kansas working papers in linguistics

volume 5
1980
no. 1

edited by

Patricia Hamel and Ronald Schaefer

Acknowledgements

PREFACE

As far as is known, all languages have ways of expressing modality, i.e., notions of possibility, necessity, contingency, etc. But this pervasive phenomenon has so far been the object of little systematic linguistic analysis. In fact, investigators do not even agree on the scope of the term modality. Very roughly speaking, two kinds of modality have been distinguished, namely epistemic and deontic. The former involves the speaker's judgment as to the degree of certainty of an event or state of affairs being referred to. Deontic modality, on the other hand, has to do with such notions as obligation, permissability and necessity. However, as useful as this distinction is, little is known so far concerning the linguistic patterns which express those ideas. It is clear that the modality systems of a great many languages will need to be thoroughly scrutinized and compared before any conclusions can be drawn as to their place in 'universal grammar.'

The papers included in this volume of the Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics were written by graduate students at the University of Kansas for a seminar on modality taught by Professor Choon-Kyu Oh in the spring of 1979. They deal with a variety of topics bearing on modality and with a variety of languages and language families. It is our hope that these papers will stimulate comments from colleagues at other institutions.

The Editors

CONTENTS

MODALITY IN MODERN HEBREW: A Preliminary Attempt
To Account for Epistemic and Deontic Interpretations

Esther Dromi

Abstract: Several aspects of the modality system in
Modern Hebrew are examined. In general, Hebrew modal
expressions are found to be unambiguous as to epistemic
and deontic interpretations. The behavior of modal
expressions with respect to a number of syntactic cate-
gories and constructions is also examined. It is pro-
posed that future investigation focus on the complex
morphological structure of the lexical forms expressing
notions of Hebrew modality.

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to examine the modality system in
Modern Hebrew. Rather than attempt an exhaustive analysis of Hebrew
modality, the following will focus on a number of the major characteris-
tics of that system. Hebrew modality, as far as I know, has not been
studied systematically, and for this reason, all of the examples and
discussion notes to follow are based on my own intuitions as a native
Israeli-Hebrew speaker.[1]

Hebrew utilizes a very distinct modality system in which most
modal expressions are not ambiguous between epistemic and deontic inter-
pretations. Therefore, the epistemic and deontic categories of Hebrew
will be discussed in separate sections of this paper. For each modal
category various expressions will be presented ranging in intensity from
possibility to certainty for epistemic modality and from permission to
obligation for deontic modality. After discussion of the different de-
vices by which Hebrew expresses modality, various syntactic categories
and syntactic constructions, such as negation, questions and tense will
be examined with special reference to their behavior within the modali-
ty system.

Epistemic Modals in Hebrew

Epistemic modals in Hebrew express one of three core notions:
possibility, probability and certainty. As is indicated below, alter-
native terms are available to express the same modal notion. In the
following chart epistemic modal expressions along with a literal gloss
and grammatical classification are presented.

(1)

possibility	probability	certainty
uli (adv) 'perhaps'	kanir?e (sent. pred) as seems 'apparently'	betax (adv) 'securely/cer-tainly'
yitaxen (sent. pred) 'likely/feasible'	karov le-vadai (adv) near to certainty 'almost certain'	batuax (adj) sure;secure 'assured/certain'
efšar (sent. pred) 'maybe/perhaps'		Vadai be-vadai (adv) certain; in cer-tain 'most certainly'
yaxol lihiot *(VP) able to be 'perhaps/maybe'	tsarix lihiot *(VP) need to be 'probably'	muxrax lihiot *(AP, VP)
		xaiav lihiot is obliged to be 'must happen/ bound to happen

*asterik forms are the epistemic/deontic ambiguous expression

Most expressions with an epistemic interpretation in Hebrew have no deontic interpretation, as one might expect from other languages. Only expressions that can be represented as $\begin{bmatrix} \text{verb} \\ \text{pred. adj.} \end{bmatrix} + \text{lihiot}$ are am-biguous as to a deontic or epistemic interpretation. For example, ambi-guity will occur when a modal expression takes one of the following com-plements: NP, AP, or Locative.[2]

