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ing to the law (cf. Langendoen 1971). In fact, the pro-adverb ka-dat ve-xa-din may modify any verb whose underlying meaning includes a presupposition of this kind, e.g.,

\[ \text{nesege ha-yišuv niuxaru la-va’dada ka-dat ve-xa-din} '\text{The settlement’s representatives had been elected to the committee exactly according to the law}'. \]

4. Conclusion

a. In Hebrew the main difference between grammatical and semantic pro-adverbs appears to be their derivation. While grammatical pro-adverbs are primal and deictic, having been formed very early in the history of the language, most of the semantic pro-adverbs were first created in the Rabbinic Hebrew. Semantic pro-adverbs have their own independent meaning, while grammatical ones do not.

b. Most Hebrew semantic pro-adverbs usually indicate that relevant entities are arranged according to a ‘proper’ order: the activities in question are properly carried out in accordance with certain rules and laws, governing aspects of the behavior of either the individual or society. The differences between the pro-adverbs discussed above lie in their different emphases. While ka-balaxa emphasizes the ‘fitness’ between the way an activity is done and some undefined given thing, ka-dat ve-xa-din emphasizes that something is done exactly according to the law, and while ka-din emphasizes ‘rules and laws’ as an immanent part of the general structure of the universe, ka-ra’eny highlights the required norms in any structured domain.
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null subjects in Hebrew. In (1) and modern example in (2) illustrate subject and object positions. The biblical exam-

Biblical Hebrew and Modern Hebrew fall into three general categories (see Huang 1984; also Dryer 2008): those that allow pro-drop only in restricted environments (e.g., English, where a subject can be dropped only in non-tensed clauses, such as John preferred ___ seeing Mary versus John preferred that he see Mary); those that allow pro-drop in most subject positions, but not the object position (e.g., Italian, Spanish); and languages that allow both subject and object pro-drop (e.g., Chinese, Japanese). Biblical Hebrew and Modern Hebrew fall into the third category: they allow pro-drop in both subject and object positions. The biblical example in (1) and modern example in (2) illustrate null subjects in Hebrew.

(1) התפוח מפרע תּהא את חותא יָאָהשא עִמָהּ wat-tiqqa mop-pirya wat-tokal wat-titten gam-la-¥is ¥bam ¥ay-¥okal
‘and pro (Eve) took from its fruit and pro (she) ate it and pro (she) gave it to her husband who was with her and pro (he) ate it’ (Gen. 3.6)

(2) לאכלתי את התפוח (אני) ‘axalti ‘et ha-tapua¥
‘(I) pro ate the apple’ (Borer 1986:376).

As of yet, there has been no focused study on subject pro-drop in most stages of pre-modern Hebrew. The lone exception is Naudé’s work on null subjects in Qumran Hebrew (Naudé 1991; 1996; 2001). Naudé also compares the syntactic distribution of null subjects and overt subjects in Qumran Hebrew, Biblical Aramaic, and Mishnaic Hebrew, with a final discussion of some differences in Biblical Hebrew. Pro-drop in Modern Hebrew, in contrast, has been a focus of numerous studies (see, among others, Borer 1986; Shlonsky 1987; 2009; Doron 1988; Ritter 1995; Vainikka and Levy 1999; Gutman 1999; 2004).

Though a full scale study of pro-drop in any stage of pre-modern is lacking, it has long been observed that the subject pronoun is not obligatory and also that an overt pronoun signals ‘emphasis’ (i.e., Topic or Focus) (see GKC 437–443, Joüon and Muraoka 2006:505–511; Heimerdinger 1999; Shimasaki 2002).

One feature that distinguishes Modern Hebrew is that the null subject may be used only with first and second-person past and future verbs; with third-person past and future verbs in main clauses and all present tense verbs the subject pronoun is obligatory (3).

(3) התפוח תּהא versus *את התפוח
hu ‘axal ‘et ha-tapua¥ *‘axal ‘et ha-
tapua¥
‘he ate the apple’

For this reason, Modern Hebrew is sometimes called partial pro-drop (see, for example, Shlonsky 2009).

Although pro-drop is most often used to refer to the phenomenon of a null subject, languages falling into the third category of pro-drop demonstrate that the null pronoun can also appear in the object position (Rizzi 1986). This is certainly so for Biblical (4) and Modern (5) Hebrew.

(4) התפוח מפרע תּהא את חותא יָאָהשא עִמָהּ wat-tiqqa mop-pirya wat-tokal wat-titten gam-la-¥is ¥bam ¥ay-¥okal
‘and pro (Eve) took from its fruit and pro (she) ate pro (it) and pro (she) gave pro (it) to her husband who was with her and pro (he) ate pro (it)’ (Gen. 3.6)

(5) תּקנאת את התפוח תּהא יל tique ‘et ha-tapua¥ ve-titen li
‘buy the apple and give pro (it) to me’

Both examples in (4) and (5) illustrate that the null object is dropped only when the antecedent is accessible within the discourse (see GKC 364; Gutman 1999:126–254). In both (4) and (5) the antecedents of the null object pronouns (fruit and apple, respectively) are explicitly identified in the preceding clauses. Creason 1991 is the only focused study of null object anaphora in Biblical Hebrew; null objects are also often discussed within the scope of ellipsis studies, as in McShane 2005 (esp. pp. 33–41, 114–27), although no such work has been focused on pre-modern Hebrew (+ Ellipsis).

Within generative theory, the ‘dropped’ pronoun has been identified as a type of empty or null category—a phonologically empty, but syntactically real pronoun—and is referred to as pro (read as ‘little pro’). Early on in the
A grammatical approach to pro-drop, the phenomenon was associated with the nature of verbal inflection, since in many pro-drop languages the finite verb is inflected with morphologically rich affixes (i.e., the verbal affixes are portmanteau morphs, carrying a bundle of person, number, and gender features). While agreement affixes in these languages (such as Italian, Spanish, Arabic, Hebrew) may aid in the identification of the null subject pro, morphological agreement between the verb and subject is clearly not a prerequisite for pro-drop, since Chinese and Japanese, for example, are pro-drop languages without verbal agreement features.
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Pronominal Suffixes

Pronominal suffixes may be attached to nouns to express the genitive, to prepositions, and to verbs to express the direct object or, sporadically, other case relations.

The following are the most common forms of the pronominal suffixes occurring on singular nouns ending in consonants in the standard Tiberian tradition of Biblical Hebrew, as well as on some prepositions and some plural nouns ending in מ/מ - ō:

Examples: הַבָּשֶׁנהֶם 'your (ms) son', יָדְךָ 'your (ms) hand', לֵבָב 'to her', שָמוֹתָם 'their (m) names'. The 2ms has the habitual form יָהָנָם with penultimate stress.

On nouns ending in a vowel the most common forms are: