is in construct to a following noun or pronominal suffix, or, in BA, in the so-called determinate state ('status determinatus') with the suffixed demonstrative/definite article -ā; its appearance is, accordingly, a sign of the construct state. In the third feminine singular perfect verb form, it lingers on in Classical Arabic and Biblical Aramaic but disappears in colloquial Arabic and in Biblical Hebrew (in Neo-Aramaic the entire verb conjugation is replaced: v. 5.2, Sec. a).

15. This is based on the traditional Hebrew grammatical practice of labelling the radicals or root-consonants of a verb by mapping them in a one-to-one correspondence onto the model of the regular triconsonantal root pāl 'make, do' (borrowed from the Arab grammarians' traditional practice of using the cognate root fāl id.), so that in speaking of the verb root ṿ m r 'watch, guard', for example, ṿ is pē (p) happō collect 'first radical of the verb', m is ṣayin (ṣ) happō collect 'second radical of the verb', and r is lāmed (l) happō collect 'third radical of the verb'. This ties in, of course, with the use of course,
with the use of $p^{C}$.1/f^{C}l$ to label morphological forms, both verbal and deverbal, as we have been doing with $f_{a}Caal$-. In this system, irregular verb-classes are labelled according to the irregular root-consonant: final weak are $\overline{lamed-he}$ ($l^{'h}$, III"h"), that is verbs whose third radical is (synchronously), $h$ those with initial assimilating $n$ are $\overline{pe-nun}$ ($p"n$, I"n"), and so on.

16. If Hebrew is taken as a model, this suffix may be presumed to have spread to sound/regular verbs from the deverbal nouns of final weak verbs, where it was originally felt to be part of the root (that is, vocalized final $w/\hat{u}$ + feminine -t nominal suffix - v. s, fn 14 (Ch. 2) and 3.4); taking it back still further, we may surmise that it too shows the analogical influence of feminine nouns in the construct state; compare the apparent back-formations in the absolute state, which forms end in $\hat{u}$: e.g., final weak $\overline{ribu}$ 'greatness', $\overline{ba\hat{c}u}$ 'request', regular triconsonantal.

17. $ho->*\hat{ha}$ CAUS + w initial glide.

18. The macron over $a$ in fn 7 is due to complex conventions of Masoretic transcription (v. 3.1), and may not even represent real length. cf also transcription tables, n.4.

19. LBH (Song of Solomon) already manifests most of the distinguishing morpho-syntactic features of MH, and the two may in fact be treated for most purposes as a single dialect/stratum; v. Givon 1977:188-9.
20. A point one of whose functions in BH is to distinguish the stop and spirant allophones of plain (non-emphatic/pharyngealized) obstruents (voiced and voiceless), which are largely in complementary distribution (spirants post-vocally, stops elsewhere): pointed (stop) versus unpointed (spirant). Dāqāyī hāzāq or 'strong dagesh', identical in form, is placed in all consonants with the exception of the pharyngeals, laryngeals and retroflex ḫ, ḥ, ħ, and ṭ to indicate gemination.

21. The hyphen here indicates syllable-, not morpheme-, boundary.

22. Exceptions, which are not numerous (v. Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910: 124) are perhaps inevitable in a text with the checkered and complex scribal history of BH, especially with regard to the vocalization, of which the dagesh is a part (v. 3.1). Moreover, such exceptions are to be expected when one is dealing with a change-in-progress dependent upon the frequency of grammatical forms.

23. According to the alternative derivation, of course, the CI is of substantival origin like the AI; the point here, however, is precisely that, especially with the li- dative prefix, the CI is undergoing verbalization (cf 2.3.5 and references therein).

24. Actually, the syllable-final ẓālēf (glottal stop, ?) in this and many other instances is probably just an orthographic fossil, having lost its own consonantal value and become a mater lectionis for a long vowel (in this case, ē), the real
pronunciation being something like [lēmr̩] (v. Harris 1941: 144, #4 for an account of this as a general NW Semitic sound change).

25. See Chapter 3 for the gemination of the consonant following mi—.

26. Another factor in the specialization/grammaticalization of li- as infinitive marker with the CI might have been the necessity to differentiate the CI from the imperative (I owe this suggestion to J. Callender, p.c.), with which, if the alternative derivation is correct, it had fallen together in form, the two forms perhaps even having been reanalyzed as the same; cf Fig. 3 and 4.2.

27. See Givón 1977:188-9 for a relative chronology of the books of the OT.

28. Note that English end, aim, goal, point, even target, when used with the meaning 'purpose', show precisely the same semantic fading from physical/spatial goal to a metaphorical/abstract sense of purpose or intent (target most recently, as shown by the still-colloquial connotation of such use): this would seem to be a natural process of semantic development. Compare also IH matara '(military) target, goal, desired outcome', Fr but (<Gmc; cf Eng butt) 'archery target, goal, the 'point' (of an action), purpose', and the common English purpose-clause prepositional phrase toward GERUND, as They all contributed toward the building of the sanctuary, i.e., to build the sanctuary, again with exactly the same extension of the semantics.
of preposition toward from allative-directional to metaphorical/abstract goal-purpose. In the same vein, note English to/toward the end/point/aim/purpose (of GERUND), he set out to INF. In 5.2, Sec. j, we will discuss the forcible parallel between the alternative derivation and the origin of the English infinitive with to).

29. Not surprisingly, li- retains this sense of purpose-intent in IH, at least in the literary register:

\[\text{vi-?ot-xa} \quad \text{gidal-ti} \quad \text{li-magen-\text{ha-}Cam}\]

and-ACC-you (m.s.) raised-I to-shield (n.) (of) the-nation

'And thee I raised to be the shield of the nation', i.e.,

'so that, to the end that you might be...' Bi\text{Carvot-Hanegev}

'In the Wilds of the Negev' (Israeli folk song). Note also li-\text{Sem} X to-name (of) X 'toward the end of X, with the purpose of X'. See also the items in 2.11.

30. Note that great frequency has also lead to phonological reduction of the same form, 2.3.2.

31. \text{\text{?atn\text{"a}}} (\text{\text{\i"a}}} X | \text{\i"a}} S), sil\text{"uq} (\text{\text{\i"a}}} X | \text{\i"a}} S), z\text{\text{"a}}f\ text{\text{"a}}\text{\text{"o}}\text{\text{\text{"a}}} (\text{\text{\i"a}}} X | \text{\i"a}} S), si\text{\text{"o\text{"a}}} (\text{\text{\i"a}}} X | \text{\i"a}} S). These indicate the end of a verse of sub-verse by 'dividing' the last word from the first word of the next unit. \text{\text{"a}} is the BH verse-divider. The accent-markers occur on the last word preceding the verse-divider.

32. For a concise but thorough account of the Masoretic ti\text{\text{"a}}}\text{\text{"a}}}\text{\text{"a}}} or accentuation/cantillation signs, chiefly used for the chanting of liturgy but serving also to mark syntactic structure, see Blau 1976:19-20, Rabin 1966:10-11, and also 3.1.
33. Later the jussive meaning fades and the form becomes the unmarked imperfect indicative, as 'he kills'.

34. Cf fn 24.

35. Of course, this poses no problem for a theory connecting these two functions of li- etymologically, whereas those who claim separate provenance for each are faced with a vexing (and, it seems to me, highly suspect) isomorphism. Our claim would be that such an asseverative use of li- does not differ in principle from the goal-purpose semantics normally exhibited by the dative marker in its infinitive function.

36. Cf 3.1.

37. Note, in this archaic (or archaizing) poetic text, the absence of accusative marker ?at (v. 1.6.7), and concomitant presence of construct state marker maqqēf (fn 17 (Ch. 1)).

38. See Segert 1979:2, 10, on parallelistic verse structure in ancient Canaanite poetry as an aid in linguistic analysis: the stylistic device, formed through long oral tradition, of parallel pairs of synonyms ('A'- and 'B'- words) in parallel cola may not only serve in determining the meaning of obscure lexemes but also, as in this case, help with the determination of grammatical form.

39. Of course, allative semantics are at least theoretically possible for main verb + dependent infinitive with no DO at all; cf English Where are you going? To sleep, with allative and purposive senses equally possible, and IH Camad-tila-lexet
stood-I to go 'I was about to go', with a faded metaphor of directional (physical) motion indicating a kind of imminent action-semantics. The constructions with DO are important in the case of the BH CI because of the reductive changes on the infinitive form (cf fn 2, 1.6), which indicate that in the earliest construction-type, the CI must have stood in construct to its semantic patient as genitive modifier.

40. In actuality, constructions of the first type must also be so regarded; synchronically, it is difficult to find a BH citation in which the purpose-intent reading of the CI cannot be derived, i.e., one for which the allative sense is the only reading. This is perhaps inevitable in view of the nature of the change itself: the reinterpretation of (action verb) + dative marker + deverbal noun as infinitive marker + infinitive with purpose-clause function is perhaps so universal a tendency as to block any attempt to exclude such a reading (cf 2.1, 2.3.8, 4.1.1, 5.2). In addition, of course, the reanalysis in BH has already taken place and the syntactic change has reached an advanced state (cf 2.3.6); for this reason, we should not be surprised that relics of the very oldest stage are difficult to find.

41. For the lowering of i (actually retention of original) *a, v. Fig. 2) to a, before a pharyngeal consonant, v. fn 13 (Ch. 2).
42. The infinitive la-\text{ca}'\text{sa}t is marked both times with a conjunctive accent, indicating close syntactic liaison, and possibly the construct state, between it and the following direct object (v. 2.3.6, 2.8).

43. The infinitive la-ye\text{sa}c is marked with a conjunctive accent (cf fn 42 (Ch. 2)).

44. The second vowel is lowered before a pharyngeal consonant (v. fn 13 (Ch. 2)).

45. In so far as we can both interpret the ninth-century Masoretic vowel-marking and regard it as reliable for the much earlier linguistic stage of BH, cf 3.1.

46. The maqqēf may indicate that the quantifier kol-' all' (unreduced form kōl) stands in construct to the noun it modifies: v. fn 17 (Ch. 1) and 2.6.

47. hāyā 'was' (3ms) has a modal sense here; cf English I'll to England.

48. Interestingly, Gùdë (a Chadic language) marks definite direct objects with demonstrative feminine t (R, Schuh, p.c. – cf 2.2.4, fn 7, Diakonoff 1965:73 on feminine t in Afroasiatic): this is an independent innovation among the Chadic languages, just as the BH nota accusative function of ?et, to which it may even be cognate, is an innovation within the Semitic branch (cf Brown, Driver and Briggs 1979:84-5). We may also note the Neo-Aramaic reanalysis of demonstrative-cum-genitive particle standing between infinitive and pronominal object.
as accusative particle: m-Ixdāma did-e 'worshipping of him'

\[ \text{INF-worship of-his} \]

> 'worshipping him' (Sabar 1976:37 and p.c.)

49. v. fn 5 (Ch. 6) on the grammaticalization of substantives, of which these are three more examples. Note also the origin as substantive (+ genitive attribute) of the Semitic incremented prepositions (v. Givón 1972:20, Diakonoff 1965:59: 'as the prepositions, almost without exception, are of nominal origin in Semitic, they are invariably construed with the genitive'), some BH examples of which are given in 2.9.

50. In fact, concomitant with this reconstruction, it has been suggested (Rundgren 1965:62-74) that the final -ā in this nominal-verb form is the PS accusative case-marking.

51. Interestingly, this form is linked (Bauer-Leander 1965:317, 270) with fa(c)aal(i), PS etymon of the BH AI and nomen agentis/opficum (1.2) (the latter perhaps showing sound-symbolic gemination and vowel-lengthening?), as well as VN stems with the other thematic vowels, I and U (below), and faāol adjectives cognate to the latter (3.3). Bauer-Leander (1965:317) refer to this ursprünglich nominal form as GRUNDFORM DES NOMINALS.

52. The question of canonical and non-canonical functions of nouns and verbs will be gone into in Ch. 6; cf also Hopper and Thompson (1984).

53. cf Cohen 1975 on development of conjunction with suffixes as the sound step in verbalization processes involving the nominal predicate that have taken place in a number of Semitic languages. This will be discussed further in 5.2, Sec. n and in 6.1.
Actually, the *fa\textsuperscript{cal}- stem may already have taken subject-pronominal suffixes in the proto-language, although development into a full canonical verb-form did not occur until after the split (cf. Hetzron 1976a:104-5). This hypothesis of nominal origin further Semitic perfect (and, independently, imperfect as well, cf. Callender 1975:5) explains quite nicely the Semitic use of ancient PAA genitive pronominal suffixes for the accusative (direct object) with these forms, cf. Callender 1975:5.

54. The second person plural (masculine and feminine) subject-suffixes -'\textit{tem}, -'\textit{ten} are exceptions which, due to their extra-heavy phonological 'weight' and corresponding final stress (as opposed to penultimate stress for the other forms, v. Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910) do trigger reduction of the first stem-vowel: \textit{kitab- tem}, -'\textit{ten} 'you (pl m,f) wrote'.

55. One might wish to claim that this form of the CI as reduced AI is original, and this is not out of the question; in view of the secondary nature of the derived patterns, however (as the standard term implies: v. 3.2.1), it is probably a secondary feature in the intensive stem (pi\textsuperscript{CCE}1), adopted at some point during the wide-scale reanalyses involving the derived patterns.

56. In MH, the passive participle is frequently used to express continuity in a state that one has entered rather than semantic patient-ness (grammatical passivity) per se, as \textit{yašûb} 'seated', \textit{šakûb} 'lying (down)', \textit{sâhûn} 'stinking', \textit{sâbûr} 'of the opinion'.
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57. $\text{ṣe}$, historically a MH compound $\text{ṣe + li-}$ that (REL) + to-, i.e., 'that (which belongs/is) to', functions in IH as an independent (and unanalyzed) word.

58. Of course the reanalysis might subsequently have been obscured, but it is rather dubious to propose such a complex series of events with so little support (more on this below).

59. Yona Sabar (p.c.) suggests that this is a phonological process taking place before pharyngeal consonants; this cannot, however, explain $\text{vēser}$, although such a process might have served as a contributing factor in the items with initial $\text{c}$.

60. Note that the scenario in Fig. 2 does not preclude development of CI from AI through stress-reduction in construct without dative prefix (compare the development in 2.9), explaining this kind of usage.

61. Lengthening of the preceding vowel compensates for the impossibility of geminating the guttural $\text{r}$.

62. This is shown with especial clarity by the peculiarly BH (also AIH) use of other substantives, deverbal nouns with no such participial-circumstantial meaning, with genitive suffix pronouns in such adverbial PPs, as $\text{li-badd-ō}$ to-isolation-his 'alone', 'we went $\text{li-?itt-ēnū}$ to-slowness-our 'slowly'.

63. The vowel appears before the genitive suffix pronoun-$\text{kā}$ because this is the pausal form (before verse-divider, v. fn 3 (Ch. 2)): cf 2.9.
64. It is, of course, to be expected that nominalized, and hence presupposed, propositions occur chiefly in subordinate clauses, particularly circumstantial, as the latter function to background information—v. Hopper-Thompson 1980.

65. Both colloquial IH and the Arabic colloquial dialects (and, to some extent, even journalistic style) rely much less on such nominalizations and tend more toward use of finite subordinate clause constructions more or less parallel to those of the standard Western European languages. Much of this may be due to syntactic influence from those languages (cf Blau 1981 on both Hebrew and Arabic, Eytan 1972:1656-7 on IH); higher stylistic levels tend to be more faithful to such as AIH and MSA, by contrast, Classical Semitic style (cf 5.2, Sec. d).

66. AIH, it should be mentioned at this juncture, comprises both written and spoken IH in the higher, more classical-literary/formal/prestige registers, i.e., a superstandard. Educated (and even the not-so-educated) Israelis will often use this register in formal or quasi-formal, learned, academic, journalistic, or public-official contexts, including lectures and discussions, and particularly when conversing with educated non-native speakers of Hebrew. It is perhaps even possible, although not crucial for our purposes, to make a distinction between classical-literary and AIH, using the latter in a narrower sense to refer to such features as use of the AI in internal-object constructions (4.2.1), i.e., out-and-out
imitation of BH style, this feature being much more stylistically marked than, for example, mere use of the conjugated CI in PPs, a standard feature of classical-literary Hebrew down through the ages.

67. In fact, the predominance of deverbal nouns in the seopolate $\text{mišqal}$ (noun-pattern) at one point caused me to wonder if its substantival/nominal character were truly certain. However, numerous antique segholate nouns exist which are of an undeniably concrete nature (e.g., $\text{пеrez}$ 'cedar', $\text{седа}^\text{c}$ 'temple (anatomy)', $\text{геред}$ 'lime', $\text{зефек}$ 'bird's crop', $\text{некед}$ 'grandson', $\text{петен}$ 'cobra', $\text{геlet}$ 'fruit-basket'). The predominance of DVNs in the segholate $\text{миqal}$ is doubtless due in part to a) the simple commonality of the pattern, and b) additionally, abstract/DVNs (cf fn 29 (Ch.3)) tend to predominate cross-linguistically in the lexicon in general (hence in the segholate $\text{миqal}$ as well) because they tend to be derived and therefore productive.

68. The spirant $\upsilon$ here is unusual; the norm for segholate nouns in construct to genitive suffix pronoun is a plosive plain obstructent, as $\text{кеleb}$ 'dog', $\text{калбо}$ 'his dog' (cf Blau 1975:4.2, 5.2). The exceptional spirancy here is perhaps due to an epenthetic schwa inserted to ease the transition between the two stops $\text{-gd-}$ (so called schwa medium—cf fn 9 (Ch 1), and 3.1), or possibly just an orthographic peculiarity.
CHAPTER 3. ISSUES BEARING ON THE HYPOTHESIS

3.1 The Revelations of Masoretic Vocalization

In deciding between the two competing hypotheses, the standard versus alternative derivations, one is compelled to rely very heavily on the Masoretic vocalization. It should therefore be explained here that MASORETES (< BH masora, masoret 'tradition') is the term given to that body of scribes who vocalized the much older (second millenium B.C.E.) consonantal text of the OT during the seventh to ninth centuries A.C.E., the end of the Talmudic era (v. Rabin 1966:253), to ensure continued comprehension of the text by the common people.¹ The very fact that this proved necessary is an indication that, by then, spoken Hebrew had already diverged considerably from the dialect of the text, and indeed, distinguishing between the dialect behind the vocalization (lit. niqqud 'pointing', as the systems involve points distributed about the holy consonantal text so as not to interfere with it) and the more archaic stratum indicated by the consonantism is one of the chief tasks of the Semitist. Compare Rosenthal 1961:10 on BA: 'The Masoretes aspired to catching and noting down the finest vowel shades such as were due to the influence of surrounding consonants, word and sentence stress, etc. This is a very difficult task that can be successfully accomplished only for a living language under carefully controlled conditions. How far the subtle Masoretic distinctions are applicable to the pre-Masoretic period of BA remains doubtful.' The same may be said to apply with regard to BH.
As is becoming apparent, we are far more dependent upon the vocalization, and it plays a far greater part in most problems of BH linguistics, than we would like. As a result, when we refer to BH we in fact usually mean Masoretic Hebrew and not the oldest (consonantal) stratum. With respect to this investigation, the vocalization typically assumes a vital part in arguing for either hypothesis. Interestingly, however, it is far more crucial for the standard reconstruction, which, in view of the dubiosity of the vocalization as regards antiquity, may be said to constitute an argument against the standard derivation.

Bearing the above in mind, the evidence usually presented in the standard BH reference works for the standard derivation/conventional reconstruction may be viewed in a wholly new light. The standard derivation is more heavily dependent upon the Masoretic vocalization, which, as per the above, is not all that reliable for EBH and pre-Hebrew, representing as it does the pronunciation of a much later period (some two millenia). Even with regard to MH, non-vocalized texts are considered more reliable than vocalized (the latter being most reliable for BH citations). Yet much of the case for the standard derivation rests upon the usual vocalization with qāmāṣ qātān (ō) (v. fn 12 (Ch. 1) and transliteration tables) that results when the CI is placed in construct to a genitive suffix pronoun, as in the widely quoted example Gen 2:15 ʾā-šūbāk-dāh ʾâ-lā-šāmīrāh to-work-her and-to-watch-her 'to cultivate her and to guard her'. This is claimed to be a reflex of PS *u, thus demonstrating the
etymological kinship of CI and imperative through reconstruction of a common stem *fu̞ C̣l-* (cf Bauer-Leander 1922:269, and 1.2, 1.4). In fact, there is much evidence that the finely-tuned Masoretic transcription is very frequently phonetic/sub-phonemic, not etymological (cf Rosenthal 1961:10, above). One example is the phenomenon of so-called schwa medium (Gesenius-Kautzsch 1910:51 and fns 9 (Ch. 1), 68 (Ch. 2), 'schwa mobile in the wrong place', that is, unexpected spirantization of a plain obstruent following an (apparently) closed syllable. bìq(?)dò (fn 68) shows sub-phonemic transcription: some sort of conditioning between juxtaposed vowels and consonants is taking place. An additional example of the inconsistency/unreliability of Masoretic transcription is the variable (and apparently unpredictable) presence vs absence of dagesh qal (v. 2.3) in the third radical of CIs with prepositional prefixes and suffix pronouns; even if it does prove to be rule-governed, the conditioning would clearly be phonetic/sub-phonemic and not a reflex of an etymological distinction, as no such distinction exists.

Such being the case, it is quite plausible that the short ù in the first syllable of CIs conjugated with pronominal suffixes is in fact epenthetic, due to resyllabification (I owe this initial suggestion to R. Schuh, p.c.), perhaps on analogy to the medium ù in the final syllable of non-suffixfixed forms, with vocalization of the initial syllable of šìmûn 'my guarding' due to analogy with the vocalization of the second syllable of lišmûr 'to guard'. An analogy to the participle is also a possibility (cf Ch 4 on (A)IH, where just such a
development has occurred, with the participle substituting for an irregular CI when conjugated with genitive suffix pronoun). As it happens, CIs are attested with vocalization compatible with cognancy to the AI (o-vowel in the second syllable), as Cōmōdīkā 'thy standing' (Ob 11 and elsewhere); if we take these to be archaisms, then such forms as Cōmōdì 'my standing' (Jer 18:20) (o-vowel in the first syllable) may result in part from remodelling on analogy to the participle Cōmed 'standing' (Is 3:13 +). The orthographic distinction between (short) ō and (medium) ō (qāmas qātān (X) versus ḫōlām hāser (X): v. fn 12 (Ch. 1) and transliteration tables) may simply be an orthographic convention distinguishing between initial and final syllables, or, more likely, it may signal a subphonemic length distinction between stressed and unstressed syllables. The latter seems quite likely, as the brief qāmas qātān is correlated with unstressed and hence shorter syllables (v. Gesenius-Kautzsch 1960).

On the other hand, the intriguing idea has been advanced (Sperber 1945, Sec. 69-70, 1956:xvi, Sec. 14, xxvi, Sec. 62a, both references apud Hammershamib 1963:86; also R. Hetzron, p.c.) that this initial vowel is not qāmas qātān at all, but rather qāmas qādȫl, a reflex of *a, not *u (v. transcription tables). This would, of course, be entirely compatible with an etymology deriving the CI from *fāCaal- (Sperber, in fact, claims that it is the AI with pronominal suffix that we see in certain instances such as bi-borīhaka in thy flight, when thou fleeest in-flee-thy (Gen 35:1) (which he would correspondingly vocalize bi-bārīha-kā), rather than the CI. Needless to say, this is entirely in agreement with the alternative derivation.
Another model for an analogical reanalysis might well have been the imperfect/imperative stem; this would explain the absence of a reflex of PS *\text{"aa}" between \text{C}_2 \text{ and } \text{C}_3, where a second vowel would normally appear (cf AI \text{fā}'\text{āl}): something like *\text{šimōrām} 'their guarding' replaced by \text{šomrām} 'their guarding' \text{~} (on analogy to) \text{šomrēm} 'guard them!' or \text{yismirem} 'he guards them'. The same explanation might well account for the \text{ū} (\text{< *u}) after \text{C}_1 \text{ in BH imperatives with accusative suffix pronoun such as } \text{gōtlēnī} 'kill me!', \text{gōtlēm} 'kill them!', \text{and the lengthened imperative (a specialized use of the PS subjunctive/ cohortative desinence in the second masculine singular as hortative, v. Hetzron 1969a:16), as } \text{šomrā} 'please guard!' (Ps 25:20, 86:2, I Chron 29:18); that is, initial vowel of \text{gōtlēm} 'kill them!' on analogy to second vowel of \text{gītōl} 'kill!' and initial vowel of \text{šomrā} 'please guard!' on analogy to second vowel of \text{šimōr} 'guard!' (cf fn 6). Such an assimilation of form occurs in MH, with the BH CI \text{lā-leket} 'to go' being replaced by the innovative \text{lēłēk} 'to go', modelled after the imperfect \text{vēlēk} 'he goes'. The similar behavior of CI and imperative/imperfect stems is therefore by no means sure evidence of an etymological relationship (cf 1.7 and passim). On the contrary, there are strong indications that the relationship is one of forms which have assimilated to one another due to perceived semantic kinship (cf Fig. 3 and further discussion in 3.2).

Even within the framework of the standard derivation, there are serious doubts as to whether this short \text{ū} of the initial syllable is etymological; compare the minimal consonantal stem + epenthetic vocalism
hypothesis and \(*f^{Cul}\) reconstruction of the supposed common infinitive/imperative/imperfect stem described in fn 9, (Ch. 1) and Jouon's (1923:109) reconstruction of the CI stem as \(*qitul\).

Further, data from the (morpho)phonologically conservative CA and Ugaritic languages indicate that, even if initial short \(\ddot{a}\) were etymological, it would not necessarily constitute evidence in favor of the standard derivation. On the contrary, the existence of Ugaritic nominal infinite forms such as \(\gamma^{C(c)}\)aal\(\ddot{u}\) (in addition to \(\gamma^{C}aal\ddot{u}\)) with dependent infinitive function (v. 2.2.3), as well as the CA cognate forms \(\gamma{a}^{-}, \ gamma^{-}, \) and \(\gamma^{C}aal(i)\) (2.2.5), show that the deverbal noun form(s) cognate to the AI, with long \(*aa\) in the second syllable, that we are proposing as etyma for the CI, might have had any of the three possible Proto-Semitic short vowels, \(*a, *i, \) or \(*u, \) in the first syllable. More confirmation of this is found in BH pîlô[mat] 'a certain one', \(^2\) with stem identical to the usual CI stem \(\gamma^{C}ro\) (above), < \(*fulaan\) (cf Classical Arabic fulaan id.).

It has been argued that the common defective spelling of the CI (\(\gamma^{C}ol\)), without mater lectionis wâw (cf Solà-Solé 1961:71; this is called in Hebrew hôlâm hâser 'defective holam (o)', as opposed to hôlâm mâlê 'full/plene holam', with mater lectionis—v. transliteration tables) is an indication that the second vowel was short and hence derives from \(*f^{C}ul\) (1.4), rather than from \(*f^{C}aal-\), as does the AI, usually written plene (\(f^{C}ol\))—v. 1.1-2. This is not necessarily the case. The origin of \(\gamma^{C}ol\) as construct form could easily explain a reduction of the vowel from long \(\ddot{o}\) to medium \(\ddot{a}\). The Masoretic
orthography is in any case not a reliable indicator of etymology in general, as discussed above, and with regard to the infinitives in particular: both AI and CI may be written with or without the mater lectionis (cf Jouon 1965:110a, Solà-Solé 1961:71). Note, for example, with the CI spelled plene: Gen 42:9 (an early book, cf fn 27 (Ch. 2)) lirōt 'to see', hāsōt 'midnight' Ex 11:4, Ps 119:62 (v. 2.9), Gen 4:15 (again, EBH) and many other citations hakkōt 'strike', IK 21:20 lācōsōt 'to do', Gen 41:32 (v. 2.4) lācōsōtō 'to do it', hānōt Ju 19:9 (again, EBH—fn 27) (Ch 2)) (but hānōt Nu 1:51, hānōtēnū Nu 10:31, hānōtkem Dt 1:33 (reduction before suffix pronoun in the latter two cases, as supra?).

Furthermore, cases abound in BH in general of non-etymological spellings, where etymological long vowels are written 'defectively' (without mater lectionis) and etymological short vowels 'abusively' (with mater lectionis); the participle, with etymological long/o/ (< PS *aa) is written in the overwhelming majority of cases without mater lectionis, i.e., as medium ō rather than long ō: Cōšēnî 'my Maker' Job 31:15, 32:22, rōʔānnî 'he who sees me' Is 47:10, ḫōśōt 'his finder' Gen 4:15, nōqēm 'avenging, avenger' Nahum 1:2, sṓmēc 'hearing, judging' Ju 11:10, rōseh Dt 19:3 'murderer', ṭo̩ćəlēy 'doers of' Job 34:22, hōné 'camping' Ex 18:5, Ps 34:8 etc. In the same direction, note also pilōnî with medium ō and not long ō, < (*pālōn) *fulaan (cf CA fulaan id, and supra): defectively written medium ō covers etymological long *aa. Similarly, Deut 32:8 (v. 2.9) giḇūlōt Cammīm shows feminine plural suffix -ōt, < PS * -aṭ.
(cf Arabic -aαt id.), written defectively (reduction in construct?). Conversely, gādāl/gādol 'big, great' < *gadul. (v. Brown, Driver, & Briggs 1979:152b-153a) which we should expect to be written defectively with medium ő (< PS *y), is in fact found written both hāsēr (defectively) with ő and mālē? (plene), in this case 'abusively', with ą, and even with qāmas qātan (ą) in construct. Finally, 'māwet, with etymological long vowel (< diphthong *mawt), has as construct form usually mot- (plene). With suffix (as opposed to full NP) this etymological long vowel is shortened/reduced to medium ő (i.e., written defectively: Is 53:9 bî-mōt-āw in-death-his (pl) 'in his tomb) (lit. death(s))'. This validates our supposition, above, that the medium ő of the CI may reflect the vowel-reduction of its former construct status.

It has thus been amply demonstrated that the (usually) defective spelling (with medium ő) of the CI may indeed derive from the etymological long *aa of *faCaal-, as does the AI. Also, it must be noted that the BH text is the written version of a much older oral tradition. By the time this tradition was committed to parchment, the reanalysis we are hypothesizing had probably already taken place, and hence even the consonantal text, much older than the Masoretic vocalization (supra), cannot be taken as a reliable indicator of the original structures, but must rather be considered to represent post-reanalysis CI forms no longer felt to be related to the AI and, as a consequence, susceptible to an orthographic convention transcribing them (for whatever reason) largely with defective ő rather than full ő.
It is of interest, also, that the CI follows the AI in form in verbs with pharyngeal as third root-consonant, retaining final ֗, rather than manifesting thematic vowel ֖, as do imperative and imperfect, whose normal thematic vowel ֗ is conventionally agreed to be a reflex of PS *u (v. fn 13 (Ch. 2) on this process of vowel-lowering before pharyngeals, viz. Josh 14:7 bi-šlo֤אָh möse in-send Moses 'bei Mose senden' (cf Bauer-Leander 1965:360). Compare AI šālo֝אָh, and contrast imperative šilah, imperfect višlah. In this case, then, CI sides with AI and against imperative and imperfect with respect to vocalization. It seems clear, then, that the evidence of Masoretic vocalization is by no means as unambiguously supportive of the standard derivation as has been thought. Considerable doubt has been cast upon this claim, and, on the contrary, much of the evidence may be said to constitute qualified support for the alternative derivation.

3.2 What Derived Patterns and Irregular Verbs Show

Throughout this study, our principle object of investigation has been the base-form or simple pattern of the Hebrew verbal system, qal, as the infinitives of what are traditionally termed the derived forms or patterns (cf. Bergsträsser 1918:61, Jouon 1923:110) are historically secondary as well as synchronically derivative.

We should certainly expect to find some clues to the relative antiquity of the AI-CI versus the CI-imperative relationships in the qal simple pattern of the second or regular verb through an examination of these relationships in the derived verbal patterns (Hebrew binyanim, fn 21 (Ch. 1)) as well as the various irregular verbs and verb-classes (Hebrew gzarot), triangulating from our independent knowledge of the secondariness
of the latter relative to the infinitive of the regular qal verb. We shall discuss first the derived patterns, then the various types of irregular verbs.

3.2.1 Derived Patterns. Table I below diagrams the most salient of the formal correspondences/equivalences between the derived infinitives (AI and CI), imperative, and imperfect (stem), with the qal preceding for comparison:

Table I - Formal Correspondences in the Derived Patterns

Qal - reg(ular): CI=Imv=Impf (fāCūl); AI stands alone (faCūl)
PīCēl (trans intens/fac)-reg: AI=CI=Imv=Impf (fāCēl). AI rarely faCūl (Joʻon 1955:117), evidently a secondary form on analogy to qal faCūl; there is, of course, no mater lectionis, because Masoretic vocalization is simply superimposed/grated onto the faCēl consonantal skeleton. PuCāl (passive of pīCēl) - reg: no Imv; no CI; AI (rare) fuCūl, foCūl (presumably the ā in the first syllable is the passive infix (v. 3.2.11), the ā of the second syllable on analogy to that of the qal AI).