(2) a. dan yaxol lihiot ba-bait
   Dan modal to be   at home
   'It is possible that Dan is at home'   and
   'Dan is permitted to be at home'

   b. dan yaxol lihiot recini
   Dan modal to be   serious
   'It is possible that Dan is serious'   and
   'Dan is permitted to be serious'

   c. dan yaxol lihiot student
   Dan modal to be   a student
   'It is possible that Dan is a student'   and
   'Dan is permitted to be a student'

   d. dan tsarix lihiot ba-bait
   Dan modal to be at home
   'It is probably the case that Dan is at home'   and

'Dan is obliged to be at home'

e. dan <u>muxrax</u> <u>lihiot</u> student
      <u>xaiav</u>
      modal   to be   a student
   'Dan is certainly a student'   and
   'Dan is under a strong obligation to be a student'

It is true for Hebrew, as for English and other Languages (Steele, (1975), that epistemic/deontic ambiguity shows a systematic and predictable relationship. As was argued by Horn (in Steele (1975), a possibility reading relates to permission in the same way as a probability reading relates to weak obligation and a certainty reading relates to a strong requirement.

In Hebrew, adjectives, adverbs and sentential predicates function as pure epistemic modals. The distinction between adverbs and other form classes is manifested in terms of word order. The class of adverbials shows a relatively free or floating position within the simple sentence construction.

(3) <u>Uli</u>   dan <u>oved</u> ;   dan <u>vuli</u>   <u>oved</u> ; dan <u>oved</u> <u>uli</u>
    modal Dan work/is working   modal   modal
    'It is possible that Dan works'

Other modality terms, besides adverbs, always appear in the initial position of a construction such that the modal precedes the proposition which it modifies.

(4) a. <u>yitaxen</u>   še- dan <u>oved</u>
       <u>yaxol lihiot</u>
       <u>efšar</u>
       modal   that Dan work/is working
       'It is possibly the case that Dan is working'

    b. <u>kanir?e</u>   <u>še-</u>   <u>dan</u> <u>ba-bait</u>[2]
       <u>batuax</u>
       modal   that Dan at home
       'It is probably/certainly the case that Dan is at home'

An initially ambiguous modal expression after application of the syntactic device of sentence preposing, and subsequent treatment of the expression as a sentential predicate, is disambiguated and becomes a pure epistemic modal. For example, <u>yaxol</u> in noninitial position gives rise to an ambiguous construction.

(5) a. dan <u>yaxol</u> <u>lihiot</u> ba-bait
       modal to be   at home
    'It is possible that Dan is at home'   and
    'Dan is permitted to be at home'

But with yaxol in initial position, the ambiguity is lost.

    b. yaxol lihiot še-dani ba-bait
       model to be that   at home
       'It is possible that Dan is at home'

Deontic Modals in Modern Hebrew

In the traditional view of Hebrew grammar two deontic modal expressions are discussed: yaxol (v) which corresponds to the English 'may' 'can' and 'able to,' and tsarix (v) which corresponds to the English 'must,' 'need,' 'should' and 'have to.' As in other languages (Lakoff (1972), these two modal verbs in Hebrew manifest syntactic and semantic irregularities. Both verbs lack an infinitive form, which in Hebrew is naturally included within the system of verb inflections. Yaxol is conjugated according to a "defective" declension, and tsarix is irregular in the sense of belonging to a group of verbs for which the morphological pattern marker and the initial consonant exchange positions.[3,4]

The Hebrew modal verbs yaxol and tsarix express the deontic concepts of permission and obligation respectively.

    (6) a. hu yaxol lalexet
        he modal to go
        'He is permitted to go'

       b. ata yaxol likro
         you modal to read
         'You are permitted to read'

       c. ata tsarix lalexet
         you modal to go
         'You are required to go'

Note here that when a modal takes an infinitive complement other than 'to be' we get a pure deontic interpretation. Compare examples (6) and (2).

