

- Satzinger, Helmut, 1967. Äthiopische Parallelen zum ägyptischen *šdm-f*. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Institut-Abteilung Kairo*: 22.163-166.
- Tabaian, Hessian, 1979. Persian compound verbs. *Lingua*: 47.189-208.
- Telegdi, S., 1951. Nature et fonction des périphrases verbales dites 'verbes composés' en persan. *Acta Orientalia*: 1.315-334.
- Zaborski, Andrzej, 2003. The origin of the suffix 'conjugations' in Afroasiatic languages. *Polska Akademia Nauk (Oddział w Krakowie) – Sprawozdania z Posiedzeń Komisji Naukowych*: 45.59-61.

Tali Bar

Kochav Ya'ir

EXTRAPOSITION IN MODERN HEBREW

1. Introduction

Extrapolation can mainly be regarded a result of a transformation of a simple sentence by moving one of its elements from its original place and turning it into an isolated subject, usually in front of the sentence. The new structure maintains traces of the former one: primarily a resumptive pronoun in the adjacent sentence (and sometimes even a preposition that has been moved from its former location to the head of the changed sentence). The essence of turning a sentence into an extrapositional sentence is emphasis of the transformed element by making it an expressive subject. An extrapositional sentence is basically a nominal structure; its subject is isolated from its adjacent sentence of which one element relates to it, points at it or even repeats it. This structure is one of the phenomena of apposition in a language (Jespersen 1909-1949:357), as the isolated extraposed part of the sentence corresponds to one of the elements of the adjacent sentence. In a language with nominal sentences the identification of the extrapositional element is more transparent than in languages which lack non-verbal predication, since the extrapositional sentence with a basic nominal structure easily fills the pattern of a nominal sentence with no need for any modification. In languages in which predication calls for a verb not always does its appearance maintain the transparency of the structure¹.

The question of the formation and structure of the extrapositional sentence has been discussed in both general and Hebrew linguistic literature (see Bussmann the entry *Extrapolation*), and the terminology used to define it characterizes its structure, the special status of the new subject and the syntactic transformation that

* This article is based on a paper written in Hebrew "Extrapositional Sentences in Contemporary Hebrew", *Lěšonenu* 60 (1997) 297-328.

¹ Prof. Gideon Goldenberg, in private communication.

it goes through. The Hebrew term *yixud* is derived from *meyuxad*, "special". The non-Hebrew terms express both the structure, which differs from the basic structure of an unmarked indicative sentence and the transfer of a part to either the beginning of a sentence or to its end. The term *Casus Pendens* (used by Driver), the independent case which "stands by itself", reflects the idea that the extraposed subject remains "hanging" and isolated² without a predicate (verb) which refers to it directly. The term "extraposition" (coined by Jespersen), on the other hand, reflects the structural aspect of the phenomenon with the extraposed element standing outside it "as if it had nothing to do there" (Jespersen 1937:35). For Jespersen extraposition marks both front and rear extraposition, i.e. topicalization and an "afterthought", viz. a word or words said after the sentence was completed (Jespersen 1909-1949:357). To explain the phenomenon of extraposition linguists used a few sets of terms: subject and predicate for the structural aspect and logical or psychological subject and predicate and later theme – rheme and topic – comment for the communicative aspect (see Jespersen 1924:145; Elffers-van Ketel 208-211; Lyons 335; Bussmann the entries *Topicalization*; *Left vs. right dislocation*). This is what gave rise to the use of the term *Topicalization* in the wider sense of transfer any element of a sentence to its head, which is in many indicative sentences the natural place of the subject. However, not every case of topicalization necessarily transforms the structure of the sentence into that of an extrapositional construction; extraposition is actually a specific case of topicalization.

In the generative literature the term *left (right) dislocation* is prevalent to designate front or rear extraposition (according to Bussmann p. 272a this term was presented by J. R. Ross, but Ross himself, in his book *Infinite Syntax!* P. 253, attributes the term to M. Gross). This is similar to Jespersen's *extraposition* in that it expresses a clearly structural reference.

In this paper, I will use the term *extraposition* for the construction and the term *subject* will be used to indicate also the extraposed subject.

In the definition of subject and predicate subject is the known element, whereas the predicate is the new information (Jespersen 1924:145). Observation of extrapositional sentences shows that they are clearly divided into two parts (see e.g. Bally, 60-70) – the determined extraposed part, the subject, and the adjacent sentence – the predicate. In spoken language there may be a pause between the extraposed part and the adjacent sentence. In written language the division may be indicated by punctuation.

² Prof. Gideon Goldenberg pointed out to me that H. Reckendorf referred to the construction from the point of view of isolation using the term "Isolierung des natürlichen Subjekts" in *Die syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen* (Leiden [1895-]1898) and in *Arabische Syntax* (Heidelberg 1921).

Listening to sentences with front extraposition in extemporaneous speech, one frequently gets the impression that the speaker began to speak about something, changed his mind and began to speak about something else that is connected to his first utterance. Rear extraposition expresses a second thought, some additional information regarding what has already been said.