HifCil (caus) - reg: AI=Imv=Juss (h-arfCēl); CI=Impf (h-arfCīl).

II w/y: same (h-āfel, h-āfil)5 HofCāl (passive of hifCil) - reg: no Imv; no CI; (rare) AI h-urfCēl, h-orfCēl stands along, with ē evidently on analogy to the active (hifCil) AI (Joʻon 1965:110 calls this a 'hybrid' form, with passive y/o + active ē of hifCil AI h-arfCēl).

NifCāl (passive - PS inchoative/refl, v. Diakonoff 1965) - reg: AI=CI=Imv=Impf (h-ippāCēl). Also found: innovative AIs n-ifCūl, n-ifCōl h-ippāCūl on analogy to the qal AI faCūl.
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Table I - Formal Correspondences in the Derived Patterns (cont)
(cf Joüon 1965:110) and (for the first two forms) níf\textsuperscript{c}al
perfect n-if\textsuperscript{c}al. (IIw/y): AI=Cl=Imv=Impf (h-iffôl).
Hitpá\textsuperscript{C}e1 (intens refl) - reg: AI=Cl=Imv=Impf (h-itpá\textsuperscript{Cc}e1)
final geminate (c\textsuperscript{C}, kfulim) verbs: AI=Cl=Imv=Impf
(h-itpalle1)

The complexity of these formal interrelationships renders them diffi-
cult of elucidation. A number of points in this table, however, stand
out as noteworthy. Most revealing for our purposes, it is very clear
that a wholesale leveling of paradigms has taken place, with various
phonetically similar forms reanalyzed as homophonous (v. fn 55
(Ch. 2)). To a certain extent this observation may be said to cut
both ways, as identity of form between AI and CI (except in hif-\textsuperscript{C}il,
intra) accompanies identity of CI, imperative, and imperfect stems.
One may therefore justifiably ask in which direction the reanalysis
has taken place, i.e., convergence through reanalysis of either AI-CI
or CI-imperative in the base forms might have led to their identity
in the derived forms. We have, however, presented independent
evidence to the effect that the regular qal AI and CI were no longer
felt to be related in BH, that is to say are synchronically unrelated
forms (2.9). Additionally, we have the semantic grounds of irrealis
function mentioned in Fig. 3 and infra as drawing infinitive and
imperative together (v. also 3.3). Finally, the sheer analogical
weight/pressure or influence exerted by two semantically similar
forms, imperative and imperfect (a full set of three, if one counts the jussive) as against the single form of the AI, must be taken into account.

Such being the case, the extensive identity of imperative, jussive, AI, CI, and imperfect stems in the derived forms (esp. in pi<sup>CC</sup>el, nif<sup>Cal</sup>al and hitpa<sup>CC</sup>el) gives rise to the impression that the derived CI (and perhaps the AI as well—the latter to be discussed further in 3.3), as well as in the irregular verb-classes (hollow and final geminate) listed above, are secondary forms (as, after all, the standard term 'derived' implies) resulting from reanalysis on analogy to the synchronic identity of CI and imperative in the simple verbs, and a falling-together with the imperative as non-finite verbal forms with irrealis function perceived as similar (consider: qitōl 'kill!' and qitōl 'kill(ing)' and cf. 1.7, 5.1, and Ch. 6). Bergsträsser (1918: v.2, p.61) claims the derived AI to be secondary, and (1918:10) states unambiguously that the AIs of the derived conjugations are modelled after their imperatives, on analogy to the imperative use of the simple AI (5.1, 3.3). Jouon (1965:110) refers to the derived AI as a 'création secondaire'. The references here exclusively to the AI as secondary, and not the CI, may be regarded as displaying the standard bias in favor of a common etymology of CI and imperative and an assumption that this is naturally reflected in the derived patterns, while the assimilation of the AI is worthy of note; we have shown this bias to be just that (above). In fact, most revealing on this point are the formal equivalences noted above for the hif<sup>Cal</sup>il (causative) pattern. Alone among the derived conjugations, the causative CI sides with
the imperfect against the AI and imperative; on the other hand, this is only visible in hi[Cil], because in the other binyanim imperfect = imperative. This, taken together with the later MH remodelling of the simple CI on analogy to the imperfect (to be detailed in Ch 4), impels one at least to consider the possibility of DRIFT (v. 5.2), an internal tendency in all patterns finding overt expression at first only in the causative, later manifesting itself in the MH base form as well.

Along the same lines, the quiescent schwa almost invariably found with the 1i-CI syntagma of the simple pattern instead of schwa medium as with other prefix-prepositions (v. 2.3.1) as lis-pōr (≠ li-sifōr — here the hyphen indicates syllable, rather than morpheme, boundary) 'to count', may be partially due to the analogical influence of the imperfect vis-pōr; cf Jouon 1965:112, Sec. 49f. Note also CI ši[kab] 'lie', with thematic vowel a (unusual for an infinitive, v. 3.3) perhaps on analogy to imperfect viškab, and CI, huggas 'be served (food)' on analogy to imperfect yuggas (Jouon 1965:234).6

In fact, with regard to the base-form, one might even suggest that the now-obscure (i.e., no longer clearly identified as deverbal noun, v. 7.6) AI, in its canonical use as cognate object/figura etymologica/ emphatic adverbial, was reanalyzed as a peculiarly deformed kind of copy of the following finite imperfect verb stem, as katob yiktob 'Indeed shall you write, lit. write shall you write' (disregarding, for the moment, spirantization of bgdkpt and subphonemic vowel distinctions): note the synchronically superfluous (that is, to speakers of BH) a of the AI. If the AI was indeed so regarded, we can explain
derived AIs as SIMPLIFIED models of the qal AI, simplified in that AI is now identical to the verb-stem, i.e., verb-stem copies/reduplication of the verb-stem, as dabber yi-dabber 'Indeed shall you speak!' for pi\textsuperscript{3}C\textsuperscript{1} etc. (cf 3.3).

Interestingly, Jouon (1965:110) refers to the differentiation of regular causative AI and CI (\textsuperscript{haf\textsubscript{C}\textsuperscript{1}} \neq \textsuperscript{haf\textsubscript{C}\textsuperscript{2}} respectively) 'par une modification secondaire'. A change that differentiates the two infinitive forms, rather than assimilating them to one another, surely accords better with the alternative than with the standard derivation (v. the detailed discussion in 2.9).

It is instructive to note the secondary nature of the Ugaritic, Syriac, and Akkadian derived patterns as well (Segert 1979: Sec. 5.12 and 1980: Secs. 5.37, 5.47, and Buccellati 1972: 15-16 respectively). Specifically, Ugaritic passive infinitives for the derived patterns are clearly an innovation, showing both movement toward the verbal pole with the adoption of this verbal feature, voice distinction, into the infinitive paradigm (v. Ch. 6) and, for the present purpose, the secondariness of the derived patterns.

3.2.2 Irregular Verbs. We have already observed in the table above (cf also 2.11) that the infinitives of the irregular verb classes share with derived patterns the characteristic of SECONDARINESS or later origin, a paradigmatic homogeneity of form that attests to mass restructuring of the 'set' — AI and CI, imperative, and imperfect — on analogy to the simple pattern of the regular triconsonantal verb. This follows the general principle of genetic reconstruction that the more heterogeneous of two paradigms, all other things being equal,
represents the older state of affairs (v. Hetzron 1976). We shall now exemplify this further.

Note the identity of CI and imperative (and imperfect stem) is hollow/medial weak (IIw/y) and final geminate (II"II or kfulim, lit. 'doubled') verbs: hollow CI \( \text{šāb} \) 'return', Inv \( \text{šāb} \) 'return!', Impf \( \text{yā-šāb} \) 'he returns', fin. geminate CI \( \text{lā-šāb} \) 'revolve', Inv \( \text{sōb} \) 'revolve!', Impf \( \text{yā-sōb} \) 'he revolves' (< *subb). This perfect, exceptionless identity must perforce arouse in us the suspicion that it is due to reanalysis on analogy to the regular verbs, rather than common (etymological) origin. Again, the near-identity of form between segholate CI and imperative (esp. in forms with lengthened \( \ddot{ā} \) (v. fn 79), as \( \ddot{	ext{sēt}} \) 'go out' ~ \( \ddot{	ext{sē}} \) 'go out!') leads one to suspect that a reanalysis has taken place on analogy to the now-identical CI and imperative of the šlemim ('whole', 'sound' or regular verbs), and/or the universal semantic (irrealis) grounds mentioned above, both of which are probably responsible for the identity of these forms in the derived patterns. The result is a CI stem that looks like the bare Inv stem + feminine -t suffix. The secondaries of this state of affairs is supported by a few rare instances of a segholate CI which differs in form from the imperative, nīšō? (cf Jouon 1965:157); these are very likely archaisms, as compared to the normal (~ innovative/remodelled) CI \( \text{lā-šēt} \) (*sā? + t < *šē?et (segholization, v. Gesenius-Kautzsch 1960) > \( \ddot{	ext{sēt}} \) v. fn 79) ~ Inv \( \dot{	ext{sā}} \).

Along the same lines, note the exact identity of segholate imperative and imperfect stem: Inv \( \ddot{tā} \)C 'plant!', Impf \( \ddot{yītā} \)C 'he plants',
Imv šēb 'sit!', Impf yēšēb 'he sits', etc. Also of interest is the differing vocalization of CI stem C₂eC₃e-t, with šegh₉l (ē) < *f₂C₁ (cf CA deverbal noun formation fa₂C₁), as opposed to imperative — imperfect stem C₂eC₃, with cere (ē) < *fC₁l (v. Fig. 1), which bespeaks different etymological origins for the two forms, despite the apparent reanalytical convergence of form mentioned above.

Even more direct evidence is available of the secondary nature of the irregular CIs. The whole class of šegholate CIs (form C₂eC₃e-t, with aphaeresis of C₁ (in construct?): cf Jouon 1965:157) is analogical in origin, manifestly resulting from assimilation of form of a number of verb-roots with weak initial root-consonant (cf fn 81 on cross-contamination between the irregular verb-classes) on the basis of a common meaning, a semantics of motion: ⁸viz. šēbet 'sit', ledeṭ 'give birth', leket 'go'⁹, redet 'descend', reṣet 'take possession of, inherit (perh. orig. 'take in' or sim.)', geset 'approach', seget 'withdraw', gahat₁₀ 'take', gaC₃t₁₀ 'touch', taC₃t₁₀,₁₁ 'plant', seṭ₁₂ 'go out', šīṭet₁₃ 'carry'.

It might even be suggested (S. Segert, p.c.) that the feminine -t of the šegholate verbal pattern, which certainly appears to be a later phenomenon, (v. Bergsträtzer 1918:53,84) spread systematically from another weak verb class, the final weak verbs (3.4 and v. fn 82). The lā- variant of the infinitive prefix found with several irregular verb classes (šegholate, medial weak, and final geminate) is also highly significant. The hollow verbs also are probably an analogically-formed class (again, many verbs of movement: rus 'run',
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gum 'arise', sur 'turn aside' etc.; cf also anomalous verb bo 'come', which also takes là-). The 'detachability'/independence of this prefix\(^14\) (v. 2.11), found (only?) with analogically-formed classes of irregular verbs, is an indication that the CI of these classes is secondary, formed on analogy to the predominant šlemim infinitive pattern of dative/allative prefix + CI by juxtaposing là- amid a deverbal noun. The deverbal noun status of these hollow, segholate, and final geminate CI stems is evident from their use as substantives\(^15\): hollow šir 'song', šōb 'quarrel (n.)', ḏuz 'contempt', seg. šebet 'sitting', fin. gem. dōm 'silence'. This, in turn, clearly argues for the origin of the regular CI as deverbal noun (not proto-verb form, v. 1.6) because of the choice of deverbal noun, not verb-form, to fill this syntactic slot (cf 2.3).

Our scenario, then, goes something like this. First the syntactic change diagrammed in Fig. 2, including subsequent reanalysis, takes place. Later, the irregular verb classes (gzarot), the medial weak, segholates, and kfulim, innovate CIs from deverbal noun formations on analogy to the regular verbs (šlemim), by the simple expedient of prefixing là-\(^16\). The vocalization indicates to us that these structures never actually were in construct; instead of the dative/infinitive marker being fused to the CI (as it would be in the construct state, 2.3), producing the reduced vocalization -i- (v. 1.6), it is simply attached to a deverbal noun (the substantive segholate, hollow and final geminate infinitive stems, above) in the absolute state as a separate prefix with full, unreduced vocalization (lā-) and total lack of fusion between prefix and stem (v. fn 14 (Ch. 3)). This
dovetails with the observation (2.9) that the regular CI is no longer viewed as being in construct in BH; one must presume that the rise of irregular CIs via analogy to the šlemin occurred after the construct state ceased to be productive for regular CIs (cf 2.11, and supra).

The development of a productive AI of fa'ol form for segholate verbs (v. 3.3) may also be viewed as secondary, having been inspired by the šlemin. However, the archaic/defective (i.e., aphaeretic, above) form of the segholate CI as compared with this new, regularized AI indicates that these forms were not associated by speakers; i.e., at the time that the gzarot developed CIs and AIs on analogy to the šlemin, speakers demonstrably did not connect the two forms. This, in turn, strengthens our supposition (above) that the CI was no longer viewed as the construct-state alternant of the AI at the time that this analogical influence of the regular verbs on the irregular verbs was exerted. This, in turn, constitutes additional evidence that the AI-CI connection is archaic rather than innovative, i.e., is not due to reanalysis. Rather, the etymological association of AI and CI was lost, and the two infinitive forms went their separate ways in the regular verbs, and the irregular verbs innovated both forms in their separate functions on analogy to the regular verbs, but did not associate the two.

Further confirmation that the CI-imperative connection is secondary may be found in verbs with initial glottal stop (I"ʔ). Here the imperative is ʔekol, the bare CI ʔakol, the CI with li- (or ki-, v. 2.3) (le/ke-) ʔekol. The imperative, then, sides with the
prepositional-object form, of the CI, not the bare stem. As the form with prefix is far more common (2.3), this would strongly indicate that the less frequent, 'odd' form, here the bare CI with differing vocalization (\( \ddot{a} \) instead of \( \ddot{e} \)), represents the older stage, the identity of imperative and prepositional-object CI resulting from post-reanalysis assimilation in form of CI to imperative (v. supra). What is most interesting is the nature of the difference in vocalization. The seghol (\( \ddot{e} \))-colored schwa, \( \ddot{v} \), is the unmarked alternant of schwa regularly found with \( \ddot{a} \); especially in CIs and imperatives (v. Gesenius 1960); i.e., it fulfills the 'minimal vowel' function normally served by schwa in regular verbs, its quality colored by the laryngeal character of the glottal stop (note the concomitant assimilation of the prefix vowel from \( i \) to \( e \)). By contrast, the \( \ddot{a} \) of the bare CI is not normally found with \( \ddot{a} \); we may suppose it to be a reduced version of the short \( a \) in the initial syllable of \( *faCaal- \), that is, to cover the original (etymological) vowel of the etymon of the AI. This agrees with our supposition (above) that this is the archaic of the three forms, and supports the monogenetic hypothesis.

Evidence from the derived patterns and irregular verbs, then, while not absolutely decisive in either direction, is by no means against the alternative hypothesis, and, like the evidence from Masoretic vocalization, may be seen as providing support for the latter in a number of respects.
3.3 The Absolute Infinitive: Reanalysis and Renewal

It was mentioned in 1.7 (Fig. 3) that the AI appears to have undergone some sort of reanalysis subsequent to its separation from the CI (1.6). We are impelled to this conclusion by the consistently full and regular phonological structure, both consonantal and vocalic, exhibited by the AI in irregular verbs, as opposed to the more archaic-looking CI (and imperative): viz. segholate verb roots \( \sqrt{\text{\text{\textit{y}}}s} \) (1"y, III") 'go out': AI \( \text{\textit{vas\,}} \), CI \( \text{\textit{se\,}} \), Imv \( \text{\textit{se\,}} \), and \( \sqrt{\text{\text{\textit{h}}}l\text{\text{\textit{k}}} \) 'go': AI \( \text{\textit{hal\,}} \), CI \( \text{\textit{le\,}} \), Imv \( \text{\textit{le\,}} \), final weak root \( \sqrt{\text{\text{\textit{r}}}sy} \): AI \( \text{\textit{ras\,}} \), CI \( \text{\textit{ris\,}} \), Imv \( \text{\textit{ris\,}} \), and final geminate root \( \sqrt{\text{\text{\textit{sb}}}b} \): AI \( \text{\textit{s\,}}\text{\textit{b\,}}\text{\textit{b\,}} \), CI \( \text{\textit{s\,}}\text{\textit{b\,}} \), Imv \( \text{\textit{s\,}}\text{\textit{b\,}} \).

In the segholate verbs, the complete consonantism of the AI, with morphologically-present initial \( \text{\textit{y}} \), stands in contrast to the older defective biconsonantal stems (3.2.2) of the CI and imperative, and shows clearly that the AI is a reновated form, in contrast to the more archaic CI and imperative. Additionally, the perfectly regular \( C_{1}C_{2}C_{3} \) vocalism of the AI stands in suspicious contrast to the specifically segholate vocalism of the latter two forms, with CI stems \( eC_{e} \) and \( \tilde{e} \) (< *e\( \tilde{e} \) (cf fn 79)) and Imv \( \tilde{e} \) (< *i, 3.2.2).

The AI of the final weak verb manifests a phonotactically very odd and artificial-looking final \( -\tilde{\text{\textit{e}}} \), quite unusual for any morpheme, nominal or verbal, with synchronic final \( t-h-\tilde{\text{\textit{e}}} \) (in verbs, < PS \*w\( \tilde{\text{\textit{y}}} \)) (v. 2.2.4, 3.4), in contrast to the older CI and imperative stems, the former with the expected feminine \( -\text{\textit{f}} \) (3.4), the latter revealing with its \( \tilde{\text{\textit{e}}} \)-vocalism the PS thematic vowel *\( \text{\textit{i}} \) that has become, in BH, the standard vocalization of final weak verbs (cf Rabin 1948:24). The \( -\tilde{\text{\textit{e}}} \)
vocalism in the AI, then, evidently follows the dominant vocalic pattern of the regular verbs. The absence of feminine -t may indicate a fresh reapperception of the role of the AI as absolute-state form of the CI (Fig. 3). Just as likely, however, it simply reflects the absence of feminine -t in the finite masculine singular perfect form selected as model (more on this below).

The final geminate AI not-so-coincidentally manifests both root-consonants of the final geminate, while CI and imperative show only one; although an independently-motivated phonological process of geminate-reduction could theoretically account for this distribution, the completeness of triconsonantal pattern that the final geminate AI furnishes tallies well with the image of the AI as verbal 'citation form' for speakers (below) and with our knowledge of the secondariness of the irregular verb-classes. If indeed etymological, this feature might well have enabled the final geminate AI itself to exert some analogical influence on the other irregular AIs to conform to the model of triconsonantal regularity (cf fn 14 (Ch 3) on the interrelationship and mutual influence of the irregular verb-classes).

The most logical explanation for these facts is that the AI has been reanalyzed and given new life as a productive grammatical form. This corresponds well with the previously-discussed secondary character of the derived AI (Bergsträsser 1918:61, Jöon 1965:110, and 3.2.1).

Clearly the next question is why the reanalysis has taken place. The presumption must be that renewal of the AI was inspired through analogy to some other grammatical form. The most obvious candidate is the class of regular verbs, to the analogical influence of which
we have already shown the irregular verbs to be subject (2.2.2). This accounts for both completeness of consonant-structure and regularity of vocalism. Once this pattern has been established, of course, a model within the irregular verb paradigm itself is needed to supply the missing root-consonant(s), and the third masculine singular perfect would seem to be the best candidate here, as it provides the most reliable 'citation form' for speakers with respect to the three root-consonants, and also resembles the AI in that they share the vowel-pattern $C_1\tilde{a}C_2VC_3$ ($V$ standing for a (short) vowel): cf AI hālōk, pf hālak, AI yāsā, pf yāsa, AI rāsō, pf rāsa. The behavior of the AI in the derived forms, however (3.2.1), provides grounds for including the imperfect and even the imperative as potential models (with regard to the latter, v. 5.1 on the functional relationship between AI and imperative, and Bergsträßer 1918:10 on how this may have led to a perceived connection between the two forms). In addition to these two models (the Ślemim and the perfect tense-aspect), a strong case can be made for adjectives of the pattern $fā\tilde{a}C_1\tilde{o}l$, virtually identical in form to the AI $fāC_1o\tilde{l}$, as a model. The semantics and function of the two forms motivate them beautifully for reanalytical convergence. The $fā\tilde{a}C_1\tilde{o}l$ adjectives derive from the same source as stative $fāC_1o\tilde{l}$ verbs, the PS verbal noun stem *fa\tilde{a}C_1ul- (v. 2.7 — this is shown by the feminine singular of $yādōm$ 'red', $yādūmāmā$). This, of course, is why they consistently manifest stative-intransitive-continuative, i.e., quasi-verbal, meaning: viz. colors (note esp. $sāhōr$ 'shining', $cāqād$ 'striped',) $bārōd$ 'spotted, dappled' measures and distances ($gādōl$ 'big', $gātōn$ 'small', $cāmōq$ 'deep',
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gábo^2h 'tall' (associated with a stative verb-root 'be tall' in BH), namok 'short', arök 'long', rahoq 'far', garob 'near', pahot 'less'), qualities-characteristics (ratob 'moist, wet', layom 'terrible, threatening' (cf intensive verb ?ivyêm 'threaten'), carom 'naked', matog 'sweet', tahor 'pure', godob 'holy (sanctified or set apart)', casot 'forged (steel), hardened', anog 'tender, delicate', hasoôn 'sturdy, strong' cabor 'thick, bushy') and shapes (caqol 'round', caqom 'bent, curved, crooked'). This stative verbal sense of the fa^2 pattern is still productive in NH (as camog 'sticky, adhesive' ~ cemeg 'rubber', cf cmig 'tire'), as well as the color sense (tapoz 'orange (color)') < tapuza zahav 'golden apple'. It is certainly still productive in BH, viz. caqob 'bearing traces (of something)' ~ verb-root caqob 'follow', caqeb 'heel, footprint, trace'. Conversely, the AI is frequently referred to in the literature as 'verbal adjective' (cf, for example, Jouon 1965). It is, therefore, not hard to see the AI coming to be perceived by speakers of BH as an adjectival form of the finite verb, perhaps specifically of the perfect (supra), a kind of citation form.

Additional confirmation of this view of AI as renovated verbal adjective may perhaps be found in the 'verb-stem copy' theory advanced in 3.2.1 to explain the identity of the derived AI with the finite verb-stem in its function as emphatic adverbial (the tenuous boundary between adjective and adverb as nominal and verbal modifiers respectively is quite frequently crossed, v. Ch 6). This, in turn, may correlate with the role of the AI as absolute-state form of the CI.
being perceived anew (supra): if CI, imperative, and imperfect are now perceived as related forms (3.2), then it would perhaps be only logical for the AI in emphatic adverbial use to be seen as the absolute-state form of the (CI) stem now perceived in the following finite imperfect. Such a partial rediscovery of what we are claiming to be the original etymological relationship of the two infinitives would explain any indications of secondariness in that relationship (cf 1.7 (Fig. 3), 2.9).

This corollary hypothesis about the AI throws some interesting side-lights on our claims regarding the relative antiquity of the AI-CI and CI-Imv-Impf relationships. In the segholate verbs, the CI stem (minus -t) testifies to an earlier stage than the rennovated AI, but also indicates different etymological origin than the imperative-imperfect stem (3.2.2). The anomalous segholate verb 'give', with innovative (i.e., regularized) AI nāton, (cf perf nātan) nevertheless has clearly differing CI versus imperative-imperfect stems, viz. CI tēt ≠ Imv tēn, Imp yittēn (cf fn 7 (Ch 3)). This particular verb is, however, uncertain evidence for either the standard or alternative derivations. On the one hand, the CI form tēt may be a reduction of *tin-t through loss of the n (perhaps by way of anticipatory assimilation to the following t and subsequent geminate simplification (again, cf fn 7 (Ch 3))—showing the same stem as imperative and imperfect (the vowel shift is quite regular); on the other hand, this would not in itself constitute strong evidence for the standard derivation, as the irregular verbs (like the derived patterns) elsewhere show consistent signs of analogical restructuring and convergence of these
forms (3.2.2). More indicative in this regard are the more archaic (3.2.2, 3.4) final weak verbs, where again CI stem differs from imperative-imperfect: \textit{risōt} 'want' versus \textit{rise}, \textit{virise}. Witness to the productivity of the \textit{fa'ūl} AI pattern is borne by its presence even in gzarot whose imperative and imperfect manifest thematic vowel \textit{a}, \textsuperscript{21} the verbs with second and third guttural (cf fn 44) and stative verbs. (Another factor might be avoidance of the homophony/syncretism that would result if thematic vowel \textit{a} were to replace \textit{ā} in the AI, resulting in a form identical to the third masculine singular perfect (\textit{fa'ūl}).) With rare exceptions, \textsuperscript{22} the \textit{ā} vocalization wins out in the CI of the above gzarot too, probably aided by the analogical influence of uniform thematic vowel \textit{ā} (< PS *u) of the regular imperative, imperfect, and, most importantly, of the regular CI. \textsuperscript{23} Jouon (1965:111, Sec. 49c) refers to \textit{fa'ūl} as 'envahissante', having become 'comme la forme propre de l'infinitif construit', viz. second guttural CI \textit{šihōt} 'slaughter' despite Impf \textit{višāt}, third guttural \textit{šilōḥ} 'send' despite \textit{višlah}, final ? \textit{mīsō}(')? 'find' despite \textit{vimsā(')?}, \textsuperscript{24} statives \textit{šima'ac} 'hear' despite \textit{vismā'c} and \textit{šī'ūl} 'borrow, ask' despite \textit{viš'ul}. This last doubtless accounts also for the \textit{ā} of the final weak CI, in contrast to the more conservative thematic vowel \textit{ā} (< PS *i, supra) shown by final weak imperative and imperfect.

To sum up, then, it appears as though the AI of the irregular verbs, like the derived AI (3.2.1), is not of the same antiquity as the AI of the regular verbs, a reduced form of which we claim to lie behind the CI (1.7). Rather, the irregular AI results from a subsequent
reanalysis of that ancient form on analogy to the perfect (and possibly other tenses/moods, supra) and the fā'āl adjectives, this reanalysis becoming visible only in the irregular verbs\textsuperscript{25} where it leads to regularization of the triconsonantal pattern and vocalism. This development explains the suspiciously regular appearance of the irregular AI, bearing no traces of the defective consonantism or vocalism that often characterize the archaic-looking irregular CI (supra). The latter fact may be construed as arguing against the standard derivation, in that (with the possible exception mentioned earlier, renovated AI and antique CI are evidently not synchronically perceived as closely-related forms, but rather have pretty clearly gone their separate ways, as described in the alternative derivation scenario (1.6.10).

3.4 Final Weak Verbs: A Corollary/Subsidiary Hypothesis

One of the heuristic advantages of the monogenetic hypothesis and alternative derivation is that one is compelled to review a number of diverse syntactic and morphological facts in a new light.\textsuperscript{26} As mentioned in 2.2.4 and 3.2-3, the irregular verb-class that we have been calling final weak, traditionally termed I"h or III"h, is in fact reconstructed on the basis of internal and comparative evidence as III w/y, that is, as verbs with final radical glide w/y (cf W. Chomsky 1978; this is still the state of affairs in Classical Arabic.

This fact may be of tremendous significance for the alternative derivation. The synchronic -t/-h/-∅\textsuperscript{27} alternation of final weak verbs (hence the traditional term I"h) is identical to the -t/-h/-∅
alternation of nominals with etymological feminine -t. The natural assumption is that, at some point in pre-BH, an abductive change took place, an analogical proportion: since many nominals with final -a(h) in the absolute state alternate with feminine -at in the construct state (< older *-at through lenition, cf fn 14 (Ch. 2) and CA feminine singular ending -at), the presumption must have been made (doubtless aided by the triliteral Systemzwang, v. 6.2) that all vocables, without a clearly perceptible final root-consonant, i.e., all 'final weak' vocables including those with original final w/y (by then attenuated to Ø or additional vowel-length, cf fn 27 (Ch. 3)), had feminine -t as final radical. Such an analogy between the synchronically indistinguishable reflexes of final -a < *-ah < *-at ~ final -a < *-aw/y would seem to be the only explanation for this distribution of -t/-h/-Ø in final weak verbs.

Results of the reanalysis are visible within various parts of the final weak verb paradigm: a third masculine singular perfect written with orthographic (if not actually pronounced, cf n 27 (Ch. 3)) final -h, and, more importantly, a third feminine singular perfect of the form C₁aC₂tā, as gantā 'she acquired'. The significant point here is the placement of the t. Were it a reflex of the (PS) feminine verb-ending *-at, it would come after the final vowel; its actual location between C₂ and the final vowel indicates that it is the reanalyzed third radical, i.e., C₁aC₂tā = C₁aC₂C₃ā, which brings l"h into line with the regular third feminine singular perfect (as šamīrā 'she gardened', < šamarat, cf Bauer-Leander 1965).

Most important for our purposes, the reanalysis gave rise to a CI for the originally III w/y with the form C₁iC₂ōt, perhaps specifically
on analogy to plural feminine nouns in construct, with ending

\[-\ddot{\text{o}}t/\ddot{\text{o}}t.\]  

This course of events is quite plausible in view of what we know about the secondariness of the irregular verbs and their susceptibility to analogical influence by the regular verbs (3.2.2, 3.3); if the \(\ddot{o}\) of the final weak CI is due at least in part to the influence of the regular CI (3.3), and if, as we hypothesize, the regular CI originally stood in construct to its object (1.6), serving in this capacity as a model for the irregular CI, and, finally, given the evidence elsewhere in the final weak paradigm that III w/y has been reanalyzed as final \(-t/-h/-\ddot{o}\) (supra), then such a triangulation on the part of BH speakers seems inevitable: final weak CI = feminine plural noun standing in construct to its object.

This, in turn, provides confirmation for the alternative derivation similar to that provided by the segholate verbs (2.11). As the nominal form of the latter indicates, indirectly, that the regular CI \(\text{fi}^{\text{Cn}}\) serving as model must still have been perceived as nominal (not verbal) at the time that the segholate CI was developed, so the evident development of final weak CI ending \(-\ddot{\text{o}}t\) on analogy to both the regular CI and to feminine plural nouns in construct confirms our supposition that the regular CI stood in construct at that time. As with the monogenetic hypothesis (2.4, 2.10), the most decisive evidence for this corollary hypothesis may be found in actual 1"h CI stems standing in construct to their D0s-as-genitive attribute, such as \(\text{has\ddot{o}t}-(\text{hal-})\text{layl\ddot{a}}\) (2.9), \(\ddot{\text{s\ddot{i}t\ddot{o}t}}\) yayin (Is 22:13) with drink(ing)(of) wine.
conjunctive accents connecting CI and DO, and others; v. 2.9
for the wider theoretical implications of such constructions.
Additional support for the corollary hypothesis is found in the
feminine -t that appears in place of third radical w/y in final weak
developed nouns of the form fiCùt: viz. zinùt 'whoredom' (√zny
'fornicate'), ricùt 'grazing' (√rcy 'graze'), dimùt 'image' (√dmy
'be like, be similar'), rπùt 'vision' (√rπy 'see'). These forms
were very likely originally construct-state forms, later extended to
absolute-state use (v. fn 16 (Ch. 2), and 2.9; as in 1.6.8
(fn 26); text-counts on the early books might show interesting
results). This -ù ending, originally felt to be part of the root
(presumably arising out of vocalized final w/ù + feminine -t nominal
suffix), is later metanalyzed in MH as a general abstract/deverbal
noun suffix, and applied to regular triconsonantal verbs (cf. fn 16
(Ch. 2)).29,30 This form, too, may show the analogical influence of
construct-state feminine nouns; remember that the Aramaic -ù is the
construct-state form only, with back-formations in the absolute
state ending in -ù (fn 16 (Ch. 2)).
A less direct but also interesting parallel is found in the later
Hebrew and BA reanalysis of suffixed definite article -ã as feminine
It was suggested in 3.2.2 that the otherwise inexplicable -t ending
of the segholate CI may have spread from the 1h reanalysis. Although
the chronology cannot be certain, the phenomenon seems to be quite
productive in the segholates (a highly productive abstract/deverbal
noun misgâl generally) and hence perhaps of later vintage than in the
final weak verbs (cf fn 16 (Ch. 3) on independent evidence that the
morphology of the 1"h verb-class is older than that of the segho-
lates). This view receives confirmation from the closely-related
Central Semitic languages of Arabic and Syriac\(^{31}\): feminine deverbal
nouns Ar \(\text{id}^\text{at}\) \(\text{un}\) Syriac \(\text{lid}^\text{a}\) 'birth' (cf BH DN \(\text{led}^\text{a} (t-)\) id.,
closely related to segholate CI \(\text{led}^\text{et}\)  'give birth' (3.2.2)), Ar
\(\text{r}^\text{it}^\text{at}\) \(\text{un}\) 'inheritance' (cf BH segholate CI \(\text{r}^\text{es}^\text{et}\)  'inheri-
at'), \(\text{si}^\text{n}^\text{at}\) \(\text{un}\) 'sleep' (BH \(\text{sen}^\text{a} (t-)\) id.), which all end in feminine \(-t\). Bergstrasser
(1918:53, 84) claims the spread of feminine \(-t\) to be a later phenome-
non (v. 3.2.2). Older feminine abstract/deverbal noun formations
\(\text{f}^\text{i} \text{c}^\text{ul}(1)\text{a}\) (e.g., \(\text{gi} \text{r}^\text{ull}^\text{a}\) 'redemption, deliverance'), \(\text{f}^\text{i} \text{c}^\text{al}^\text{a}\) (e.g.,
\(\text{zi}^\text{n}^\text{a}\) 'old age', \(\text{\d}^\text{im}^\text{h}^\text{a}\) 'happiness'), \(\text{fa} \text{c}^\text{al}^\text{a}\) (cf \(\text{l}\) a. below, and Bauer-
Leander 1965:316), \(\text{f}^\text{i} \text{c}^\text{a} \text{l}^\text{a}\) (2.2.4), and \(\text{f}^\text{y} \text{c}^\text{a} \text{l}^\text{a}/\text{fu} \text{c}^\text{a} \text{l}^\text{a}\), all with feminine
\(-t\) in construct, even \(\text{fa} \text{c}^\text{a} \text{lat}\), as \(\text{g}^\text{ar}^\text{a} \text{hat}\) 'baldness', might have
served as models for the reanalysis, especially as they may be found
occasionally with infinitival function (below).

