

THE INFINITIVE AS A COMPLEMENT OF A PREDICATE OF INCOMPLETE PREDICATION

by

NAFTALI STERN

Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, Israel 52100

0.1 The purpose of this paper is to describe the Hebrew infinitive (henceforth: INF) in its function as a complement that completes a predicate of incomplete predication. The description applies to the INF in Israeli Hebrew (IH) only, and is based on research of a very limited corpus. We have collected 2022 occurrences of INF¹ from different levels of IH, which are derived from a controlled and continuous text. The sources are:

1. Newspaper language—*Ma^cʾarib*.
2. Articles from periodicals: we selected papers from the fields of linguistics, literature and education.
3. Prose describing Israeli army life—“*Pārāšiyyôt gebūrā*”.
4. “*Sēliḥa šēnicaḥnū*” by Ephraim Kishon.
5. Writing by high school students.
6. Spoken Hebrew—recorded conversations.

The numeration refers to the samples indicated below. Of the 2022 occurrences, we have used 561 for this study—only those which match the discussed structures.²

0.2 The INF in the structures that will be represented below is a governed element that completes the predicate, i.e., not only is INF necessary for

1. These do not include “doubles”. Thus “doubles” does not refer to what is called *word-token*, in contrast to *word-type*, as cited in Nir (1981, para. 6.1.1.6). By double occurrences we mean that the whole phrase, comprising the infinitive and its syntactic environment, is repeated.

2. The remaining 1,461 occurrences served the present author in describing other structures. See Stern (1983 and 1986).

the completion of the utterance, but predication is not at all possible without it. The various constituents that function as grammatical predicates in the phrases to be discussed have the status of auxiliary verbs or else are coupled with the auxiliary verb *hāyā*. They contain, however, grammatical categories, such as tense, gender and number, which are non-existent in INF, and which express modality, such as ability, possibility, necessity, etc. But the “verbal essence” remains in the INF.³

The subject is a noun or its substitute, but the agent might be marked \emptyset (zero) to express indefiniteness, in which case the grammatical predicate will be in the plural, e.g. *muḵrāḥīm lihyôt šāmēah*, or *yēḵōlīm lihyôt gam yēḥūdī vēgam āmēriqanī (Ma^carīb)*.⁴

We shall not discuss here constructions containing impersonals (*h.g.m.*) or verboids (*dēmūyē pō^cal*) + INF. These are analyzed in detail in Stern (1983).

1. NP (subject) + Adj. (+ *hāyā*) + INF

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| (1) | אני מוכרח להגיע | .1 |
| (5) | הספר מסוגל להשיא עצות | .2 |
| (2) | לזאת אין אנו נכונים להסכים | .3 |
| (2) | חייב התלמיד להביא את . . . | .4 |
| (6) | האיש בהחלט עלול להפריע | .5 |
| (2) | אין אנו רשאים לכלכל מעשינו . . . | .6 |
| (2) | . . . שאותם הם עתידים לפרוץ | .7 |
| (1) | אנו חופשיים לפעול לפי הבנתנו | .8 |
| (2) | אין אנו בני-חורין להיפטר הימנו | .9 |
| (3) | הם היו מוכרחים להסביר לך | .10 |
| (6) | נאלצים היינו ללון בחוץ | .11 |
| | 1.1 כינוי \emptyset (נר) + תואר (+ היה) + ש"פ | |
| (6) | מוכרחים להיות שמח | .12 |
| (2) | את הידיד חייבים להכיר | .13 |
| (6) | עלולים להפריע לנו | .14 |

The predicative component in the above structure is an adjective, that is to say, a word marked by “gender concord”⁵ with a noun, but not con-

3. See Rosén (1967, p. 284); also Rubinstein (1971, para. 7).

4. In German it is usual to use an indefinite pronoun: *man muss fröhlich sein; man kann auch Jude, auch Amerikaner sein*. Similarly in other languages that have a similar pronoun: *on* (French); *se* + inf. (Portuguese). Thus, *muḵrāḥīm* + INF = *precisar se* + inf., etc.