Within the deontic domain, yaxol is ambiguous between interpretations of permission and ability/capability.[5]

    (7) a. hu yaxol lilmod   refu?a
        he modal to study medicine
        'He is permitted to study medicine'   and
        'He is able/capable to study medicine'

       b. ata yaxol levaker   otanu
             modal to visit   us
        'You are permitted to visit us'   and
        'You are able to visit us'

The notions of permission and ability can also be expressed by means of one of the following predicate adjectives: <u>mesugal</u> and <u>mutar</u>. <u>Mesugal</u> corresponds to the English expression "is able to."

 (8) a. hu <u>mesugal</u> lalexet
    he modal   to go
    'He is able to go'

   b. hu mesugal lilmod   refu?a
     <u>modal</u>   to study medicine
     'He is able/capable to study medicine'

The two examples in (8) seem superficially identical to the examples in (6) and (7), but they do appear to have distinct underlying representations. The sentences in (6) and (7) are "complete" sentences (S-V-O) while the sentences in (8) are copula constructions. A construction indicating the future will demonstrate the distinction.

 (9) a. hu <u>yuxal</u>   lalexet
    he <u>modal</u> future to go
    'He will be able to go'

   b. hu <u>yihie</u>   <u>mesugal</u> lelexet
     he to be future modal   to go
     'He will be able to go'

The other predicate adjective, <u>mutar</u>, corresponds to the English expression 'is permitted'.

 (10) a. <u>mutar</u> le-dani   lalexet
     modal to dani   to go
     'Dani is permitted to go'

   b. <u>mutar</u> lo   lilmod   refu?a
     modal him(dat) to study medicine
     'He is permitted to study medicine'

The examples in (10) are syntactically similar to the epistemic modal constructions discussed in the previous section. But here, the deontic modal expression appears in initial position and precedes the proposition it modifies. In (10) the originator of the permission is not identified as the subject of the main clause.

The deontic notion of obligation, as already shown, is expressed by the verb form <u>tsarix</u>. The notion of obligation in addition is expressed in Modern Hebrew by the predicate adjectives <u>xayar</u> and <u>muxrax</u> each conveying different degrees of strong obligation. These two expressions of obligation, in combination with the verb <u>tsarix</u>, can be ordered with respect to the internal intenstiy of their obligation.

(11) <u>modal</u>   <u>deontic interpretation</u>
      <u>tsarix</u>   requirement
      <u>muxrax</u>   weak obligation
      <u>xayav</u>   strong obligation

(12) a. hu <u>tsarix</u> lakum   mukdam
        he modal   to wake up   early
        'He needs to get up early'

     b. hu <u>muxrax</u> lakum   mukdam
            modal   to wake up   early
        'He is forced to get up early'

     c. hu <u>xayar</u>   lakum   mukdam
            modal   to wake up   early
        'He is under a strong obligation to get up early'

Independent evidence for this ordering is the use of the three obliga-
tion expressions in contexts where they function as main verbs.

(13) a. ani <u>tsarix</u> kesef
        'I   need   money'

     b. ani <u>muxrax</u>   kesef
        'I   (desperately) need money'

     c. ani <u>xayav</u>   kesef[6]
        'I   owe   money'

Grammatical Categories

        The modal system in Modern Hebrew consists of verbal as well as
nominal constructions. In comparison to English, which uses quite a
number of verbal auxiliaries to express modality notions, (Lakoff, 1972),
Hebrew utilizes only two verbal expressions that in traditional grammar
are considered to be auxiliary verbs. Most epistemic concepts are ex-
pressed by adverbs, some modify the main verb and some modify the whole
sentence. In addition, though, predicate adjectives are used to express
both epistemic and deontic concepts. Two frequent complements of modal
terms in Hebrew take the form of infinitival phrases and embedded sen-
tences marked by še- 'that'.