Almost as impressive as \(\text{h}^\text{us}^\text{ot}-\text{lay}^\text{la}\), above, for the hypothesis of
final weak reanalysis is the considerable number of deverbal noun
formations, mostly with singular or plural FEMININE endings \(-\text{a}(t)\) and
\(-\text{ot}/-\text{ot}\), which serve INFINITIVAL FUNCTIONS, most often the common BH
CI function as genitive in adverbial PPs (cf 2.11), but even depen-
dent infinitive function (cf 2.3). Many stand in construct to
their objects. These are generally considered to be archaic remnants
of an earlier period when pre-Hebrew, like other Semitic languages
such as Arabic, made use of a multiplicity of gerundive nominals
for infinitive purposes (1.5, Solâ-Solé 1961:1). These quasi-verbal
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constructions are even more clearly suitable models for the l’h reanalysis than the mere existence of such forms serving as deverbal nouns or gerunds (supra), perhaps serving as a kind of swing-position or focus-point for the reanalysis, somewhere between gerunds proper and canonical l’h CIs, as earlier (2.4) constructions intermediate between allative/physical-directional goal and purpose-intent must have functioned for the reanalysis of (reduced) DVN fi[C0l as dependent infinitive. There follow several examples of this:

1. As dependent infinitive:

   a. Ex 30:18 + 1i-rāhs-ā(h)32 'to wash, for washing'
      to-wash-fs

   b. Liturgical li-?ahāb-ā û-li-yir?-ā ?et 1i-sim-ikā
      to-love-fs and-to-fear-fs ACC name-your(ms)
      'to love and (to) fear thy name'

      Note that verbalization accompanies the dative prefix (2.3),
      as indicated by both the nota accusativi (2.6) and the lack
      of construct-state feminine -t (however, li?ahābā does occur
      also with -t in verbal syntaxis, as II Chr 2:10 bi-?ahāb-at
      in-love-fs

      YHWH 1i-sim-ikā in Yahweh's loving his people,
      Yahweh ACC - people-his

      because Yahweh loves his people'). In II Sam 19:7 ?ahābā is
      opposed to antonymic CI šinā 'hate', and another indication
      that it functions here as infinitive and not as gerund (cf
      Jouon 1965:111, and fn 38 (Ch. 2) on BH parallelistic verse
      structure as an aid in determining grammatical form). Compare
      these forms used in the more archaic function of gerunds:
Ps 5:8 bi-yir-āt-ēkā’ in fear of thee, with in-fear-fs(of)-your(ms)
feminine -t in construct and DO as genitive suffix pronoun,
Jer 31:3 ḥābat ǧūlām ‘eternal love' with feminine -t in con-
love-fs(of) world struct and adverbial genitive attribute.
c. Although it is not a feminine form, compare the segholete
developer noun infinitive formation (not a normal segholete CI
with -t ending) liyēsa (item 7 of 2.4, and v. also 2.11).
d. Gen 4:23 kā ḭîsh hārāḡ-ti li-fīṣ̱-ī wi-yeled for man kill(pf)-I to-wound(DVN)-my and-boy
li-habbūr-at-ī: ‘For I have killed a man for wounding
to-bruise-fs(of)-mine me, and a boy for bruising me'.

Both formations here are clearly DEverbal nouns with DO as
genitive suffix pronoun: the first, absolute-state form
pesa ‘wound' (v. 2.11 on segholete internal vowel changes,
and cf yēsa, above; note that fiṣ̱, from the early book of
Genesis, shows more archaic (= nominal) morphology syntax
than the latter)); the second, feminine singular deverbal noun
of mīṣqal faṭṭūlā. Actually, the dative marker is used here
in unusual fashion, with the sense of 'in return for, in
retribution/revenge for', rather than as canonical dependent
infinitive. It is not hard, however, to see how this meaning
of li- might have developed from its benefactive sense
e. (Saving the best for last): Ezek 17:9 lî-massâ?-ôt ?ôt-âh
to-lift-f pl(of) ACC-her
‘to lift her’ (v. 2.2.4).

This Aramaized (= late) BH infinitive constitutes the most
direct evidence for our 1"h reanalysis on analogy to plural
feminine nouns in construct, which end in -ôt/-ôt. Both
massâ? sg 'lift(ing), bear(ing)' and massâ?ôt abs pl id.
are independently attested with substantival function, and
massâ? even as CI (2.2.4). massâ?ôt is hence evidently the
construct plural of massâ? (with vowel reduced from absolute
state massâ?ôt), being used as CI. Conjunctive accents link
the CI to the following nota accusativi (cf 2.6), something
like [to-(the)lifting-f pl(of) ?ôt-her].

2. As genitive in adverbial clauses:

a. Gen 19:16 bî-heml-at YHWH Câl-âw 'when Yahweh was
in-mercy-fs(of) Yahweh upon-him
merciful to him/took pity on him'.

b. Hb 2:1 ū-mâ ?â-sib Câl- tôkah-t-î
and-what I-reply(impf) upon- scold-fs(of)-mine
‘and what shall I reply upon my scolding [i.e., being
scolded]’.

Again, the genitive suffix is DO.

ki-ma-âpêk-at ?êlôhîm ?et- sidom...
as-DVN-overthrow-fs(of) God ACC- Sodom
‘like God’s overthrow of Sodom...’

Again, the presence of nota accusativi shows a degree of
verbalization (2.6).
d. Es 1:15 ʿu-bi-mîlōʔat hay-yâm-îm hāʔ-ēlēe...
   and-in-fill-fs(of) the-day-pl the-these
   'and when these days were fulfilled...'

Here a conjunctive accent, as well as construct state
feminine -t, links the CI and its genitive attribute.

e. Ezek 16:52 ʾbî-saddeg-tēk ?ahâʔ-ōt-ēk:
   in-justify-fs(of)-your(fs) sibling-f pl(of)-your(fs)
   'in thy justification/justifying of thy sisters'

Here a rare feminine piCCel CI (cf Jouon 1965:111: Sec. 49d,
117: Sec. 52c) stands in construct to subject genitive pro-
nominal suffix (interestingly, the DO (a full NP) follows
without intervening nota accusativi, perhaps indicating that
it too may be considered a genitive attribute of the CI).

f. Dt 1:27 ʾbî-šînʔ-at YHWH ʾōtānû
   in-hatred-fs(of) Yahweh ACC-us
   'in Yahweh's hatred of us, in Yahweh's hating us'

Here, CI stands in construct to its subject-as-genitive-
attribute.

g. Nu 14:16 and Dt 9:28 (with slight variation)
mib-bîlti yîkōl-et YHWH lî-hā-bî?
from-without ability-fs(of) Yahweh to-CAUS-come
?et- hāʔ-Câm haz-ze ʾel-hāʔ-âres ṭāʾer- n-īṣbâC
ACC the-people the-this to-the-land that PASS-sworn
lâ-ḥem "On account of Yahweh's inability to bring this
to-them
people unto the land that was sworn unto them"

Again, the CI stands in construct to its subject as genitive
attribute.
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As mentioned in 2.2.4, the attestations of feminine construct-state ending -\textit{at} in the BA derived CI, originally a deverbal noun, lend support to the 1"h hypothesis.

The apparently secondary verb-root √\textit{nht} 'land, come to rest' may show a further reanalysis and lexicalization of this construct-state feminine -\textit{t}, already the result of a reanalysis per the 1"h hypothesis, as a root-consonant, presumably from the final weak verb-root √\textit{nhw/y} 'rest'; both secondary semantics (above) and less complete attestation in all branches of Semitic than the cognate, and older root(s) medial weak √\textit{nwh}, final weak √\textit{nhw/y} 'rest', point to the secondary nature of √\textit{nht}. This second reanalysis constitutes an additional instance of the analogical spread of construct structures to the absolute state (cf 2.9).

To summarize: three stages are posited in our hypothesis regarding the genesis of the 1"h verb-class, corollary to the monogenetic hypothesis. 1) The oldest stage, in Proto-Semitic or Pre-Hebrew, where final weak verbs manifest etymological final radical \textit{w/y}; 2) The intermediate stage, during which the final weak CI is reanalyzed as a substantive with feminine construct ending; and 3) The final and historical stage, during which this perception fades, final weak CIs no longer being viewed as standing in construct in BH (cf 1.6.8, 2.9). Their concomitant extension to absolute-state contexts (cf 2.9) partially obscures the reanalysis. This subsidiary analysis correlates well with, and provides additional corroboration for, the monogenetic hypothesis and alternative derivation.
3.5 Givón's Binding Hierarchy: Evidence for the Hypothesis

In Givón 1980 the case is made for a syntactic BINDING HIERARCHY of complement-taking verbs distinct from, but interacting with, the logical notions of implicativity and factivity/presupposition. We shall not go into detail here regarding either these logical notions, Givón's semantic typology of matrix verbs, or the cross-linguistic evidence he marshals for his hypothesis (interested readers are referred to Givón 1980). Suffice it to say that the Binding Hierarchy provides a unitary scale (and thus a unitary explanation) for plotting the correlation between the semantic feature of tighter control ('binding') by matrix verb over subordinate-clause verb (implicativity or factivity/presupposition) and various morphosyntactic features indicative of lesser independence on the part of the subordinate clauses; of the latter, we are interested in the more nominal/nonfinite character of such subordinate clauses. Conversely, looser 'binding' by matrix verb of subordinate-clause verb ~ greater independence of subordinate clause, specifically more verbal/finite character. As should be obvious by now, this correlation provides us with a useful diagnostic tool for determining the nominal or verbal character of a particular grammatical form, given the semantic type ~ position on the Binding Hierarchy of the matrix verbs which may govern it, and hence will prove of use in testing the alternative as against the traditional derivation (below); or, to put it another way, dependent infinitive (i.e., complement) function being a canonical syntactic function of the BH CI (as of infinitives across languages), it makes sense to examine the main-clause verbs which
take them as complements for clues to their nature. First, however, some examples from other languages:

1. English
   a. He avoided working.
   b. *He avoided to work.
   c. He refused to work.
   d. *He refused working.
   e. He wanted to work.
   f. *He wanted working.

These six complex sentences with modality verbs in the matrix clause, grammatical and ungrammatical, exemplify the semantic-syntactic correlation discussed above. With the strongly (negative) implicative matrix verb avoid, only the gerundive-participial (i.e., more nominal/realis) form working may follow; the (more verbal/irrealis) infinitive is ungrammatical. Conversely, the nonimplicative refuse and want (you may refuse to do X and be forced to anyway, or want Y and nevertheless not get it) take complement verb in the form of the infinitive preceded by infinitive-marker to, and cannot take the more nominal gerundive form. In short, the implicative verb, located higher on the Binding Hierarchy, binds the complement-clause verb more tightly, resulting in a more dependent/presupposed/nominalized verb-form and clause. Conversely, the nonimplicative verb, located lower on the scale, with less syntactic/semantic control over the subordinate-clause verb, allows a more independent, less nominal verb-form and clause.
2. Palestinian Arabic (Givón 1980:360, with modifications in transcription and gloss)

a. kaan-a bidd-u yi-Šğul 'He wanted to work'
   was-it desire-his he-work

b. xalas-a Šğul-u 'He finished working/his work'
   finished-he work-his

Again, the non-implicative 'want, takes a finite/verbal complement, the imperfect, while the highly implicative 'finish, takes the entirely non-finite, deverbal noun/gerundive formation fu^\(c\) (cf 3.2.2); note that English finish also takes the gerund (*He finished to work).

At the top of the scale for BH, of course, we have lexical causatives (which might also be considered univerbation or predicate-raising, cf Givón 1980) as in a. below:

3. Biblical Hebrew

a. way-y-o-rqîd-ēm kînō cēgel...
   and-he-CAUS-dance-them like lamb
   'And he makes them dance like a lamb...' (Ps 29:6)

of more interest to us, however, are the modality verbs of differing implicativity in b. – g.:

b. Gen 37:8 way-y-o-sif-ū ġōd śînō? ūôt-ū...
   and-he-CAUS-add-pl still hate ACC-him
   'And they hated him the more, lit. and they added still (more) hating him'

c. Ps 18:39 wî-lô-yükîl-û qûm
   and-not-could(pf)-pl arise
   'And they could not arise'
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d. Gen 4:12 劫—t-ō-sēf tēt-kōh l-āk...
   not-she-CAUS-add giv(ing of)--strength-her to-you
   'She shall not again give (lit. add the giving of) her
   strength to you'

e. Amos 5:2 劫— t-ō-sīf ʾqūm 'She shall not rise again'
   not-she-CAUS-add arise

f. Gen 8:10-12 way-y-ō-sef ʾṣallāh ʾet— hay-yōnā min—
   and-he-CAUS-add send(INTENS) ACC-the-dove from—
   hat-tēḇā:...wišo— yāsīf-ā ʾṣūb— ʾel-āw ʾCūḏ:
   the-ark:... and-not— add-she return— tō-him again:

   'And again he sent forth the dove from the ark (lit. he added
   sending the dove)...and she did not return to him (any)more,
   lit. she did not add the return(ing) to him'

g. Ps 40:14 risē YHWH li-ha-ssīl-ēnī...
   want(Imv)Yahweh to-CAUS-deliver-me...
   'Be pleased, O Lord, to deliver me...'

In b. - f., the modality verbs in the matrix clause, yāsāf (qal)/
ḥôṣīf (hifil) 'add, increase, do again' and yākōl 'can, be able',
are highly implicative (those with negative marker, negatively
so). If Givón's Binding Hierarchy is correct they should govern
a tightly-controlled and hence more nominalized subordinate
clause. Sure enough, the verb-form in the subordinate clauses of
b. - f. is the bare CI stem, without infinitive prefix. In g.,
by contrast, with the non-implicative modality verb rāsā 'want,
be satisfied' in the matrix clause, the dependent-clause CI
correspondingly takes the dative-cum-infinitive prefix. In this
case the non-implicativity of the main-clause verb is quite
apparent, as the worshipper can by no means simply assume that
his deliverance is a certainty.

Although an entire scale of points may be mapped out for any state of
Hebrew, BH included, it is the contrast between bare CI stem and liCI
syntagma that interests us most, as it focuses on the crucial distinc-
tion between the nominal bare stem and the increasingly verbalized
syntagma with dative-cum-infinitive marker (2.3.1).

The facts about BH, then, agree with the monogenetic hypothesis, in
that the bare CI stem liC01 is shown, through its correlation with
highly implicative matrix verbs, to be a nominal form, more so than
the CI syntagma with infinitive prefix li-, which has begun shifting
toward the verbal axis as a consequence of the infinitivalization
engendered by the dative-cum-infinitive marker (cf 1.6.7, 2.3.6, and
Chs. 5 and 6). Needless to say, the conventional reconstruction/
standard derivation has no means to account for this, positing as it
does the derivation of the CI from a proto-verb form (1.6-7), it can
explain neither the nominal functions of the CI (Ch. 2, 2 passim, esp. 2.11,
and above) nor the increasing verbalization that accompanies the
dative-cum-infinitive marker li- (above).

By MH, of course, the bare CI stem no longer functions as dependent
infinitive, the li- prefix having fused inseparably with it; as men-
tioned in 2.3.1 (cf also Ch. 4), this is a clear indication that the
CI has been verbalized, in accordance with our hypothesis (above).

Even so, some interesting echoes of the distinction between stem with
and without li- persist into MH and even IH, albeit fossilized/
lexicalized in the latter. The implicative modality verb hirbiq
'make far' (hif'il) occurs twice in BH with dependent (construct) infinitive, once the li- prefix and once without (Ex 8:24 rag only)

ha-rheq lō? t-a-rhīq-û lā-leket
CAUS-make far(AI)-not- you-CAUS-make far-pl-to-go

'Only go not very far away', Ps 55:8 hinnēh ḫ-a-rhīq ni̇dōd
Behold I-CAUS-make far wander...
wander afar off'). In PRH/AIH it is standardized in a fixed expression with the bare CI stem lexet 'go', hirzik lexet 'be extreme, go to extreme lengths (figuratively)'; the latter has even innovated hirzik ri'ot 'see from afar, predict', with bare CI stem ri'ot 'see' following the same matrix verb (cf Even-Shoshan 1977:1274, s.v. Alp ḫnnēh)

and hosif lexet 'continue/keep on going, go on (lit. add going))',

with the highly implicative modality matrix verb hosif 'add, increase, do again' (supra) and the same CI stem lexet 'go'. At the same time, modality verbs of low implicativity in NH can never take bare CI stem as dependent infinitive; the infinitive marker is obligatory: hiskim/

hazelal lexet 'He agreed/decided to go', * hiskim/hazel lexet,

raciti lalexet 'I wanted to go', * raciti lexet.

As mentioned above, we are not interested here in mapping out the entire scale even for BH, much less IH, but a neat syntactic minimal pair in IH illustrates that lower points exist on the binding scale than CI + infinitive marker. With some modality and cognition-utterance verbs (v. Givón 1980) of very low implicativity, as xašav 'think', the speaker has a choice between li-CI and a finite sub-ordinate clause introduced by complementizer ye 'that', viz.:
4. Israeli Hebrew
   a. xašav la-rovod 'He intended to work'
      (he)thought to-work
   b. xašav ye-yar-rovod 'He thought (that) he would work'
      (he)thought that-he-work

a., with the li-CI syntagma, has a somewhat implicative modality
sense (this was first pointed out to me by Susie Ben-Chorin); in
fact, this kind of rising on the scale of cognition-utterance
verbs to modality status is discussed by Givón (1980:345-6, and
v. 5.2). b., with fully-tensed dependent clause (the less-
marked syntactic structure for the ordinarily non-implicative
xašav 'think'), is much weaker. Compare English 'John thought
to work' vs. 'John thought (that) he would work', with an
arguably greater implication in the former that John will, in
fact, work.

In short, Givón's Binding Hierarchy affords some indirect, but
strongly indicative, corroboration for the monogenetic hypothesis
and alternative derivation.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 3

1. Of the three systems, Tiberian, Palestinian, and Babylonian, the Tiberian system is most common, ultimately became the standard system, and is the only one in modern use. The Babylonian vocalization is frequently referred to by Semitists because of its many archaic features.

2. Probably from an 'unused' (unattested but reconstructed) noun *pālōn Gesenius, in Brown, Driver and Briggs 1979:811).

3. Note: as we are concerned exclusively with vocalization of the stem, the sign = here links forms with differing initial consonant as well as those which are completely identical. The actual form given is that of the infinitive in question. When this form includes a prefix (causative, reflexive, etc), it is set off from the rest of the form by a hyphen. For example: in hit₃Cil CI=Impf (h-af₃Cil), the actual form of the imperfect is y-af₃Cil.

4. Synchronically for BH. Historically, this form is a simple passive later reanalyzed and incorporated into the intensive/factive paradigm.

5. *a lengthened to compensate for absence of second root-consonant and complete the triliteral pattern, which constitutes a very powerful systemzwang in Semitic (v. 6.2, and cf also Fox 1979).

6. The identical phenomenon may be observed in substandard IH *lī-gale 'to reveal' (standard lī-galot), showing the influence
of future (imperfect) yi-gale 'he will reveal'. The m.s. participle/present tense mi-gale 'reveals, revealing' might also be the model, but it too is a (finite) verb-form in IH (v. 2.8, 6.1).

7. Geminate т due to anticipatory assimilation of initial radical n, which undergoes aphaeresis in the imperative.

8. The ever seemingly intractable exception to these semantics, do c at 'know', may perhaps be fitted in when one considers that carnal knowledge was a prime component in the definition of this verb (cf Brown, Driver, and Briggs: 1979:394a).

9. Note that lā-leket 'to go', root √hik, shows imperfect prefix ye- (< *ya-y) on analogy to such other verbs of locomotion as lā-sēt 'to go out' (root √ys?).

10. V. fn 13 (Ch 2).

11. This form attested only in Ecclesiastes, one of the later books, another indication that it is a secondary form.

12. Probably < *se?et through elision of the glottal stop and compensatory lengthening of the vowel (cf fn 24 (Ch. 2)).

13. Presumably by formal assimilation to such substantives as bēr 'well' (cf Jouon 1965:157). In construct it follows the usual segholate pattern like sēt (but v. also 2.3.2).

14. Probably a retention of PS *la- (cf Jouon 1965:274) under somewhat unclear phonological conditioning (Jouon 1965:275 states that this 'vocalisation forte' occurs before stressed monosyllables, the latter term referring also to segholate stems,
which derive from the monosyllabic PS etymon *faC₁ (v. text)), later spreading analogically throughout the above three irregular verb-classes (which in fact show a considerable degree of cross-contamination), elsewhere > *li- > li- (v. Fig. 2). In hollow verbs, it may have spread from imperfect (ya-qûm 'he rises') > CI (lā-qûm 'to rise' (so Gesenius 1960:195 3d...), and references therein), showing again the analogical influence of imperfect on CI (supra). Perhaps BH (verbal) phonotactics allow the -iCo- of the regular simple pattern, and the -aCeCe-, -aCu-, -aCo- of the segholates, hollow, and final geminate classes respectively, but disallow *-iCeCe- (cf borrowed noun pîlegeš 'concubine', from Greek or Hittite — v. Brown, Driver and Briggs 1979 s.v. εἰγός), *-iCu-, or *-iCo- (cf Bar-Lev 1977 and 1978a-b, and also fn 9 (Ch. 1)) for some discussion of these phonotactic constraints, which seem to disallow two non-low vowels within a stem except when there is an intervening consonant-cluster or geminate consonant). The vocalization with ā (qamaš gadol) may also be an indication by the Maorettes that the prefix is independent, or only loosely attached to the stem, as the vowel would have to be written with (short) a (pataḥ) if the initial consonant were geminated, indicating a tight phonological relationship between prefix and stem (cf Jouon 1965:275).

15. Pursuant to this, an interesting 'borderline' case for segholates: Ju 9:9 he-hódal-ti ṭet-dišn-i 'shall I [the Q-ceased-I ACC-fatness-my
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olive tree] cease my fatness [i.e., oil]? stative segholate
derverbal noun de$en 'oil, fatness' (not infinitive of segholate
verb—it has no feminine -t, there is no li- form extant, and
in any case it has neither the phonological nor the semantic
structure (initial weak radical, meaning of movement)) occurs
with suffix pronoun in dependent—infinitive-like use; cf
English 'ceased to be fat, being fat'.
16. Note that final weak (IIIw/ or l"h) verbs do not take this
prefix, but behave in this respect exactly like regular verbs
(for which v. 2.3). Their morphology in BH is presumably to
be dated farther back than the other three groups, whose
analogical remodelling is evidently fairly recent (supra).
This would agree with the archaic feminine forms that will be
examined in 3.4.

17. Second pattern-vowel lengthened to compensate for ellipted
final radical, glottal stop (cf fns 5, 12 (Ch. 3)) and glide
(fn 5 (Ch. 3)) respectively.

18. This similarity of form does not hold for the final geminate
AI and perfect; it is quite possible, however, that the fâcöl
adjective model (below), coupled with the fact that the geminate
consonant in other forms of the paradigm was probably still
analyzable as a sequence of two consonants, is sufficient to
account for the AI sâbôb.
19. The geminate final radical is not etymological, but is so marked in the Masoretic transcription to conform to complex constraints of syllable structure which are not relevant here.

20. Hence they are ultimately related to the AI through the common etymon of PS (verbo-) nominal stem *fa\textsuperscript{c}al- (v. 4.8.7). This original relationship is at several removes, however, and was surely no longer perceived by BH speakers, although it would not detract from our suggestion of reanalytical convergence if it were; on the contrary.

21. For that matter, the perfect also has a in the second syllable, although it is of independent etymology.

22. As the stative š\textsuperscript{y}kab 'lie', probably influenced by imperfect viš\textsuperscript{y}kab (Jouvon 1965:234 and 3.2.1); with this principle exception, CIs with a occur only in construct to a suffix or NP (cf Jouvon 1965:110), which seems to indicate a morphophonological realignment classifying a as the reduced allomorph of o (cf 2.8 and fn 55 (Ch. 2)).

23. It must be remembered that we posit CI, imperative, and imperfect to have been reanalyzed as synchronically identical in BH (Fig. 3, 3.2.1); historically, of course, we are claiming the o of the CI to be of independent provenance (1.6).

24. cf fn 17 (Ch. 3).

25. cf Anttila 1972:103-4, Sec. 5.17, on this kind of development in Finnish, where a reanalysis is moot or covert in the syntactic environment in which it first occurs, only later manifesting itself overtly after it has spread to another environment.
26. Non-Semitists may wish to skip over the detailed discussion 
that follows and proceed directly to the summary at the end.

27. The null sign is included because BH $h$, like $\text{?}$ (fn 24 (Ch. 2)), is 
frequently just a mater lectionis for extra vowel-length; by its 
very nature, of course, the laryngeal glide in final position 
is rather ephemeral.

28. Jouon (1965:159:79f) suggests a reanalytical association 
between, e.g., Al $\text{g\breve{a}l\breve{o}}(h)$ and CI $\text{gil\breve{o}}$ 'uncover, reveal' as 
absolute and construct forms respectively of a substantive 
ending in feminine -t, (cf 3.3 for a similar suggestion) and 
provides as model a substantive ending in -a(t), sânâ, sinâ-
'tyear', but says nothing to account for the o, not a, vocaliza-
tion of the CI; an additional model is needed, which function 
is most plausibly filled by the fem pl ending ȯt/ȯt.

29. Cf Rensky 1966:291: actually, the term deverbal noun or 
gerund generally includes abstract nouns cross-linguistically.

30. The same process may be assumed to have taken place in BA in 
the derivation of the deverbal construct suffix -ût; once so 
established, the form was free to go one step farther and 
assume infinitival functions (2.2.4 and v. Ch. 6 on the N-V 
cline).

31. v. Hetzron 1976a for a full explanation of this classification 
scheme, wherein Arabic is grouped together with the 
traditionally-termed "Northwest Semitic" languages (including 
BH and Aramaic/Syriac) in a single CENTRAL branch of Semitic,
instead of standing apart in a coeval "Southern-Central Semitic" branch (as in Diakonoff 1965:11-12) (in which it was, rather suspiciously, the only attested occupant). I use the term here because it accords well with the close relationship between the three languages, as evidenced by the regularity of morpholexic correspondence demonstrated in this particular area of the grammar.

32. (h) indicates orthographic ñ, probably not pronounced, but an index of attenuated feminine -t, of which it is the absolute-state allomorph. Henceforth its presence will be assumed and not indicated in the transliteration.

33. Cf fn 73 (Ch. 2)

34. I take this placement of (English) gerund/participle and infinitive on the N-V scale more or less as a given (note substitutability of the GERUND with canonical NPs, as in He avoided paying ~ He avoided payment); some empirical support from Hebrew will be offered in 4.1.1. This scale will, of course, be discussed in much greater detail, for English and other languages, in Ch. 6, as will the corresponding concept of realis/irrealis.

35. On the presuppositionality of nominalizations, cf fn 74 (Ch. 2) and Fox 1981.

36. Hebrew macliax, lit. 'successful', or mistameaC 'making itself heard or understood'.

162
37. Note that, ipso facto, CIs with ƙi- may be regarded as more 'verbal' only insofar as the syntagma itself does not show the archaic sense of ƙi, 2.3-4; i.e., ƙi- can only be regarded as an index of more verbal status once it has developed past its archaic directional-goal semantics into a genuine infinitive marker (1.6.7, 2.3.6).

38. There is a close parallel here with the (modern) English bare infinitive stem, which, as Visser (1963: v. II:948) notes, 'survive[es] only in particular colligations where it is very intimately connected with the accompanying verb': he lists modals and object + infinitive constructions with certain matrix verbs of causing and physical perception, all of which rank high in implicativity and, consequently, by the Binding Hierarchy.

39. ṭosịf 'add, increase, do again' (above), another imperative modality verb, also occurs both with and without ƙi-; it would be interesting to do some text studies to see if the presence vs. absence of ƙi-correlates with different shades of meaning/discourse factors, which is very likely.

40. This is, of course, about as close as a subordinate clause can be in IH to being independent, the only difference being the presence of ƙe (which, unlike English that, is obligatory).
CHAPTER 4. POST-BIBLICAL HEBREW

In this chapter we shall examine the AI and CI in Post Biblical Hebrew (henceforth PBH; Hebrew כִּוְרַיִת בָּתַר-מִקְרָא?ִת), first in Mishnaic-Mediaeval Hebrew (4.1), then in modern Israeli Hebrew (4.2), under the assumption that following their development in later stages of Hebrew¹ must of necessity cast some light upon the two competing etymologies that we have been examining.