5. See Stern (1983, p. 149, para. 1.0 and footnote 3); Stern (1974, p. 4); also Rosén (1962, para. 5.1).

taining the grammatical category “tense”. These adjectives do not govern a noun, but their predication always has to be completed by an INF.⁶ Sometimes this principle seems to be refuted, but this is only apparent. The reasons will become clear later. But let us return to the INF in this paragraph. It does not allow any transformation—either nominative or predicative. The INF is therefore quite different from its appearance in the sentence patterns which contain an adjective having the status of an impersonal (*h.g.m.*).⁷

The adjectives are derived either from participles of passive stem patterns (*bênônî* of the passive *binyānîm*, e.g. *muḵrāḥ*, *mēsuggāl*, *nāḵôn*, or from the passive participle (*bênônî pāʿûl*) such as *ʿāsûy*, or they are components that do not function as adjectives of a noun at all, e.g. *ʿālûl*, *raššāy*, *ʿāʾîd*.⁸

In sentence 4, *ḥayyāḅ hattalmîd lēhakkîr ʿet . . .* the governing component is *ḥayyāḅ*. Apparently *ḥayyāḅ* should be able to function without INF, e.g. *hanne ʿēšām yācā ḥayyāḅ*; or, as in Mishnaic Hebrew, *yāmût zakkāy vēʿal yāmût ḥayyāḅ* (*Sanhedrin*, 8:5); similarly, *ḥayyāḅ be*, *ḥayyāḅ ʿal*; yet these are synchronically different lexemes, and they have nothing in common with the previous examples except their etymological form.⁹ Inter-lingual equivalence will support this claim.¹⁰ The same applies to *ʿāsûy* + INF, of which the meaning is “possibility”, in contrast to *ʿāsûy* without INF, as in *haddāḅār ʿāsûy*, a passive transform (*Zustandspassiv*) of the active expression *ʿôse*.

In sentences 8 and 9 it would seem that the predicative constituents are of complete predication, as in *ʿānû ḥopšiyîm*, *ʿānû bēnē ḥôrîn*; but this is not the case. *Ḥopšî* as an adjective of complete predication is different

6. Thus we include this combination within the category called in Hebrew *nāsû murḥāḅ*; see Stern (1974, p. 6).

7. Thus *ʿāsûr liḵtōḅ* → *ʿāsûr šeyiktēbû* → *hakkētîḅā ʿāsûrā*. For sentence patterns including impersonals (*h.g.m.*) see Stern (1983, para. 1.2). But the following usages, *ʿānî muḵrāḅ šeʿektōḅ* or *hakkētîḅā*, do not exist.

8. *Ḥayyāḅ*, *ʿālûl* and *raššāy* are not Biblical Hebrew; also *ʿāʾîd* in its status of an adjective exists only in the Hagiography (Esther and Job). They do not function as normal adjectives, but only as predicative constituents. Cf. Rosén (1966, p. 268, footnote to 42.8.)

9. Everywhere a common semantic base for all these forms might be found which could seemingly explain their development—these, too, would be irrelevant. Indeed, the synchronic description of IH will verify the lexical fact here discussed.

10. The equivalents in other languages would be entirely different. Thus, in translating from Hebrew into Portuguese, English and German:

ḥayyāḅ + INF = must/has to = *precisar se* = *müssen/hat zu*.

ḥayyāḅ (without INF) = guilty = *culpado* = *schuldîg*.

from *ḥopšî* + INF̄. Thus, two variant lexical entries exist (as in other languages where similar lexical entries and even morphological identity exist for *ḥopšî*).¹¹ The same applies to *ben-ḥôrîn*, which is its Mishnaic synonym.