Since topicalization is basically nominalization, the elements of the sentence which become the extraposed subject – the subject itself, the object and the attribute – are mainly nominal. For example³, in the sentence (1) *mišṭara, hi betax lo ʔohebet ʔet ʕinyan šel ha-rakkebet* ("the police, it surely does not like the train thing") the isolated element – the police – is represented in the adjacent sentence by the pronoun *hi* (lit: she; "it"). On the other hand, in the sentence (2) *ve-ha-mesummamim ha-ʔelle, terdi mehem* ("and those drug addicts, leave them") the isolated part is represented in the object *mehem* ("them") of its adjacent sentence. The extraposed part can be a noun, a name, a pronoun, an infinitive or a nominalization: (3) *Xayyim Štauber ha-ze, xabal še-lo pagašta ʔoto* ("this Chaim Shtaubert, it's a pity you didn't meet him"); (4) *ʔatta, gam ʔim ha-šed yidxap ʔotka laʕazor le-binka lo tedaʕ ma laʕašot* ("you, even if the devil pushes you to help your son, you won't know what to do"); (5) *ʔanaxnu, ʔim ha-megamma tihye [...] ʔanaxnu niššaʔer bli xayyot* ("we, if the trend is going to be [...] we will be left without animals"); (6) *laqaxat ʔani lo loqeax me-ʔap ʔexad ve-lignob, ʔani lo goneb, ʔabal laxmod [...] ʔani xomed u-leqannot ʔani meqanne* ("to take, I don't take from anyone, and to steal, I don't steal, but to covet [...], I covet and to envy, I envy"). (7) *u-ma še-nogeaʕ la-šekel šelli, halo ʔatta kbar mizman hiskamta ʕim ʕatsmekā sopit še-ʔani metumtemet legamrei* ("and regarding my intelligence, well you agreed with yourself a long time ago that I am completely stupid").

In two sentences I heard a preposition before the extraposed element: (8) *ʔet ha-taprit ʔani hekanti ʔoto* ("the menu, I prepared it"); (9) [...] *be-roḥ rubbam šel ha-ʕamutot ʔanaxnu rošmim ʔotam* ("[...] in most of the cases of non-profit organizations, we register them [...]"). Such sentences should be considered as if their transformation was not completed.

The extrapositional part may be one word, a phrase or a clause (see ex. 7), and it may subordinate another sentence: (10) *ʔadam še-ʕabar šaloš milxamot [...] matsabo [...] qaše mi-šellahem* ("a person who went through three wars [...], his situation [...] is worse than theirs"). The sentence adjacent to the isolated part can be simple or complex, nominal or verbal. The rear extraposition is expressed in utterances like (11) *ze be-toḵ ha-dam šello, ha-ballašut* ("it is in his blood, the detective work").

³ The numbered sentences which exemplify the phenomena were collected by me from contemporary Hebrew books, newspapers and conversations. The others are my own examples.

A number of scholars have discussed the Hebrew extrapositional sentence. Gessenius, Bravmann⁴ and Driver consider it a complex sentence. Blau holds a similar position, asserting that the use of an isolating element accords the psychological-logical subject and predicate the form of the grammatical subject and predicate and bridges the gap between the psychological-logical and the grammatical. The approach of Ornan and Goldenberg is mainly characterized by their reference to the extraposition of the verb (see particularly Goldenberg 1971).

I maintain that the extrapositional construction is a complex sentence; the extraposed element is the subject, and its adjacent sentence is its predicate. Its uniqueness as a complex sentence is that its predicate sentence is not subordinate.

2. Repetition and Isolation

2.1. Extraposition without an Explicit Resumptive Pronoun in the Predicate Sentence

Two conditions are necessary for an extrapositional sentence: isolation of the subject and a reference to it in the predicate sentence (= repetition). This repetition of the extraposed element in the predicate sentence is usually morphological. That is, the subject in the extrapositional sentence is represented in the predicate sentence by another element, usually some pronoun which refers back to it. Repetition is an essential element in the extrapositional sentence, but it does not necessarily express itself as a morphological element; it is definitely possible that the resumptive pronoun (or a noun) will not be explicit in the structure, but in such cases there is no doubt regarding its implied existence in the sentence (cf. Ornan 104-105). The morphological absence of the repeated element does not form in these cases anacoluthon; consider the following three examples:

- (12) *ha-hitnaš'ut ha-zot, ha-zxixut ha-lamdanit, ma 'anaxnu, 'anaxnu kan seminar 'aqademi 'o hitgayysut le-hatsalat xayyim tse'irim?*
 ("this arrogance, this learned hauteur, what are we, are we here an academic seminar or a mobilization to save young lives?").

The "academic seminar" in the predicate sentence points at the "arrogance" and "learned hauteur". The speaker means that (1) the discussion he participated in was not intended to clarify academic matters but to take practical decisions;

⁴ He thinks (p. 181) that extrapositional sentences have developed from interrogative sentences.

- (2) "this arrogance" and the "learned hauteur" mean "our arrogant behaviour", "our learned hauteur" and "we" in the adjacent sentence refers to it.

- (13) *'eize 'ereḥ yape. ve-gam 'att. 'amarti: toda. be-'einay matsa xen ha-bittuy šellka, tse'irim meraxapim. ve-derek 'agab, lišmoa' 'etsleka muziqa giz'it vekulei, be-linda tištaddel lo lipgoa'* ("what a beautiful evening. And you too. I said: thanks. I liked that expression of yours, floating youngsters. And by the way, to hear at your place great music etc., Linda try not to hurt").