(14) a. dani <u>yaxol</u> (v)   la?avod   ba-bait
             modal   to work   at home

     b. dani <u>xayav</u> (adj) lilmod   ?ivrit
             modal   to study Hebrew

     c. dani <u>xuyav</u> (v)   lilmod   ?ivrit
             modal   to study Hebrew

d. <u>yitaxen</u> šе-   dani   xole
   modal   that   Dani   is sick

e. <u>mutar</u>   <u>le-dani</u>   likro   sefer[7]
   modal   to Dani   to read (a) book

Negation

Sentence negation in Hebrew is formed by the adjunction of a nega-
tive marker <u>lo</u> before the main verb of a dominating or an embedded sen-
tence. With present tense sentences, sometimes a special negative marker
<u>?eyn</u> is used both in an initial position or following the subject of the
sentence. When <u>?eyn</u> follows the subject it is always pronominalized .

(15) a. dan <u>lo</u>   oved   po
            negative marker   work(M)   here
         'Dan is not working here'

     b. <u>?eyn</u> dan   oved   po
            negative marker   work(M)   here
         'Dan is not working here'

     c. dan <u>?eyno</u>   oved   po
            negative +pro   work(M)   here
         'Dan is not working here'

     d. rina <u>?eyna</u>   ovedet   po
             negative marker   work(F)   here
               + pro
          'Rina is not working here'

In copula constructions in present tense ("nominal sentences"), <u>lo</u>
or <u>?eyn</u> [+pro] are inserted between the subject and the predicate.

(16) a. dan <u>lo</u>   po
            negative   here
         'Dan is not here'

     b. dan <u>?eyno</u>   po
            negative +pro   here
         'Dan is not here'

The basic negative marker <u>lo</u> alternates with <u>al</u> in imperative sen-
tences and with <u>?iy-</u> in "derived" nominal constructions.

(17) a. <u>al</u>   tilmad ?ivrit
            negative   study   Hebrew
         'Don't study Hebrew!'

b. ?yi-   kabalat   hamixtav   hirgiza   et   dan
   negative   acceptance the letter irritate(past) acc. Dan
   'The fact that the letter never arrived irritated Dan'

Berman (1978) argued that the prefix ?iy- indicates an underlying negative
sentence for the "derived" nominal.

  Two types of semantic negation are possible for all modal expres-
sions in Hebrew:
  (i) External negation - here the modal operator itself is negated
($\sim\Diamond P$ or $\sim\square P$).
  (ii) Internal negation - here the proposition is negated ($\Diamond \sim P$ or
$\square \sim P$).
External negation in Hebrew takes the form (negative + modal)

(18) a. lo   yitaxen še- dani   xole
        negative modal   that dani (is) sick

     b. dani lo   yaxol   lihiot   xole
             negative modal   (is) sick
        'Dani can not be sick'

     c. hu lo   mesugal lalexet
        he negative modal   to go
        'He is not able to go'

     d. hu lo   xayav   lilmod   ?ivrit
           negative modal   to study Hebrew
        'He is not obliged to study Hebrew'

Only the epistemic modal efšar is negated by the prefix ?iy-.

(19) ?iy-   efšar še   hayom   yom šiši
     negative modal that the day day six
     'It is impossible that today is Friday'

     ?iy-   efšar lalexet ?axšav
     negative modal to go   now
     'It is impossible to go now'

  The epistemic modal uli 'perhaps' does not accept the common syn-
tactic form of negation. The term uli can only be negated semantically
by the epistemic modal betax 'certainly'.

(20) a. uli   hu   oved
        modal he   work/is working
        'Is it possible that he works'

     *b. lo   uli   hu   oved

```
c. betax    hu    oved
   modal    he    work/working
   'It is certain that he works'
```

Not accepting the common form of negation is also true for the deontic modal mutar 'is permitted', which is semantically negated by the negative modal asur 'is forbidden.'

```
(21) a. mutar    le-  dani    likro
        modal    to   dani    to read
        'Dan is permitted to read'

    *b. lo  mutar  le-dani  likro

     c. asur      ledani    likro
        modal     to dani   to read
        'Dani is not permitted to read'
```

Internal negation, negating the proposition, takes the general syntactic form of [modal + neg + VP] within the modality system.

```
(22) a. uli     hu    lo            oved
        modal         negative     work/is working
        'Perhaps he is not working'

     b. dani    vadai    lo          ba-bait
                modal    negative    at home
        'Dani probably is not at home'

     c. mutar   le-dani   lo         likro
                to dani   negative   to read
        'Dani is permitted not to read'
```