The noun phrase (NP)—the subject—might be a pronoun \emptyset , that is to say, an indefinite pronoun with parallels in other languages: *man* (German), *on* (French), *se* (Portuguese), *one* (English), etc. In this case the predicate is in the plural, but this does not influence the INF's status in the structure.

2. NP (subject) + Verb + INF

2.1 NP (subj.) + Verb + INF (only)

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|-----|
| (2) | . . . כדי שיוכל הילד לבחור במלה . . . | .15 |
| (2) | יוסי ישתדל להדיח כלים | .16 |
| (3) | עד שהכלבים הספיקו לנבוח | .17 |
| (1) | צבי יעז לארגן הפגנה | .18 |
| (2) | מורה מנוסה ימאן לנהוג כן | .19 |
| (2) | ההורים מתעתדים לחנך ילדיהם | .20 |
| (6) | אם תואילו להקדיש לי מספר דקות | .21 |
| (3) | שעה שהוא נאלץ להילחם | .22 |
| (6) | בכית יכולים להשתולל | .23 |
| (2) | יכולים היו להסדיר את הגיור | .24 |

There is no essential distinction between the features of this structure (2.) and those in paragraph 1., but the grammatical predicate is different. The constituent governing the INF is a verb of incomplete predication that could be completed only by an INF. Likewise, predicative transformation or nominalization of INF in the language system of Israeli Hebrew is prevented. That is, there is no way to transform the INF into a verb or into an action noun (*šēm pē^cullā*). Further, no alternation between INF and any NP as a complement is possible. The same applies to alternation with an objective clause.¹² The NP—subject—might also be a pronoun \emptyset (zero) to express indefiniteness, as shown in sentence 23.

When the predicative component is a participle (*bēnōnî*), it might be coupled with the auxiliary verb *hāyā* to indicate tense. In this case, the predicative nucleus no longer comprises the category of tense and there-

11. So in German, from which in all probability this expression derives:

²*ānū ḥopsiyyīm* + INF = *Wir sind (so) frei . . . zu* + inf.

Bēnē hā²ādām (hēm) ḥopšiyīm = *Die Menschen sind frei*.

12. See Stern (1971, para. 4); also Rubinstein (1971, p. 7).

fore does not function as a verb, as in sentence 24. In fact, it should be categorized within structure 1., as in sentence 10. The question as to whether there is any semantic differentiation between a structure in which the tense is expressed by the auxiliary verb *hāyā*, and a structure whose function is reserved for a derivative verb, requires a separate empirical analysis. For example, *nēlācīm hāyīnū lālūn bahūc*—in contrast to *nēlācnū lālūn bahūc*.¹³

2.2 NP (subject) + “adverbial verb” + INF

- | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|-----|
| (6) | . . . שמחנו לשמוע ש . . . | .25 |
| (2) | והיטיב לעשות המכר | .26 |
| (3) | כל אחד מיהר להתחפר | .27 |
| (6) | איחרת לבוא להירשם | .28 |
| (3) | הוא חזר לעמוד על מכסה המנוע | .29 |
| (6) | עליך למהר ולהירשם | .30 |
| (6) | (אז כמו שאמרתי) עליך למהר להירשם | .31 |

The verbs governing an INF to complete the predication in this structure function as adverbs in relation to the “verb category” which is included in the INF.¹⁴ In other words, the combination V + INF allows the following transformation, while the “word chain” is changed: [INF → V] + [V → Adv.] as *šamaḥnū lišmōa^c* → *šama^cnū bešimḥā, mihēr lēhithappēr* → *hithappēr mahēr*, etc. The transform no longer includes INF. After the structural change, the INF functions as a verb and becomes the predicate, while the verb now functions as an adverb.