The meaning of the extraposed element "to hear at your place great music etc." is clear to both the speaker and the hearer and doing it may "hurt Linda". Therefore, the statement "Linda, try not to hurt" is a repetition of the preceding matter and is understood from the context.

- (14) *ha-keseḥ še-natatta ke'illu lo natatta* ("the money you gave, it is as if you did not give [it]").

In this sentence, the extraposed element subordinates a sentence which includes only a *verb*; this verb also serves as the nucleus of the predicate sentence, and therefore, the content is completely understood from the context, particularly since the missing resumptive pronoun in the sentence is a direct object, which has a tendency to fall in attributive sentences in contemporary Hebrew. Thus the structure *ze ha-'iš še-ra'iti* (lit: this the man that I saw) appears alongside *ze ha-'iš še-ra'iti 'oto* (lit: this the man that I saw him). However, when the object is indirect, the preposition usually stays: *ze ha-'iš še-dibbarti 'itto* (lit: this the man that I spoke with him) and not *ze ha-'iš še-dibbarti* (lit: this the man that I spoke). Nevertheless I found two examples of omitting the resumptive pronoun as an indirect object; both represent low spoken language:

- (15) *ha-limmudei qodeš' ani biklal lo me'unyan* ("the religious studies I am not at all interested").

The missing preposition is *be-* "in"; it should have been *ha-limmudei qodeš' ani biklal lo me'unyan bahem*.

- (16) *be'erek šiššim 'axuz mi-ma še-katabta 'ani dei maskim* ([the spelling mistake of *be'erek* instead of *be'erek* is originally written] "about sixty percent of what you wrote, I more or less agree").

The missing preposition is *'im / 'et* "with". It should have been *be'erek šiššim 'axuz mi-ma še-katabta 'ani dei maskim 'im ze*.

To sum up: as the repetition of the subject does not need to be expressed in a morphological manner, we may therefore conclude that an explicit resumptive pronoun is not a necessary condition for defining a sentence as extrapositional.

Isolation, on the other hand, is a necessary condition for extraposition. But not every isolated expression creates an extraposition: in certain stylistic utterances, one may find a sentence such as *pagašti ʔoto. ʔetmol*. ("I met him. Yesterday"), in which the isolated part does not create an extrapositional construction.

An element of the sentence can be isolated when it is in an appositive status. Therefore, from the structural point of view, one may see every verbal sentence with an explicit subject as extrapositional (Goldenberg 1998:169; 177). We will see below examples of verbal sentences with overt pronouns which should be considered extrapositional constructions if the isolation of their subject is obvious (see also Bar, "Pronouns in Hebrew Verbal Sentences"; forthcoming).

2.2. Levels of Extrapolation

The expressiveness of the sentence is derived from the extent of the isolation of the subject. In this regard I find that there are five levels: at the highest level of extraposition we find those sentences in which the subject is preceded by the prepositional(!) phrase *(ba)ʔašer le-*, which specially serves for expressing extraposition (in addition to its adverbial role). At the lowest level we find sentences without a resumptive pronoun in which the order of the words has changed (these are considered extrapositional only due to the isolation of the subject). Actually, only the first two types are undisputed extrapositional constructions, whereas the other three are *structurally* extrapositional, but it is their expressiveness that determines whether or not they should be functionally considered extrapositional sentences.

The following are examples for the five levels:

I. Sentences with *(ba)ʔašer le-* and the like; *(ba)ʔašer le-* is a rigid adverbial phrase which is used to present an isolated subject, and it is most interesting that it starts with a preposition. The development of a specialized structure to designate isolation is a sign of its high level. In written language the extraposed element which is preceded by this phrase is always separated from the predicate sentence by punctuation:

- (17) *ʔašer la-ʔamana ha-palešinit, ʔani gam sbura še-hem tsrikim lešannot ʔotah* ("regarding the Palestinian Covenant, I also think they should change it").

II. Sentences in which the subject is designated in the predicate sentence by a resumptive pronoun, which serves as an object or an attribute, and the distinction

between the subject and the predicate sentence is clear-cut, represent a high level of extraposition. Unlike the former extrapositional sentences they have no special marker of isolation:

- (18) *mišpaxa, ʔatt yodaʕat, ʔein li muššag ʔeik ʔoklim ʔet ze* ("family, you know, I have no idea how to digest it").

III. Sentences in which the subject is a noun and the third person pronoun or the demonstrative pronoun represents it in the predicate sentence as its subject, reflect a lower level of extraposition. In some of these sentences the erosion of the expressiveness of the utterance is clearly felt, and they may be considered copular sentences (see below). Hebrew is replete with such sentences in which the resumptive pronoun is a third person pronoun or the demonstrative *ze* ("this"):

- (19) *ʔopozitsya [kazot] hi bilti nisbelet* ("[such] an opposition it is intolerable").
 (20) *ʔani poʕel [...] še-mipleget ha-ʕaboda, hi tiššaʕer ba-šilṭon* ("I am working [...] that the Labour party it will remain in power").