Formation of Questions

Yes-No questions in Hebrew are formed by changing the intonation pattern (rising intonation implies a question). Wh-questions are formed by introducing a question word in the initial position of a simple declarative sentence (no change in word-order is necessary).

```
(23) a. hu    lomed     ba-bait
        'he   studies   at home '

     b. hu        lomed    ba-bait?
        'does he  study    at home'

     c. eifo   hu    lomed?
        'Where does  he study?'

     d. mi        lomed    ba-bait?
        'Who is   studying at home?'
```

Information seeking questions in Modern Hebrew are formed with all of the epistemic and deontic modals.

(24) a. uli   hu   oved?
      modal   he   work
      'Perhaps he is working'

    b. batuax   še   rina   yešena?
      modal   that   rina   is sleeping
      'Is it certain that Rina is sleeping?'

    c. Ha?im   tsarix   la?avod   axsav?
      quest   modal   to work   now
      'Is it necessary to work now?'

    d. mutar   le?ašen   po?
      modal   to smoke   here
      'Is it permitted to smoke here?'

Past and Future - Interaction with Tense

Modern Hebrew manifests a three-way tense system. The morphological forms for past tense in Modern Hebrew are similar to the Biblical Hebrew perfective aspect. Future tense forms are similar to the Imperfect aspect in Biblical Hebrew. Present tense or Beynoni 'intermediate' forms refer to an indetermined time span, which is neither past nor future. Additionally, aspectual categories such as durative or perfective have no clear manifestation in verbal forms and they are expressed by the use of time adverbials, (Berman, 1978). In order to indicate past or future tense for a sentence, regular main verbs are inflected. The verb (g-m-r + morphological pattern "kal") has the following forms:

(25) a. (ani)   gamarti   lilmod
        I   finish(past)   study

    b. ani   gomer   lilmod
       I   finish(present)   to study

    c. (ani)   ?egmor   lilmod
       I   finish(future) to study

Note that obligatory marking of person is needed only for present tense forms, since past and future forms are inflected according to number, gender and person.

In addition to main verb constructions, tense is manifested in copula constructions. Copula constructions share the surface property of having no overt manifestation of the verb in present tense (nominal sentences), and of having some form of the copula h-Y-Y 'to be' in past

or future.

(26) a. hu yeled tov
      he boy good
      'He is a good boy'

   b. hu <u>haya</u> yeled tov
          was
      'He was a good boy'

   c. hu <u>yihiye</u> yeled tov
      'He will be a good boy'

In Hebrew, as in other languages, epistemic expressions which are based on the current knowledge of the speaker do not have past or future forms. Thus the only interaction between epistemic modals and tense takes the form of making the proposition itself past or future.

(27) a. <u>kanir?e</u> še dani oved
      modal that Dan work/is working

   b. <u>kanir?e</u> še dani ya?avod
      modal that Dan work(future)

   c. hu <u>betax</u> xole
      he modal sick

   d. hu <u>betax</u> haya xole
      he modal be(past) sick

Deontic modals in Modern Hebrew, on the other hand, do have past and future forms. In Modern Hebrew, the future marker functions as a pure tense marker; it does not convey any modality notions. Here consideration must be given to the class of verbs and other form classes as well. Verb forms accept explicit past and future forms, while nominals accept the form [copula + modal] . In nominal constructions the copula is conjugated to indicate tense.