The INF in structure 2.2, as in 2.1, does not allow either a nominal transformation or a predicative one.¹⁵

Sentence 29 is somewhat different. The above transformation seems to be prevented because of morphological deficiency, i.e., it is impossible to derive an adverb from the root *ḥ.z.r.*¹⁶ An etymological modification is therefore needed, such as *hū ḥāzar la^cāmōd* → *hū^c āmad šūḥ* (*šūḥ* instead

13. A test of high-school students has shown that most think that the meaning of the two sentences is not identical. But, to establish hard and fast rules, more tests will be necessary, for even if a variant meaning may arise it might not suit the others.

14. See also Rosén (1962, p. 81); Rubinstein (1971, p. 149); and Stern (1971, p. 24).

15. Because of the similarity of these structures to those of paragraph 2.1, we also include them in the category called in Hebrew *nāšū murḥāḇ*; see note 8 above.

16. In substandard colloquial language there exists an adverb *bahāzārā*, e.g. *hū nātan li^{ʔet} hassēper bahāzārā* (= *hū heḥzīr lī^{ʔet} hassēper*). But it is irrelevant here, because *ḥāzar la^cāmōd* could not be transformed in Colloquial Hebrew: *Hū^c āmad behāzārā^c al miḫšē hammānōa^c* does not exist.

of *ḥāzar*). But the combination still belongs to structure 2.2, because the adverbial meaning of the verb *ḥāzar* in the given phrase is clearly understood and very similar to the adverb *šūḥ*. But it should not be confused with a phrase like *hū ḥāzar millimmūdāw la^cāmōd bērōš ḥārēšīmā lakkēneset*. Here we have *ḥāzar min*, a verb governing the preposition *min*. The INF which joins it is no longer obligatory for a complete predication. The syntactic function of the INF is that of an adverb of purpose which can be preceded by a conjunction of finality, as *kēdē*.¹⁷ This INF will, of course, not enable the above mentioned transformation.¹⁸

The “adverbility” of these verbs could be expressed also by an INF accompanied by a periphrastic INF,¹⁹ in two different forms: with a *waw haḥibbūr* (sentence 30) and without it (sentence 31). In both cases the adverbial transformation is possible: *‘āleḳā lēmahēr ulēhērāšēm* → *‘aleḳa lēhērāšēm mahēr*, and is equal to *tēmahēr lēhērāšēm* → *tērāšēm mahēr*.²⁰

2.3 An idiomatic phrase + INF

- (2) ידו תקצר לקשור חיי חברה .32
 (1) “בערו לו הידיים” לעשות את זה .33

An idiomatic expression fulfills the function of the incomplete predicative constituent. It is likewise possible to include sentences such as *yēš lēḳā dām lāšīr, lō ḥāyā lō ‘āwīr linšōm, lō ḥāyā lāhem lēḥ la^cācōr ba^cādēnū*, insofar as disconnection of the INF will change the sentence meaning. Thus, *lō^c ḥāyā lāhem lēḥ* (was it removed by a surgeon?) in contrast to *lō^c ḥāyā lāhem lēḥ la^cāōr ba^cādēnū*, which means “they were not so cruel as to stop us”. All phrases of this kind contain a noun in metaphoric usage, which, without the INF or another complement, would not express the writer’s intent. However, we may accept them as idioms of incomplete predication which require an INF as a complement. It is, of course, possible to see them as belonging to the category termed “impersonals” (*h.g.m.*) + INF, as analyzed in Stern (1983, p. 258, para. 1.5).

3. NP (subject) + “intr.” V + INF

- (1) ובהשראתן קמו להילחם .34
 (1) אני הולך לדבר סרה בנוער .35

17. See Stern (1971, para. 7.0) and (1974, p. 10).

18. The obligatory completion of the verb *ḥāzar min* is an adverbial one, *ḥāzar miššām*. See Stern (1971, p. 40).

19. See Rosén (1967, p. 370; 1966, para. 56.4) and Stern (1971, pp. 64–68).

20. About the construction *‘al* + NP + INF, in its status as an impersonal (*h.g.m.*) + INF, see Stern (1983, p. 256).

- (6) אני עומד לארגן מסיבה .35
 (2) כשלונה של ההוראה נוטה להתפשט .37
 (5) מורה זה נוהג להעניק ציונים .38
 (6) עברתי להיות ה"חבוב" של הגנת .39
 (2) בבואנו לקבוע את זהותו .40