IV. Sentences in which the subject is a personal pronoun and the repetition is by a pronominal index of the verb are on a low level of extraposition:

- (21) *va-ʔani, še-lipnei regaʕ hayiti raq noseaʕ ragil ba-rakkebet nišlapṭi pitʔom* ("[...] and I, who just a moment ago was just a regular passenger on the train [...] was suddenly pulled up [...]").
 (22) *va-ʔani hen kol ha-šanim ha-ʔelle lo ratsiti be-qirbat yišraʕelim* ("and I, verily, all these years, I didn't desire the proximity of Israelis [...]").
 (23) *ʔani? mi-kitta alep lo tsiyyarti* ("I? since first grade I haven't drawn").

In these above sentences the extraposed element is the pronoun; the element which refers to it in the predicate sentence is the person of the verb; the isolation of the pronoun is achieved by the word order of the sentence, with an adverbial standing between the personal pronoun and the verb of the predicate sentence. The use of the first person as the subject of these sentences is clearly highly emotive and expressive.

V. The lowest level of extraposition is that of sentences in which there is no repetition of the subject and only its isolation – i.e. placing it at the head of the sentence – makes the construction extrapositional. I found three examples, (14), (15) and (16) above. Had the isolated subject been preceded by a preposition in these sentences, it would have become an object and the sentences would be simple sentences beginning with an object. Topicalizing the *ha-keseṭ še-natatta*, *ha-limmudei qodeš* and *beʕerek šiššim ʔaxuz* and the omission of a preceding

preposition emphasizes and isolates them, and therefore, such a sentence should be considered an extrapositional sentence. This type is not prevalent, and not surprisingly, it belongs to a low level of speech.

2.3. *The Status of the Personal Pronoun in the Pattern Noun – Pronoun – Noun / Adjective*

Linguists are divided over the definition of the status of the personal pronoun in such sentences. Driver (1892) and Goldenberg (1998) see it as a resumptive pronoun in an extrapositional sentence pointing at the subject; they do not define it as a copula. Rubinstein, Azar and Ornan see it as both a resumptive pronoun and a copula, whereas Rosén considers it a copula.

According to my findings, frequently the pronoun in nominal sentences should not be considered a copula. However, in certain types of nominal sentences in contemporary Hebrew, one may indeed view the use of the personal pronoun as a copula, i.e. as the core of the predication, where attrition of the nominal predication and weakening of the expressiveness of certain structures necessitates placement of a pronoun between the subject and the predicate of a sentence.

The following are the nominal structures with a resumptive pronoun:

I. A sentence in which the predicate of its predicate sentence is an adjective such as *ha-mišqapayim hem šburim* lit: the glasses they broken (“the glasses /they/ are broken”).

II. A sentence in which the predicate of its predicate sentence is a prepositional phrase, such as *ha-seper hu ‘al ha-šulxan / šelli* “the book /it/ is on the table / mine”.

III. An equation sentence in which the first element is determined, such as *ha-‘opannyim hem / ze kli taxbura* (“the bike /it/ is a vehicle”).

IV. An equation sentence in which both its elements are undetermined, such as *‘opannyim hem / ze kli taxbura* (“a bike /it/ is a vehicle”).

V. An equation sentence in which both parts are determined, such as *ha-hatslaxa šello hi ha-hatslaxa šellanu* (“his success /it/ is our success”).

VI. An equation sentence in which the second element is determined, such as *yayin ze ha-mašqe* (“wine /it/ is THE drink”).

In a sentence of structure VI there is generally an attribute following the second noun. In structures I-V the personal pronoun may rarely appear at the end of the sentence in eloquent style. In sentences of type I, the pronoun can be deleted, and the sentence will still be clear, since its predicate is a deverbal adjective and therefore the predication is not doubted. In sentences of type II

the pronoun is also optional because the second element is a prepositional phrase. Examination of sentence types III, IV and V shows a difference between equation sentences III on one hand and IV and V on the other hand. The predication in type III is clear even without a pronoun, since there is a difference between the determined and undetermined elements of the sentence, whereas in equation sentences of types IV and V this is not so: here the pronoun is necessary since the marking on both sides of the equation is identical (determined or undetermined); there is no stress on any one of the elements and the predicative distinction is eroded, though the two parts of the sentence can be well distinguished by a long pause between them. Therefore, the role of the pronoun here is different from its role in the other structures and we can view it as a copular usage in its conventional meaning, i.e. as the core of the expression of predication.

3. Front Extraposition

In most of the sentences in which the extraposed element is a noun and the resumptive pronoun in the predicate sentence is an independent pronoun, the predicate sentences include assertions and the like and they are often nominal, though such verbal predicate sentences are to be found as well (see e.g. 24). These constructions are very prevalent in all levels of spoken and written Hebrew. The routine use of the personal pronoun as a resumptive pronoun which refers to the subject is found both in equation sentences and before a predicate which is an adjective or a prepositional phrase, as already indicated above. In such sentences, when the identification of the subject is unambiguous, the personal pronouns *hu* or *hi* (“he” or “it”; “she”) will appear and not the demonstrative pronoun *ze* (“this”). In equation sentences *ze* appears when it refers to non-specific matters, and being neutralized it does not necessarily agree in number with any of the sentence members (i.e. as in a well known song *yeladim* [mas.pl.] *ze* [mas.sg.] *šimxa* [fem.sg.], “children are a joy”). The expressiveness of many of the sentences of this type has been eroded (as noted above) and they are no longer to be considered extrapositional. Some, however, still are:

(24) *‘adon ‘abba šellka hu qore ‘otka nono* (“Mister your father, he calls you Nono”).

