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Hebrew-Aramaic reads from right to left, if we join the dots of the seghol pattern and allow our voice to follow the pattern, we will begin at the dot at the base of the pyramid, then rise to the dot at the apex of the pyramid, and finally descend toward the dot at the left base of the pyramid, thus producing a rise-fall pattern. "A shorthand for Yiddish intonation patterns discussed here not only originated in the Land of Israel, but they have also returned to the modern Israel. Wherever Ashkenazic Jews have gone, they have taken these intonation patterns with them. Modern Israeli Hebrew has adopted these intonation patterns from Yiddish, as it has adopted Modern Israeli Hebrew has adopted these intonation patterns with them. Wherever Ashkenazic Jews have gone, they have also returned to the modern Israel.

3. Link to the Ancient Land of Israel and to Modern Israel

Kahan Newman conjectures that the Jews of Ashkenaz, remnants of a Palestinian community, settled in Ashkenaz before the Babylonian Talmud became dominant. When, at a later date, the Babylonian Talmud gained ascendency, the Jews of Ashkenaz kept the chant patterns they had used for the Jerusalem Talmud, even as they switched to the Babylonian Talmud.

Other scholars have postulated a link between the Land of Israel and the settlers of early Ashkenaz, as well. They have noted that in early Ashkenaz, as in the Land of Israel, extraordinary weight was placed on custom over law (Ta-Shma 1992:60–64, 73). In addition, the piyyut of early Ashkenaz has been indisputably linked to the piyyut of the Land of Israel (Ta-Shma 1992:99). The phonology of Yiddish has been said to derive from the Land of Israel (Katz 1986:35–36), and researchers who study reading tradition have claimed that the "genetic link of the pre-Ashkenazic tradition with the (non-Tiberial) Land of Israel tradition is a proven fact" (Ta-Shma 1992:100, n.152).

The intonation patterns discussed here not only originated in the Land of Israel, but they have also returned to the modern Israel. Wherever Ashkenazic Jews have gone, they have taken these intonation patterns with them. Modern Israeli Hebrew has adopted these intonation patterns from Yiddish, as it has adopted morphological patterns and patterns of syntax. The texts and the context have changed, but the old melody lingers.
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Aspect: Pre-Modern Hebrew

Aspect refers to the internal temporality of a situation ("internal temporal constituency" [Comrie 1976:3]), in contrast to tense, which refers to a situation’s external temporality (i.e., the temporal location of an event). There are three distinct categories of aspect:

(A) Situation aspect classifies situations by inherent temporal properties, which according to the standard taxonomy include states, achievements.

(B) Phasal aspect, whose types include inclusive, resumptive, repetitive, and completive, treats alterations of a situation’s internal temporality, focusing on the beginning, middle, or end phase of a situation. Situation and phasal aspect at times have been conflated and the label Aktionsart applied to one or the other or both types (→ Actionality [Aktionsart]: Pre-Modern Hebrew).

(C) Viewpoint aspect refers to how a speaker may choose to view or portray the internal
temporality of a situation. Relevant to Hebrew are the perfective-imperfective opposition as well as the perfect (anterior) and the progressive viewpoint aspects, discussed in turn below.

1. Viewpoint Aspect in Hebrew Studies

Aspect is a relatively recently established category of linguistic description. The term itself is a loan translation from Slavic grammar, where it refers to the perfective-imperfective morphological distinction (see Binnick 1991:135–136). In Hebrew studies, the Latin terms perfectum and imperfectum were applied in their etymological sense of ‘complete’ and ‘incomplete’ in the early 19th century (McFall [1982:44] traces the introduction of the terms to Johann Jahn’s 1809 Grammaticae linguae Hebraeae). Heinrich Ewald (1879) popularized these terms in his widely read Hebrew and Arabic grammars and established the ‘aspeclual’ theory of the Hebrew verbal system as the major alternative to the medieval description of the Hebrew verb forms in terms of tense (e.g., Elias Levitas 1518, cited in McFall 1982:12). Despite differences between Ewald’s theory and Driver’s (1998) treatment of the Hebrew verb, the latter’s work served to disseminate the basic ‘aspeclual’ theory particularly in English-speaking scholarship (see esp. Driver 1998:xiii–lxxxvi).

In the 20th century numerous studies were published in which the Hebrew verbal conjugations were described in terms of tense, aspect, or (more recently) mood oppositions, but no consensus was reached beyond the long-standing tense explanation (e.g., Joüon and Muraoka 2006:326–327) and the aspect theory (e.g., GKC 309, 313) found in the standard grammars. For a survey of the field, see Cook (2002:chap. 2). The disparate approaches reflect the problems inherent in describing linguistic structure in terms of abstract categories such as tense, aspect, or mood. For this reason many linguists have eschewed such an approach, choosing to focus on tense-aspect-mood (TAM) as an undifferentiated whole, and treating individual conjugations without classifying them within one of these abstract categories (e.g., Lindstedt 2001:770). While it is true that the individual conjugations, which generally express a cluster of TAM meanings (e.g., perfective conjugations frequently express past tense, future tense also expresses volitive mood), are the real building blocks of TAM systems, the abstract categories of tense, aspect, and mood retain their usefulness for the purposes of typological comparison. For example, the presence of a distinct class of stative verbs in Biblical Hebrew (→ Actionality [Aktionart]: Pre-Modern Hebrew) and absence of tense shifting (as for example English indicative ‘I am rich’ versus conditional ‘If I were rich’) both align the Biblical Hebrew verbal system with aspect-prominent TAM systems (Bhat 1999:40, 150). The following treats the grammatical types which belong to the category of viewpoint aspect and discusses how these are expressed in the Hebrew verbal system in the pre-modern period.