(28) a. ani <u>yaxol</u> lilmod
      I modal to study

   b. (ani) <u>yaxolti</u> lilmod
      I modal past to study

   c. (ani) <u>?uxal</u> lilmod
      I modal(future) to study
      'I am/was/will be permitted to study'

d. ani   <u>tsarix</u>   lalexet
   I   modal   to go

e. (ani) <u>hitstaraxti</u>   lalexet
   I   modal (past) to go

f. (ani) <u>?tstarex</u>   lalexet
         modal(future)
   'I have to/had to/ will have to go'

g. ani <u>mesugal</u> likro
   I   modal   to read

h. (ani) <u>hayiti</u>   mesugal likro
   I   be past   modal   to read

i. (ani) <u>?eheye</u>   mesugal likro
         be(future) modal
   'I am/was/will be able to read'

j. (ani) <u>xayav</u>   lišon
   I   modal   to sleep

k. (ani) <u>hayiti</u>   <u>xayar</u> lišon
   I   be past   modal   to sleep

l. (ani) <u>?eheye</u>   <u>xayav</u> lišon
         be(future) modal
   'I have/had/will have a strong obligation to sleep'

So far no irregularities in the tense system have been encountered, but more investigation is needed in order to test the role of tense in the modality system.   In colloquial Hebrew regular past and future con-jugations of modal verbs are used interchangeably with [Cop + present] verb forms.

(29) a. (ani) <u>hitstaraxti</u>   lalexet
        I   modal past   to go

b. (ani) <u>hayiti</u>   <u>tsarix</u> lalexet
         be past   modal   to go
   'I have had to go'

c. <u>yaxolta</u>   lilmod   ?ivrit
   modal(past)   to study   Hebrew

d. <u>hayita</u>   <u>yaxol</u> lilmod   ?vrit
   be(past)   modal
   'You could have studied Hebrew'

Both forms are used widely and considered to be grammatical and identical in meaning. Berman(1978) has argued that there is a general tendency among Hebrew speakers to prefer periphrastic analytic forms to the older more normative verbal forms. This might explain the high frequency of [Cop + present] in the modality system. Moreover, the fact that non-verbal forms such as mutar, mesugal, muxrax, xayav, can accept verbal forms such as matir, maxriax, mexuyav, makes it possibile to use verbal forms in past and future constructions rather than in [Cop + modal] constructions.

(30) a. 1. hu <u>haya</u>   <u>muxrax</u> la?avod
             <u>be(past)</u> <u>modal</u>   to work
          'He needed to work'

      2. hu <u>huxrax</u> (V)   la?avod
             <u>modal(past)</u> to work
          '(somebody) forced him to work'

   b. 1. ani <u>hayiti</u>   <u>xayav</u> lišon
          I   <u>be(past)</u> <u>modal</u> to sleep
          'I needed to sleep'

      2. ani <u>xuyavti</u> (V) lišon
          I   <u>modal(pass)</u> to sleep
          '(somebody) forced me to sleep'

   c. 1. <u>haya</u>   <u>mutar</u> lexa   lehikanes
          <u>be(past)</u> <u>modal</u> to you   to come in
          'You could come in'

      2. <u>hutar</u> (V)   lexa   lehikanes
          <u>modal</u>(pass)   to you   to come in
          '(somebody) let you in'

The (1) and (2) sentences above are not identical in meaning. For each pair the verbal form in (2) makes it clear that the permission or the obligation is extrinsic and has been imposed by someone on the speaker. (Compare Newmeyer, 1970). The fact that all Hebrew "open class" lexical items share the same general form, [consonantal root + morphological pattern], makes any analysis much more complicated. In Hebrew very often verbs, nouns, and adjectives are derived from the same consonantal root and so convey a very similar meaning. This aspect of the Hebrew modality system deserves further investigation.

In sum, several aspects of the modality system in Modern Hebrew have been discussed. It has been suggested that both epistemic and deontic categories of meaning are in general unambiguously expressed. The instances of ambiguity that do occur have been explained on the basis of structural evidence. An attempt also has been made to look at the syntactic constructions of negation, questions and tense within the

modality system. Further analysis of the lexical forms expressing
modality in Hebrew is hampered by a complex morphological structure and
it is therefore proposed that future investigation accept this complex
structure as a starting point.

Footnotes

1 As argued in Givon (1976),it is quite difficult to define what is
a native Israeli dialect. Most Hebrew speakers have been raised in a
multi-dialect environment, and then have been exposed to a wide variety
of Biblical, Mishnaic, Talmudic, Aramic and East European Hebrew texts.
A lot of formal teaching of Hebrew morphology and syntax is taking place
in school programs. For these reasons it is extremely difficult to
elicit reliable information concerning native intuition (Berman,1978).
As for my own dialect both my parents were native Israelis, and Hebrew
was the only language spoken at home. Hebrew also was the first language
of instruction at school from first grade through graduate level educa-
tion.