4.1 Mishnaic and Mediaeval Hebrew

4.1.1 The CI in MH: Ongoing Verbalization, Analogical Remodeling, and a Syntactic Switch

Before we take up the qal CI, we may remark that LBH-MH adoption of the Common Semitic deverbal noun form prCavl as factitive-intensive (piCCel) construct infinitive with lî- (cf 2.2.3, fn 25) affords a most instructive parallel to the (alternative) derivation of the BH construct infinitive from the Common Semitic deverbal noun form faC(c)aal-; as a matter of fact, variants of the latter are also found with geminate second radical (1.2, 2.2.3, fn 25). Rendering the parallel even more decisive are MH expressions in which the piCCul form serves as goal of a matrix verb of directional/allative movement (2.1, 2.3, 2.4), as la-C’amâd lî-wikkûah 'to enter into argument, to-stand to-argu(ment) lit. to stand to argu(ment)' (v. 2.2.1 and 5.2, Sec. e. for similar constructions in Arabic and Ancient Egyptian). Such use is not uncommon even today, in MH-styled NH — compare the citations with lî-zeruz and lî-Ciyun in 2.11 and 5.2, Sec. d. respectively
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If our hypothesis concerning the verbalization of an originally nominal (qal) CI (1.6-7) is correct, MH should show signs of this process having further advanced, and this indeed seems to be the case. The dative-cum-infinitive prefix \( li^\text{-} \) has become more closely united with the CI (2.3.6, 3.5). The whole syntagma may now take any of the other prefix-prepositions (v. 2.3), such as ablative prefix-preposition \( mi^\text{C}- \) 'from', as in \( mi^\text{C}-li^\text{-}za\text{ro}^\text{AC} \) from-to-sow 'from sowing' (Kilayim viii, 1—cf Segal 1980:166), or oblique \( bi^\text{-} \) 'in, with', as \( ?eyn nezeq bi^\text{-}li^\text{-}ra\text{to} \) no harm in-to-see 'There is no harm in seeing', in contrast to BH, which prefixes these formatives directly to the bare CI stem as nominal, with no intervening dative/infinitive marker \( li^\text{-} \), as \( mi^\text{C}-za\text{ro}^\text{AC}, bi^\text{-}ra\text{to}^\text{2,3} \) Verbalization of a nominal form following prefixation of a dative or instrumental marker is not uncommon cross-linguistically, as we shall see extensively documented in 5.2.4 This Mishnaic usage has persisted into IH of the higher registers, as in the common phrase \( bi^\text{-}li^\text{-}hi\text{yot }X \) in-to be \( X \) 'in being \( X \)', 'He persists in being stubborn'.

\[ \text{e.g.,} \quad \text{he ptc-CAUS-persist in-to be stubborn-SUBST} \]

\[ \text{hem lo mi'-ruc-im} \quad \text{bi-l-hi\text{yot} yehud-im} \quad \text{They are not satisfied they not ptc-satisfy-m pl in-to be Jew-m pl} \]

\[ \text{fied to be Jews', or mi-l-vacea}^\text{C} \quad \text{from executing' in MH-styled NH from-to-execute} \]

(publ. of Chabad House, L.A.). Here the entire, now-unitary construction of infinitive-marker + CI acts as gerund.5

Concomitant with its loss of nominal function, the bare CI of both the simple stem (qal) and the derived forms no longer functions as deverbal noun in MH, having been replaced by extended use of the BH
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deverbal noun mišqal fās-Cilā (Segal 1980:98, 103), as in śikar-

halîk-āt-o bi-yād-o 'The wage of his going is in his hand,
going-fs-his in-hand-his

i.e., he profits from his going' (Pirigey ʾābōt). One finds the bare
CI only in such registers as archaizing poetry (piyyûtîm), e.g.,
kīrōt qôm-at bi'rôš bigqēs 'The uprooting of the cypress
uproot height-fs cypress sought(3ms)

(i.e., the destruction of the nation of Israel) did he seek' (MaCôz Sûr
'Fortress of Salvation'), MedH — note that, once again, Semantic
patient follows the CI directly, without nota accusativi (cf CH. 3
passim). Also gone is its gerundive use in adverbial PPs with the
prepositions bi-, kî- (cf 2.3, 2.11), this classically Semitic use of
the infinitive being replaced by finite subordinate clauses introduced
by the complementizer kî-e- 'when' (Segal 1980:165). In fact, usage
with a prefix other than lî- attached directly to the CI survives,
in PBH, only in AIH (2.3, 4.2), with the exception of occasional
archaizing usages, essentially fossilized in BH quotations; cf MedH
(Sêder Kapparôt) mē-redet yahat 'from descending into the
from-descend(ing) pit

pit' (from Job 33:24). This development has already begun in LBH
(Segal 1980:166). The parallel structure in TA, kî-dî, is to be noted;
the possibility is present of influence in either direction, or even
mutual encouragement of a Semitic tendency to develop from synthetic
to analytic/isolating morphosyntax and from nominal to verbal expres-
sion (v. fn 75 (Ch. 2) and 5.2 for more on this).
The second striking difference between the BH and MH CI is the refashioning of the latter on analogy to the imperfect: viz., BH lēmōr 'to say' (cf 2.3.2) is replaced by the irregular MH lōmar on analogy to the imperfect yōmar 'he says, will say'. The same applies for līlek 'to go', līṭṭen 'to give', līssāc 'to travel', līdač 'to know', līṣeb 'to sit', lēyṛēd 'to go down'. Interestingly, the MH imperfect is used largely for MODAL (i.e., irrealis) functions; as discussed in 1.7, 3.2, and Ch. 5 this tallies with the widespread merger of both infinitives, but especially the CI, with the imperfect and other irrealis modes in the derived patterns and irregular verbs, and supports our contention that the relationship obtaining between these forms is a functional and secondary one, as opposed to etymological (Ch. 5).

MH syntactic use of the lī-CI syntagma coincides generally with BH. Interestingly, MH allows only object pronominal suffixes, never subject (cf Segal 1980:166), as Kīl’ayim ii,3 lī-zor-ḥā to-sow-her 'to sow it', Bīrākōt 38b lā-hā-qīm-îkem to-CAUS-raise-you(m pl) 'to raise you (m pl)'

the very least, this constitutes some natural support from a later stage of Hebrew for our designing of the hypothesis around such constructions (cf 1.6-7, 1.6-8, 2.3, 2.5). One major syntactic distinction between BH and MH with regard to the lī-CI syntagma may be noted: in compound clauses where the dependent clause has the same subject as the matrix clause, the participle replaces the lī-CI syntagma: viz. hī-thillū ṣārīf-în⁶ CAUS-began-pl burn(ptc)-m pl
in place of BH hi-thîl-û li-śrôf 'they began to burn'. Although
CAUS-began-pl to-burn

a systematic text-count is of course needed in order to be certain,
one might proffer the explanation that this shift in syntactic dis-
tribution reflects the ongoing verbalization of the li-CI syntagma
(above) as measured through the Binding Hierarchy (3.5): simply, a
highly implicative modality verb like hithîl 'begin' demands a
tightly-bound (nominalized) subordinate clause; the verbalized li-CI
syntagma is no longer suitable, so the more nominal participle
(cf fn 34 (Ch. 3)) has been substituted.

Another, even stronger index of verbalization in the li-CI syntagma:
the stylized/fixed phrase talmûd lômâr 'Talmud says, lit. Talmud
to-say' of NH exegetical literature shows continued verbalization into
a kind of habitual/continuative tense.

4.1.2 The AI in MH: Lexicalization and Specialized Functions.
The AI has concomitantly ceased to function as infinitive (although
it is common in the Babylonian Talmud with its canonical BH emphatic
adverbial function, Segal 1980) and survives only lexicalized in
certain idiomatic expressions and quotes from Biblical and liturgical
passages, like the following: ṣôš tâ-śîś wâ-tâ-ĝēl
rejoice you-rejoice and-she-make merry
hâ-âqâr-â  'Indeed shalt thou rejoice, and the barren one
the-barren-fs
(Jerusalem) shall make merry' (Compare Is 61:10 ṣôš ?a-śîś
rejoice I-rejoice
bî-YHWH  'Indeed shall I rejoice in the Lord', Jer. 20:15
în-Yahweh
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explanation)' as opposed to hasbārā 'the generic concept of explanation', hebdēl 'a particular) difference' ≠ habdālā 'the process-concept of) differentiation'. A possible explanation for this might be as follows. An association of abstract semantics with feminine endings in deverbal nouns is a marked tendency from MH onward (cf 2.2.4, 3.4); as the BH feminine deverbal noun form hafCälā (originally Aramaic: 2.2.4, Segal 1980:115) already served this abstract function, and in view of the comparatively specific-referential semantics entailed in the use of hafCēl as internal object (hālōk tēlek! 'What a) going shall you go!'), it seems natural that the latter might be identified in the minds of speakers with a 'single instance' deverbal noun semantics (i.e., more specific-referential), as opposed to the more generic/abstract/conceptual semantics of the feminine hafCälā.

4.2 Israeli Hebrew

We shall continue to use the term IH loosely to mean Post-Revival Hebrew (PRH), i.e., Hebrew from the period of the Enlightenment (Hebrew vime-hahaskala) onward through the gradual development of Hebrew into a modern language with an increasing number of native speakers in the 30's and 40's, up to the spoken and written native Hebrew of present-day Israel in its various registers/stylistic levels (for an extensive discussion of the terminological alternatives, v. Rosen 1977:15-29). This broad categorization is acceptable for our purposes, in that it constitutes one dialect-level in terms of its essential morphosyntactic features, taking into account (as we shall, below) differences of style and register.
4.2.1 The AI in IH: Lexicalized Survivals and Functional Analogues

The AI survives in IH, as in MH, in fixed expressions/idioms or formulae and Biblical quotations (e.g., boš te-voš! shame you-be ashamed 'Indeed should you be ashamed!') but also, more significantly, in a variety of lexicalized nominal uses: round-trip flights are (tisot) halox va-soy or halox va-hazor, lit. 'go(ing) and-return(ing)', an apparent gerundive-participial use with adverbal/absolute-clause function. Note also halox va-soy 'continually', go(ing) and-return(ing)
yaco va-soy 'leaving and returning'. This is not surprising in AIH in view of BH AI-as-participial in absolutive constructions (as Nu 6:23 kō ti-bārik-û ʔet-biney yiśrāʾēl thus you-bless-pl ACC-son-pl(of) Israel,
ʔāmōr lā-hēm: 'Thus shall you bless the children of Israel, saying say(ing) to-them:
unto them'. Compare the equivalent in MSA rāyih jāvy 'going-coming' = 'round trip', with participle. Y. Ratoṣh's poem Haλom 'Dream' (in Spicenhander 1974:100-103) makes use of a whole series of AIs as participial forms (producing an 'effect of exaltation' (1974:101) according to translator David Saraph, perhaps simply because Biblical style is elevated), and a few bi+-CI clauses. Interestingly, translator Saraph renders sdor kol divr-ey nxoHa as 'Ordering order all thing-pl(of) truth of all the things of truth' (1974:101), and indeed Ratoṣh's bare CI is followed by semantic patient (DO), seemingly as genitive modifier, as are most of the AIs, including the example below: paroc burst(ing)
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kōl gader dxuya 'bursting all weak fences'. N.b: According to the uniformitarian principle, one might venture to state that if the AI now (i.e., in AIH) stands before semantic patient/DO as modifier (genitive or otherwise), this is an indication that it may have stood in the same syntactic position in pre-Hebrew as per the alternative derivation (Fig. 2), thus constituting some support for the latter.

Participial/absolute-clause function also characterizes a considerable number of hifCil AIs which have survived into IH from MH: literary expressions hahele bi- 'beginning with', haskem vi-haCrev 'arising (ing) and-retir(ing)'

'(upon) rising and (upon) retiring', halox vihahres 'going and go(ing) and-quiet keeping silent' (Natan Alterman). There is a whole set of frozen hifCil AI adverbials: harbe 'much, many (lit. multiplying (tr))',

harhek 'distant(ly)' (v. 3.5), haskem 'early (adv.)', hayser 'directly', hafle 'considerably', day va-hoter 'enough and more'

(adverbial use of hifCil AI 'exceed, be superfluous', something like 'enough and excessively (so)'). A rather unusual development is hēytēb 'well (adv)', apparently from participial use 'doing good', with monophthongization of *hay- > hēy-, presumably through frequency of use. Note also piCCell AI maher 'quickly' (cf fn 16 (Ch. 4) below).

An explanation for the above phenomenon (initially suggested to me by Y. Sabar): extension/fossilization from emphatic adverbial 'cognate object' use as maher miharti 'indeed I hurried, lit.
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(a) hurry(ing) did I hurry' harbe hirbeyti 'exceedingly did I multiply' lit. (a) multiply(ing) did I multiply' > maher halaxti 'rapidly did I go', harbe casiti 'much/greatly did I do'. This shows, of course, the relationship between adverbs and objects, the former as, in some sense, dereferentialized or attenuated versions of the latter (cf fn 5 (Ch. 6)). Subsequent use of harbe as quantifier/adjective seems to follow the same pattern as pahot (piCel AI): AI > adverb (perhaps pahot pahiti 'indeed did I lessen' > pahot casiti 'I did less') > 'telescoped' into attributive adjective/quantifier in a kind of ellipsis from adverbial use because adverb ~ predicate adjective, i.e., harbe casiti > casiti harbe > (leads to the use of) ha?anašim hayu harbe 'the people were many' > harbe ?anašim 'many people'.

Note BH use of causative AI as absolute clause without object:
Josh 11:11 wa-y-akkû ?et-köl- han-nefes ?āser- b-āh lī-fī hereb hahrēm 'And they smote all the souls to-mouth(of) sword destroy(ing) that were therein with the edge of the sword, (utterly) destroying (them)'. Possibly it was this kind of absolute-clause usage, without object, that ultimately led to lexicalization of certain causative AIs as adverbs detached from the 'internal object' syntagma. Absolute clauses have discourse-peripheral 'descriptive' functions (S. Thompson, lecture notes, and cf 3.3) similar to that of adverbs, i.e., modifying the main course of action/proposition/sentence/verb etc. We can thus hypothesize an evolution from '...destroying (them)>' '... devastatingly' and similarly for other AIs such as harbe.
The MH use of her\textsuperscript{C}el as nomen actionis survives into and is still quite productive in IH. Any feeling for her\textsuperscript{C}el as infinitive has of course long since been lost; the derivational relation with hif\textsuperscript{C}il causatives is entirely as deverbal noun, with the semantics described in 4.1.2, viz.: heytez 'ricochet, shrapnel', hez\textsuperscript{C}ek 'emergency callup', hespek 'capacity, output'.

The AI is also used in even more clearly-nominal positions, and as personal names: macav\textendash haxen (hif\textsuperscript{C}il) 'state of alert', macav-hikon (nif\textsuperscript{C}el) 'state of preparedness', kom-hamdina '(the) founding/establishment (lit. rise) of the state', zov 'gonorrhea (lit. drip(ping))', rom 'height', noa\textsuperscript{C} 'movement (all hollow verbs, cf 3.2.2). Note also construct-like compounds like kolnoa\textsuperscript{C} 'cinema, lit. voice of movement', ofanoa\textsuperscript{C} 'motorbike, lit. wheel of movement'. Concomitant with its nominal status, the AI of hollow verbs may occur in PPs in IH: li-hargis bi-noah to-feel OBL-ease 'to feel at ease' cad bos\textsuperscript{y} 'until shame, shamefully' (< BH, cf fn 13 (Ch. 4)). This kind of usage, with the AI either in construct to a following noun or genitive suffix pronoun or v.v. is virtually nonexistent in BH (cf 4.2, Jouon 1965:348).\textsuperscript{13} One might hazard that, at least in the case of medial weak ('hollow') or II w/y (AI of form C\textsubscript{1} \hat{O} C\textsubscript{2}, cf 3.2.2), the extended productive use of AI as noun is or was given impetus by confusion of BH AI forms with the homonymous (deverbal) nouns of form f\textsuperscript{\textl acute}l/f\textsuperscript{o}l < *fawl, f\textsuperscript{o}/\textl acute{/}(1) < *full, such as (hollow) q\textsuperscript{\textl acute}l 'voice' (cf CA qaw\textsuperscript{l} 'word, speech'), s\textsuperscript{\textl acute}m 'fast' (CA \textsuperscript{\textl acute}aw\textsuperscript{m} id.), \textsuperscript{\textl acute}or 'ox', b\textsuperscript{\textl acute}r 'pit', also proper names such as no\textsuperscript{\textl acute}h 'Noah, lit. 'rest/ease', (fn 13 (Ch. 4)), (fin. gem.) z\textsuperscript{\textl acute}k 'purity, brightness', a.o.\textsuperscript{14} Such
contamination would help explain the seeming counterexample to our undirectional hypothesis (Ch. 6) of a form increasing in number of nominal characteristics, that is, the appearance of the AI in construct-state environments in IH. In addition, it can be pointed out that the AI never entirely lost nominal function. Note fossilization of the causative AI into deverbal noun in LBH and MH (4.1.2); similarly, the hollow AI of the simple form, never fully verbalized in BH, retained enough nominal function (internal object, etc. — v. 5.1) to allow for its fossilization as deverbal noun in PBH and concomitant development or 'filling-out', as though by analogy to its earlier nominal functions (as well as the homonymous deverbal nouns mentioned above) of the new nominal characteristics such as its appearance in construct-state structures, both as construct-state noun and as genitive attribute to same.

Internal object (emphatic adverbial) function is extremely marked as an archaising device, indexing not simply classical-literary-poetic but Biblical style in sensu strictu, as ĉet pakod yi-fkkod ĉet-xem time command he-command ?elokim '(at) the time (when God shall indeed command you...'

ACC-you(m pl) God

(N.H. Imber, c. 1909). Here the AI serves no real emphatic function, but is just an indicator of high Biblical style; compare the weakening of cohortative first-person -ā in LBH (Hetzron 1969:16, also quoted in 5.1, fn 2).

In colloquial IH, a variety of syntactic devices are used in place of the AI with the analogous function of indicating emphasis. These
devices include separate lexemes employed adverbially, such as ʔifu 'even, in fact' (sentential connective), be-ʔemet in-truth 'really', (vi-)ken '(and) indeed', ʔomnam 'in truth, indeed' and the nouns-cum-
adverbs (cf Ch. 6) + complementizer ʕe as higher predicate (sentential
adverb or adsentential, with scope extending over the entire sentence
rather than just the VP, as is the case with ordinary adverbs), ċuvda
'fact', betah 'certainty, (slang) certainly', as betah ʕe-ya-vo
certain that-he-come 'Certainly he will come' (cf other substantives
which may function as higher predicates in IH: slīxa 'pardon',
halila 'God forbid', tikva 'hope', zman 'time', safek 'doubt'). We
thus have new forms fulfilling an old function.

4.2.2 The CI in IH: ʔi-CI Much the Same as in BH, Bare Stem

Lexicalized

The ʔi-CI syntagma is used much as in BH, and as infinitives normally
are in English and other standard Western European languages, as non-
finite verb-form in complement clauses ('dependent infinitive').

Participial use in PPs with circumstantial adverbial clause function,
with prefixes other than ʔi- (harking back to BH, infra, as MH has
lost these constructions completely—4.1.1) is retained only in
elevated literary-poetic style (AIH) and fixed expressions, finite
subordinate clauses being employed in this context in the vernacular—
cf fn 4.1.1 on the larger implications of this): viz.,

bi-hit-hašev ʕal ha-ʕinyan 'in consideration of the matter',
in-REFL-consid. on the-matter

ka-ʕavor ʕan-im 'upon the passing of years', bi-hakic in-wak(ing)
as-pass(ing) year-pl
'while awake', ?aharey ki-klot ha-kol 'in the last analysis'
after as-finish the-all

(cf 2.9), cet-xa bi-salom u-bo?-ixa bi-salom 'Thy going-
exit-your in-peace and-com(ing)-your in-peace

out (be) in peace and thy coming (be) in peace' (traditional greeting),
bli hit-mahmeah 'without hesitation', Cad klot
without REFL-hesitate.

kox-am 'Until the end of their strength' (B. Berger, in conv.),
strength-their

bi-mlo? 1-o ¥eva ˘ ¥an-im 'When he was seven years old, lit.
in-fill(ing)to-him seven year-pl

when seven years were fulfilled to him' (cf 2.11), be-heyot-xa
in-be-your

b-a- ˘ cir 'When/if you're in town' (T. Alexander, personal letter,
in-the-city

c.5737 (1977 A.C.E.), bi-sel heyot-o yihudi 'Because of his being a Jew'
in-of be(ing)-his Jew

(HaMevaker 21 May 1982), bi-vø?-i ha-yom 1a- ˘ sir 1-ax
in-com(ing)-my the-day to-sing to-thee(fs)

'in my coming today to sing to thee' (N. Shemer, Yerushalayim Shel
Zahav), bi-¥ivt-ixa bi-vet-xa
in-sit(ing)-your in-house-your

(Amir Shaviv, Israeli newscaster, UCLA lect., Dec. 1982, from Dt 6:7,
cf 2.11).
The MH use of participle in place of infinitive in reduced clauses is
not found, IH again siding with BH in the use of the CI in this
syntactic environment. Interestingly, for all of the verbs mentioned
in 4.1.1 as having been restructured in MH under the analogical
influence of the imperfect, IH has selected the BH form rather than
the MH form. The single exception is ?amar 'say', which retains MH CI
lomar rather than adopting BH lemor. This is indicative of the
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relatively greater influence on the development of PRH of BH as opposed to MH (infra). Note, however, a number of frozen CIs used as adverbs or sentential connectives (grammatical functives, fn. (6.1)), taken from MH: lamrot 'despite' < li-ha-mrot to-CAUS-rebel 'to rebel', li-fahot to-decrease 'at least' < 'to decrease/minimize'. In the latter case, perhaps the infinitive was originally asyndetic and later fossilized as an adverb: yi-hi-y-u ham, li-fahot, siloša he-is-pl there, to-minimize, three ?anaš-im '(There) will be there, to decrease/minimize, three people' > person-pl

'There will be at least three people there' (cf supra on harbe). The same kind of explanation suggests itself for li-rabot 'to multiply' > 'including' (again, cf harbe) and li-maceq 'to reduce, lessen' > 'with the exception of, excluding'. In fact, AIH retains at least one fossilized CI-as-grammatical functive that was apparently already so in BH: li-fnot- boker/Čerev to-turn(ing)(of)morning/evening 'before morning/evening' < 'to turn (toward the) morning/evening' (note that this construction conforms perfectly to the model of Fig. 2 and 2.4, and cf 2.3, Gesenius 1980:348h on turning towards an object as the proto-semantics of li-).

The bare CI stem (as (de)verbal noun/gerund) survives only fossilized/lexicalized in fixed/stereotyped phrases inherited from BH (v. 2.11; note that these did not survive in MH (4.1.1), and hence are direct revivals of BH—see the first and last paragraphs of 4.2 on lines of descent leading to PRH/IH). Note that this constitutes a SPLIT of function for the same form, the CI stem, in two different syntactic environments: deverbal noun on the one hand, quasi-independent stem.
morpheme within the li-CI syntagma on the other. Examples: da'Cat
'opinion, knowledge' (cf 2.11), cannot 'singing',16 (as in
ma kol cannot ?ani someaC
'Do I not hear the voice of song' what voice(of) song I hearing(ptc)
(< Ex 32:18; cf 2.11) from the popular song, Lu Yehi 'Were It So'),
hallel 'praise', šir 'song' (hollow), dom 'silence', šod 'robbery',
zoq 'purity, brightness' (< Med H), p.n. Ron lit. 'singing, song', (all
final geminate, cf 3.2.2) kro u-xtov read(ing) and-writ(ing) 'reading
and writing', yisod 'foundation, basis', hefred u-mšol
'playing division and-tale telling
both ends against the middle' (cf 4.2.1) hirik leket 'traveled far, lit.
made distant (his) going', hosif leket 'continued going, lit. added
going' (v. 3.5), koxav-leket 'planet, lit. star of going', šir-leket
'song of going, i.e., travel-song' zman cet
(the)time(of)going-out(of)
ha-šabat 'end/departure of the Sabbath' (wall-calendar by Chabad
the-Sabbath
House, Los Angeles, Hebrew Speakers Dept.); cf also cet carb-ayim
going-out(of) eve-DUAL 'twilight'!) lifney redet ha-hasexa before
descent the-darkness (D. Rosén, in conv.), hisog- ha-ta Cam (nifCal)
withdraw(al)(of) the-stress 'withdrawal of the stress (gram.)'
šallah-manot '(the) sending of portions (alms)' (Note that here the
intensive (piC Cel) CI stem is in construct to following direct object,
and is reduced in form (cf fn 22 (Ch. 3)), ševet- ?ax-im
sit(ting)(of) brother-pl
'the sitting of brothers'. Note participial use in heyot vi-S
be(ing) and-[S]
'Being as, it being the case that, should it be the case that [S]'
(e.g., heyot u-ktovt-i lo? his-tan-ta 'Being as my
be(ing) and-address-my not REFL-changed-fs
address has not changed, if my address has not changed' (letter from
T. Alexander, c. 5737 (1977, A.C.E.), hodot li-NP 'thanks to, owing
thank(ing/s) to-NP
to'. A common 'error' in modern literary style is substitution of the
(masculine singular active) participle for CI in circumstantial PP
clauses, especially when the CI is segholate and thus irregular in
form (v. 2.11, 3.2.2): viz., *bi-voš-y-o
in-sitting(ptc)-his
'When he sits/sat'
(in-sit(seg.CI)-his in-giving(ptc)-her to-him ACC the-bas(is)
ha-mu-cah 'In her giving him the firm foundation, because she
the-p.p.-pour
gave him the firm foundation' rather than classical-literary
bi-tit-ah 'When she gives/gave'. This development is not
in-give(seg.CI)-her
surprising in view of the fact that both participle and (as we are
claiming) CI are etymological nominal forms ((de)verbal nouns) under-
going verbalization (cf 2.8). With the conjugated CI gone in collo-
quial IH (supra), it stands to reason that writers attempting to imitate
Biblical style (i.e., writing in AIH, fn 66, (Ch. 2)) might experience
confusion (especially with irregular CIs such as the segholates) and
select instead the alternative quasi-nominal/non-finite form available
in colloquial IH, i.e., the participle. Ps 30:4 miy-voš-ī from-
descend(ing)-my 'from my descent', in place of the expected mē-ridit-ī,
looks like the same phenomenon back in BH, regular-appearing participle
substituted for irregular segholate CI, constituting something of a
precedent for such substitution in PRH.
A number of quasi-verbal structures in IH will be adduced in 5.2 as
support for the alternative derivation.
As J. Blau points out (1981:151 ff.), IH, as a revived language (per-
haps the only successful case thus far in history), constitutes not
direct continuation of either BH or MH but rather something of an
amalgam of the two, and even of later stages of Hebrew (such as
Mediaeval, treated for morphosyntactic purposes in 4.1 together with
MH, but which is innovative with regard to vocabulary and has con-
tributed much of the latter to the IH lexicon (cf Even-Shoshan 1977
passim)). The absence (in the colloquial) of the AI (4.2.1), bare
CI, and CI with prefixes other than li- (4.2.2), besides being pre-
dictable (at least the latter two, and possibly even the first,
v. 5.1.2) on the basis of verbalization of the infinitive (cf 4.1.1),
correspond exactly to the MH situation, yet the forms selected are
those of BH, not MH (as, e.g., BH, IH lātēt 'to give' ≠ MH littēn id.,
supra). This preference for BH forms Blau attributes to centuries
of editing of MH texts by copyists who viewed the MH forms as errors
and substituted BH forms for them. Although at first blush this
claim would seem to exemplify the naive orthoepist's confusion of
written prescriptive norms with spoken language, it must be remembered
that Hebrew had indeed, for the most part, ceased to function as a
spoken language long before the Revival (with the possible exception
of certain remote areas of the Sephardic diaspora, such as Yemen),
and thus the contribution of written texts to the actual corpus of
forms, the lexicon and morphology, that came to be selected for PRH/IH, including the spoken language, was greatly magnified in importance. Greater emphasis, for ideological reasons, on the Bible and Biblical Hebrew than on the Talmud and Mishnaic Hebrew during the crucial nineteenth-century period of revival, the Enlightenment, may also account for the preponderance of BH morphology in PRH/IH.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 4

1. Keeping in mind dialectal differences between BH and MH and the admixture of influences on PRH/IH (cf 4.2.2), which should also be kept in mind whenever a construction is referred to as '(not) surviving into IH from MH.

2. This holds true for BH as late as the book of Daniel (c. 300 B.C.E). Compare Daniel 12:1

\[\text{mi-hi-yôt} \quad \text{gôy} \quad (\text{Cad} \quad \text{hā-ćet} \quad \text{hā-hî?})\]

from-be(ing) nation (until the-time the-she)

'Since there was a nation (even unto that same time)'. Note archaizing/literary IH gam mi-kavot also from-hop(ing) 'even from hoping' (Shimôn Halkin). Standard spoken (and even written) IH would be mi-li-kavot from-to-hope, with inseparable li- prefix.

3. Parallel fusion of prefix with substantive stem is shown by the additional prefix in mi-bi(-)lî from-OBL(-)NEG 'without', where naked stem *lî no longer occurs; the same situation prevails in mi-bi(-)fînîm from-OBL(-)interior 'from inside', fînîm alone being rare (cf fn 20 (Ch. 2) and transliteration tables on the p ~ f alternation), mi-bi(-)rèsi from-OBL(-)beginning 'from the beginning', rèsi alone being rare; a.o.

4. This observation was first made to me informally by T. Givón.

5. Cf App. A on this as a different plane of nominal function.

6. BH final -m frequently > final -n in MH (this is traditionally termed nunization), perhaps partially due to (Talmudic) Aramaic
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influence, partially to the universal phonetic tendency of final labial nasals to shift to dental-alveolar place of articulation (cf. Zee 1980).

7. Interestingly, its use with oblique prefix-preposition bi- in an adverbial PP bi-hehlet 'absolutely' is a comparatively later development, in MedH.

8. In seeming contradiction to this stand such oppositions as hehzer 'return (on investment)' ≠ hahzara 'return (general causative)', hecaC 'supply (as in supply and demand)' ≠ hacaCa 'offer, proposal'. In these cases hefCel has an ITERATIVE semantic charge, while hafCala indicates a single action (as hahzarato sel ha?asir lita?o 'The return of the prisoner to his cell'. Here, however, the innovative semantics for hefCel is distinguished from hafCala by semantic specialization/restriction; it still stands in contrast to the general abstract deverbal semantics of hafCala. Another tendency, however, seems also to be at work: f4C-ālah deverbal nouns borrowed from TA into MH, with feminine -a(t) (v. 2.2.4), show the semantics of nomina unitatis (v. fn 13 (Ch. 2)); this may be responsible for a change in the relative values of hefCēl and hafCālā, the semantics of the latter being influenced by similarity of form to f4Cālā (v. 1.6 and 1.7.2 on the form and function approach) and the former shifting to a more abstract domain as a result. This would in any case conform better to the Common Semitic pattern, best known in Arabic, whereby addition of the feminine
-a(h/t) suffix (cf 3.4) to an abstract deverbal noun yields a nomen unitatis (cf Diakonoff 1965, Wehr 1976).

9. Cf Christy (forthcoming 1983), Wilhelm Scherer 1975; simply put, 'the present is the key to the past', or 'plus ça change, plus ça restera la même chose', i.e., no past causes, currently unobservable, should be proposed to explain a given present state of affairs without independent motivation.

10. Interestingly, harbe is the only one of these to have succeeded in spreading to the colloquial register (the others are literary) presumably on account of frequency of use. It is, as a matter of fact, the adjectival expression of the concept 'many' many-pl man

(ʔanəŠ-im rab-im 'many men', rather than the adverbial expression many (adv) man-pl)

11. Perhaps this also explains adverbial use of feminine plural adjectives like camukot 'deeply', qasot 'harshly', deriving perhaps from an ellipted object like hašav-nu și on this thought we (adv acal) ze

[maHašav-ot] camuk-ot 'We thought deep thoughts on this'
[thought-fpl] deep-fpl

> 'We thought deeply on this'. Compare BH Gn 42:7,30

dibbêr [mill-im] qas-ot 'He spoke harsh words' > 'He spoke

spoke harshly', Jer 12:6 yi-dabbir-û ʔeley-ka [mill-im]

he-speak-pl to-thee(ms) [word-pl]
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tob-ot 'They spoke fair words to thee'. > 'They spoke kindly to thee.' [The bracketed inserts are the author's hypothetical reconstructions.]

12. The same path was doubtless followed by yôtêr 'more', lit. active participle 'increasing': adverb ~ predicate adjective Casiti yôter 'I did more, lit. I did increasing(!)' > yôter anašîm 'more people'; the reverse, adjective > adverb, is unlikely because of yôter's anomalous position (pre-nominal) for an adjective. This analysis of yôter also adds credence to the above analysis of the AIs.

13. This claim of Joûon's does not, however, take into account the AIs of hollow verbs, which, being indistinguishable from deverbal nouns of fôl pattern (both < *faWl-, below), cannot be said not to enter into construct-state relations (e.g., nôdi 'my wandering': the deverbal noun nôd derives from a still-extant (in BH) verb \(\sqrt{n\,wd}\) and is identical to the predicted AI of that verb, which never occurs in any of the AI's usual functions. Note also such personal names as nôhôh 'Noah, lit. 'rest, ease'' which occurs in construct phrases on a number of occasions; cf AI nôhôh.) Even so, such occurrences are not common (even the nôdi example is not certain, as it might also be the CI of cognate final geminate root \(\sqrt{n\,dd}\) 'wander' (cf fn 81 on the interrelationship of medial weak and final geminate), and there are enough cases in which AIs which show no construct-state function in BH (gôm 'rise', sôm 'put') gain it in PRH

186
(kom hamdina (above), som-lev '(paying of) attention')
put(ting of)-heart
to validate the hypothesis of analogic extension advanced below.
It is also possible that Jouon meant to consider only the
šlemim (regular) verbs, and not the irregular verb-classes,
secondary in origin (3.2.2), which we are taking as exceptions
to his statement.

14. Although the etymological origin of such *faCi deverbals as māwet 'death' (deviant absolute-state form—construct-state
mot), gōl 'voice', Cōd 'again' (presumably from proto- semantics
'return (n.)', as Ar Cāwd(a) id.; nominal function in circum-
stantial PP is clear in, e.g., Es 6:14 Cōdām '(while) they
yet —', lit. 'their yetness' cf 6.1, fn 5, on the development
of substantives into adverbs) is the same as that of medial
weak (hollow) AIs like gōm 'rise'; mot 'die' (remember that the
adaptation of these forms as infinitives for the irregular verb
classes is a later, secondary phenomenon (3.2.2)), the latter
have become restricted in BH to quasi-verbal use ('infini-
tivalized') as noted above, and generally cannot function as
full nouns in the construct state, as can fōl deverbals (  < *faCi).
Their resurrection in NH as full deverbals like gōl must be attributed to analogy with the latter and con-
comitant convergence of function, as the canonical AI internal
object function of these forms had not survived (cf 4.1.2).
15. Indeed, Lambert (1946:266) has gone so far as to claim that, in BH, 'L'infinitif 2de [CI] correspond exactement à l'infinitif français'; while something of an exaggeration for BH, this statement holds more or less true for IH.