The predicative constituent is an intransitive verb, a one-place verb,²¹ which generally, when disconnected from INF, is of complete predication and does not govern any complement. But in the present construction the verb is only a secondary element with a somewhat modal function. It contains, of course, the grammatical categories which characterize a verb, such as tense, gender and number. But the verbal function is expressed by the INF which is governed by the verb and thus completes the sentence predication. Disconnection of INF would lead to essential changes of sentence meaning. They are therefore considered as separate lexical entries, e.g. the verbs *qām* and *hālak*:

- hālak*:²²
- a one-place verb: *bēmiqre ze ʿānī pāšūʿ qām wēhōlēk*.
 - a verb that requires an adverbial complement: *ʿānī hōlēk lahābērī*.
 - a two-place verb governing an INF: *ʿānī hōlēk ledabbēr sārā bannōʿar* (35).
- qām*:
- a one-place verb: *kaʿāšher niqnas hannāšī, hakkōl qāmū*.
 - a two-place verb governing an INF: *ubēhašrāʿātān qāmū lēhillahēm* (34).

Likewise for the other examples. These distinctions have to be in dictionaries in order to aid the student, particularly in the case of bilingual dictionaries.²³

A construction containing an adverbial phrase between a verb and an INF does not belong in this category. Here the predicate is an intransitive

21. See the definition of a "one-place" verb in Kaddari (1972, p. 103).

22. The verb *hālak* is "overloaded" in the dictionary (and so in other languages). To cite a few examples:

- hālak* + an adverbial complement that signifies an orientation of a target (*Zielorientiert*).
- hālak* without a complement, signifying an orientation of departure (*Ausgangsorientiert*).
- hālak* + INF which signifies an abstract aim, etc. See Stern (1977, p. 178) for further differentiations.

23. See Stern (1977, pp. 4–7 and the dictionary section) and Helbig and Schenkel (1973, pp. 50–58 and other examples, *passim*). Also Prof. Goshen in his *Introduction to the Lexicography of Modern Hebrew*, *passim*.

verb and the INF is no longer governed by it, e.g. $\text{ʔānī hōlēk} \text{ʔel ha} \text{ʔāšēpā kedē lēdabbēr sārā bannō}^{\text{c}}\text{ar}$. This contrasts with the construction of sentence 35.

In example 39, ʔābartī lihyōt is slang for $\text{hāpakṭī lihyōt} = \text{nihyētī}$ (= I became). We therefore include it in this paragraph, but it might also belong to the next category 4.

Sentence 40 represents a variation of the above structure. We have a gerund time clause that allows a predicative transformation. Its transform should be categorized thus: $\text{behō} \text{ʔēnū liqbōa}^{\text{c}} \text{ʔet zehūtō} \rightarrow \text{kēše} \text{ʔānū bā} \text{ʔīm liqbōa}^{\text{c}} \text{ʔet zehūtō}$ (see also Rosen, 1962, pp. 324–325).

4. INF completing a “transitive” verb of incomplete predication

- | | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|-----|
| (2) | האמת ניתנה להיאמר | .41 |
| (3) | הוא יוסיף לשבת בשקט | .42 |
| (1) | ובאלה אמרו לנצח את היונים | .43 |
| (1) | וביהודה הפכנו להיות שליטים | .44 |
| (2) | באמרנו להעשיר את לשונו של הילד | .45 |