(25) *ha-keseq, ‘im ‘omnam yihye keseq, hu lo šellak* (“the money, if there will be money indeed, it is not yours”).

In (25) the parenthetical conditional clause *‘im ‘omnam yihye keseq* (“if there will be money indeed”) isolates the subject and calls for a personal pronoun after it.

- (26) *ve-²atta be-²ivvalteka xošeš še-koax ze bišbīl leharbits* ("and you in your stupidity think that strength it is for to hit").

A resumptive demonstrative pronoun may also play the role of the predicate in the predicate sentence (see Goldenberg 1983), as seen in the following sentences with a structure of subject – predicate – subject. In these sentences the demonstrative pronoun is the stressed element of the predicate sentence; it serves as the predicate and also points at both the extrapositional subject and the subject of the predicate sentence:

- (27) *hitqahut xušim, ze haya ha-tahalik še-marbit ha-xayyalim ^cabru* ("blunting of senses, this was the process that most of the soldiers [...] went though during these months").
- (28) *qape ^cim glida [...] ze ma še-²ani rotsa ^cakša(y)v* ("coffee with ice cream [...] this is what I want now").

The extraposed subject may also be repeated by a noun instead of a (resumptive) pronoun. Its repetition by means of a noun may or may not have been meant for sake of emphasis: the absence of intonation markers in the written language makes it difficult to divine the author's intention. In any case, a noun is more specific than a pronoun, and its use for repetition of the isolated subject is not the conventional way to indicate the appositive element in the predicate sentence, though it exists. Such a repetition may of course be tautological:

- (29) *ha-somo ha-ze, ²epšar haya laxšob še-²išteka ha-mesaxreret baxara lah ba-sop ²et Gregori Pek* ("this Somo, one may think that your dizzying wife [...] finally chose for herself a Gregory Pek").

In the aforementioned example only a name of someone very different from that Mr. Somo can properly express the contempt and the sarcasm that the writer wishes to express. Therefore, the extrapositional subject could not have been expressed through any resumptive pronoun but only through another suitable noun.

- (30) *ve-ha-yeled, ²eik hitslaxta lehabi ²et ha-yeled?* ("and the boy how did you succeed in bringing the boy?").

The resumptive pronoun in the predicate sentence may often be an object (or, seldom, an adverbial). Actually, the most common type of extrapositional sentences that I have found are those in which the extraposed element is a noun with a resumptive pronoun in the predicate sentence serving as an object. Examples:

- (31) *ha-yeled? Muttar leka laqaxat ²oto kaka?* ("the boy? Are you allowed to take him like that?").

- (32) *ve-²oto miḥṣan hem ^camdu bo* ("and that exam, they passed it").

When a preposition appears before the extraposed element, the latter should be considered as an incompletely transformed subject. It is understandable that such sentences appear in the spoken language (see ex. 8 above). An extraposed subject which is an adverb is rare⁵; I found only one example, in which the preposition has been omitted and hence its transformation is complete; its resumptive element in the predicate sentence is also an explicit adverbial:

- (33) *Qapulski? yihyu šam harbe ²anašim* ("Qapulski's? [an Israeli café] there will be there lots of people").

Extraposition in Hebrew also customarily appears in expressions of possession and existence:

- (34) *²immka kḥar haya la maspiq tuga mimka ve-²illu ²ani yeš li midda šel sippuq xelqi* ("your mother had already enough sadness from you whereas, I, I had a measure of partial satisfaction").

The extraposed element can be a personal pronoun⁶, represented in the predicate sentence by the same pronoun, standing alone or being part of the verb, if the predicate sentence is verbal. Not everyone would agree that ex. (22) *²ani? mi-kitta ²alep lo tsiyyarti* is an extrapositional sentence; however, placing the personal pronoun at the head of the sentence in certain situations isolates it and emphasizes it, as already shown above, and a question is anyway naturally an isolating environment. Sentences with the first and second persons are more likely to express emotions such as complaint, apology, insult etc., and therefore the first and the second persons' pronouns may be more easily considered isolated and thus may be distinct as extrapositional. Some examples are as follows; in the first example the predicate is a nominal sentence, the second and the third examples are complex sentences:

- (35) *hi gḥoha mimmenni ve-yapa, va-²ani, mi ²ani biklal?* ("she is taller than me, and pretty, and I, who am I at all?").
- (36) *ve-²atta, yoter toḥ lek še-hayita mapsiq kḥar ligdol [...]* ("and you, it would have been better for you had you already stopped growing [...]").

⁵ Such examples were mentioned by Schwartzwald without indicating their sources.

⁶ Schwarzwald does not think that in Modern Hebrew the pronoun should generally be considered extrapositional, though it may happen if the pronoun differs from the predicate sentence's subject. However, some of my examples such as (5) above show that the isolated pronoun and the subject of the predicate sentence may be the same.

- (37) ²att. xasabti še-²att xabera šelli ("you, I thought that you are my friend").

In (36) and (37) the predicate sentence is complex; in (36) the repetition of the subject is both in the independent and the subordinate clauses, and in (37) the repetition of the subject is in the subordinate clause.

The attribute too may serve as a resumptive pronoun; such sentences are rather common. Consider the following examples:

- (38) va-²ani, ha-yadayim šelli qšurot ("and I my hands are tied").
 (39) hem tapqidam liqnot karṭisim ("they, their duty is to buy tickets").