16. It might be argued that this and the following piCCel forms could be either AIs or CIs, as AI=CI in the derived conjugations (3.2.1). Precisely because of this, however, and because the identity of AI and CI in the derived forms is clearly secondary (3.2.1), and because in BH in the simple pattern qal, only the CI has this kind of nominal function (2.11), one may safely assume the form to be a CI.

17. The Talmud (lit. 'learning'), the compilation of oral Rabbinic civil and religious law, is actually a comprehensive term for two bodies of literature, the Mishna (lit. 'secondary') (written in (Mishnaic) Hebrew) and the Gemara (lit. 'finish(ing)) (written in Aramaic, usually referred to as Talmudic Aramaic).
CHAPTER 5. CROSS-LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE

In Ch. 2 we examined some intrasystemic evidence for the alternative derivation, including parallel developments of various kinds (in both verbal and other grammatical systems) within both BH itself and cognate Semitic languages. In particular, the reader will recall the development of purpose function by the dative marker li- throughout Semitic (2.3.8-13), development of predicative (dependent infinitive) function in Ugaritic by the nominal marker mimation (2.2.3), adoption of Common Semitic deverbal noun form fi\text{CC}uul in LBH and MH as intensive infinitive (fn 3 in 2.2.3), and the evolution of the common Semitic/Afroasiatic perfect (suffix-conjugation) from a nominal form, 2.7. Note also the hypothesis of nominal origin for the Common Semitic/Afroasiatic imperfect (prefix-form), cf Diakonoff 1965:85. In this chapter we shall adduce cross-linguistic/typological support along the same lines, documenting the historical development of deverbal nouns into infinitives from outside as well as inside Semitic/Afroasiatic (5.2). First, however, we shall present cross-linguistic evidence of a related but distinct sort, to the same end of validating the alternative derivation-monogenetic hypothesis and casting serious doubt upon the standard account: namely, strong arguments to the effect that the infinitive-imperative correlation in general (not just specific to BH or Semitic) is not etymological (as the standard derivations holds) but functional, or, more accurately, that the etymological relationship is asymmetrical: imperatives may develop historically out of infinitives, but the converse
does not occur. Finally, we will present a principled theoretical explanation for this: universal diachronic unidirectionality of semanto-syntactic nominal verbal shifts.

5.1 The Interrelation of Infinitive, Imperative, and Other Irrealis Verb Forms

Before we embark upon the cross-linguistic investigation, we need look no farther than the uses of the AI in BH (and its cognates in other Semitic languages) for support in our contention that the relationship between the infinitive and imperative is functional and not etymological. One classic use of the AI is with imperative force (v. Lambert 1946:262, Solà-Solé 1961:92; the early translations of the OT (Arabic, Syriac, Aramaic, LXX) quite correctly render such use by the imperative form, cf Hammershaimb 1963:87), as in the famous liturgical admonition

\[ \text{Yamôr wî-zâkôr} \]

\text{guard and-remember}

'Guard and remember!'

\[ \text{zâkôr wî-hay-vm ha-z-ê!} \]

\text{remember ACC- the day the-this!}

'Remember this day!' Ex 13:3 (Ex 20:8 sim)

\[ \text{zâkôl wî-shâ-tô (ki mâ-hâr nâ-mût)} \]

\text{eat and-drink because tomorrow we-die}

'Eat and drink, for tomorrow we die', Is 22:13, a.o.
and even the formulaic \textit{wi-gāmōr} 'And finish!' at the end of Biblical passages. Were CI and imperative really derived from the same etyman (1.2, 1.4), surely we should expect the CI, not the AI, to be confused on occasion with the imperative, in a kind of archaizing usage.\textsuperscript{2} The fact that it is the AI, with no etymological cognacy whatever to the imperative (1.2.2)\textsuperscript{3}, that is so used confirms the above supposition of functional, rather than etymological, connection between infinitive and imperative.

Specifically, one way in which the AI might have acquired this kind of imperativic function is the following: it might be claimed that imperativic use of the AI reveals an abductive change on the part of BH speakers: gerundive nominal use of the AI in the context of emphatic adverbial function preceding a finite verb-form (a.k.a. cognate accusative) may have been interpreted epiphenomenally\textsuperscript{4} as bearing imperative or quasi-imperative force, something like \textit{va-sāmōr} t-ismor '[(a) watch(ing) shall ye watch!, i.e., watch you-watch]'

'Indeed shall ye watch!': injunctive future (imperfect with imperative force) preceded by AI as cognate accusative \textsuperscript{⇒} 'Watch! Shall ye watch!', which (covert) reinterpretation is not revealed overtly (cf fn 25 (Ch. 3) until the AI appears alone in its new imperative function, i.e., simply \textit{va-sāmōr} 'Watch!', or \textit{va-sāmōr wi-zākōr} (above). Significantly, Lambert (1946:262) notes that 'l'infinitif s'emploie dans le sens d'un imperatif, quand l'ordre doit être execute constamment',
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as in 'les lois' (my italics). Jouon (1965:356) calls this use of the AI 'futur injunctif', and comes close to the above explanation in stating that at times the AI enlarges upon or details the actual future injunctive, although he does not actually refer to this as a gerundive/participial (absolute-clause) function, which it clearly is. The above semantic component renders clear the functional connection between participial and imperative syntactic use of the AI. Quite in tandem with this, Solà-Solé (1961:15: Sec. 9, 93: Sec. 54), offers 'la valeur durativo-adverbiale' of the AI as an explanation for the imperative use of both the AI in BH and its gerundive cognate in CA, claiming, in fact, that the -i ending of Classical Arabic fa'ala(i) (2.2.1) constitutes 'une finale dativo-adverbiale' (found also in El-Amarna Cannanite, and almost certainly in Palmyran Aramaic and in Ugaritic), in conjunction with the CS genitive ending -i (1961:15). He proposes, moreover, a cross-linguistic 'rapport linguistique' holding between gerundive/infinitive and imperative, giving examples from Spanish (andando!) and French (en courant!) of gerundives employed as imperative. This, in turn, may be related to the proposal (infra) with regard to the nominal motivation for imperative use of an infinitive (or gerundive) form. The cognates of the AI in other Semitic languages appear in analogous constructions with imperative use.\(^\text{5}\) CA indeclinable lexicalized imperatives hadaari! 'Beware!', lit. 'wariness'
hadaari 'be present!', lit. 'presence' (cf Hammershaimb 1963:86, Wright 1977:1162B) nazaal!' descend!', lit. 'descent', samaaci 'listen!', lit. 'hearing' (Jouon 1965:356) are of particular interest, as the faaali form is the undoubted cognate of the BH AI (Bergstrasser 1918:61, and supra), and it is in general employed with imperative sense exactly parallel to the BH imperativic AI. The CA gerund faaali(i), which derives from PS faaali(i) (1.2) is in no way related to the CA imperative ?ufcul/?ificil, from PS *f(u)cul, *f(i)cil (v. fn 9 (Ch. 1); the parallel between infinitive and imperative is, again, not etymological but functional.

In this context, it is instructive to note the Phoenician verbal constructions (past or imperative) in which the AI takes suffixal object personal pronoun and independent subject pronoun, verbal characteristics both (v. 1.6.8 and 6.1, esp fn 8), viz:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bn-}y & \quad ?nk \\
\text{build} & \quad 1.13,17,11.9,17, \text{without object suffix pronoun}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bn} & \quad ?nk \\
\text{build} & \\
'I & \text{built it}', & 'I & \text{built'}
\end{align*}
\]
Similar 'imperativic infinitive' constructions are found in BH, in the book of Ecclesiastes. S. Segert (p.c.) has suggested to me that this use of the AI is on analogy to the perfect verb-forms with personal pronouns, with a proportion of the type

\[
\frac{\text{imperative AI}}{\text{perfect}} + \text{personal pronoun.}
\]

This proposal fits well with the corollary hypothesis suggested in 3.3 with regard to the rejuvenation of the AI on analogy to the third masculine singular perfect, and constitutes another instance of verbalization of the AI in a Semitic language closely-related to BH, thereby supporting the alternative derivation.

Ugaritic, too, exhibits the AI with imperative function (v. Gordon 1965: Sec. 9.28), or, as Segert (1979:64.612) puts it, as nominal predicate functionally corresponding to the imperative. In addition to the obvious corroboration that Segert's choice of words for our corollary hypothesis of functional correlation between infinitive and imperative, his syntactic analysis of the phenomenon as nominal predicate coincides nicely with the above-proposed gerundive nominal as (emphatic) adverbial (a.k.a. internal or cognate object) derivation of the Imperativic AI in BH.
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Parallels in other languages for use of the infinitive, gerund/participle, or other (de)verbal noun form as imperative are not hard to find: in French, Spanish, Italian, and German, the formal/formulaic written imperative is simply and unambiguously the infinitive (in German, in fact, the regular polite plural imperative (with Sie) is isomorphic with the infinitive, as well as the third plural indicative: French appeler les pompiers 'Call the firemen', à écrire 'to be written', ne pas aller 'Don't go', défense de fumer 'smoking prohibited', interdit de se perdre '(it is) forbidden to get lost', Spanish (favor de) no fumar '(please) don't smoke', ir y enseñar a todos 'Go and teach all!' indirect imperative cuidar de INF 'take care to INF', negative imperative no hay llorar 'You mustn't cry', medieval Latin and Italian negative imperative construction with infinitive, as non negare 'do not deny it', Old French n'en douter 'doubt it not' (cf Jouon 1965:356), Italian non caminare 'Don't walk!' (traffic sign), chiamare i vigili del fuoco 'Call the firemen' (emergency instruction sign), even polite interrogative-potentive lei accompagnare 'May I accompany you?' (La Dolce Vita) German nicht rauchen 'No smoking', nicht hinaus lehnen! Don't lean out!' (Warning sign on trains), maul halten und weiter dienen! 'Shut the mouth and serve further (i.e., continue to serve)' (German proverb), weiter fahren 'Go further' (road-sign), Yidd. fereiniken zich 'Pull yourself together!' English not to worry! (cf Fox 1981), I'll thank you to keep quiet, It is forbidden to approach the throne, smoking prohibited/no smoking, Talmudic Aramaic rahm-an-â li-sl-ân 'God (lit. the all-merci-ful-DET to-save-us merciful one) save us!', Middle Egyptian employment of bare infinitive
as imperative (J. Callender, p.c.), (E)BH 2K 13:19

\[ \text{li-hakkot} \]
\[ \text{to-strike} \]

'It was to smite' = 'thou shouldst have smitten' (Gesenius-Kautzsch 1980:349) (counterfactual-hortative). IH employs the \text{li-} CI syntagma in a number of imperativic and quasi-imperativic constructions, as the stylized negative imperative (written AND spoken, cf fn 76 (Ch. 3)

\[ \text{?eyn/lo}^{10} \text{li-} \text{c} \text{asen} \]
\[ \text{no(t)} \]
\[ \text{to-smoke} \]

'no smoking',

oblique imperative (hortative, we might call it)

\[ (\text{na}) \text{ la-} \text{sevet (bi-vaka}^{\text{\text{\text{v}}} } \text{)a}^{\text{\text{\text{v}}}} \]
\[ \text{pray) to-sit (in-request) } \]

'Please sit down/be seated',

\[ \text{yes la-} \text{sevet} \]
\[ \text{EXIS to-sit} \]

'one ought to sit (lit. there is to-sit)',

\[ \text{la-zuz (bi-vaka}^{\text{\text{v}}} \text{a}) \]
\[ \text{to-move (in-request) } \]

'Move (please)',

\[ \text{li-rxoc } \text{heytov} \]
\[ \text{to-wash well} \]

'Wash well' (B. Berger, recipe),

\[ \text{li-havi } \text{\text{\text{v}}} \text{едер} \]
\[ \text{to-bring sweater} \]

'Bring a sweater',

\[ \text{lo? la-kixat } \text{?išít} \]
\[ \text{not to-take personally} \]

'Don't take it personally',
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(ye$s) li-fnot ba-makom
(EXIS) to-turn in the-place

'Apply there' (employment ad).

A rather peripheral but nevertheless interesting use is the salutation

li-hitra?ot
to-see (REFL)

'goodby, lit. to see each other',

possibly a calque from Fr au revoir, Gm auf Wiedersehen or something similar. The intent thus expressed, a kind of first-person pl. cohor-
tative, may perhaps be related to other imperative uses of the li
CI syntagma.

All of these imperativic uses of the CI with li-prefix are clearly and
unambiguously derived from nominal function, to which point we shall
return in App. A.

A related point is the far-reaching formal identity and/or interrela-
tionships of non-finite forms representing other irrealis moods\textsuperscript{11}
across languages, paralleling the syncretism of A1, CI, and imperative,
subjunctive, hortative, jussive, future/imperfect/prospective/potentive
etc, in BH derived patterns and irregular verbs (3.2, cf also 1.7, and
Ch. 6, where the semantic reasons for this will be discussed). In
2.3.13, it will be recalled, we correlated the common imperative-
subjunctive-jussive-asseverative emphatic use of Semitic dative marker
li- with imperative use of the infinitive as bespeaking a functional,
rather than etymological, connection between the two grammatical forms.
Quite in tandem with this, Buccellati (1972a:2 ff, 10ff.) suggests that
Akkadian non-finite relative clauses with infinitive correspond
directly to finite clauses in the precative (jussive-optative-potentive)
mood, with prefixed dative-cum-jussive/optative/asseverative particle *1ū < *1i (2.3.10, and cf von Soden 1952: Sec. 81c, apud Hetzron 1969a: 4-5) + jussive stem, other irrealis moods (cohortative, imperative), and finite clauses with present-future action (present indicative or subjunctive moods), in contrast to nominalization of clauses in the past indicative by means of the subjunctive. Corresponding to this is English identity of the irrealis modal forms subjunctive, conditional, imperative (hortative, jussive), and periphrastic future stem (will go) with the bare infinitive. (Note that, unlike present indicative, subjunctive/imperative = infinitive for all persons in the paradigm, including third singular and (archaic) second singular/familiar; even when English was richer in (verbal) morphology, the subjunctive/imperative was a bare (that is, unsuffixed) stem like the infinitive, viz: second singular/familiar, third singular prepare thou!, that thou/he prepare, as against indicative thou preparest, he prepareth. It is interesting to note in this context that Bolinger has suggested the synchronic identity of the infinitive and imperative, in meaning as well as form, in present-day English (1977:152 ff, 'Is the Imperative an Infinitive?'), again as though the relationship were ahistorical, non-etymological, i.e., functional, in nature; n.b. also that the wording 'Is the Imperative an Infinitive?' makes a clear statement regarding directionality of development, infinitive > imperative, exactly as we are claiming.

Note also English infinitive functioning as conditional: for these [agreements] to break,...could destroy Lebanon's chances to survive... [L.A. Times, 29 August '83]. ~ if these [agreements] break... Not
dissimilar is IH

\[ \text{li-daber ?it-o?} \]
\[ \text{to-speak with-him?} \]

'(should I) speak with him?'

with infinitive serving an irrealis modal function.

Compare the remodeling of the MH CI on analogy to the imperfect
(4.1.1); interestingly, the latter has largely MODAL (\(\sim\) irrealis)
functions in MH.

In Romance, as is well-known, the future tense derives from an
analytic/periphrastic construction consisting of the infinitive +
tensed/conjugated auxiliary verb 'have', later fused into a synthetic
inflectional paradigm, as French \((\text{je})\) \(\text{chanterai}\) 'I will sing <

\[ \text{chante-r + ai} \]
\[ \text{sing-INF have(I)} \]

'I have to sing',

verbalization of an infinitive accompanied by infinitive marker will
be dealt with at length in 5.2. Similarly, English obligatory
necessative/modality verb construction (again, irrealis) \(\text{have to} + \text{INF}\)
(the synchronic unity of this construction is of course convincingly
demonstrated through colloquial \(\text{hafta}\), with the erstwhile infinitive
marker cliticized to the auxiliary) < have [to + INF] (later we shall
discuss this kind of nominal (in this case, possessive) use of infinitive
phrase (n.b., with dative/infinitive marker), claiming that it
actually constitutes verbalization. Along the same lines are the
English and German periphrastic future constructions consisting of
auxiliary + infinitive (stem): \(\text{will INF (supra)}, \text{werden INF}\), as I will
\(\text{go, ich werde gehen (cf 2.4, 5.2)}, \text{German modality (irrealis)}\)
construction *wollen* 'want' + infinitive (cf 3.5), and periphrastic future with infinitive in Old Church Slavic (Birnbaum 1958). Again, compare Romance and English (perhaps a Western European Sprachbund? cf fn 5 (Ch. 5) periphrastic future with the verb 'go' (*aller*, *ir*, etc.) +

[dative-infinitive marker + INF stem] (cf 5.2), and also Spanish INF PHR

modal construction tener que INF 'must, have to' (obligative)

hold that INF

(note the presence of the complementizer as an index of verbalization (infra and 5.2), perhaps tied in with irreality (cf 3.5, and 6.1). Interestingly, one may note the general Western European perfect construction have/be PAST PTC, clearly possessive/nominal in origin (cf 5.2, Sec. n). With the above data, a correlation may be observed: participle (more nominal — cf 3.5, fn 34 (Ch. 3)) ~ perfect/realis, infinitive more verbal(ized) ~ future/irrealis. This will be discussed at greater length in 6.1.

Further evidence for the formal interrelationship of irrealis moods cross-linguistically: Irish use of prepositional phrase with non-finite clause as subjunctive. Nearly complete identity of polite/plural imperative and subjunctive in Spanish and French isomorphism of imperative and subjunctive is the case throughout the Chadic Branch of Afroasiatic (R. Schuh, p.c.). Similarly, the Berber 'unmarked stem' serves both subjunctive and imperative purposes (cf Penchoen 1973:40). In Mandarin Chinese, the same morpheme, *yao*₁², is used to mark both periphrastic future and imperative. In colloquial IH, the classical Common Semitic imperative (v. 4.4) has been replaced by the future
form (the BH imperfect) by analogy to the negative imperative, which uses the BH jussive form (isomorphic, in PBH, with the future tense), i.e., ʔal t-elex 'Don't go!' > t-elex 'Go!' The future form has thus taken over the imperative function, relegating the old imperative to tightly-constrained high-stylistic/register use (and even then only in its simplest (non-suffixed) form, except in writing). Compare the BH injunctive future (supra), and French, English instructive/imperativic future You will go, vous irez. All of the above demonstrate the same kind of development of imperativic sense by a future form.  

IH ʔulai 'perhaps, maybe', an adverb of modality/probability, has developed a use as polite/indirect imperative particle, as

ʔulai t-igor ʔet ha-delet 'Would/could you (maybe/perhaps) shut the maybe you-close ACC the-door
door', 'Maybe/perhaps/if you could/would shut the door' (note the English employment of interrogative and/or conditional (irrealis) moods for the same purpose, as well as similar adverbials, even use of modality verb want as oblique imperative: You want to shut the door(?)

In colloquial IH, (subjunctive) subordinator ʔe develops a function as jussive or mild imperative marker for either second or third person, as

ʔe-lo ti-ʔkax 'that you not forget' > 'Try not to forget, please don't forget!', ʔe-ya-kum! 'Let him arise!' (ad in Haaretz, over-

Conclusion—Evidence has been presented, then, to the effect that the relationship obtaining between infinitive and imperative is functional and not etymological: that is to say, infinitives are not derived from imperatives. In fact, it might be more accurate to state that there is an etymological relationship, but it is ASYMMETRICAL: infinitive forms may be extended to function as imperatives (INF > IMV), but not v.v. (IMV > INF); if this eminently falsifiable hypothesis is proven to hold true, it constitutes virtually a categorical refutation of the standard derivation of the BH CI from a proto-verb stem together with the imperative and imperfect (Ch. 1).

Within the framework of the unidirectional hypothesis that will be presented in Ch. 6, it is not hard to see why such an asymmetrical relationship should exist. Common irrealis semantics lead to a functional similarity between infinitive and imperative syntactically, the genus of infinitive as imperative, really the extension of imperative function to infinitives, may be understood as a further step on the unidirectional cline of verbalization, N > V (6.1) that gives rise to infinitives from deverbal nouns (5.2), accompanied by morphological indices of verbalization (v. App. A). Conversely, unidirectionality provides a plausible explanation for the non-occurrence of imperative forms used infinitively: unidirectionality explains why the imperative, with the indicative one of the two most basic verb-forms (moods) cross-linguistically (S. Thompson, p.c.), cannot develop into an infinitive, a category intermediate between noun and verb (cf. fn 9 (Ch. 2) and 6.1).
This observation, then, may be considered a major contribution of theoretical-typological linguistics to philology, or more specifically to the solution of a classical philological problem; in fact, it may be considered to exemplify the ways in which the discoveries of cross-language research, with its wider scope and concomitantly broader perspective, can shed light upon the inevitable shortcomings of research too much blinkered by exclusive attention to one language or family of languages. In this case, the cross-linguistic generalizations we have discovered with regard to infinitive and imperative bear direct consequences for the two competing accounts of the origin of the BH CI: if infinitives tend overwhelmingly to develop from deverbal nouns (as we shall demonstrate in the following section), and if it can be shown that the infinitive-imperative relationship does not involve etymological derivation of infinitives from imperatives, and a principled theoretical explanation can be given for the latter (unidirectionality), then this confirms the alternative derivation-monogenetic hypothesis and casts considerable doubt upon the standard/conventional derivation of the BH CI.

5.2 Infinitivalization and Verbalization Across Languages

We have noted before (4.1.1, 5.1) that cross-language/typological evidence abounds for the historical derivation of infinitives, quasi-verbal forms, from nominal forms/substantives (nomina actionis or gerunds), subsequent to their construction with dative-instrumental locative-directional case-marking, as charted for BH in the alternative derivation (2.3, 4.1.1). Concomitant to this are loss of nominal morphology and development of infinitive-marker function by the case-
marker, the latter evolving from directional-to purpose- to infinitive-marker (grammaticalization or semantic fading/bleaching—cf 1.6.7). Analogues of this process can be found throughout the Germanic, Romance (5.1), and Bantu language families. The Indo-European family shows this with particular clarity (unless otherwise indicated, the following data are thanks to R. Anttila, p.c.). With no reconstructable proto-infinitive, each language generalizing a different nomen actionis as its infinitive (I emphasize: a nominal, not a verbal form—cf 1.5), Celtic preserves the archaic situation, with no infinitive per se but rather a different lexical action noun for each verb. This parallels Arabic and the PS situation (1.5). Certain languages select nominal constructions with stationary locative or ablative (movement away from) case-marking (cf 1.3 for BH): so Slavic/Russian infinitive ending -tī < P.I.E. *-tēy, originally a locative singular case, the corresponding infinitive a fossilized nominal form used predicatively (i.e., verbalized) (cf Birnbaum 1958, 1965, 1967) - the 1958 study is even titled Ein Beitrag zur Historischen Verbsyntax des Slavischen (my italics), highlighting this contrast between diachronic nominal origin and synchronic verbal function), Classical Greek absolutive phrases with infinitive in the genitive (= ablative) case, and Swedish infinitive phrase att+INF, as att giva 'at giving, to give'. In by far the majority of instances, however, the nominal form receives CM indicating movement to(ward), dative/allative, as in the alternative derivation (3.4). Some of these will be discussed below; here we may mention Classical Greek retention of PIE absolute constructions with the dative, a possible locative-dative element in the Classical Greek
infinitive itself, and Vedic Sanskrit nominal infinitive stem with accusative/dative-allative case, as kar-tu-m, kar-tav-e.

In this section we shall present further examples of the same and related syntacto-semantic changes (including, more generally, any development of a substantive or nominal form into a verbal or quasi-verbal form, as participle or verbal adjective) in various language families, outside as well as inside Semitic/AA; it should be borne in mind that the data listed are by no means exhaustive, and additional examples are welcome. With respect to IE, the most important reference language family, one may briefly mention the derivation of the IE perfect from a nominal form (cf 3.7), and the late Sanskrit future from an agent noun (cf Watkins 1969) — thanks to R. Anttila for first pointing this out to me). Compare the analogic influence exerted over the nominal AI and CI by the imperfect (3.2), and the general European (Romance, Germanic, Slavic) use of infinitive in periphrastic future and other periphrastic tense constructions (5.1). Finally, there will be some discussion of a possible pan-AA or even Nostratic Systemzwang of verbalization. An interesting parallel on a higher level may be noted here: the rise/upward movement of cognition-utterance verbs on the semanto-syntactic scale of Givón's Binding Hierarchy to become modality or manipulative verbs (that is, more implicative) (cf 3.5 Givón 1980: 345-6) is comparable to the semantic fading/grammaticalization of dative/physical-goal marker + gerund (preceded by verb of physical motion) to infinitive marker + infinitive. In other words, were
physical MOTION on the part of the agent has been translated upward into the more implicative modality sense of PURPOSE or INTENT, and finally into the even more abstract realm of grammatical function, bleached of any richer lexical content (cf 1.6.7). The theoretical and cross-linguistic implications of this process will be enlarged upon in Ch. 6.

a. Aramaic

In 2.:3.4, we mentioned infinitivalization/verbalization of the N(eo)A(ramaic) verbal noun in compound verb-tenses f(i)C.a1a, feminine of faCaal-, as indicated by fusion of oblique prefix and verb-stem, as a striking parallel with verbalization of the CI in BH indicated, among other things, by fusion of dative prefix l1- with the CI stem (2.3). An additional parallel is to be found in NA and Syriac: the C(ommon) S(emitic) stative-passive participle, a nominal form, has been reanalyzed as an (active) preterite through the addition of dative pronominal suffixes (compare the reference to Cohen 1975 in 2.7), replacing the CS finite verb-forms and developing its own paradigm with pronominal inflections as the main, and synthetic, verbal tense (v. Sabar 1976:XXXVI-XLI, Boyarin 1982:103-6, Givón 1975:164-5, 181-3). Finally, Noldeke (1875:387 f., apud Hammershaimb 1963:93) adduces examples from Mandaic (Aramaic), where the infinitive with dative marker 11 after complementizer d-(which usually introduces a finite clause) functions as finite verb.
b. Lebanese Colloquial Arabic

Lebanese colloquial Arabic has a progressive construction, historically derived from a locative construction with verbal noun (N. Sabbaagh, p.c.): CA ḥuwwa Caalaa taftiiš 'he upon search(ing)'

'He is (upon) searching (i.e., he is on the task of searching, he is occupied with searching)' ḥuwwa Caalaa taftiiš

'He is (a') searching' (cf k. below). Phonological reduction of the locative preposition indicates that the locative character of the construction has been lost; the predicate has developed from [prep + (V)N]_{loc} pp [progressive participle + V]_{vp} and thus prep > aspect marker, and nominal form > verbal form, as in the alternative derivation.

c. Egyptian Colloquial Arabic

In Egyptian Colloquial Arabic (cf O'Leary 1963), the present (progressive/ continuative) tense is formed with the CA active participle, declined for gender and number: e.g., ?inta Caaawiz ?ey? 'What do you want?', you(m.sg.) wanting(m.sg.) what

hum raayh-iin 'They are going' (cf Fox 1981 on the they(m) going-m pl

restricted agreement system (no conjugation for person) that this same development produces in IH).

d. Archaising Israeli Hebrew (AIH) and Modern Standard Arabic

There was some discussion in 2.11 (cf also n. below on Afroasiatic/Nostratic drift) of a Semitic tendency toward nominal expression of subordinate clauses (where the standard Western European languages generally have a finite verb
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or infinitive with infinitive-marker (cf 5.1), i.e., verbal expression). In particular, we mentioned AIH constructions with deverbal noun employed infinitivally (usually as purpose-clause, 2.11) following li -, with the same syntactic distribution as the CI (some constructions with the other prepositions and prefix-prepositions are also given below).

As discussed in that section, such structures demonstrate that the same forces which brought about the alternative derivation scenario are alive and well in AIH. Herewith some further examples of that, and parallel structures in MSA (cf 22.1), with masdar ((de)verbal noun) used in syntactic environments where the standard Western European languages would require an infinitive:

AIH \textit{slixa}\textit{Cam} ha-\textit{?ixur} \textit{the-lateness} 'Sorry I'm late'

\textit{apology on the-lateness}

(n.b. both clauses nominalized!)

PRH \textit{?adam c\textit{ose k\textit{i-xefec- lib-o man does like-desire(of) heart-his}}

'A man does as his heart desires, lit. according to the desire of his heart'

AIH \textit{li-hamsix bi-matan \textit{Cezra to-continue in-giving help}}

'to continue in the giving of help, i.e., to give help'

AIH \textit{sefer li-\textit{Cezer l-a-mitCanyin-im bi-hora} a book to-help/aid(n.) to-the-interested-pl in-teaching}

'a book for the aid of, i.e., to help those interested in teaching'
tekes li-ṣiyun ha-wwed
ceremony to-commemoration the-date
'a ceremony for the commemoration of, i.e., to com-
memorate, the date'

MSA māta y-astaṭīṯ ad-duktūr al-hudūr hīna?
when he-manāge the-physician the-arrival here?
'When will the doctor manage to arrive here? (lit.
'manage the arrival')'

ʔ-urīd at-takallum
I-want the-speech
'I want to speak (lit. I want speech)'

saahil al-inkisaar
easy the-breaking
'easy to break (lit. easy of breakage)'

Especially interesting are the translation equivalences
found in the instructions on an international travelers'
map: Eng How to get to the center of London, Fr Comment
vous rendre à Londres (both with infinitives) ~

MSA kayf-iiyat u-l-intiqal ?ilaa Landan and,
how-ness(of) the-transportation to London
interestingly, Gm Fahrt ins Zentrum von London (both with
deverbal nouns). Of similar significance is relative-clause
formation in German and Chinese, such clauses being expressed
as non-finite nominal modifiers rather than tensed
clauses: Gm der auf der Ecke stehende Mann 'the man
The on the corner standing (PTC) man
standing on the corner, lit. the on-the-corner-stand-
man', Chin. wǒ zōu-tiān kàn de rén 'the man I saw
I yester-day see GEN man
yesterday, lit. I-yesterday-sees man'. Finally, MSA
\[ \text{bi-liga3-ki} \]
\[ \text{in-meeting(DVN)-thee(m.sg.)} \]
meeting \sim \text{when I meet you}' (N. Šabbaagh, p.c.). Note, in
particular, \text{DO} as genitive in nonfinite subordinate clause
(cf Sec. h below, and 4.1.1).

e. Ancient Egyptian

The Ancient Egyptian verbal form \text{s3jm.f} (actually four mor-
phologically and syntactically distinct forms/constructions,
v. Callender 1975:3) is conventionally taken to have origi-
nated in a genitive construction with what Callender calls
'a result nominalization', i.e. a passive participle indica-
ting the result or product of the action of the verb, with
the PAA subject genitive pronominal suffixes, as \text{f3i-k sy}
'You will carry her' (verbal sentence) \(<\text{original meaning}
'She is your prospective V-stem-your (m.sg.) she load'
\text{v}
\text{v}
Callender 1975:3-5), where the \text{s3jm.f} form serves as nominal
predicate in a nominal sentence. Callender enlarges upon
this hypothesis in distinguishing between the several forms
covered by \text{s3jm.f} and demonstrating that various verbal
nuances of tense/aspect and mood shown by them can be
explained by positing case-endings for these nominalizations,
which correspond both formally and functionally to the PAA
case-endings. Interestingly, Callender (1975:5) analyzes
dependent infinitive phrases in Ancient Egyptian as \text{VN +
genitive OBJECT constructions: } i.e., \text{mr+i m33.s }
to see her' as 'I desire her seeing'. Most relevant for our purposes, however, is the use of the prospective (≈ future) $s^\text{v}_{\text{im}}$ form in purpose-clause (1975:7): $\overset{2}{\overset{}{\text{w.k}}} \overset{2}{\overset{2}{\text{w.ti}}} f\overset{2}{\overset{}{\text{i-k}}} s\text{y}$ 'You have come in order (for you) to carry her'. As evidence for his case-ending thesis, Callender adduces syntactic parallels with action nouns and active participles in Classical Arabic and Modern Literary Arabic (1975:8), noting that such adverbial accusative purpose-clauses occur most commonly AFTER MATRIX VERBS OF MOTION ('come', 'go', 'arise'), as $\overset{?}{\overset{a}{\text{quum-u}}} \overset{}{\text{la-hu}} \overset{\text{c}}{\text{tazlim-an}} \overset{\text{li-}}{\overset{?}{\text{ustaad-ii}}} \overset{\text{I-rise-INDIC}}{\text{to-him}} \overset{\text{honőr(VN)-ACC}}{\text{to professor-my}}$ (Wright 1954 119:52b, apud Callender 1975:8) 'I stand up to honor my professor' (Callender: 'in order that I might honor...', Fox: 'toward the honoring...'). Callender, in fact, explicitly mentions that 'the use of a verbal noun in the accusative is no doubt an extension of the use of the accusative to designate the goal [my italics] of the motion, which would normally be a place'. Moreover, he specifically claims that this is indicative of the origin or point of departure of the Egyptian tense. The parallel with the alternative derivation is, needless to say, very close (cf. 2.2.1), and compare the MH idiom $\overset{\text{C}}{\overset{\text{A}}{\text{la}}} \overset{\text{\~a}}{\overset{\text{\~a}}{\overset{\text{\~a}}{\overset{\text{\~a}}{\text{wa}}} \overset{\text{li-}}{\overset{\text{wikkd}}} \overset{\text{to-stand}}{\overset{\text{to-argu(ment)}}{}}} \overset{}{\text{\text{-ment})}} \overset{}{\text{\text{-ment})}} \overset{}{\text{\text{-ment})}} \overset{}{\text{\text{-ment})}} \overset{}{\text{\text{-ment})}}$ 'to enter into argument, lit. to stand to argu(ment)' (4.1.1).