The grammatical predicate is a verb that is usually transitive, a two place verb,²¹ i.e., a verb governing a NP = object. In our case, this NP is prevented unless we wish to change the meaning of this verb. The INF is needed to complete the phrase, whereas the verb has an idiomatic or a modal meaning only. Thus, for example, sentence 41: $\text{hā} \text{ʔēmet ne} \text{ʔēmeret}$, but not: $\text{hā} \text{ʔēmet nittēnā}$; or 42: hū yāšab bēšequet etc.²⁴ No. 45, similar to no. 40 in the previous structure, represents a gerund time clause, and its transform belongs here: $\text{be} \text{ʔomrēnū} + \text{INF} \rightarrow \text{kēše} \text{ʔānū} \text{ʔōmrīm} + \text{INF}$.

5. NP₁ (subject) + V + NP₂ (object) + INF

5.1 with preposition (PP) *lē*

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----|
| (1) | תרשי לי להאשים גם את הציבור | .46 |
| (4) | הפליטים הורשו לצאת את המחנה | .47 |
| $\emptyset = \text{צ} \text{ʔ} \text{ש}$ (1) | שלא נותנים ליהודי להתפלל | .48 |
| (3) | תן לזה לעבוד | .49 |
| (4) | אם ניתן להשתלט על . . . | .50 |
| $\emptyset = \text{צ} \text{ʔ} \text{ש}$ (2) | הקריטריון מרשה לדרג את . . . | .51 |

24. The lexical equivalents in other languages clearly demonstrate the lexical difference:
 a. $\text{ha} \text{ʔēmet nittēnā lēhē} \text{ʔāmēr} = \text{um die Wahrheit zu sagen} = \text{the truth must be said}$.
 b. $\text{hassēper nittan lō} = \dots \text{wurde gegeben} = \text{was given}$. As is readily realized, the *nipʿal* in sentence a. is limited to *admissivum*, in contrast to the *nipal* in sentence b., which is the passive transform of an active expression. See also Stern (1977, p. 33).

5.2 PP ^cal

- (3) .52 הוא ציווה על הנהג לאוספם
 (3) .53 פקדתי על האנשים לקפוץ החוצה
 (1) .54 הסורים פקדו עליו כיריות עליהם להפסיק

5.3 PP *bē^cad*

- (1) .55 רק הפחד עצר בעדם לחצות את הקורים

Paragraph 5. represents patterns that differ from the previous ones in their construction. They contain a second noun phrase, an object complement which is a noun. Nevertheless, the predication is not complete without an INF. As in the four previous paragraphs the INF cannot alternate with the noun-object.

By contrast, other structures exist in which such alternation does prevail. This INF can alternate with a noun-object. Thus, *hēm nehēnū lāḥō ʔēlēnū/hēm nehēnū min hāʔārūhā*. Such sentences, whether they include two-place verbs²⁵ (*nehēnīm lāḥō/nehēnīm min hāʔārūhā*) or three-place verbs²⁶ (*hū limmēd ʔōtānū lehābīn/hū limmēd ʔōtānū tōrā*), have no bearing on our subject.

The uniqueness of the structures discussed in paragraph 5. is that generally the INF allows a nominal or a verbal transformation, or even both, thus no. 55, *happaḥad ʔacar baʔādī laḥcōt → ʔet ḥāciyyat → šeʔehēce (ʔet) haqqawwīm*. For that reason it is similar to the structure which allows the alternation of the INF with a noun, as in *lōʔ ḥāšašnū lippōl/lōʔ ḥāšašnū mimḡawet → lōʔ ḥāšašnū šenippōl/šennāmūt*.²⁷

In the corpus which served us in this paper we found the following prepositional phrases: *lē*, ^c*al* and *bē^cad*. But certainly more may exist. NP₁ can be a pronoun \emptyset , as in no. 48. Likewise, NP₂ can be replaced by a \emptyset , which expresses indefiniteness of the object, as in no. 51, *haqqriterion marše (lāʔādām/lēkol ʔehād etc.) lēdārēg . . .*²⁸

Although no *lē*-object is shown in sentence 47, it should not be differentiated from sentence 46. Verbs in passive form should not be separated from their active partner if there is a direct transformational

25. See Stern (1979, p. 35 [2.25]; p. 37 [2.4]; p. 44 [7.2]).

26. Three-place verbs in general, and those that allow the alternation Noun/INF, have been described by the present author in a separate article. See Stern, (1981, especially paragraphs 2, 3.2, 4.1, 4.3, 5.5, 6.1, 7.2, 9.1, 9.3).