In these examples the appositive element in the predicate sentence is the possessive inflected pronoun which corresponds to the extraposed element. From the point of view of the type of the extrapositional subject we may say that a simple sentence in which the subject is a noun + a possessive suffix can be easily transformed into an extrapositional sentence whose subject is an independent pronoun by placing in its first sentential position the personal pronoun which corresponds to the inflected noun.

A resumptive pronoun which is a possessive suffix appears in nominal extrapositional constructions which bear a resemblance to equation sentences. In this structure nouns with the meaning of *perušo*, *mašma^cuto* (lit: its meaning; "that means") serve as the subject of the predicate sentence. The lexical content of these words has been eroded to a certain extent, and the important element in them is the possessive pronoun, which corresponds to a personal pronoun. Therefore they can actually be replaced by an independent personal or demonstrative pronoun; the omission of the noun "meaning" will not matter. For example:

- (40) vittur ^cal ne²emanut zo, mašma^cuto sopah šel ha-tnu^ca ("foregoing this loyalty, that means the end of the movement").
 (41) hasgarat[o] [...] li-dei šaliṭ zar perušo hapqarat qodeš ha-qodašim [...] ("giving it up to the hands of a foreign ruler, that means abandoning the Holy of Holies [...]").

In this structure, "time" or "measuring" words (in their widest extent) may also be the subject of the predicate sentence:

- (42) šetax [ha-medina] rubbo mišor ("the area of [the country] most of it is a plane").

It would seem that sentences such as the above are typical of journalistic and academic writing. A place name (see ex.33) and a question (ex. 31; 33; see fn.4)

may also function as the extraposed subject, and a subordinate (nominalized) clause may also play the same role:

- (43) mi še-²abba ve-²imam šello kbar metu, ve-²išša ²ein lo, vi-(y)ladim ²ap pa^cam lo yihyu lo, hu lo tsarik šem mišpaxa ("he whose father and mother have already died, and a wife he doesn't have and children he will never have he doesn't need a family name").

As a rule, the extraposed subject agrees with the element which points at it, in gender and number. However, in a few examples there was no agreement:

- (44) ²elle še-²ohabim ²et manzini ²ani rotse lesapper lakem [...] ("those who love Manzini, I would like to tell you [...]").
 (45) mišehi kamoni ²ein šum sikkuy še-ha-goral yaṭil li-sbibatah ²et ha-geber [...] ("somebody like me, there is no chance at all that fate will bring her the man [...]").

Actually, the phrase *mišehi kamoni* ("somebody like me") means *I*, and the sentence could have been worded *²ani ²ein šum sikkuy še-ha-goral yaṭil li-sbibati [...]*. However, in this example the agreement of the possessive pronoun is to the core *mišehi* ("somebody") and not to its attribute *kamoni* ("like me"), so that we find *li-sbibatah* (lit: to her environment; "to her") instead of *li-sbibati* ("to me").

4. Rear Extrapolation

Although linguists who wrote about extraposition in Hebrew did not actually refer to rear extraposition, the corpus of sentences which I have investigated clearly shows that this construction is common in Modern Hebrew.

In sentences with front extraposition the subject and the resumptive pronoun which points back to it are generally not adjacent. Rear extrapositional sentences, however, may resemble sentences with apposition – the two elements, the subject and the element which refers to it, may follow each other. This makes it difficult to distinguish between the two types of sentences, but this difficulty should not be an obstacle in places where the distinction exists. For example, in (46) *ze ha-²okel, bureqas?* ("is this the food, borax?"), it is quite clear that if we change the place of "borax" and move it to the front position, we will keep the extrapositional construction, but then it will be front extraposition. If the elements are only appositive elements with no after thought expression, it will not be possible to move one of them to the first sentential position without a basic change of the sentence structure. In a sentence like *hu laxats ²et yado šel dan, ha-šaxqan ha-toḇ*

be-yoter ("he shook the hands of Dan, the best player"), it will not be possible to say *dan, hu laxats ʔet yado šel ha-šaxqan ha-toḥ be-yoter* ("Dan, he shook the hands of the best player"), if we want to keep the identification Dan = the best player. Only when the appositive element is a real after thought expression it can be topicalized. The following are other examples of the same construction; the after thought expression is a noun and the cataphoric pronoun is either demonstrative or pronominal:

- (47) *ʔeik hem meʕizzim, ha-ʔanašim ha-ʔelle* ("how dare they, those people?").
- (48) *ze ʕala li harbe kesp he-xalah ve-ha-geṭ ve-ha-mišpaṭim ve-ha-kol* ("this costed me lots of money, the milk and the divorce and these court suits and everything").
- (49) *hi ṭippus, ʔimma šellka* ("she is one of a kind, your mother").

The rear extraposed element in these sentences sheds light on what is indicated in the preceding sentence by the pronoun and clarifies its essence. As seen in the following examples, it may also be a nominalization:

- (50) *ze lo kol kak mešanne li še-ʔišteka yodaʕat me-ha-halvaʔa* ("It doesn't matter to me so much that your wife knows about the loan").
- (51) *ze nakon ma še-ʔomrim ʕaleikem?* ("is it true what they say about you")?