Callender remarks (1975:16) that it seems 'bizarre' to claim, as he does, an etymological relation between case-endings and
tense-markings, but notes the millenia-old surmise, dating back to the Arab grammarians and reflected in Arabic grammatical terminology, that the CA case-endings -u/a/i (nomi-
native, accusative, and genitive respectively) might be connected with the seemingly parallel mood endings -u/a/∅ (indicative, subjunctive, and jussive respectively). I may remark here that there is nothing particularly bizarre about this claim if one accepts the unidirectional hypothesis of Ch. 6, according to which development from substantives is, if not the exclusive, at least a very common means by which verbal forms develop cross-linguistically; such interrelationships of nominal and verbal morphology are, then, to be expected.

In Middle Egyptian (J. Callender, p.c.), concomitant with a shift in word order from VSO toward increasing SVO order, the old verb conjugation is replaced by a periphrastic tense with the infinitive, fragments of the verb do being conjugated as AUX with infinitives as their objects, something like he did-see(ing). This brings to mind the parallel English reanalysis of they did worship from V + DO (VN) > AUX + MV (INF).

f. Chadic

The Chadic branch of Afroasiatic provides us with a highly indicative parallel to the alternative derivation scenario: verbalization of an originally non-verbal predicate (whether oblique PP, dative PP or plain nominal predicate) consisting
of (de)verbal noun + following object complement standing in a genitive relation to it.

Most Chadic languages have two types of genitive constructions\textsuperscript{17}: an indirect or analytic genitive (overt genitive 'linker' between head noun and genitive modifier) and a more archaic direct or synthetic genitive (direct juxtaposition of the two nouns, equivalent to the Semitic construct state).

As might be expected, it is the latter that most often includes non-finite clauses with VERBAL NOUN + OBJECT, although this is not exclusively the case.\textsuperscript{18}

In the Kanakuru language (W. Chadic a—data from Newman 1974), the transitive imperfective (progressive/incomplective) verb-aspect actually consists of a nominal predicate with the direct genitive construction, VN + O:

\[
\text{ato } \text{dushe} \quad \text{kure} \quad \text{she will pound corn', shij she} \quad \text{pound(ing of) corn} \quad \text{he}
\]

\[
\text{ay-mo-wo} \quad \text{'He is helping you (m.sg.).'}
\]

help-VN-you

In both Hausa and Bade-Ngizim (also W. Chadic, a and b respectively) the indirect genitive construction with verbal noun + object (there is no direct genitive in these languages) is used for the imperfective (progressive-continuative) verb-aspect. From Hausa: \text{t-ana shi-es}

\[
\text{daka-n dawa} \quad \text{'She is pounding corn', y-ana he-is}
\]

\[
\text{pounding-GEN corn} \quad \text{he-is}
\]

\[
\text{tainako-n-ka helping-GEN-you(m.sg.)}
\]
In fact, the Hausa construction which most closely resembles the direct genitive with verbal noun + object of noun Chadic languages is historically a nominalized verb-phrase, as kashe maciji y-ana da kyau 'killing a snake has killing snake it-is with goodness goodness'; compare verbal sentence yaa kashe maciji he(past) kill snake 'He killed a snake'. This provides us with solid distributional evidence for verbalization of verbal-noun + genitive-object-as-nominal-predicate in Hausa, as the indirect genitive fulfills the function of a finite verb.

In Ngizim (Schuh 1971:56) 'zero' anaphora in this imperfec-
tive VN construction requires an overt marker, /w/, which, expectably enough, is also the referential marker used with nouns (e.g., ḏuukà-w, < ḏuukà + w/ 'the horse in ques-
tion'): viz., āa ndìmà w ——> [āa ndìmàw] 'He will he greeting(of) REF greet (him)'. As this marker can only appear with nouns, it constitutes irrefutable morphological evidence of the nominal source of this verbal construction.

Insofar as actual verbalization of this archaic nominal construction is concerned, Gúdè (Biu-Mandara a) presents us with clear and unambiguous evidence of a (verbal) noun > verb reanalysis parallel to the alternative derivation: it has innovated a progressive tense with verbal syntax,
whose nominal origin as a locative construction is still evident in the morphology:

\[ \hat{a} \ gî \ ?\hat{a}l-\în \ nî \ Bëli? \ \hat{u}uz-\în \]

at eye (of) seek(ing)-ART COP Beli boy-DET [interior]

'Beli is seeking the boy, lit. at-seeking is Beli the boy'.

The above resembles a locative (non-verbal) sentence, yet the word order is that of a verbal sentence, VSO; the DO is not a genitive complement to the erstwhile verbal noun, as shown by both the interpolation of the subject between them (as genitive, it would have to follow the verbal noun directly) and the form of the verb-complex, which would not include the article \( \hat{î}n \). Rather, the erstwhile genitive complement has become a chômeur-like argument, detached from the orbit of complementation to a verbal noun and rendered into the DO of a verbal sentence. Furthermore, the incremented locative preposition \( \hat{a} \ gî \) 'within' is positioned perfectly at the beginning of the sentence for a reanalysis as progressive tense-marker (cf secs. b, k), as the tense-marker is the first constituent of a canonical verbal sentence in Gûôê.

g. Baltic Finnic

The Baltic Finnic languages, particularly Finnish and Estonian, provide a number of parallels to the alternative derivation (the following data are from R. Anttila, p.c.).

In addition to derivation of the imperfect verb-form from an agent noun, and the third singular and plural present
tense from a participial form (an areal feature found not only in Finnish and Estonian but also in Lithuanian (IE), where it is probably due to diffusion from Baltic Finnic), Finnish has what is traditionally termed the 'third infinitive illative', as syömään 'into eating, to eat',

\[
\text{eat-NOM-into}
\]

consisting of an illative infinitival construction (verb-stem + nominal (gerundive) affix + illative case-suffix) used in such dependent infinitive contexts as mene-n
go-I

\[
\text{syömään 'I go to eat', or hän pako-tt-i miehe-n}
\text{eat-NOM-into he force-CAUS-PAST man-ACC}
\]

\[
\text{syömään 'He forced the man into eating, i.e., to eat'}
\text{eat-NOM-into}
\]

(Givón 1980:351, from R. Anttila, p.c.) (note still-possible allative physical-goal interpretation—cf 1.6, 2.4). A similar situation prevails in Estonian.

h. Irish

Irish, frequently referred to in the literature of Celtic linguistics as a 'noun-based' language (cf 2.11 and d, above, on Semitic) (J. McCloskey, lecture notes), forms the progressive passive with genitive direct OBJECT (cf 4.1.1) + VN. Again, the active present indicative involves a locative PP-construction which glosses I am in/at his-seeing,

\[
\text{prep GEN-VN/INF}
\]
i.e., 'I am while seeing him = I see him', with genitive direct object. Of even more interest to us are the dependent infinitive phrases chun an tsaoil seo
to(ward) the life this
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d'fhágáint 'to leave this life', Chun a leaving (nonfinite)
toward (ward) his

fhágáint na saoil seo 'toward his leaving of this life'
leaving gen. life this
def. art. (f.)

(all the above data from T. Wilbur and H. Lazar-Meyn, p.c.) Note the directional/physical-goal semantics of the infinitive marker, and in the latter example, both subject and DO in the genitive.

i. **Polish**

One index of verbalization of nominal forms is the switch from genitive to accusative case on the object (2.6, and fn 2.4). Compare the isomorphism, in Polish, of genitive and accusative case (data from H. Cardenas, lecture notes):

Jan nie dal bic dziecka 'Jan didn't allow
Jan NEG allow beat(ing) kid
the beating of the kid, that the kid be beaten', where it is moot whether the subordinate clause is finite or non-finite.

j. **Germanic Infinitive**

In middle high German, the infinitive with preceding infinitive-marker takes dative case, as indicated by the -e ending: zu kommene 'to come', er wünschte zu singene 'He wished to sing' (v. Paul et al 1982: Kap VI: Sec. V: B: 389ff); the same holds for early Old English infinitive, as bare stem seón 'look, see', but to seonne 'to see' with preceding to and consequent dative suffix (v. Visser 1963: v. II: 942).²⁰ Visser (1963: v. II: 947) notes that 'the particle to preceding the infinitive was originally a preposition with the sense of "direction towards" which caused the
change of e.g., *singan* to *singenne*; exemplifying this with Ælfric, Hom. ii, 322, 15 = *wa ðæn ðæ  stræng  bið  to  swiðlicum  drencum  and  to  gemencgenne  ða  micclan  druncennysse*.

'Woe, then, be to the strong, to such drink[ing] and to gathering together [in] much drunkeness'. Visser also provides (1963:v. II:948) citations demonstrating the attenuation of prepositional force in *to* (cf2.3.6); actually, even the above quotation seems already to show a degree of metaphorical extension, from physical movement toward a goal to the abstract notion of wishing 'woe' (a state) upon 'drinking and gathering' (actions).

Middle English affords similar examples of such archaic allative-directional function with the even more transparently locative-directional prepositions *at*, *til*, and *unto* (*til* already in late Northern Old English and still in Scottish English), many examples in Visser 1963:v. II:947. The parallel with the alternative derivation is perfect, from original prepositional semantics, through metaphorical extension, to grammaticalization as infinitive marker. Note also the frozen colloquialism *es ist zum Kotzen* 'It's enough to make you sick, lit. it is to vomit', with phonologically reduced dative definite article *(de)m* on the infinitive marker (the initial capital is the modern orthographic indication of the supine or infinitival noun - cf 5.1). This
seems highly indicative of an original allative, 
physical-movement-toward-VN-as-goal semantics as in 
the alternative derivation.

k. English Progressive Construction with Participle

The development of the English participle provides a very 
instructive parallel to the alternative derivation (v. Visser 
1963:v. II:Ch. 9:1065-1098, and Mustanoja 1960 - I am 
indebted to I. Maddieson for first pointing this out to me).
The Modern English particle (-ing form) has two possible 
sources in Old English: a quasi-nominal form with the 
suffix -end(e)/and (also the etymon of the Modern German 
present active participle), somewhat more verbal than a 
more canonically nominal form ('pure noun[s]' according to 
Visser 1963:v. II:1065) ending in -ung/ing (also the 
etymon of the modern German deverbal noun), nevertheless 
with both gerundive and participial functions. Both forms 
may be used as action nouns/gerunds of the 'singing is fun' 
type, as absolute clauses (crashing and yelling, he came 
down the hill), and may occur in construction with preposi-
tions, as ic was on gang-end-e 'I was going'. 
I was on go-ing-DAT

The latter two uses show clearly that verbalization is taking 
place, as does the construction of the -ung/ing form with 
direct and indirect objects (Visser 1963:v. II:1067-9, who 
attaches the same significance to these features; cf 2.6 
and 6.1), and present participial use of the -ende form
(Visser 1963: v. II:1070-1077). After a later period of scant textual attestation, and evidence from orthography and rhyme of confusion between the two suffixes in Middle English (v. Visser 1963: v. II:1085) a single -ing form appears, of uncertain etymology, with syntactic characteristics indicating a merger/convergence of the functions of the two earlier forms, functioning as both gerund and participle. Even after the merger, the form is found with gerundive function as object of locative PP: witness archaic at going > colloquial a' going. Phonological reduction of the erstwhile preposition indicates that the construction is no longer thought of as a locative PP, but has evolved into a present progressive-continuative verbal tense construction, with what must synchronically be considered progressive particle + participle (cf Sec. b above on Lebanese colloquial Arabic cāa).

Perhaps the most obvious cross-linguistic parallel to the alternative derivation is the reanalysis/grammaticalization of Fr aller, Sp ir a, Eng gonna, Gùdè (Chadic) ni'go' + a 'at/in' + VN > future AUX + INF (cf Sec. f), and even, most recently, in the colloquial IH of yordim (Israeli emigrants — the structure is perhaps a calque from American English), generally with a connotation of negative outcome:

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{ata} & \text{holex} & \text{li-label yok} \\
\text{you} & \text{going} & \text{to-receive shock}
\end{array}
\]

'You're going to get a shock', from V + (prep +) VN 'movement
toward a locative/directional goal' > future/purposive marker (+ infinitive marker) + INF. (Note that, in English, with this particular lexical verb, the preposition fuses with the main verb rather than the infinitive.) Note also colloquial Levantine Arabic yaruuh/raayih + imperfect 'going [to] V' with the same semantic development, although here the 'main verb' is finite. The English case provides us with two nice points of evidence for the reanalysis: 1) the phonological reduction of directional-cum-purposive going to > gonna, and 2) the semantic clash that would result if gonna were interpreted as physical movement in, for example, I'm gonna think about it.21 Compare the even clearer Levantine Arabic sentence huwwa yaruuh/raayih yi-ji 'He is going to he going he-come come'.

1. French and Spanish

The French expression arriver à INF 'manage/be able to INF, lit. arrive at INF', is clearly the result of metaphorical extension from verb of physical movement toward VN-as-goal, complete with directional-goal preposition, to a more abstract purposive semantics on the part of the matrix verb, with infinitive marker + INF; the same holds for Spanish llegar a ser 'come to be, get to be'. lit. 'arrive at be(ing)'. Compare colloquial IH ba? l-i (it) came to-me (sudden) notion', English it came to me = 'It occurred to to me, I realized', and 2.3.6, fn 34 on the English structure
toward/to the end of GERUND, he set out to go = with the purpose/intention of going.

m. **Turkish**

The Turkish infinitival ending *-mag* (-m + -aq) contains Altaic nominal suffix *-m* (Ramstedt II:104—, *Einführung in die Alti}sche Sprachwissenschaft*, apud Koskinen 1980:144).

n. **Semitic/Afroasiatic Drift**

Throughout this work we have mentioned a possible pan-Afroasiatic Systemzwang of verbalization, a kind of drift (in the sense of Sapir 1921:154 ff.). Now as it happens, most of the Semitic colloquials have innovated analytic/periphrastic particles for expression of the genitive in place of the older construct state of the classical language and formal/literary registers (v. fn 1, Ch. 1). Indeed, we can even extend this up one level, to the AA phylum: most Chadic languages have both a conservative or direct (synthetic) genitive construction, cognate to the Semitic construct state, and an indirect or linked (analytic) genitive construction (Sec. f, above). Of those possessing the distinction, most are moving in the direction of expanding use of the (innovative) linked genitive, i.e., the latter is spreading, as in Semitic (R. Schuh, p.c.). This tendency may be seen as part and parcel of a general AA drift from synthetic/inflecting to analytic/isolating morphosyntactic type (cf Blau 1981, Kaye 1983a,b, Fox 1983a).
The drift from synthetic to analytic structure, in turn, may be seen as connected with our proposed tendency of nominal forms (deverbal nouns/gerunds) to develop verbal function and evolve into verbal forms (and, as one particular case within this entire spectrum, infinitival function and infinitival forms). Recall, in this context, the common morphosyntactic trait, even among non-cognate Semitic infinitives, of taking both genitive and accusative suffixes (fn 8 (Ch. 2)), evidently an index of the infinitive's intermediate position on the N-V cline (6.1); this may be considered one aspect of the Systemzwang. The steady shift in the Semitic colloquials from nonfinite to finite subordinate-clause constructions (fn 65 (Ch. 2)) may be seen as another aspect of the same process; a shift from synthetic/declensional (nominal) expression to analytic/periphrastic (verbal) expression. Compare 4.1.1 on the parallel development in both LBH-MH and TA of finite subordinate-clause structures introduced by the complementizers ki-se-, ki-di like-COMP 'when' respectively, replacing the classical Semitic nominal subordinate-clause constructions.

The idea of such a verbalizing trend, incipient in the AA phylum, is discussed by Hodge (1976:57-60), who also links it with the shift from more synthetic to more analytic structure, specifically mentioning Egyptian, Hebrew, and Aramaic verb-forms, placing these developments within the framework of the nominal sentence (1976:57), i.e., the nominal predicate. One thinks of the Hebrew active participle developing into a present tense through the medium of the nominal predicate (2.8), the same phenomenon in Egyptian colloquial Arabic (Sec. c), Ugaritic development of the Common Semitic-Afroasiatic nominal
desinence -m (mission) into a predicative marker by way of the nominal sentence (2.2.3), Ugaritic AI-as-nominal predicate functionally corresponding to the imperative (Segert 1979:64.612, v. 5.1 of this work), Ancient Egyptian sāmīf (Callender 1975:3-5, in sec. 4 of this work), in which nominal predicate with 'result' nominalization + subject genitive pronoun develops into nominative pronoun + verb-form, evolution of the Neo-Aramaic apparent dative-possessive construction with passive participle into a preterite, as sāmīi? l-eh 'he has heard' heard to-him (Hodge 1976:57, and v. sec. a) (compare the English: cf 5.1), the English and Lebanese colloquial Arabic developments from locative predicate (PP) with gerund/verbal noun into progressive/participial constructions (secs. b, k), and the Chadic nominal and locative predicates with verbal noun + object genitive construction as transitive imperfective and possessive verb-tenses (sec. f) D. Cohen (1970, earlier noted by M. Cohen (1948-51), both references apud Hodge (1976:58); cf also the reference to Cohen 1975 in 2.7) implies that the nominal sentence or proposition is in some sense basic to Semitic in viewing the VP as acting as a nominal (predicate, presumably). This fits in with the thrust of Hodge's argument and can be related to his claim (1976:58) that 'Verbs basically arise from nominal constructions', to be discussed further in Ch. 6, where I will make a similar (but not identical) claim with regard to unidirectionality of the N > V cline. Similarly, Nyberg (1952: sec. 85, apud Hammershaimb 1963:93), like the Arab grammarians, regards Hebrew and Arabic finite verbal clauses with preceding subject (the word order of the conservative Semitic
nominal sentence) as compound nominal clauses with verbal clause constituting the predicate, and Pedersen 1926: Sec. 122r (also apud Hammershaimb 1963:93) notes that the boundary between verbal and nominal clause is often vague. Hodge comments on the well-known persistence and relative importance/fundamental nature of the nominal sentence type (presumably, vis-a-vis verbal sentences) throughout the AA phylum at different periods, particularly in Semitic and Egyptian (1976:58, and references therein). In line with this, he notes similarity in nominal sentence construction (presumably according to the conservative Semitic/AA pattern, above) even between AA languages/families with little or no similarity in verbal sentence construction, as Hausa and Egyptian (1976:58). This ties in, of course, with the Semitic noun-basedness referred to earlier and below, and cf. Sec. e on Ancient Egyptian.

Hodge (1976:57 and references therein) mentions also parallels between the Ethiopic gerund construction (verbal noun + suffixes), an Ethiopic adjectival construction with pronominal suffixes, and the Egyptian suffix conjugation $\text{ṣīmf}$ (Sec. e above); all three exemplify the Systemzwang further. Ryder (1974:165, apud Hodge 1976:59) claims a 'nominal/verbal' origin for the factitive-intensive stem ($\text{πiCCēl, faCCāla}$) in Hebrew and Arabic. Hodge refers as well to discussion of the secondary nature of 'verb' forms (Hodge's quotation marks), particularly in Cushitic, by Reinisch (1909) and Plazikowsky-Brauner (1965) (both references apud Hodge 1970:60).
In line with the above, one may mention Rosén (1977:107-8) on IH 'verboids', such as the (originally nominal) expression of possession haya li-X ṭet- Y was to-X ACC- Y 'X had/owned Y', which now show such verbal morphosyntactic features as, most dramatically, taking nota accusativi on the thing possessed, originally in the nominative/absolutive case (shades of 2.6, and cf Fox 1983a, Blau 1981:142-3, and references in the latter) and developing person, number and gender agreement systems between subject and predicate (cf Sec. a above, and Hodge 1976:57-8 on Neo-Aramaic, Egyptian, and certain non-AA languages in which the dative case has developed into a subject case within a preterite verbal paradigm of participial origin; the semantic-pragmatic similarity of dative/indirect object and subject shows up also in discourse behavior (Fox 1983b). Interestingly, although this phenomenon occurs in BH, Rosén claims its appearance in IH to be independent of its occurrences in BH; if he is right, this would lead one strongly to suspect that the same N > V drift is at work. Similarly, note IH (< MH, possibly Aramaizing) carix 'must, have to, need' (even, by extension, higher predicate 'be necessary (that S)'), a modal-like verb (interestingly, like its English modal AUX counterpart must, it does not conjugate for person, and takes another form entirely in the past and future— cf I must go, I need to go, I will have to go), derived from a CS substantive, a passive-participial-adjetival formation (cf cognates Ar jamiil 'beautiful', rafiid 'rejected, dismissed'), and BA fiCq passive participial formation (Rosenthal 1961:45, 61), declinable and functioning as any noun or substantival adjective.
In the same vein, cf Comrie (1982) on the reanalysis, in modern Maltese, of the existential/possessive, originally a nominal sentence, as verbal.

Pertinent here is the interesting Israeli tendency to refer to a verb as 'comes from the word' (me-ha-mila) of its deverbal noun or gerund (Heb. sem-pica, lit. nomen actionis), showing a feeling among native speakers that the noun is primary and verb secondary (2.11, secs. d, h above, and 6.2). Concomitantly, that the infinitive has been felt to be nominal is indicated by traditional Semitic grammatical terminology: Heb. magor 'infinitive', lit. 'source, origin', sem-poica noun (lit. name) (of)–the-verb 'infinitive', Ar masdar id.22 From another family than Semitic in the AA phylum: Tuareg (Berber), native speakers of which customarily give the verbal noun or gerund as citation form of the verb (e.g., if asked for the equivalent of acheter (R. Schuh, p.c.)). Finally, although we shall not be able to treat of the subject as it deserves, we may at least note that verbal use of nominal forms, leading ultimately to verbalization, may in fact be a common Indo-Semitic or even Nostratic trait (R. Anttila, p.c.). One may offer as perhaps the best-known example of this phenomenon in Indo-European the synthetic to analytic development in language-type from Latin through the Romance dialects (Blau 1981: Ch. 1, reviewed in Kaye 1983a) and verbalization of infinitive into tensed (finite) verb-form in Romance, Germanic, and Slavic (5.1). Further investigation of this tendency in the IE family is certainly a desideratum. We have now
risen still another level (as before from the Semitic family to AA) up from the AA phylum to a more inclusive genetic grouping (cf Pedersen 1972:338-9, Anttila 1972:320-1, and Illič-Svityč 1971, 1976). From here it is not far to speculate on the possible universality of the noun to verb cline of development, and it is to this that we turn in Ch. 6.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 5

1. From ḥir-hakabala (a.k.a. ḥxa ḏdi, the traditional liturgical song of greeting of the Sabbath, in turn from the ten commandments (Caseret hadibrot), (Deut 5:12).

2. As a matter of fact, this does occur, but in such a manner that it seems to indicate specifically that the CI ~ Imperative relationship is secondary/functional, not etymological: Gen 46:3 mē-ridā from-descend 'from descending', which CI form (in PP) is unequivocally the masculine singular imperative, (co)hortative mood (a specialized, lengthened use of the PS subjunctive a-ending (note that both moods are irrealis) in BH; v. Moran 1960: 1-19, Hetzron 1969a:16). The mood-ending on the imperative form conveys strongly the impression that the confusion between the two forms is quite a late, secondary occurrence, an innovation and not some PS retention.

3. One might even hypothesize that the imperative, like the CI, is a form of the AI phonologically reduced under the same conditions as the CI (Fig. 2); the above usages would then constitute either archaisms or Masoretic hypercorrections. Although this is drastically at odds (as is, for that matter, the alternative derivation of the BH CI) with the standard derivation of the imperative, together with the CI and imperfect, from a minimal verbal stem (1.4), the Semitic imperative as an originally infinitival/nominal form would certainly dovetail with the evidence presented below for cross-language etymological derivation.
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of imperatives from infinitives, and compare the imperative with cohortative augmentative \( \text{sim} \text{C} \text{a} \) 'C' mon, listen!' (cf fn 2, and 4.2.1), with the segholate (nominal, v. 2.11) verb-pattern. This radical departure from the standard assumptions of Semitic linguistics is not, however, crucial to our argument.

4. v. Maher 1977 on this concept.

5. This may in turn be correlated with the Semitic/Afroasiatic Systemzwang of verbalization (5.2), in other words, DRIFT, rather than an archaic retention from PS or PAA (but cf fn 3 (Ch. 5)), may be the operative factor here. That imperative use constitutes verbalization, at least in BH, is certainly confirmed by the verbal regimen, with nota accusativi, taken by the imperative AI (see also below): compare \( \text{žákór?et- hay-yôm} \),

\begin{align*}
\text{remember ACC- the-day}
\end{align*}

'Remember the day!' (Ex 13:3)


7. Note that, in the overwhelming majority of cases, the infinitive is so used in an infinitive phrase-structure complete with infinitive marker. The significance of this will be discussed later.

8. Some sort of (Western) European Sprachbund effect is evident at this high stylistic level, but the other examples from modern and ancient Semitic, Afroasiatic, Sino-Tibetan, etc, etc, make it
clear that the correlation cannot be dismissed as limited to such a grouping.

9. This putative infinitival usage may in fact be none other than jussive-subjunctive-asseverative-emphatic li + imperfect, something like *li + yi-sî-ăn 'May/Let he/him save us'; ASSEV+he-save-us

cf 2.3.12 for possible similar occurrences in BH.

10. ?eyn is the nominal negator (more precisely, a negative existential particle), lo? the verbal (v. 2.8). See the end of 5.1 for the significance of this morphological alternation.

11. Again, forms with related functions tend to syncretize, i.e., semantic-functional similarity brings about analytic pressure (contamination) for formal convergence (levelling) as well, and vice-versa, provided that the forms are not so dissimilar to begin with that a relationship between them would be completely implausible.

12. Lit. 'want', obviously having developed a strongly implicative modality sense (v. 3.5), as well as being grammaticalized (cf 6.1, esp fn 5).

13. The context/pragmatics under which this takes place are evidently different from those under which infinitives assume imperative function, but we shall not explore this aspect further here.

14. The imperative tends to be a bare (uninflected) form for pragmatic reasons: tense-aspect and person need not be expressed linguistically as they are already present in the speech
situation (of course, this is not so for the indicative). Imperatives tend to be like simple roots/stems cross-linguistically (R. Schuh, p.c.): two examples are Somali use of the imperative as citation form of the verb (V. Fox, *Somali Verbal Morphophonemics* (in prep.)), Ladakhi identity of imperative and bare stem (S. Koshal, *Grammar of Ladakhi*, cited by W. Labov, lecture notes). Of related interest, perhaps, is the special radical de-tensed, depersonalized verb-form found in Basque proverbs and certain types of subordinate clauses neither realis nor irrealis, implying a kind of continued potentiality (T. Wilbur, p.c.); again, these verbal features need not be expressed linguistically because the proverbial mode presupposes timelessness and generality/depersonalization.

15. The term deverbal noun is somewhat inappropriate, as it implies synchronic derivation from a verb, whereas such substantives may of course be quite primary in nature (cf fn 22 (Ch. 5). Deverbal nouns proper, in the above sense, will be discussed in 6.2 for the light they shed on the relationship between noun and verb.

16. Unless otherwise acknowledged, all of the data in this section are thanks to R. Schuh, lecture notes and p.c.


18. Interestingly, in many Chadic languages with a direct vs. indirect genitive distinction, *subjects* of nominalized constructions require the indirect form (genitive particle),
whereas objects take the direct form (simple juxtaposition), e.g., Miya virkak ta ?am 'giving birth of/by a woman' ≠ virkaka vîrîk 'bearing a child'. This would seem to indicate that, at least in Chadic, the object is viewed as a more natural, tightly-bound genitive attribute of a nominalized verb, standing in a closer syntactic relationship to it than subject, much like the very common cross-language constituent VP (= finite) Verb + Object. This may be seen as constituting some indirect support for the alternative derivation, with (direct) object/semantic patient as genitive attribute to the CI.

19. Such locative-derived progressives are ubiquitous in Chadic; the Gôde example has been selected because the contrast between nominal morphology and verbal syntax renders the verbalization process particularly clear.

20. My thanks to T. Wilbur, R. Anttila, and R. Stockwell for first pointing out these facts to me.

21. Thanks to R.G. Schuh for first pointing this out to me.

22. According to Wright (1977:i, 1108), 'because most Arab grammarians derive the compound idea of the finite verb [my italics; cf Nyberg 1952: Dec. 85, above] from the simple idea of this substantive. No clearer confirmation of the primariness of the noun could be asked.

Any specific linguistic problem, synchronic or diachronic, is bound to raise issues of cross-linguistic, general theoretical import, and, ceteris paribus, to contribute to their resolution. In 5.1 I mentioned the mutually beneficial or symbiotic relationship between cross-linguistic (typological) theory, and referred to the corollary hypothesis of functional, as opposed to etymological, relationship between infinitive and imperative as the contribution of (typological) linguistics to classical Semitic philology, providing an insight into BH unattainable through philological method alone. What follows in this chapter may, in a sense, be considered the complement of the above: viz., the contribution of historical-comparative (genetic) Semitic linguistics/philological investigation in the narrow sense (the alternative derivation and monogenetic hypothesis, formulated to account, diachronically, for various morphophonological and morphosyntactic phenomena in a single language, Hebrew) to typological and theoretical linguistics in the broadest (and deepest—v. p. 160) sense of the term.¹

The most natural question, it seems to me, to ask after examining the data collected in 5.2 is the following: is it merely coincidence that, in all of the cases examined, infinitives are derived diachronically from substantives?² Everything seems to point in this direction. Have we merely 'stacked the deck' by selecting only those cases which serve to parallel the alternative derivation, while ignoring an equal
number of counterexamples? Or do the quite randomly-collected nominal-to-verbal shifts in 5.2 motivate a more general hypothesis? 

6.1 Unidirectionality and the Nominal-Verbal Cline

I suggest that it is no coincidence that infinitives tend overwhelmingly to develop from substantives; that, in fact, this observation merely constitutes a corollary or sub-theorem of an even more general cross-linguistic fact, the regular evolution of substantives into verbal forms. To put it another way, the very common and possibly universal origin of infinitives in nominal (gerundive) forms (INF < N) is but a subset or particular case of a more general, and very strong, tendency on the part of nominal forms to develop verbal function and evolve into verbal forms (N > V), a process which we have been calling verbalization. The latter has been exemplified by incorporation of participle and infinitive into tensed (finite) periphrastic verb-constructions in Romance, Germanic, and Slavic, 5.1, and particularly the Romance future, where fusion of infinitive and AUX actually takes place, rendering exceptionally clear the rise of a new (finite) verb-form. Going one step further, we are going to claim that this cline or scale of historical development is assymetrical or UNIDIRECTIONAL, i.e., that verbs do not develop similarly across the cline into nouns. This very strong claim will be defended in 6.2, after we have expanded upon the nominal-verbal cline and detailed some of its properties in this section.

Grammatical categories and sub-categories seem to group themselves on this cline of historical development from noun to verb something like Fig. 4 (p. 232).
Figure 4 — The Nominal-Verbal Cline
The terms canonical/categorial are here used in the sense of Hopper and Thompson (1984), to refer to nouns and verbs which may be judged prototypical of those categories by two very specific criteria: a) functional/semantic: being used in the canonical nominal or verbal functions of, respectively, reference to concrete entities and predication of events (more on these discourse-related definitions in 6.2), and b) formal: displaying, respectively, characteristic nominal or verbal 'trappings', morphosyntactic markers/indices of nominal or verbal status that correlate with this prototypical function. This correspondence between degree of prototypical nominal/verbal form and function Hopper and Thompson rightfully term a kind of diagrammatic iconicity (S. Thompson, lecture notes): the more nominal or verbal the function/behavior of any given instance of noun or verb, the more morphosyntactic 'trappings' accrue to that form. One might describe the end-points or poles of the nominal-verbal cline, the canonical/categorial nouns and verbs, as clusters of such properties.