2 When the modal + to be   takes a V complement we get an un-
grammatical expression.   *dan tsarix lihiot oved
                           Dan   modal   to be   work/working
                           'It is probably the case that Dan is working'

However, there are some verbs that take NP, AP, locative and VP in pre-
sent tense as complements. For example: dan haya   Omed
                                          be/past stand/standing

For a comprehensive discussion of copula constructions see Berman (1978),
chapters 5 and 6.

3 All Hebrew verbs manifest a rich system of inflectional affixes.
Verbs are conjugated according to Tense, Number, Gender, and Person.
Any verb is classified as belonging to a "full" or "defective" declen-
sion. The "defective" verbs go through several irregularities in terms
of their consonantal structure. These irregularities are usually ex-
plained by morphophonemic rules. All Hebrew verbs are based on a com-
bination of (Consonantal Root + Morphological Pattern). The function
of the morphological patterns 'bynianim constructions,' is to express for
each verbal root syntactic processes such as transitivity, causativeness,
inchoativeness, ingression, reflexivity and reciprocality (a detailed
analysis of the Hebrew verbal system is in Berman (1978), chapter 3).

4 For simplicity all the verbs in this paper will take
the form (Present, singular, masculine, 3rd person) unless there is a
point in looking at other forms. For each verb only one 'construction'
will be presented, usually the basic bynian, unless otherwise specified.

5 Ability and capacity both in physical and mental senses.

6 In several contexts xayav is used to denote guilt. For example:

(i) hu xayav   badim
     'He is guilty'

(ii) hu xayav   mita
     he guilty   death
     'He deserves death'
xayav has a strong implication that 'there is no other way'...

7 Examples (15) and (15e) are irregular in terms of being (S)VO
sentences. This aspect of Hebrew syntax is currently being studied by
Berman (personal communication). As noted by her, in colloquial use some
speakers supply the demonstrative ze 'this' as a substitute for the
"missing" subject. Thus:
(i) yitaxen še- dani   xole ∼ ze yitaxen še- dani   xole
    modal   that Dan(is) sick   this modal that Dan is sick
The investigation of this process is beyond the scope of this paper and
requires further exploration.

8 Note here that regular main verbs do not take [Cop + V] forms
(i) ani halaxti lišon   but
    I   went   to sleep

*(ii) ani hayiti   holex lišon
       I   be past go   to sleep

References

Alcalay, R. 1962. The complete Hebrew-English Dictionary. Massadah
  Publishing Co., Jerusalem.

Barkali, S. 1964. Luax hasemot hasalem. Rubin Mas, Jerusalem.

Barkali, S. 1965. Luax hapealim hasalem. Rubin Mas, Jerusalem.

Berman, R. 1978. Modern Hebrew structure. University Publishing pro-
  jects, LTD. Tel-Aviv.

Berman, R. (To Appear) Lexical decomposition and lexical unity in the
  expression of Aktionsarten in Modern Hebrew. Journal of Afroasia-
  tic Linguistics.

Berman, R., and Grasu, A. 1976. Aspects of the copula in Modern Hebrew.
  In P. Cole Studies in Modern Hebrew Syntax and Semantics. North-
  Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam.

Givon, T. 1976. On the VS word order in Israeli Hebrew: Pragmatic and
  typological changes. In P. Cole Studies in Modern Hebrew Syntax
  and Semantics. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam.

Lakoff, R. 1972. The pragmatics of modality. In Papers from Chicago
  Linguistics Society, 8. 229 - 246.

Newmeyer, F.Y. 1970. The "root modal": Can it be transitive? In Sadock
  and Vanek (Eds.), Studies Presented to R.B. Lees. 189-196.

Steele, S. 1975. Is it possible? In Working Papers in Language
  Universals. 18. 35 - 58.