In these sentences the content of the pronoun which is the subject of the predicate sentence is unspecified. Anything can be the "it" which doesn't matter or the "it" that is true. Therefore the addition of the rear extrapositional expression at the end of the sentence is necessary to provide it with real lexical content. In all sentences with rear extraposition the preceding pronoun is a demonstrative pronoun, except for those sentences in which the subjects are certain people: in those the preceding pronoun is a personal pronoun.

5. Extraposition of the Verb

Extraposition of the verb should not be treated as one general subject, since, as Goldenberg (1998) has shown, one must distinguish between the different components of the verb (the person, the predicative lexeme, and the nexus between them). Above I brought examples for the extraposition of the person of the verb. Here I am dealing with the extraposition of its lexical content, which is done by a nominal deverbal form, the infinitive. The positioning of the infinitive, which is

deprived of tense, modality, person or number at the head of the sentence, common in many languages, makes it, according to Goldenberg (1971), into the "logical subject" of the sentence. He points out that "it is obvious, however, that a verb cannot be represented by a pronoun and with no proverb (i.e. vicarious verb) available, tautological repetition is compulsory" (see also Mishor). Ornan dealt with the extraposition of the lexical content of the verb too. He believes that "extraposition of the verb usually occurs when the verb serves as the predicate of a following sentence in which the content contradicts or questions the previous sentence".

Sentences with extraposition of the verb in this study are of two sorts: those with front extraposition and those with rear extraposition. Indeed, the linguistic literature, which deals with verbal extraposition in Hebrew, speaks mainly of front extraposition. However, rear extraposition of the verb is to be found as well. Two constructions can also be discerned from the point of view of pointing at the infinitive within the predicate sentence: an inflected verb of the root of the infinitive and a cataphoric / anaphoric demonstrative pronoun. In Hebrew a demonstrative pronoun may point at the infinitive, i.e. in such cases the transformation of the verb into a nominal form is complete and it is referred to as if it were a masc. sg. form. In most of my front extraposition examples the inflected verb form is negated and it is clear that the placing of the verb at the head of the sentence is intended to point at the contrast between what could have been done – as expressed by the infinitival lexeme – and what actually happened, which is expressed in the inflected verb form.

In sentences in which the infinitive is in rear extraposition, there is always a preceding cataphoric pronoun in the sentence just like in all other cases of rear extraposition; in these sentences the pronoun is a demonstrative, and its placement there is natural since it indicates a general matter and not a specific entity. These sentences are found mainly in spoken language, but also in writing.

5.1. Front Extraposition

Most of the sentences of this type which I have found are from one book. The use of this structure is the distinguishing style of one of its characters. Consider ex. (6): *laqaxat ʔani lo loqeax me-ʔap ʔexad ve-lignoh, ʔani lo goneh, ʔahal laxmod [...]* *ʔani xomed u-leqannot ʔani meqanne* ("to take, I don't take from anyone, and to steal, I don't steal, but to covet [...], I covet and to envy, I envy"). In this example the inflected verb is of the infinitive's root and it is negated. The following one is interesting because of its second part, which shows that the corresponding element of the infinitive is a noun:

- (52) *leʔekol ʔani ʔakalti ʕašahim, u-mayim ʔani šatiti min ha-nahar* ("to eat, I ate grass, and water I drank from the river").

This coordinate sentence includes two clauses; the inflected verb in the first part is not negated. The noun *mayim* ("water") is the counterpart of the infinitive *le'ekol* – "to eat"; the personal pronoun in the first clause corresponds to the identical pronoun in the second clause, since the actor is the same in both clauses, and the two inflected verbs are semantically parallel ("eat"; "drink").

In the next two examples, however, the repetition of the infinitive is performed not by another inflected verb but by a resumptive pronoun, which points back to the verb:

(53) [...] *lehatsits be-miktabim šel ʔaxerim ze beseder mi-bxinatek* ("to look at other peoples' letters that is okay for you").

(54) [...] *lišʔol ze lo ʕole kasep* ("to ask, this does not cost money").

5.2. Rear Extraposition

Unlike an infinitive in front extraposition, whose repeated counterpart may be a verb of the same root, a verb in rear extraposition cannot be preceded by any inflected verb. Thus in these instances the demonstrative pronoun will always appear as the preceding element. There is a general assertion about something undefined such as *ze ʔob* ("this is good") or the like, and then an explicit explanation is necessary for understanding what "is good"; the explicit explanation is an after thought infinitival expression (though a verbal noun may appear there as well):

(55) *ze metaskel lirʔot ʔotam nimlaʔim ka* [...] ("it is frustrating to see them escape like that").

(56) *zot hayta haxlaʔa meʔod mitxašebet mi-tsiddek lehitqalleax qodem* ("that was a very considerate decision on your part, to shower before").

In (56) the demonstrative noun has the fem. form *zot* because the predicate of the sentence is the word *haxlaʔa* ("decision"), a fem. form in Hebrew.

6. Conclusion

The extraposition construction is a complex sentence with a basically nominal structure. It has a clear distinction between subject and predicate, the latter being a non-subordinate sentence. This distinction is expressed in the spoken language by prosody and by punctuation in the written language. Extrapositional sentences have certain syntactic traits which distinguish between them and other

complex sentences, such as: non-subordination, isolation of the subject, its representation in the predicate sentence – usually, but not always – by a resumptive pronoun which points at it. Some nominal constructions which are structurally extrapositional have lost their expressiveness and one can notice the developing of a nominal copula, a pronoun, in them.