It is not difficult to compile a cross-linguistic taxonomy of the relevant properties ('trappings', markers, indices) themselves: for nouns, case-marking, plurality, NP constituents such as determiners/articles and deictic markers/demonstratives and modifiers (adjectives, genitives, relative clauses), and, for Semitic, the construct state (v. fn 2 (Ch.1)). For verbs, of course, tense/aspect, mood, voice (recall the Ugaritic innovation of infinitives displaying the pronounced verbal characteristic of voice as well as Aktionsart ('manner of action' markers of derived verbal pattern-intensive-factive, causative, reflexive, inchoative, etc.), 3.2.1), and the governing of
a direct object (cf 5.2, sec. n, on the common morphosyntactic trait, among Semitic infinitives, of taking either genitive or accusative suffix pronouns as an index of the infinitive's intermediate position on the cline, between noun and verb; in Akkadian (Buccellati 1972:16) the infinitive alone among substantives manifests the verbal morphosyntactic characteristic of taking accusative suffixes, thus distinguishing it from various types of deverbal nouns). (See Addendum, p. 297). The (B)H CI is fairly typical of infinitives with respect to verbal marking, with no marking for tense/aspect (as the terms 'infinitive' and 'finite verb' imply, this is perhaps the most fundamental difference between the two; P. Hopper (p.c.) remarks that tense/aspect marking is generally quite restricted in infinitives) but person, number, and gender agreement (for both subject and object) in the form of suffix pronouns; the AI, which has developed more adverbial than verbal function (v. fn 5), usually does not take even those. Actually, Hopper (p.c.) has noted that, in the cross-linguistic variation with regard to the degree of verbal marking infinitives receive, person agreement, a prototypical verbal feature, is 'the first to go'; this way of putting it implies a view of the infinitive as decanonicalized/decategorized verb-form. From our diachronic perspective, and positing the hypothesis of unidirectionality, we should rather approach from the other direction and say that person agreement, along with tense/aspect marking ~ finiteness, are perhaps the two last verbal features that an infinitive form can gain before verbalization pushes it beyond the limit of the grammatical category INF to a further point on the nominal-verbal cline, and it is replaced by a
fresher, more nominal form coming up from behind. By this criterion, the Hebrew CI has advanced quite far toward the verbal pole in showing person as well as number and gender agreement (the latter two being less exclusively verbal marking in that they are also manifested by substantives). (See Addendum, p. 297) On the functional side, use of an infinitive form as imperative or other irrealis mood, or as finite verb, constitute further development on the cline toward the verbal pole (5.1, 2).

Negation is one of the most useful criteria for deciding whether a particular form is nominal or verbal, as languages very frequently have distinct systems for the two categories (English no vs not, for example); substitution of verbal negative particle lo? for the nominal negative particle ?eyn of classical-literary usage was the key for us in determining the now-verbal status of the formerly nominal l4-CI imperative (App. A, p. 269) and participle-as-present-tense constructions in colloquial IH (2.8). A very interesting index of nominal-vs-verbal status in BH was discussed in fn 11 (Ch.2): the vowel-length difference between nominal/substantival a and verbal a, which correspondence is quite general in BH; the Aramaized LBH CI (with li-) manifests the verbal variant with short vowel, indicating that it has been re-analyzed as a verbal form (i.e., verbalized).

How, then, does the proposal of a unidirectional N > V cline differ from the notions of categorial noun and verb found in Hopper-Thompson 1984? Essentially, we have added the dimension of time, and are examining the cline from a historical perspective: we claim that progression through various stages can be correlated with/is accompanied by loss of canonical nominal characteristics and concomitant
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assumption of verbal characteristics. It is, in other words, a
dynamic, process model, not a static one, with movement on the cline
an ineluctable feature of it, and, crucially, diachronic rather than
merely synchronic; in fact, as we have already hinted and shall dis-
cuss further on, it is evidently cyclical in nature. Diachronic
change is thus a central feature of the N>V cline. Moreover, we are
making the empirically falsifiable claim that this process is
unidirectional: that nominal forms may and frequently do wander away
from canonical nominal function, toward either the verbal pole or the
status of grammatical functive (fn 5), whereas verbs may not, con-
versely, migrate over time towards the nominal pole, but are rather
restricted to another dimension of interrelationship with nouns which
will be discussed in the following section.
The model presented in Fig. 4 above is, of course, very much in the way
of a first attempt: even more ambitious, as it is at least putatively
universal, than the 'general synthesis' for the AA phylum mentioned by
Hodge as not yet having been undertaken (1976:59). It seems not to be the
case that a substantive form must pass through every point on the cline in
the course of verbalization, as witness the development of the partic-
cipial form into a present tense (finite verb-function) in colloquial IH
without passing through the stage of infinitive function (2.8). Other-
wise, as we shall see shortly, the relative order of participle and
infinitive cross-linguistically seems to be quite certain; note, in
fact, that the various BH deverbal nouns mentioned in 2.11 as develop-
ing infinitival (CI) function do indeed seem to pass through a stage of par-
ticipial (i.e., verbal noun) function, lost in later Hebrew (v. Ch. 4).
Indeed, while the relative order of categories that I give here is certainly subject to adjustment, elaboration, and 'fine-tuning' in the light of new data, its virtue as a hypothesis lies precisely in that it is amenable to such adjustment and verification through the entirely objective and empirical procedure of utilizing the above-listed parameters to determine and diagram degree of nouniness-verbiness, which should thus be, at least to some extent, measurable. As examples of the kind of data I feel to bear upon the order of categories on the cline, we may take the development of BA -ūt from part of lexical verbal root, through deverbal (noun) suffix, into infinitive ending, losing, along the way, the nominal property of standing in construct (1.4). With regard to proximity of participle and infinitive on the cline, recall the Syriac adoption of nominal prefix m- in the infinitive, even for the derived patterns, presumably on analogy to the participle (2.2.4). Note also the frequent substitutability of English present participle and infinitive, especially with the so-called raising verbs (cf 5.1) and extraposed constructions: I hate to go, I hate going, he began falling, he began to fall (in colloquial they began t'runnin', this interchangeability goes so far as to give rise to a hybrid structure with infinitive marker + gerund (t)), no use coming, no use to come, it's fun coming, it's fun to come. Note also the occasional isomorphism of English past participle and infinitive, next to each other on the cline: to come, has come. The gradated nature of the cline inevitably implies that boundaries between categories will blur and overlap; one may note the
Finnish so-called 'fourth infinitive', which shades in function into a deverbal noun (R. Anttila, p.c.), and the synchronically isomorphic English participle and gerund (v. 5.2: sec. k, and below) where a single morphological form, stem + ing, serves both participial (VN, an integrally functioning part of the verbal system in the periphrastic continuative tenses: I am going) and gerundive functions (DVN or nomen actionis, a regular noun except for its abstract-verbal semantics: swimming is fun, the killing (of Sam) was terrible).

As I noted in connection with the alternative derivation in 1.4, one of the features of a good hypothesis is that it provides an explanation for diverse phenomena previously inexplicable or thought to be unrelated. As remarked in sec. e of 5.2, on Ancient Egyptian, Callender's (1975: 16) terming 'bizarre' his claim of an etymological relation between case-endings and tense-markings can be seen to be utterly unnecessary in the light of the unidirectional hypothesis, which makes clear that such an interrelationship of nominal and verbal morphology is a natural and expected corollary to the development of nominal forms into verbal forms.

With respect to relative order of categories on the cline, a number of important pieces of evidence have already been presented. It will be noted that in Fig.4 the irrealis verbal modalities (future, imperative, subjunctive, jussive, (co)hortative, conditional, etc.) are positioned next to the infinitive: the justification for this is the close morphological and semantic association and commonality of syntactic function of infinitive and irrealis mood hypothesized in 1.7 and 3.2.1, and demonstrated with cross-linguistic data in 5.1. The
irrealis moods stand between the infinitive and the canonical or
categorial verb because they are less verb-like, in terms of both
canonical verbal function (reporting an event) and, usually, form, than
the finite indicative verb moods (cf Hopper-Thompson 1984). Unless
specifically marked, then, for modality (realis/irrealis), infinitives
may generally be assumed to side more with the irrealis moods in terms
of form and function. Conversely, participles, the other main verbal
noun category, are associated more, across languages, with realis
moods/tense-aspects such as past and perfect (this correlation was
noted in 5.1 for Romance and Germanic). Some empirical evidence that
gerund or participle is a more nominal category than infinitive was
given from English and Hebrew in connection with Givón's Binding
Hierarchy in 3.5 (cf fn 34 (Ch.3)), and from Hebrew in 4.1.1; we can
perceive a definite correlation here between infinitive-irrealis-
verbal on the one hand, and participle-realisa nominal on the other.
The origin of the Semitic/Akkadian perfective tense in a static-permanive
(nominal) stem has already been discussed (2.7). This semantic cor-
relation with degree of nouniness ('factivity' in Bolinger's terms,
apud Stockwell, Schachter, and Partee 1973) is readily observable in,
for example, English Thanks for keeping quiet, which expression re-
quires gerundive/participial complement corresponding to past/realis/
presupposed (cf fn 74 (Ch.2) and Fox 1981 on the presuppositionality
of nominalized propositions), as opposed to I'll thank you to keep
quiet!, where infinitival object-complement fills an imperative or
subjunctive (irrealis) function (5.1). Compare also I remembered
doing it vs. I remembered to do it (P. Schachter, p.c.), with the
former again pushing the event farther back in time to a pluperfect aspect (= I remembered that I had done it), and the latter a more recent simple past tense or perfect aspect (= I remembered, and I did it). Similarly, I wanted to stop rationalizing vs I wanted to stop to rationalize; here, the gerundive nominalization acts as the object of a single assertion, presupposing that rationalization acts in fact already taken place (past/realis), whereas the infinitive acts as reduced complement, comprising a separate proposition, as yet unrealized (future/irrealis).

A somewhat different semantic distinction that also points to the greater degree of nouniness of participle as against infinitive may be found in I heard someone whistling ≠ I heard someone whistle: the former, with participle, is more durative (~ nominal), the latter, with infinitive, more punctual (point-action, ~ verbal – cf Hopper-Thompson 1980, 1984). This semantic feature of durativity characteristic of the participle stands behind the cross-linguistic use of participial forms with substantival (nominal or adjectival) function (as Arabic, Ugantic, Hebrew, English, German, Italian). Note also that English gerundives can take relative clause modifiers (pace Stockwell, Schachter, and Partee 1973:3-4), a nominal property, whereas the infinitive cannot, viz.: the thinking which/that he did vs. *(the) to think which/that he did. Neither can the infinitive be the object of genitive particle of, whereas the gerund-participle, of course, can: of punishing ≠ *(to) punish. These unmistakable semantic correlates of nouniness in non-finite verb-forms, then, constitute additional support for the relative placement of participle and infinitive on the nominal-verbal cline.
One may bring in here Buccellati's (1972) observation for Akkadian that infinitives, unlike the more nominal participles and adjectives, can refer to or describe only actions, not the performer-doer-agent. In fact, this applies as well to English (and Hebrew and other languages): the participle *going* may refer to a subject *John* (as in an equational/identificational sentence), as may adjective *fat*, but the infinitive *(to) go* can refer only to the concept or action of going, as in infinitival complement *he wants to go*. This equatability of participle or adjective with agent, an *entity* (discourse participant) rather than an event (as Hopper-Thompson 1984: 1), is another indication of their nominal/substantival character. The infinitive, by contrast, is *irrealis* in nature (above), and, as both categorial noun and verb are realis, the infinitive, at once less noun-like than the realis participle or (verbal) adjective and less verb-like than finite verb, takes up its unique position between the more nominal non-finite verb forms, participle and (verbal) adjective, and the irrealis verbal modalities. Thus we arrive at what should be a coherent, consistent, and cross-linguistically verifiable definition of the infinitive as the most verbal(ized) of verbal substantives, in a fairly precise and perhaps even quantifiable sense (cf 1.5, and Givón 1980).

It seems apparent, then, that the categories conventionally termed deverbal noun or gerund, participle, verbal adjective, infinitive, and so on, deploy themselves at various points along the cline. We are claiming that these category labels possess a degree of
cross-linguistic consistency and validity, that such coding-points on the scale are in some sense inherent to human language, although they may vary across languages within certain parameters (as discussed earlier with regard to the infinitive), rather than being entirely idiosyncratic to individual languages. In any given language, at any given point in time, the infinitive may be closer to the nominal or verbal pole than in other languages; take, for example, the greater nouniness of the German as opposed to the English infinitive, shown formally and functionally by its gerundive use with the definite article (examples in App. A., p. 275), both nominal characteristics; in English, the (more nominal) participle form fulfills the gerundive function. This is with the provision that certain constraints on relative order of categories hold. I have made a beginning on ordering constraints with respect to infinitive and participle, above, indicating that, however nominal an infinitive may be in a language at a certain point in time, the other verbal substantives must ipso facto be even more nominal. Further investigation is, of course, a desideratum, and there are surely substantive discoveries to be made with regard to the ways in which the properties or coding-points of the nominal-verbal cline group together within various languages and language families, and how they distribute themselves typologically. Universals or universal tendencies (both absolute and implicational) may become evident. The discourse-semantic side of unidirectionality is also ripe for investigation. At what point does an entity become an action or event? Are there degrees to this, also? The question of causality presents
itself: we have merely provided a certain structure, a set of parameters within which change may take place. What factors determine when forms and form-classes do in fact move on the cline, and how far they develop? Pull- or push-chains within syntactic systems will surely provide part of the explanation.

A rather natural corollary to the unidirectional hypothesis, in fact, is the notion of cyclicity, mentioned earlier in this section with regard to the infinitive: new substantive forms are more or less constantly in the process of being verbalized, replacing those that have advanced so much further along in that direction as to obscure their substantival origin from all but the linguist. One might compare this concept of certain more or less constant category frames, such as INF, independent of whatever particular form happens to fill the function-slot at any given stage of the language with the idea of a fixed spot on a waterfall, riverbed, or conveyor belt (cf fn 3, 2.2.4, where this analogy is discussed and illustrated with data from BA). Hodge (1975, and apud Hodge 1976: 58) mentions the constant replacement of Semitic verb-forms by nominal constructions.

Hodge, writing about the AA phylum (1976: 58), states that 'With the growing evidence of how known 'verb' forms have arisen [cf 5.2, sec. n-A.F.], and of the nature of structures which replace them, a view may be defended which holds that verbs basically arise from nominal constructions'; his claim appears to be essentially that new verb-forms arise specifically out of nominal predicates or through the medium of the nominal predicate (cf 5.2, sec. n, for exemplification). This writer agrees that the aforementioned may be one of the most
common paths by which the change is actuated, but must consider verbalization and grammaticalization (fn 5) to be much more general/abstract, perhaps even governed at some higher, overarching metalinguistic level, and instantiated by various individual mechanisms of syntactic change. Consider, for example, verbalization of the CI in Hebrew and infinitives in other languages following dative marker (5.1.2).

Ironically, Hodge himself inadvertently indicates that his formulation is too narrow, even if one stretches a point and includes such nonverbal predicates as dative-locative within it (cf 5.2, sec. n)\(^7\), in his mention of the BH AI, whose much-remarked-upon function as historical or 'finite' infinitive he sees as supporting the above contention, representing another instance of such verbalization. In fact, this proves that verbalization is a more general process than just nominal predicate > verb; cf Es 9:6:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{û-bî-šûšān} & \quad \text{hab-bîrā} & \quad \text{hārīq-û} & \quad \text{hay-yîhûd-îm} \\
\text{and-in-Shushan} & \quad \text{the-capital} & \quad \text{killed-they} & \quad \text{the-Jew-pl} \\
\text{wî-abbēd} & \quad \text{hameš} & \quad \text{mē?-ôt} & \quad ?îš \\
\text{and-destroy(AI)} & \quad \text{five} & \quad \text{hundred-pl} & \quad \text{man:} \\
\end{align*} \]

'And in Shushan the capital the Jews slew and destroyed five hundred men.'

This cannot be interpreted as an equational-identificational (nominal) proposition with nominal predicate; on the contrary, the preceding finite verb and the conjunction between the two forms makes it quite clear that the AI constitutes the second verb in a narrative series
of finite verbs, the tense-aspect and person-number-gender agreement 'Third plural perfect' of AI abbed being inferred from that of preceding finite verb hārīḏu. N.B. this kind of usage occurs predominantly in the later books of the Jewish Scriptures, as Esther and Ecclesiastes, which accords with its status as a more advanced development on the noun > verb cline (note that the Egyptian 'conjunctive tense' discussed in fn 5 occurs in LATE Egyptian and Coptic, not Ancient Egyptian), as does the secondary nature of the derived (piCCel and nifCcal) AI forms, particularly the innovative nifCcal AI nifCäl (showing the influence of the nifCcal perfect verb-form nifCcal and simple AI pāCōl) as opposed to more archaic hippāCēl (3.2.1). I suggest that this seemingly paradoxical 'finite' infinitive, i.e., the infinitive as a kind of unspecified verb-form which assumes the verbal features (tense-aspect marking, person, number, and gender agreement, etc., as discussed above) of a finite verb-form closely preceding (or following) it in discourse, or the interpretation of the otherwise unspecified form for these features, through other aspects of syntactic-semantic-discourse context may in fact be a nearly universal discourse function of infinitives, constituting as it does one more manifestation of the general process of verbalization.

Concomitantly, Hodge's (1976: 59) point is well-taken: much synchronic and diachronic work is necessary to pin down the specific syntactic frameworks, including pragmatic factors, in which reanalyses of noun > verb take place, instantiating this general process. I have tried to do this a number of times in preceding chapters, from 1.6 (the alternative derivation model) onward (note, in particular, 2.8 on
the Hebrew participle, the detailed hypothesis of reanalysis given for the development of imperative (irrealis verb) function by the (substantival) AI through an intermediate participial state (5.1), and the various verbalizing reanalyses presented in 5.2). Detailed investigative work is vital to the advancement of our knowledge (der Lieber Gott liegt im Detail). Conversely, though, it may be desirable to conceive of a higher, more abstract process, a GOVERNING PRINCIPLE independent of these individual mechanisms of morphosyntactic change, as above, and of which they are merely instantiations. Otherwise, the general DRIFT (quite literally, in the sense of 5.2, Sec. n) will be lost, and the unidirectionality of the noun > verb cline not perceived.

6.2 The Nature of Syntactic Categories
In 6.1 we outlined a putatively universal principal of diachronic unidirectionality on the nominal-verbal cline, a more general formulation of the hypothesis that infinitives always derive historically from substantives. This principle states both that substantives evolve, historically, from the nominal to or toward the verbal pole of the cline and that the converse seems not to occur: verbal forms do not evolve diachronically into nominal forms, i.e., the directional relationship is ASYMMETRICAL/NON-RECIPROCAL. Is this really the case and, if so, why? Such a strong claim impels us to examine, very closely, apparent category shifts in either direction, seeking possible counterexamples. What we find, at this point, is that the verb-to-noun relationship, i.e., the derivational relationship in the 'opposite direction' from our unidirectional principle, appears to be qualitatively different in nature from the historical migration from
nominal to verbal pole so common across languages. Specifically, it appears to be limited to SYNCHRONIC DERIVATIONAL RELATIONS between the categories of verb and noun. The clearest case is formation of deverbal nouns in the narrow sense (fn 20, Ch.5), that is, clearly new/secondary deverbal formations (usually, though not always, with overt morphological markings to that effect in synthetic/inflecting languages, as the Semitic tarciil and mifcal formations). We may consider the deverbal noun essentially to be formed through superimposition of a deverbal noun 'template' over a verbal root or stem with the function of making an ENTITY out of the verbal concept (cf Hopper-Thompson 1984:1, discussed in 6.1 and later in this section); in other words, nominalization. This is a regular SYNCHRONIC process (verb → noun), usually involving the affixation of derivational morphology across languages, and the deverbal noun may be considered cognitively/synchronically derivative of the verb,9 i.e., the verbal meaning is primary.10 This kind of process may also take place in the other direction, from noun to verb, as in the case of denomina-


tive verb formation (English to case (the joint), to crown (a king) (v. Clark and Clark 1979 for an extensive discussion of this type and many examples), to fellowship, to terrorize, Heb. mi?qupas 'nullified' < ?efes 'zero', which, although technically constituting diachronic change in that the (nominal) lexeme gains a new (verbal) function not present in a previous stage of the language, results in the same kind of synchronic derivational relationship as with nominalization, because the lexical item ALSO RETAINS ITS ORIGINAL NOMINAL FUNCTION (in the Hebrew case, the three root-consonants of the noun are simply
dropped into the factitive pattern, $\pi^{CC)e}$. Note that both nominalization and denominative verb formation involve an INSTANTANEOUS QUANTUM LEAP from category to category; a given lexical item has SUDDENLY SWITCHED CATEGORIES in its new syntactic function. This is qualitatively very different, on another plane or dimension altogether, from the gradual, HISTORICAL shift/drift/evolution of (gerundive) nominal or substantive toward more verbal form and function, which generally entails the loss of (nominal) morphology. It is this latter kind of process that we are claiming to be unidirectional; i.e., that such nominal, quasi-nominal and quasi-verbal structures as gerunds, participles, and infinitives can only move historically in a single direction, toward the verbal pole, and that (finite) verbal structures, by contrast, do not migrate diachronically in the same fashion toward the nominal end of the scale. Consistent with this is the empirically testable claim of ASYMMETRY/NON-RECIROCALITY that we made in 5.1 (p. 198): when imperative and infinitive are related in a language, the infinitive was adopted for imperative use and not vice-versa. As mentioned in 5.1, unidirectionality yields some insight into why this should be so, i.e., why infinitive $>$ imperative but imperative $\not>$ infinitive: the first development comprises one step further on the cline of verbalization, while the latter would contravene it.

The distinction being made here is a principled one, between essentially SYNCHRONIC derivational relationships between categories, in which a lexical item or group of lexical items suddenly gains a new function WITHOUT RELINQUISHING ITS ORIGINAL CATEGORY FUNCTION, and no
realignment/redistribution of grammatical forms and functions occurs, and DIACHRONIC shift between categories, where a class of structures evolves a new function (and, possibly, form) AND GRADUALLY LOSES ITS PREVIOUS FUNCTION (compare the loss of nominal characteristics that accompanies the gain of verbal characteristics, over time, in the Hebrew AI, CI, and participle, as detailed throughout this work). If its original function is retained along with the innovative function, a split occurs, with the two forms no longer being associated (i.e., polysemy - cf Anttila 1972:143-5, Case C); so the Romance synthetic future stem no longer being associated with the infinitive (as (je) tuer-ai ≠ tuer), and the split of the IH participle into substantival (nominal/adjectival) and verbal (present-tense) forms, the latter being integrated into the verbal paradigm (2.8, and cf Gordon 1982). In this case, as a matter of fact, a secondary formal (phonological) differentiation displayed in certain derived patterns makes the schism plain: for example, the feminine singular active participle for hitəil (causative) regular verbs has two variants in BH, mafəlet and mafəlā. In IH the first form has become restricted to substantival (nominal and attributival) use, the second to verbal use: (hi?) maspi'ka'(she) manages' (verbal)≠(ka'mut)mas'peket'(a) sufficient (quantity)' (attributive adjective).\textsuperscript{11}

Our claim, to reiterate, is that such sets of essentially synchronic derivational relations or 'category switches' as those we have described differ in principle from, are not to be confused with, and hence cannot constitute counterexamples to the unidirectionality of diachronic change in sensu strictu. The principle of diachronic
unidirectionality can be rather neatly expressed with the conventional symbols of linguistic transformation and change, synchronic (→) and diachronic (>) arrows: N → V, N > V, and V → N, but V ≠ N.

Let us examine a few more apparent counterexamples and see if they may be explained in the same way. First, Himaari (Jewish South Yemenite pre-Islamic poetry) al-yaṣrab 'the drinker, he who drinks', lit. 'the-he-drinks' (N. Sabbaagh, p.c.). Aside from the fact that this is a highly marked, unusual, stylistic/poetic device, here again the change in category is sudden and absolute, not gradual, and the form retains its function in the first category.\(^1\) (here, as finite imperfective verb-form). Exactly the same arguments hold for French verb-object compounds of the type porte-parole, where the verb-form takes on an agentive-habitative character. In both these cases a kind of ellipsis seems to have taken place, with the expression standing in for an unnecessarily wordy ar-raja{l} alladî yaṣrab 'The man who drinks', celui qui porte la parole 'The one who carries the speech, the spokesman'. The same probably holds for English sawbones, perhaps from 'I/you saw bones', and cf MH tînq̡ 'baby, child', which may be the second masculine singular or third feminine singular qal imperfect of yînq̡ 'suckle'. Compare Ar lâ{-}adrî 'skeptic', lit. 'I know not', perhaps ellipted (at some level, cf App.A) from (ar-raja{l} alladî yaqî) 'la {-}adrî' '(the man who says) "I know not"'. Similar to this last is NH (tfîla-t) "yi-zkor" (prayer-of) "He remembers" (from the first line of the prayer, i.e., the prayer (where you say) 'He [God] remembers'.

The only proper counterevidence, then, to the principle of diachronic
unidirectionality as we have defined it, would have to comprise a true finite verb-form gradually gaining regular and productive (as opposed to idiosyncratic) nominal function AND CONCOMITANTLY LOSING ITS VERBAL FUNCTION, and of this 'limiting case' we have as yet seen no evidence; it may not be too audacious to predict that it does not exist. It is, of course, possible that evidence for such a change may exist in some language and someday come to light. It was mentioned in 6.1 that one of the virtues of the nominal-verbal cline as a hypothesis is its amenability to adjustment. Similarly, it should be noted that this formulation of the unidirectional principle is quite preliminary in nature, and subject not only to falsification or verification but revision in the light of new data. If, as currently worded, it constitutes too powerful a generalization, a weaker, more conservative/qualified version may prove necessary. We might conceivably be confronted with a case like al-yatrab but not trivial-idiosyncratic or stylistically limited, a case where the form's original verbal function was lost and hence an actual historical change occurred in the distribution of grammatical forms and functions. We could then still suggest that verbs are restricted, in such diachronic shifts, to developing into certain specific types of nouns, such as agents or habitual actors (recall the semantics of porte-parole). Note that we would still be able to maintain that INFINITIVES do not derive historically from verbs. Moreover, it is surely empirically demonstrable that verbalization is far more common; that if the reverse can occur at all, it would be statistically much less frequent, if not downright rare. In any case, until
such a hypothetical counterexample turns up, we shall hold by the stronger version.

The rationale behind proposing the hypothesis of unidirectionality, then, is in part its empirical testability. As said before, it is a very strong claim but a fruitful one, in that, even if the relationship between the categories noun and verb is not precisely as I have depicted it and the hypothesis must ultimately be emended, it seems certain that principled differences will emerge in the levels on which noun and verb interact\(^{13}\) and develop from one pole to another, with the synchrony versus diachrony distinction doubtless playing an important role. A more profound understanding of this is a significant desideratum in morphosyntactic theory, only just beginning to receive the attention it deserves (cf, in particular, Hopper-Thompson 1984).

We have mentioned, a number of times, the rather metalinguistic notion of primacy of the noun over the verb; even, according to the Arab grammarians, the gerund or 'verbal substantive' (fn 24 (Ch.5), and fn 10 (Ch.6)), hence all the more so the categorial/canonical concrete noun. The principle of unidirectionality is, in a sense, the logical consequence of this notion. It is fitting, then, that we discuss it at some further length.

Earlier, we referred briefly to the view taken in Hopper-Thompson (1984) of the categories noun and verb as crystallizations of two major discourse functions. In this view, the archetypal noun/verb dichotomy or opposition is a very fundamental one, between 'discourse-manipulable participant' (noun) and 'reported event' (verb) (S. Thompson, lecture notes, and Hopper-Thompson 1984: 1; compare
Givon's time-stable vs. -unstable percepts (lecture notes)).
S. Thompson has suggested to me that the primacy/centrality of the noun may be due in part to a cognitive/communicative need to code events (verbs) as entities or arguments (nouns), i.e., to REFER TO them rather than REPORT them. From this follows also the cross-linguistic availability of grammatical mechanisms (derivational morphology) for (synchronic) nominalization, as discussed earlier. References to literature discussing the priority of the noun vs. the verb may be found in Hodge (1976: 58). One may note Chafe (1970: 96-7), who claims the verb to be central. Compare Hodge (1976: 58) on the 'verbal biases of traditional or tradition-influenced theory' as hampering effective research into the relationship of the nominal and verbal sentence to each other in AA [one might add, cross-linguistically - A. F.] (cf also 5.2, Sec. n); he warns against 'treating the "verb" as an isolate'. Obviously, if the category 'verb' is taken to be a primitive, no attempt will be made to explore its possible historical derivation from something else.
Relevant here is Spinoza's contention (apud, and affirmed by, Kaye 1980: 115) that, among other categories, BH prepositions are 'nouns' ('substantival in origin' is perhaps a better way of putting it); this is now more or less undisputed for Semitic as a whole (v. 2.6, and Callender 1975: 2 on Ancient Egyptian (Afroasiatic)). The development of substantive into preposition is, in fact, very common, not only in BH/Semitic/AA but cross-linguistically, and exemplifies grammaticalization of substantives, the route alternative to verbalization when a substantive is decategorialized/decanonized (v. fn 5).
Additionally, Kaye (lecture notes, 'Spinoza the Linguist', Seventy-seventh annual meeting of the P.A.P.C., linguistics section, U.C.L.A., 10 November 1979) mentions the well-known example of the exclamation 'Fire!' as evidence that nouns are the most essential units of communication, even capable of doing elliptical emergency service for verbs (cf Shopen 1972, Fox 1980 on the ways in which substantives/nominals can constitute cognitively-pragmatically-propositionally complete speech acts).

One must not, of course, ignore the possibility of interlinguistic differences in the primacy of noun as against verb (thus the discussion of Semitic in 2.11 and 5.2, secs. d, h, and n). Nevertheless, some thought-provoking indications exist even in languages not traditionally considered 'noun-based' for the noun as primary syntactic category. First of all, it is perhaps not accidental that nouns comprise both the most frequently borrowed of linguistic structures and the core vocabulary of languages, the most reliable indicator of genetic relationship; the seeming paradox is due to the crucial position of the noun in all types of linguistic activity, central and peripheral alike. Along the same lines, we find that deep dyslexics make fewer errors (50%) on concrete (i.e., canonical) nouns than on abstract (non-canonical) nouns, adjectives, and verbs (70%) (V. Fromkin, lecture notes). Again, Broca's aphasics (a.k.a. motor-, expressive- or non-fluent aphasics) express themselves primarily by means of the so-called 'content words', nouns and UNINFLECTED (i.e., irrealis/infinitival, less canonically verbal) verb-forms (coincident with greatly reduced use of/difficulty with
grammatical functives such as prepositions and with morphosyntactic structure in general; this is usually termed agrammatism - v. Clark 1975: 151-2).

The proposal of the nominal-verbal cline has already taken us a step beyond both traditional grammar, with its rather simple-minded freeze-frame notion of the 'parts of speech', and the absolute categories of formal(istic) grammar to a more functional/historical-evolutionary, graduated or scalar definition of linguistic forms as nominal or verbal in varying degrees (T. Wilbur (p.c.) suggests the terms 'nounish' and 'verbish'). Not even this, however, has proved totally adequate for the task of characterizing the various ahistorical interrelationships of noun and verb (and other categories, fn 5 (Ch. 6)) discussed above, in which a linguistic form frequently alternates between two or more category functions. Can we devise a model that will enable us to handle this concept? We are entering a heady realm of investigation into the deep grammatical relations obtaining between conventionally accepted syntactic categories, indeed questioning the very existence of those categories themselves as absolute entities. Such metalinguistic/metatheoretical speculations must be firmly anchored in the reality of syntactic-semantic fact as manifested by substitution tests and similar objective heuristic methodology. This caveat in mind, it must be said that the traditional 'parts of speech' (category labels) seem clearly to overlap and intersect in ways not adequately described by current terminology, not even when placed in the perspective of the nominal-verbal cline. The very act of reification, labelling/naming/
classifying things as nouns, adjectives, verbs, predicates, participles, infinitives, (de)verbal nouns or gerunds, prepositions, adverbs, etc., etc., inevitably constitutes a sort of lie, or at least not the whole truth (cf Sapir 1949: 17: 'And the word ... is not only a key; it may also be a fetter'), implying as it does inclusion of some things and exclusion of others, in discrete categories (cells with impermeable membranes, one might say, or boxes with rigid sides, or squares with straight black borders). In reality, syntactic categories not only overlap but shift and change in the most protean fashion, and are interrelated in complex and multi-dimensional ways that are difficult to capture (as with sudden category switches).