27. Indeed, all these sentences exist in the same corpus (no. 3). Further analyses about the above structures will be discussed by the present author in a forthcoming article.

28. The equivalent phrase in other languages of this \emptyset would be: *erlauben einem* = allows one/us to . . .

relation between the active and the passive expression. Thus, *hiršú lappēlīṭīm lācēt ʿet hammahāne* → *happēlīṭīm huršú lācēt ʿet hammahāne* (see also Rosén, 1967, p. 162).

The sentences 48, 49, 50 seem at first sight not to belong to this category, insofar as the following structure exists. Thus, *nātan lē* + noun (without INF). A sentence like *tēn lō la ʿāḥōd* allows, of course, a transformation → *tēn lō ʿāḥōdā*, or → *tēn lō šēya ʿāḥōd*. But, in sentences 48, 49, and 50 a transformation is not possible. The following do not occur: *tēn lāze (lamaḳsīr) ʿāḥōdā* or, *tēn lō hištallēṭūt* or, *tēn lō hitpallēṭūt/tēpillā*. The verb *nātan* in the above three sentences has a modal meaning, that is to say, *ʿapšēr lō la ʿāḥōd*, etc.²⁹ Surely, *tēn lō la ʿāḥōd* is ambiguous if disconnected from its context. Thus:

- a. *tēn lō la ʿāḥōd*, that is to say: let him work; *lasse ihn arbeiten*. This belongs to category 5. No transformation is possible.
- b. . . . *āz tēn lō la ʿāḥōd (bammip ʿal šelkā)* → *tēn lō ʿāḥōdā (bammip ʿal)* = give him a job; *gib ihm Arbeit*.

To conclude, there are no essential distinctions between the structures that have been described in this paper, particularly those concerning the status of the INF.³⁰ The main differences are to be found in the predicative constituent which is of incomplete predication. The INF in all the structures discussed cannot alternate with a noun-object. Neither nominalization of INF nor predicative transformation are possible. Moreover, the predicative constituents have much in common, whether semantically or in their morphosyntactic behavior. Semantically, most have a somewhat modal meaning. Morphosyntactically, they appear in the plural when the subject is an indefinite pronoun represented by zero (∅).

Appendix:

For purposes of comparison of distribution on INF structures we investigated texts from Biblical (BH), Mishnaic (MishH) and Midrashic (MidH) Hebrew, containing more or less an equal number of words. The

29. Again, the foreign equivalences confirm this. The translation of the verb *nātan* will not be *geben*, to “give”, but *lassen*, “let”, that is to say, verbs which express “giving the possibility”, “giving the chance”, “giving permission”. See also Kaddari (1976, part III, especially, pp. 138–153).

30. Except the structures in paragraph 5., as indicated above.

Biblical text was taken from Genesis, the Mishnaic from *Sanhedrin*, and the Midrashic from *Midraš Tanḥuma* to Genesis, chapter 1–5.

Results of the comparison are summarized in the following table.

Total number of occurrences:	2022	40	29	50
The structures:	IH	BH	MishH	MidH
1.	95	—	3	5
2.1	287	17	4	5
2.2	12	—	2	1
2.3	2	—	—	—
3.	65	—	—	—
4.	73	—	—	—
5.	73	—	—	—
Total number of structures:	561	17	9	11

Each column is headed by the total number of occurrences containing INF as found in each corpus. The total sums within each column indicate the frequency of occurrence of the discussed structures. For example, in IH we found occurrences containing INF which belong to one of the seven structures that have been described.

