

**Thursday Interdisciplinary Colloquium**  
**Fall 2017-Winter 2018**  
*Thursdays, 16:00-17:30, Webb 103*

**09.11.17**

**Galia Hatav**

University of Florida

***Secondary Predication and Converbs in Hebrew***

Following the approach of studies such as Rothstein (2004), I define a secondary predicate (SP) as a predicative expression that conveys information about the subject or the object, **in addition** to the information given by the main predicate. Accordingly, contrary to what is suggested by studies such as Rapoport (1993), I do not consider small clauses, causatives, and adverbials to be SPs.

Crosslinguistic Studies discuss mainly three kinds of SPs: subject oriented depictives, as in the English sentence (1) below, object-oriented depictives, as in (2), and resultatives (3):

- (1) John drove the car **drunk**. (subject-oriented depictive)
- (2) Mary ate the fish **raw**. (object-oriented depictive)
- (3) Sharon painted the house **red**. (resultative)

The APs 'drunk', 'raw', and 'red' in these sentences are considered to be SPs of their respective sentences, as they convey some information about the subject or the object but are not the main predicates, which are 'drove', 'ate', and 'painted' in (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

As noted by Rothstein (2004), SPs are characteristically APs. However, it is well acknowledged that while Hebrew has AP depictives, it does not have AP resultatives, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (4) below:

- (4) \**Sharon cav'a et ha-bayit adom*.

Hebrew must resort to other kinds of phrases for resultative SPs. E.g., the SP 'red' in the English sentence (3) can be depicted by a PP in Hebrew: *be-adom* 'in red'.

In this paper, I will show that both Biblical and Modern Hebrew make use of converbs, i.e., verbs deprived of temporal features, for secondary predication. In particular, I will show that apart from APs, which can be used only for depictives, Biblical Hebrew (BH) makes use of the infinitive-absolute and Modern Hebrew (MH) of the Benoni for all three kinds of secondary predication, including resultatives.

Harbour (1999) considers the infinitive absolute (IA) in BH to be a converb

form deprived of temporal and agreement features. As such, it is found in a number of constructions. In this paper, I will show that what is usually referred to as 'the double infinitive absolute construction' is used for secondary predication. Example (5) below illustrates:

- (5) 1Kgs 20:37<sup>b</sup>  
*wayyakkēhû hā'îš hakkēh ûpāšōa'*  
Literally: strike (*wayyiqtol*)-him the-man strike (IA) and-wound (IA)  
'The man struck him [the prophet], **wounding** [him].'

In addition to its first occurrence in the finite form *wayyiqtol*, the verb 'strike' in this verse appears again in IA, conjoined with the verb 'wound', also in IA.

A number of analyses have been suggested for this construction. My contention is that it is used for SP. E.g., the SP in our verse, I believe, is a resultative: The man struck the prophet and as a result the prophet was wounded.

Modern Hebrew (MH) lost the IA as a productive form. For verbal SPs, MH makes use of the Benoni, which may be considered a converb, as it patterns more like nouns and adjectives rather than verbs in the past or future tense. The example in (6) illustrates:

- (6) *Satiti et kol habakbuk \*rek/ merokent oto.*  
'I drank the bottle \*empty/ emptying it.'

The use of the adjective *rek* 'empty' is ungrammatical in this sentence as it functions as a resultative SP, but the Benoni *merokent* 'emptying' is fine.

## References

- Harbour, D. 1999. Two Types of Predicate Clefts: Classical Hebrew and Beyond. In V. I-W Lin et al (eds.), *Papers on Morphology and Syntax: Cycle Two*. Cambridge: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, 159-75.
- Rapoport, T. 1993. Stage and Adjunct Predicates" Licensing and Structure in Secondary Predication Constructions. In Reuland, Eric and Werner, Abraham (eds.), *Knowledge and Language, Volume II, Lexical and Conceptual Structure*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 157-182.
- Rothstein, S. 2004. Secondary Predicates. In Klaus von Heusinger, Claudia Maienborn, Paul Portner (eds.), *Semantics, Volume 2*. De Gruyter, 1442-1462.

02.11.17

Luka Crnić

The Hebrew University

*Some Questions in the Theory of Antonymy*

There exist several competing approaches to antonymy (e.g., Bierwisch

1989, Heim 2007, Sassoon 2010). The main goal of this talk is to make further headway towards adjudicating between them. After presenting evidence against approaches that assume that so-called 'negative' antonyms like "slow" introduce a negative operator (cf., Heim 2007, Büring 2007), we turn to approaches that do not make this assumption (e.g., Rullmann 1995, Kennedy 2001, Sassoon 2010). We compare them partly by investigating a variety of phenomena that have been put forward as supporting the negative operator approach.