Perhaps we may infer the existence of ARCHICATEGORIES including more than one traditional lower-level category such as noun and verb, or connecting them on some higher, more abstract level. Such archicategories would operate on a different plane from the gradual, historical process of verbalization that we have claimed to be unidirectional (and which may be characterized in terms of traditional categories, Fig.4), as shown in Fig.5:
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Figure 5 - The Archicategory, Corollary to the Nominal-Verbal Cline and Shown in Relationship to It.
Such a concept can perhaps help explain or at least characterize sudden, 'quantum' category changes like nominalization and denomina-
tive verb-formation in a way that the nominal-verbal cline cannot, and surely deserves further attention.

Thanks to the rich morphology of Hebrew, the Hebrew infinitive has provided an excellent starting-point for the investigation of dia-
chronic shifts between syntactic categories; the Semitic root-and-
pattern morphological system makes Semitic languages especially useful for morphosyntactic investigations, in that grammatical morphology consists essentially of vocalic templates superimposed on (lexical) consonantal skeletons, rendering shifts of lexemes from category to category more transparent. A thorough and rigorous investigation of the process by which the Hebrew infinitive has evolved, diachronically, from noun-form into verb-form, the syntactic and semantic parameters involved, and comparison with parallels in other languages has, I hope, broadened our knowledge of this most inadequately-examined aspect of linguistic structure: the interrelations of syntactic categories, both synchronic (the archicategory) and diachronic (the nominal-verbal cline), and in particular of those categories and sub-categories we have discussed in detail: canonical nouns, gerunds, participles, infinitives, imperatives, irrealis verbal moods, and canonical verbs. In more than one way, then, the ramifications of this study lead beyond a single language viewed synchronically or diachronically, beyond even an entire language family or phylum, to address questions of serious theoretical linguistic interest and cross-linguistic scope.
FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 6

1. Along the same lines, R. Anttila (lecture, UCLA Conference on Causality, May 1982) has discussed the explanatory benefits, for linguistic theory as a whole, of intensive case-study of a single language.

2. Some defining of terms is in order. SUBSTANTIVE and NOMINAL are being used more or less interchangeably, although the former is really more accurate for our purposes, as the participation of adjectives has been demonstrated all along and will be further exemplified below. NOUN refers more strictly to categorial/canonical nouns in the sense of Hopper-Thompson 1984 and 6.1. I have tried to be consistent in using the terms DEVERBAL NOUN and GERUND (cf fn 15 (Ch. 5)) to refer to fairly clear canonical lexical nouns of recognizable nominal form and distribution, verbal only with regard to semantics, as distinguished from VERBAL NOUN (participle or infinitive), which term is reserved for those erstwhile verbal substantives that have been verbalized to the extent that, synchronically, they must be considered to form an integral part of the verbal system itself, along with the finite verb, and which manifest both specialized quasi-verbal syntactic function and concomitantly restricted form. The dynamic nature of the hypothesis itself, of course, makes borderline cases inevitable (see Addendum p. 297).

3. I am indebted to Ian Maddieson for initially asking me this question, which forced me to consider the evidence I had already
amassed in more global terms (rather than merely as confirmation for the alternative derivation), leading ultimately to the formulation of the unidirectional hypothesis.

4. Author's word of honor—the examples were, in fact, accumulated as they occurred to me or I encountered them, with no sifting-out of counterexamples.

5. It might occur to one at this point to ask whether deaconized substantives may acquire other than exclusively verbal function. Indeed they can, and decategorialization/grammaticalization of nouns (and, to a certain extent, verbs) into GRAMMATICAL FUNCTIVES (so-called 'closed-class' formatives (obviously a misnomer) such as (augmented) preposition, particles, demonstratives, articles, conjunctions/sentential connectives and subordinators, adverbs, etc., etc.), GF > V, etc., that is, the extended use of syntactic categories in functions other than their canonical ones, is a huge topic in itself, not to be touched on lightly and therefore the subject of a separate paper. For our purposes it will be best, in this analysis, to concentrate exclusively on the relationship between noun and verb, this focus being most relevant to the alternative derivation of the BMCI. The reader should keep in mind that statements made in this chapter will frequently apply to GFs as well. This holds as well for the 'quantum leap' category switches to be discussed in 6.2.

6. Rosén 1977:107-8, v. 5.?, Sec. n; here extended from IH to putative universal grammar.
7. Of course, the latter really constitute another type of nonverbal clause which itself gives rise to/is the source of many new verbal constructions (5.2).

8. The term 'historical infinitive' describes a similar phenomenon in Latin, as in venire 'he came'. Analogous examples of infinitive functioning as finite verb, particularly historical (preterite) infinitive, from other Semitic languages (Arabic, Ethiopic, Aramaic, Akkadian) may be found in Brockelmann 1903: v. ii, Sec. 37 and 1956: Sec. 45; also Targumic and Mandaic Aramaic and Syriac (v. 5.2, Sec. a) (references apud Hammershaimb 1963:93), and v. Höfner 1943: Sec. 54 on instances of finite verbal use of the infinitive in Epigraphic South Arabian. The converb in Ethiopic (R. Hetzron, p.c.), consisting of verbal noun ḥaći + accusative case-marking ḥa + suffix pronouns (a verbal feature—cf.p.234), has semantic features, tense, and mood determined by the governing verb. Within Northwest Semitic in particular, we have finite (verbal) use of the AI in Ugaritic (Segert 1979: Sec. 64.612, and C.H. Gordon 1965: Sec. 9.29 ('Past Use of Absolute Infinitive') and p.c.), and Phoenecian (the Karatēpē inscriptions, particularly the Azitawadda, cf Donner and Röllig 1964: 35-43 and Hammershaimb 1963: 91-92, and supra 5.1). Precisely the same kind of construction is found in the Late Egyptian and Coptic so-called CONJUNCTIVE TENSE (C.H. Gordon, p.c.), where the infinitive continues the verbal features of the preceding finite verb-form, imperative (cf 5.1),
past, present, or future; note, then, that the phenomenon exists in other Afroasiatic families than Semitic.

9. This relationship is, of course, productive or lexicalized to different degrees. Interestingly, when the derivational relationship is clear and productive, it may be evidenced by slips of the tongue, as the author's own * she's being punishment (deverbal noun, ~ verb punished). The fact that this form is the passive PARTICIPLE may have made confusion with another nominal form easier, although synchronically the passive participle must still be considered part of the verbal paradigm.

10. For the older, primary gerundive forms, of course, this is true only with respect to synchrony. Compare fn 22 (Ch. 5) on the notion of the Arab Grammarians that even the nomen actionis (all the more so, presumably, a concrete noun) is still a simple, basic substantive, not derived from the corresponding verb but rather the opposite, as per the unidirectional hypothesis! This would, again, hold only for the oldest, most primitive stratum of nomina actionis in a language. I should say that this is in fact correct from a diachronic standpoint, but that synchronically a reanalysis may have taken place: the verb once having developed as a separate and now (in some languages) dominant syntactic category, even the oldest strata of nomina actionis may indeed be 'derived from' the verb in the ahistorical sense of being associated with it by speakers in a subsidiary role. The same may be said, in most cases, for the infinitive, generally conceived as belonging to the verbal paradigm.
11. In the simple pattern qal, however, the form (po'cel) remains the same for both functions, producing an occasional morphosyn- tactic ambiguity acknowledged in a popular joke told about yordim (Israeli émigrés) that hinges around the ambiguous question, asked in an elevator: ?ata yo'red? 'Are you going down [verbal]/(an) emigrant (lit. descender, goer-down) [from Israel] [nominal]?'

12. The original function may disappear at some future date, leaving only the innovative use; one can conceive, for example, of a dialect of Arabic losing the imperfective form but retaining such frozen 'nominalizations' as al-yasrab. This would not, to my mind, affect in any way the characterization of the original innovation as sudden, absolute, and essentially syn- chronic with respect to more prototypically gradual diachronic change.

13. B. Wald (p.c.) was the first to suggest to me that verbs may indeed be able to develop into nouns, but perhaps in a different dimension/plane or mode of grammatical function. This difference in levels is what I would describe as the distinction between sudden-synchronic category switch and gradual-diachronic category shift.
APPENDIX A. IMPERATIVE USE OF INFINITIVE:
A FUNCTION OF NOMINAL USE?

In 5.1 we proposed a specific explanation for imperative use of the BH AI, and compared this with some observations by other scholars. In particular, it will be remembered that Solà-Solé (1961:93) mentions a possible cross-linguistic 'rapport linguistique' holding between gerundive or infinitive on the one hand, and imperative on the other. The implication is that it is the nominal, or quasi-nominal nature of the first two non-finite verbal noun forms (cf fn 34 (Ch. 3) and 6.1), that accounts for their special relationship with the imperative.

Pushing this observation a bit further, we may hazard that imperative use of infinitives or gerunds is a function of nominal use of infinitives or gerunds, and derives (at least in some abstract sense) from pragmatically-motivated ellipsis of such indirect/oblique imperative constructions as the classic Hebrew (and Common Semitic)

\[
(c_{al \ NP}) \quad \text{li-CI} \quad 'NP must INF', \quad \text{as} \quad (c_{aley-xa}) \quad \text{la-vo}^p \\
\text{upon [+ sentient being]} \quad \text{to-CI} \\
\text{to-come}
\]

'You must come', lit. 'to-come (is) upon you', and IH (yes) \( v \) li-CI,

\[
(\text{EXIS}) \quad \text{to-CI}
\]

\[
\text{as} \quad (\text{yes}) \quad \text{li-havi? sveder} \quad 'Bring a sweater' (supra), \text{lit.}
\]

\[
(\text{EXIS}) \quad \text{to-bring} \quad \text{sweater}
\]

'(There is) to bring (a) sweater', with the infinitive \underline{infinitive marker} (this will be of importance later on) as subject of a non-verbal clause. The result of the ellipsis, in all these cases, is an infinitive functioning imperatively, having assumed, epiphenomenally, the imperative function formerly attached to the entire construction (cf 5.1 on the AI in the BH injunctive future). In classical-modern
literary Arabic, the unambiguously nominal gerund (masdar) serves in
just such imperat ıvıc Ca laa NP constructions, paralleling Hebrew use
of the li-CI syntagma and confirming that this is indeed nominal
distribution/syntax, as Ca lay-ka al-i ti saa al u bi-hi
upon-you the-communication with-him
'You must call him', Ca lay-ka ad-dars upon-you the-study
'You must study'. Again,

note the correlation of Arabic imperative hanni-k!
congratulate-you!

'Congratulations!' with English NP Congratulations!/Felicitations (or,
for that matter, the exactly parallel jussive/imperative shame on you
(equivalent to may you be ashamed!), the latter with the same impera-
tive speech-act function as the preceding Arabic imperative proper.
This functional explanation of infinitive-as-imperative as nominal
distribution/syntax has cross-linguistic appeal: Compare the items
given in 5.1 English (there is) not to worry, Fr pour ce sujet,
(il y a (a)) voir p. 3 'For this subject, see p. 3' (instructions to
reader of text), Sp (es) prohibido fumar 'smoking prohibited', Fr
defense de fumer, interdit de fumer id., prière de INF 'pray INF', Sp,
It favor de INF render especially clear the nominal nature of impera-
tive function in infinitives, in that the infinitive functions as
object of the preposition de (more on this below), Gm (es gibt) nicht
(zu) rauchen.¹

Compare our proposal of participial origins of AI-as-Imperative, and
NA use of active participle of the ground-form, with preceding par-
ticles, as cohortative-jussive (first- and third-person imperatives),
as dā-dāz-axl 'Let us go!'. The negative imperative (prohibitive) consists of la 'no(t)' followed by the active participle, as la ?amrē-tun '(You pl) say not!' The active participle may also serve in formal-polite imperatives (cf supra for the infinitive so used in Western European languages), and stands alone as imperative singular for the derived conjugations. Most interestingly, a nominal origin for this imperative function of the active participle is manifest in d-la y-kun mī-axfi-tū-le 'You (pl) must not talk to him!' lit. 'It shall not be, you(r) talking to him!', a right-dislocated (grammaticalized afterthought syntax, cf Givón 1975) nominalized/non-finite clause (all of the data in the preceding paragraph are from Sabar 1976: XL-XLI). Nominal use in general of the lī-CI syntagma is evident throughout all stages of Hebrew: viz., (E)BH 2K 4:13 me lā-Cyi-sot l-āk... what to-do to-you(ms)

'What is to be done for thee?...' ha-yes lī-dabber l-āk...

Q-EXIS to-speak— to-you(ms)

'Should one speak about you [to the king]?, lit. 'Does (it) exist to-speak-about-you...', 2Sam 18:11 Cyi-ay lā-tet lī-kā...

upon-me to-give to-you(ms)

'It is upon me [i.e., it is my duty] to give to thee' (examples from Gesenius-Kautzsch 1980:349: Sec. 114 k, l, although I have diverged in places from their translations and interpretations), M-LBH Es 4:4 kī ?ēyn lā-bô? (v. supra) 'For entering is forbidden', lit. because no to-come
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'(There is) no to-come'.

For MH, cf yes 1-o li-smō̂h 'He has (whereof) to rejoice'

EXIS to-him to-rejoice

(Tannaya 80:33) (cf English he has to rejoice, and

yōn-ō  yôdē-ac li-s?ôl 'He knoweth not (how) to ask' (from the
NEG-his know to-ask

Passover Haggada). The following examples are from Segal 1980:166-7:

Sec. 348, 350: Neg.iv.11 harēy hu? li-hahālît 'Behold, it (is) to

behold he to-decide'

decide, i.e., to be decided [as impure]', Naz.i.I harēy īl-ay

behold upon-me

li-sâlîh perâc 'Behold, I must [lit. (it is) upon me, it
to-send forth wild(ness)

is my duty,] to (my hair) grow wild', Mak.i.I sôf-ô li-ttên

end-his to-give

'sôf-ēnu li-bôq 'We shall certainly examine, lit. our end (is)

end-our to-examine
to examine. Note its substitutability with the more nominal participle

(fn 34 (Ch. 3), 4.1.1, and 6.1) as solid distributional evidence that

the li-CI syntagma is throughout serving nominal function: Ab.i.5

sôf-ô yôrêš 'In the end he will inherit, lit. his end (is)

end-his inherit(ing)
inheriting/inheritor (v. 2.8 on this ambiguity of the Hebrew active

participle). Cf also the li-CI syntagma with prefix-prepositions in

MH and MH-styled NH/IH. as bi-li-rôt, mi-li-vacea (4.1.1, fn 5).

IH in particular shows a fondness for this kind of construction, due

perhaps in part to influence from the standard European languages,
although the above examples from BH and MH show that this is not the entire explanation. I have provided non-infinitival substitutable NPs for the first few examples, to facilitate the reader's perception of the nominal syntax:

?ani roce/carix la-lexet/kesef
I want/need to-go /money

'I want/need to go/money'

cal ha-mihab-l-im la-seget
upon the-terrorist-pl to-withdr.

'The terrorists must withdraw, lit. (the onus is) on the terrorists to withdraw' (cf supra) Haaretz, 1 Oct '82

ten l-i la-lexet/kesef
give to-me to-go /money

'Let me go/give me money, lit. give me to-go/money'

matay ha-misiba/lakum?
when the-party/to-arise

'When (is) the party/when to get up (i.e., when should I/one get up)? (Note obligative (modal) semantics, cf 5.1)

lo? ixpat l-i la-lexet/ma se hu xoqey
not matter to-me to-go /what that he thinks

'I don't care to go/what he thinks'

?ani lo? yodea le-sxot/Civrit
I not know to-swim/Hebrew

'I don't know (how) to swim/Hebrew'

yes bi-kavanat-enu la-carox...
EXIS in-purpose-our to-arrange...

'We intend to arrange, it is our intention to arrange...' (compare the imperative constructions with yes + li-CI, 5.1)

Hasbara activist's bulletin
bi-mkom/bli la-lexet
in-place (of)/without to-go

'Instead of/without going'

nim?as/mithaseq l-i la-lexet?uga
hated /desires to-me to-go /cake

'I hate/would like to go/cake' (the latter is a calque from
Yidd/Gmh gefällt mir zu INF. cf Blau 1981)

yofi li-šmoa?c
beauty to-hear

'(That's) good to hear, lit. to-hear (that) (is) beautiful'

nahug la-kum
customary to-rise

'(It is) customary to rise, lit. to-rise (is) customary'

ha-avoda hi/he-hašuv hu li-saveg...
the-work COP the-important(thing) COP to-classify

'The job/the important thing is to classify...'

la-asot davar ka-ze, ze māsehu
to-do thing like-this, this something

'To do a thing like that is something (i.e., an accomplishment)'

The INNOVATIVE nature of this last (lì-CI as left-dislocated NP) is
especially clear. Note that this kind of use of the lì-CI syntagma
cannot possibly be construed as being the same as the allative-purpose
structures of 2.2-4; it constitutes a totally different kind of
usage.

Again, the fact that this phenomenon reoccurs at every stage of Hebrew
shows it to be functional, not etymological, in nature.

At first, this seems to dovetail with our claim of nominal origin
for the infinitive in BH and cross-linguistically (5.2, Ch. 6). In
fact, however, it is crucial to note here that this kind of nominal
use (as shown by substitutability) of an infinitive-phrase consisting of infinitive stem + INFINITIVE MARKER (v. fn 7, (Ch. 5) which notes that imperativic infinitives cross-linguistically all include infinitive marker, below) as a whole constitutes a qualitatively different kind of nominal function from the archaic/conservative nominal use of (bare) infinitive stem in BH (2.4, 2.11) and other languages (2.3), as was discussed with regard to unidirectionality of substantive > infinitive development (Ch. 6); again, different form, different function. Again, it seems to be functional, non-etymological, not bound by the unidirectional evolution of substantives into verbal forms (5.2, Ch. 6) but rather operating on an entirely different, synchronic, AHISTORICAL, ANETYMOLOGICAL plane (v. Ch. 6) from the etymological nominal function of (bare) CI stem: In fact, it correlates with VERBALIZATION, as shown by modern colloquial IH substitution of verbal negative particle loʔ for nominal negative particle ʔeyn of classical-literary usage in the imperativic use of the li-CI syntagma (lo ꝰasen, lo lakaxat ʔišit, 5.1). Compare 3.8 for the same process with the active participle, and Ch. 6 on negation as one of the most useful nominal-verbal parameters. It is interesting to note, in this context, that ᵃl NP, still obligatory in Arabic, is now optional with imperativic li-CI³; ellipsis of the oblique agent-PP constitutes another index of verbalization, rendering the nominal syntax of the li-CI construction in MH (4.1.1) accompanies increasing verbalization of the bare CI stem, no longer independent and, by MH, incapable of nominal function (4.1.1).
Verbalization of a nominal form following prefixation of a dative or instrumental marker is not uncommon cross-linguistically, as was discussed and documented extensively in 5.2 (cf also 4.1.1). In any case, it seems as if inclusion of the infinitive marker acts as a kind of syntactic signal or index of the status of the infinitive stem, much like a determiner or definite article, facilitating quasi-gerundive or 'reduced' sentential complement use, which may be related to verbalization through the deeper correspondence, on some level, with a finite-clause semanto-syntactic structure. It is perhaps revealing of this function of the infinitive marker that infinitives generally cannot take both infinitive marker and determiner (or other NP modifier such as genitives) at the same time, viz. Eng *the to err, *to err of sam Gm *Das zu Lachen, *zu Lachen der Leute Sp *el à ver, Fr *le à avoir.4

Infinite phrases with infinitive marker operate this way cross-linguistically, showing innovative nominal function together with indices of verbalization: Sp 'inflected infinitive' al verte 'upon seeing thee', en haberle conocido 'in having met you, to have met you', al graduarse, (el derecho) de hablarme '(the right) to speak to me'. Fr Je viens de INF, je suis en train de INF, sans lui dire, au revoir (cf au commencement). Note both nominal syntax as object of PP and verbal regimen/inflection with person-agreement (accusative, reflexive, dative object-pronominal suffixes/enclitics; in Portuguese, even nominative (B. Osborne, p.c.) (cf Hopper-Thompson 1984, and 6.1 on this and other parameters of canonical nouniness and verbiness). Compare also a todo andar 'at full speed', de buen ver 'good-looking',
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with adjectival modifier, another nominal characteristic. With or without definite article as gerund/DVN, Sp el ver 'sight, seeing, appearance', el haber 'possession'; these also may be inflected with object-pronominal suffixes, as in el saberlo nosotros 'in our knowing it, in that we know it'. In French, je avoir 'property', entendre (quelqu'un) siffler 'hear (someone) whistling/(to) whistle'. As the ordinary gerund/DVN is sifflement or sifflet, this latter employment of the infinitive perhaps reveals a closer relationship to some sort of deeper-level finite-clause structure (infra), something like entendre que quelqu'un sifle. Compare Eng a swim, a ride (in the country), a walk (to the market), a talk (with you), etc, as well as the more abstract/conceptual DVNs love, hate, aim.

The German supine, or infinitival noun, is a term for the gerundive use of any infinitive (with inseparable infinitive ending, below). The supine nominalization takes the neuter definite article, as (das) Lachen 'laughter'. Note the classical Greek use of infinitive with article as substantive, Wright 1977:110B). Other nominal uses of the infinitive exist, as in the passive construction er war nicht anzu- schauen 'It was not to be considered', which is of particular interest because of the presence of infinitival (~verbal) marker zu (cf reduced active clause man soll ihn nicht anschauen 'One ought not to consider it', without zu).

In the same vein: Eng I want/have to go (cf I want/have a new car, Sp quiero ir, Fr je veux aller), he's to be pitied/an idiot, I expect the President/to work out, he seems (to be) a fool, he made me believe/a believer.
The Somali infinitive (e.g., kul-an 'to meet') may serve as meet-INF
(de)verbal noun with determiner, but also takes VP constituents such
as adverbial complements: as in kul-an-kii soog-a Moqadishu
meet-INF-DET downtown-DET Moqadishu
'a meeting (in) downtown Moqadishu' (cf Bell 1953, and Fox, Somali
Verbal Morphophonemics (in preparation)).

With regard to such structures as ten li lalexet (above), note that
in generative grammar, this surface-nominal construction (infinitive
phrase as direct-object-complement) would be derived from a more
abstract level through 'raising-to-object' and concomitant conversion
of finite verb to infinitive. Such a 'reduced clause' analysis
actually accords quite well with what we have been saying: namely,
that this kind of innovative nominal function (infinitival or reduced
sentential complement (subject, object, nominal predicate, nominal or
adjectival complement, and related imperativic use, above: cf. infi-
nitival object-complement as imperative in I'll thank you to keep
quiet!, and imperativic AI as nominal predicate function (5.1)),
operating on a different plane from archaic nominal use of infinitive
stem (allative/goal-purpose clause), in fact correlates with verbal-
ization and concomitant indices of verbal regimen. In other words,
what seems on the surface, according to strict distributional
criteria, to be nominal syntax, betrays its different provenance
in both the verbal regimen that frequently accompanies it and its
transparent semanto-syntactic relatability to an abstract finite-
clause structure (cf entendre siffler, supra), and the structure that
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fills such a syntactic slot is upon this principled basis to be distinguished from the archaic gerundive structures of Fig. 2, 2.4, and 2.11, with the infinitive marker functioning as an index or clue to this special finite-clause relationship and the concomitant quasi-verbal status that accompanies it. In fact, this apperception may well serve as the key to achieving a deeper understanding of the different modes or levels on which nouns develop into verbs and vice-versa, i.e., the verbalization/grammaticalization (decanonization) of substantives and the nominalization of verbs and grammatical functives. (v. discussion of this provocative question in Ch. 6.)

Now, subjunctivity may essentially be considered SYNTACTIC DEPENDENCY (as etymology of the word implies). This is a trait which infinitives share in their canonical dependent-infinitive role in complements. With a degree of abstraction, if one considers some sort of pragmatic superordinate clause acting as higher predicate/adsentential of the form I command you [(you)VP]s! (or, for (co)hortative-jussive, I suggest that—etc, I command him—etc) to be present at some level in discourse, imperatives tie in quite nicely with subjunctives and infinitives; the ephemeral imperative Cal(aa) NP of Semitic, present in the classical languages but disappearing in the colloquials, may be considered a nice piece of evidence for such a superstructure. Compare English quasi-imperative with dependent-infinitive clause as 'reduced' object-complement I'll thank you to INF, Sp, Fr polite imperatives/requests favor de INF, prière de INF, in all of which, incidentally, the infinitive clause
is transparently relatable to a tensed-clause paraphrase of the familiar I'll thank you [you keep quiet] type.

The commonality of infinitive, imperative, and subjunctive, (which we have seen demonstrated cross-linguistically), then, is not only semantic irreality but also the concomitant syntactic dependency shown above i.e., function as (non-finite) dependent clause. We have, therefore, also arrived at what seems to be a revealing generalization regarding the semanto-syntactic commonality, semantic irreality and concomitant syntactic dependence, of infinitive, imperative, and subjunctive/jussive etc. Now, we have already connected imperativic function of infinitives with nominal function of infinitive phrases (including infinitive marker) cross-linguistically. In this new context, we are in a position to understand the genesis of infinitive as imperative, really the extension of imperative function to infinitives (5.1), as, simultaneously, a quasinominal function (another non-finite subordinate clause function) and one step further on the unidirectional cline of verbalization, N > V (6.1) that gives rise to infinitives from deverbal nouns (5.2).

Evidence has been adduced to the effect that such nominal use is in fact accompanied by morphological indices of verbalization. This seeming paradox in fact resolves itself into synthesis: a promise to achieve a more profound understanding of the different levels on which nouns and verbs travel from one pole to the other; specifically, the notion of a different plane of nominal use for infinitives from that of their original archaic-conservative gerundive function provides confirmation, on some abstract level, for a derivational
relationship between such nominal structures (essentially, a kind of nominalization (but involving the infinitive rather than the gerund or deverbal noun, as the term is generally understood) and deeper finite-clause structures, as posited in early transformational-generative grammar with the general notion of accounting for sentence-relations (as Chomsky 1957, 1965).
FOOTNOTES TO APPENDIX A

1. Possible omission of the zu may be taken as a feature of the telegraphic language of signs (cf Gunter 1963:141-2, quoted in Fox 1980:57).

2. Cf supra for the imperativic use of this construction in the second person; this first-person use, and use in the third person, may be considered cohortative and jussive uses respectively.

3. In fact, there has really been a diversification of functions, with the simple li-CI syntagma serving the colloquial register and Ca1 NP li-CI reserved for a much higher classical-literary stylistic level.

4. The older stratum of infinitive markers (Gm -en, Sp, Fr -Vr) are, of course, inseparable from the stem. Note that this does not detract from their still-extant grammatical force as infinitive markers; although no longer independent/separate morphemes, they remain formally and functionally identifiable as infinitive markers, readily segmentable away from the lexical stem, with which they have not (as yet, anyway) become morphophonologically fused. This is quite clearly indicated by the old ukase against splitting the infinitive in English because it cannot be done in Latin, where the infinitive marker is suffixed directly to the stem, thus quite explicitly equating the independent prepositional infinitive marker to in English with the dependent infinitival suffix -re in Latin (and, by extension, the descendants of Latin, for which the above situation still
holds). One might even predict that if the infinitive suffix ultimately fuses with the stem, and its infinitival valence fades, in any or all of the Romance languages (as seems likely), a second-stage infinitive marker such as à will become de rigeur in imperative constructions for the reasons discussed below.

5. More on these nomina unitatis-like, 'single-action' deverbal nouns, isomorphic to the infinitive (bare verb-stem), in 6.2.

6. v. supra on the significance of the grammaticalized obligative modal function of the have + INF construction.

7. In a sense, one might want to consider this as the difference between the verbal noun and deverbal noun capacities of the infinitive, the former referring to the more verbal, reduced-clause use of the infinitive (further evolved along the N-V cline, Ch. 6) and the latter to the more archaic/conservative nominal function.

8. The idea being that, if only implicit in the speech-situation/pragmatics, an irrealis utterance must of necessity be supplied with a higher-level realis matrix in order to be properly interpreted by a hearer. Proper interpretation and consequently successful communication indeed presuppose such a matrix. We shall not, however, be pursuing this matter further.
REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY

Where two dates are given for a single volume, it is a standard work referenced in the text according to the earliest publication date in order to place it in its historical context for the reader. The second date is that of the latest edition available at the time of writing.

Abbreviations of Journal Names

AAL = Afroasiatic Linguistics
BSOAS = Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies
CILL = Cahiers de L'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain
JAL = Journal of African Languages
JAOS = Journal of the American Oriental Society
JNES = Journal of Near Eastern Studies
JPS = Jewish Publication Society of America
JSS = Journal of Semitic Studies
Lg = Language
Lg Sci = Language Sciences
Stud. in Lg = Studies in Language
REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY - cont


53. Fox, Andrew. Root-Fusion in Semitic. (forthcoming, CILL)


80. Hopper, Paul, and Sandra A. Thompson. 1984. The Discourse Basis for Lexical Categories in Universal Grammar. in Lg 60.4 (December 1984)
Jazykov. Sravnitel’nyj Slovar’ [An Attempt at Comparison of The Nos-
New York: Traditional Press Inc.
Rome: Institut Biblique Pontifical.
84. Kaye, Alan S. 1980. Spinoza as Linguist. in Hebrew Annual
of Modern Hebrew and Modern Standard Arabic: Parallels and
Differences in The Revival of Two Semitic Languages.
JAOS: 103.4.
Analytic Genitive in The Modern Arabic Dialects. in Lg 59:3.
87. Kean, Mary Louise. 1980. Grammatical Representations and
The Description of Language Processing. in The Biological
Study of Mental Processes, David Caplan, ed. Cambridge:
M.I.T. Press.
des Hamito-Semitischen, Indo-Germanischen, Uralischen und
90. Lambert, Mayer. 1946. Traité de Grammaire Hebraique. Paris:
Presses Universitaires de France.

291


111. Sabar, Yona. 1979. Lects on Toldot haLashon [History of The
(Hebrew) Language], pp 11, 19-21, 26, 43 [of my personal

112. Sapir, Edward. 1949. Language: an Introduction to The Study

113. Scherer, Wilhelm. 1878, 1890.2 Zur Geschichte der Deutschen

114. Schuh, Russell G. 1971. Verb Forms and Verb Aspects in
Ngizim. in JAL 10:1:47-60.


L'Infinitif Sémitique. in Archiv Orientální 34:123-4.

117. Segert, Stanislav. 1976. A Grammar of Phoenician and

118. Segert, Stanislav. 1979. A Basic Grammar of The Ugaritic
Language. (UCLA: (editio minor in ms—published version

(UCLA: ms for internal use).

120. Shopen, Tim. 1972. A Generative Theory of Ellipsis: a Con-
sideration of The Linguistic Use of Silence. (UCLA doctoral
dissertation).

HeHadish/The Megiddo Modern Dictionary (Hebrew-English
English-Hebrew). Tel Aviv: Megiddo.

294
123. Sperber, A. 1956. The Pre-Masoretic Bible I. The Codex
Reuchlinianus. Copenhagen.
Honore Champion.
126. Steiner, Richard C. 1977. The Case for Fricative Laterals in
127. Stockwell, Robert, Paul Schachter, and Barbara Hall Partee.
1973. The Major Syntactic Structures of English. New York:
Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
New York: Pantheon.
[Prayerbook of Israelite Liturgy: Ashkenazi Rite].
Jerusalem: World Zionist Organization.
130. Tôrâ, Nîbî?im uKitûbîm: The Holy Scriptures According to The
Jerusalem: Korên.
134. Visser, Frederic Theodor. 1963-73. An Historical Syntax of
The English Language. 3 vol. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
Grammatik. Rome.
    Verbum. in Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift Universität Halle
    17:207-215.
    Verlag.
139. Wright, W. 1890. Lectures on The Comparative Grammar of
    The Semitic Languages. Cambridge.
    Cambridge University Press.
141. Zedaka, Yizhak. 1979. Luhot HaPoCal. Jerusalem:
    Kiryat-Sepher.
142. Zee, Eric. 1980. Sound Change in Syllable-Final Nasal
    Endings in Chinese Since 600 A.D. (UCLA: ms)
ADDENDA

Ch. 1, fn 2 (p. 20). (or, structurally speaking, this set of correspondences between full and reduced forms)

6.1, p. 238. BH accusative proclitic *et* (nota accusativi) has been discussed as an index of verbalization of the CI accompanying reanalysis of genitive modifier as accusative object (1.6.7-8, 2.6).

6.1, p. 239. Its later occurrences with first person singular accusative suffix pronoun *nī* (1.6.8) is particularly noteworthy as an index of the genitive-to-accusative reanalysis accompanying verbalization: object agreement proper.

Ch. 6, fn 2, p.262. I have tended to avoid the term NON-FINITE or NON-TENSED VERB-FORM, which generally extends over the range of verbal substantives and through the irrealis verb-forms, because of the verbal bias implicit therein (cf Hodge 1976:58, and discussion in 6.2).