From the table we learn that a persistent development in the use of the INF exists—both qualitatively and quantitatively. This persistence prevails both in the kind of structures as well as in the distribution of the INF.

In Biblical Hebrew only one of the categories discussed exists. In Mishnaic Hebrew, three kinds may be found and the same applies to Midrashic Hebrew, while in IH seven categories may be identified. The influence of Indo-German languages, from ancient Greek and up to and including Contemporary English and German, is felt. These findings corroborate the fact that IH syntax is no longer Semitic, but is closer to the syntax of Indo-German languages. The following tables also confirm this.

As mentioned above, only structures of INF containing a predicative constituent of incomplete predication are analyzed. The present author is preparing a description of other structures which include the INF. The tables that follow (A,B) will summarize the distribution of INF in all their forms. We have identified eleven categories that have sixteen subcategories, totalling twenty-seven structures containing the INF.

Table A

Israeli Hebrew	4%
Biblical Hebrew	0.7%
Mishnaic Hebrew	0.65%
Midrashic Hebrew	1.65%

Table B

Israeli Hebrew	27
Biblical Hebrew	2
Mishnaic Hebrew	8
Midrashic Hebrew	13

Table A indicates the use of the INF in texts related to other sentence constituents (not including particles). In IH the frequency of the INF is approximately 4% of the total sum of words, while in Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew it does not reach more than 1%. In Midrashic Hebrew the result is slightly higher—1.25%.

Table B covers the twenty-seven different structures that are found in IH. The number of categories in the other strata is much lower. Of these 27 categories, only two exist in Biblical Hebrew. Eight occur in Mishnaic Hebrew, and in the Midrashic strata—thirteen. Clearly, the use of the INF becomes more varied as its distribution increases. The Indo-German influence is palpable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Goshen-Gottstein, M.H. 1969. *Introduction to Lexicography of Modern Hebrew*. Jerusalem.
- Helbig, Gerhard & Wolfgang Schenkel. 1973. *Wörterbuch zur Valenz und Distribution deutscher Verben*. Leipzig.
- Kaddari, M.Z. 1972. The Ergative (Causative of Intransitive Verbs) in Israel Hebrew. *Criticism and Interpretation* 2–3. Ramat-Gan.
- . 1976. *Studies in Biblical Hebrew Syntax*. Ramat-Gan.
- Nir, R. 1981. *Mahô letôrat hallašôn*. Tel-Aviv.
- Rosén, Haiim, B. 1962. *A Textbook of Israeli Hebrew*. Chicago.
- . 1967. *Ibrît tôbâ* (2nd ed.). Jerusalem.
- . 1977. *Contemporary Hebrew*. The Hague.
- Rubinstein, E. 1971. *The Verb Phrase*. Tel-Aviv.
- Stern, Naftali. 1971. *The Infinitive in Israeli Hebrew* (M.A. Thesis), Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan.
- . 1974. *The Syntax of Contemporary Hebrew* (a summaration), Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan (Internal press).

- _____. 1977. *The Verb in Israeli Hebrew* (Ph.D. Thesis), Tel-Aviv University.
- _____. 1979. "The ʔet Verbs in Israeli Hebrew." *Hebrew Computational Linguistics* 17:28–57. Ramat-Gan.
- _____. 1981. "Three-place Verbs containing the ʔet complement." *Hebrew Computational Linguistics* 17:46–61. Ramat-Gan.
- _____. 1983. "Impersonals (*h.g.m.*) and Verboids + Infinitive in Israeli Hebrew." *Lěšónēnū* 47/3–4:248–263.
- _____. 1986. "The marker $yēš$ in Biblical Hebrew and in Contemporary Hebrew," in *Dr. M. Moreshet Memorial Volume*. Bar-Ilan University (in press).