Since making an element into a subject means according it a nominal status, it is usually the nominal parts of the sentence – the subject, the object and the attribute – which are extraposed. While the verb and the adverb may also be transformed into an extraposed subject, such a transformation is less common. When the verbal lexeme is extraposed, the element which refers to it in the adjacent sentence is a verb of the same root or a demonstrative pronoun. The latter possibility emphasizes the nominal status of the infinitive.

References

- Azar, M., 1977. *Surface and Depth in Syntax*. Haifa [In Hebrew].
 Bar, T., forthcoming. Pronouns in Hebrew Verbal Sentences.
 Bally, Ch., 1944. *Linguistique générale et linguistique française*. Berne.
 Blau, J., 1958. A New Book on Syntax, *Lěšonenu* 22, 67-77 [In Hebrew].
 Bravmann, M. M., 1944. Some Syntactic Problems, *Tarbiz* 15, 181-192 [In Hebrew].
 Bussmann, H., 1996. *Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics*. London-New York.
 Driver, S. R., 1892. The Casus Pendens. In: *A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew and Some Other Syntactical Questions*. Appendix V, 264-274. Oxford.
 Elffers-van Ketel, E., 1991, *The Historiography of Grammatical Concepts, 19th and 20th-century changes in the subject-predicate conception and the problem of their historical reconstruction*, Amsterdam-Atlanta, Ga.
 Gesenius, 1910. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, As Edited and Enlarged by The Late E. Kautzsch, Second English Edition, Revised in Accordance with the Twenty-Eighth German Edition (1909) by A. E. Cowley. Oxford.
 Goldenberg, G., 1971. Tautological Infinitive, *Israel Oriental Studies* 1, 36-85; reprinted in *Studies in Semitic Linguistics, selected writings by Gideon Goldenberg*, 66-115. Jerusalem 1998.
 Goldenberg, G., 1983. On Syriac Sentence Structure. In: *Arameans Aramaic and the Aramaic Literary Tradition* (M. Sokoloff ed.), Ramat-Gan, 97-140; reprinted in *Studies in Semitic Linguistics, selected writings by Gideon Goldenberg*, 525-568. Jerusalem 1998.
 Goldenberg, G., 1998. On Verbal Structure and the Hebrew Verb. In: *Studies in Semitic Linguistics, selected writings by Gideon Goldenberg*. Jerusalem [the English translation of the 1985 study].
 Jespersen, O., 1924. *The Philosophy of Grammar*. London.
 Jespersen, O., 1909-1949. *A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*. London – Copenhagen.

- Jespersen, O., 1937. *Analytic Syntax*. Copenhagen.
 Lyons, J., 1968. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge.
 Mishor, M., 1987. 'Latset Tetse' etc., *Language Studies* 2-3, 177-197. [In Hebrew].
 Ornan, U., 1969. *Syntax of Modern Hebrew*. Jerusalem [In Hebrew].
 Rosén, H. B., 1966. *Good Hebrew, Studies in Syntax*. Jerusalem [In Hebrew].
 Ross, J. R., 1986. *Infinite Syntax*. New-Jersey.
 Rubinstein, E., 1969. *The Nominal Sentence, Studies in Contemporary Syntax*. Tel Aviv [In Hebrew].
 Schwartzwald, O., 1976. Regarding the Grammaticality and Creation of Extrapositional Sentences, *Bar Ilan Annual* 13, 321-340. Ramat Gan [In Hebrew].

Adrian Măcelaru

Center for Arab Studies,
University of BucharestON THE ORIGIN OF THE INTRANSITIVE FORM IV VERBS
IN CLASSICAL ARABIC

1. Introduction

It is common knowledge that Proto-Semitic had a prefix $*š(a)^1$ which would serve the function of deriving causatives from basic verbs (Kienast 2001:484). The antiquity of this morpheme must be extremely remarkable since an affix /s/ with causative meaning is attested in many other branches of the Afroasiatic phylum, as for instance Berber, Cushitic and Egyptian. The sibilant $*š$ of this Proto-Semitic prefix has subsequently undergone, in a number of Semitic languages, phonetic changes, becoming /ha-/. In other Semitic languages this phonetic change has went even further so that the prefix under discussion has ended up as /'a-/. Classical Arabic belongs to this last category, although it preserves relics of the preceding two stages; thus, the 'sibilant-stage' can be seen in Form X, *istaf'ala*, while the 'laryngeal h stage' is met in a few verbs, cf. *harāqa* 'pour out' < *rāqa* 'flow out, pour fourth' (Fleisch 1979:II,283).

The Arabic verbal form derived by means of the prefix 'a- is usually called Form IV. Its original Semitic (and most likely even originally Afroasiatic) basic meaning is causative. As it is often the case with derivational morphemes, Classical Arabic Form IV displays, beside the causative value, other meanings, too. Thus, there are Form IV verbs having the same meaning as the basic verbs from which they are derived. Then, there are Form IV verbs that have noncausative values. Larcher (2003:53-65) classifies these noncausative meanings of Form IV verbs:

¹ We are not tackling here the question whether the vowel /a/ following the sibilant is part of the causative prefix or has an epenthetic origin, since neither possibility impinges on the results of our present discussion.