2. A Basic Taxonomy of Viewpoint Aspect

There are four basic viewpoint aspects relevant to the description of Hebrew: perfective, imperfective, perfect, and progressive. These may be defined in terms of the relationship between an event frame and a reference frame. The event frame is the time interval during which a situation holds true; the reference frame is the time span for which a speaker chooses to view (portray) a situation. A helpful metaphor of the relationships that may hold between event and reference frames is that between different types of camera lenses and the subject: the perfective viewpoint is like a wide-angle lens, which includes the end points of a situation but at the expense of a detailed view of its internal temporal structure; the imperfective viewpoint is like a telephoto lens, which excludes the end points of a situation because of its narrow scope but provides a detailed view of the situation’s internal temporal structure. This metaphor captures the characteristic temporal succession of the perfective versus the temporal overlay of the imperfective, for example (French) Quand Pierre entra, Marie téléphonait ‘When Pierre entered Marie was talking on the phone’ versus Quand Pierre entra, Marie téléphona ‘When Pierre entered, Marie made a phone call’ (Kamp and Rohrer 1983:253).

Because the imperfective téléphona portrays the previously-reported event entra is under-
stood to overlay or interrupt the latter. By contrast, if both situations are portrayed with the perfective, they are understood to occur in succession.

The classification of the perfect viewpoint aspect has been debated because of its unique features (see Comrie 1976:52). For one, the perfect allows for tense distinctions in some languages (e.g., English had run, has run, will have run). For this reason relative tense theory has been able to treat the perfect as a tense form (Reichenbach 1947:297). At the same time, the perfect may also combine with the progressive viewpoint aspect (e.g., English had been running). By making a distinction between a situation’s nucleus and coda (to borrow terms from syllable phonology), the perfect can be defined in terms of the event frame and reference frame relationship: the perfect has a perfective-like scope, which includes the end points of an interval of a situation; but this is an interval of the coda—the resultant state of the preceding nucleus of the situation—which is included in the scope, and not an interval of the nucleus, as the perfective scope includes. This sort of analysis explains the characteristic current relevance of perfect expressions: the perfect conveys that a current state of affairs (the event coda) is semantically or logically the result of a preceding situation (the event nucleus).

The progressive has been likewise variously treated (see Binnick 1991:281–290). Most importantly, it cannot be distinguished from the imperfective using the event and reference frame model. However, there are a number of cross-linguistic tendencies that distinguish the two viewpoints. First, progressives often are or develop from periphrastic constructions, and/or are based on nominal forms (Dahl 1985:91; Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:130). Second, progressives are more restricted than imperfectives: they generally do not occur with stative predicates, and they generally have a narrower future time use, either expressing an ‘expected’ event (Comrie 1976:33–34; Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:249–250) or an element of intention (Binnick 1991:289). Third, the perfective/imperfective opposition is often correlated with the tensed past/non-past opposition, whereas the progressive is freely used for past, present, and future time reference (Dahl 1985:92–93). Hence, although the imperfective and progressive are semantically indistinguishable, they can be differentiated based on consistent cross-linguistic characteristics.

3. Expression of Perfect and Perfective Viewpoints in Hebrew

In order to describe the expression of viewpoint aspects over the course of the history of Hebrew it is helpful to employ a framework of typical paths of development involving the relevant viewpoints. One of these is the development path in figure 1, involving the perfect and perfective viewpoints.

Figure 1. Grammaticalization paths for perfective/simple past verbs (adapted from Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:105).

resultative (‘be’/ ‘have’) \ 

perfect → perfective/simple past

completive (‘finish’) /

The perfective/past conjugation in Hebrew can be identified at every stage along this path, beginning with its precursor in a West Semitic resultative construction consisting of an adjectival form and a subject pronoun: qarib + (‘at)ta ‘you (are) drawn near’. In the earliest stages of Hebrew this conjugation developed beyond the resultative to express both perfect and perfective aspects, presumably reflecting the retention of the former even after the latter came into being (e.g., qarabta ‘you have drawn near’—‘you drew near’).

Syntactic and discourse factors help distinguish between these two aspectual senses in Biblical Hebrew, particularly in narrative discourse where perfective aspect is predominantly expressed by the past narrative verb. Interruptions of a string of past narrative forms by a
perfective/past verb often indicate a perfect meaning of the latter (Zevit 1998). For example, way-yiballek hanoq 'et-ha-ëlôhîm wo-ënëmmû ki-laqqôb òto 'ëlôhîm 'And Enoch walked with God, and (then) he was not, because God had taken him' (Gen. 5.24); יְהוָה יָשָבַת אֶת־אַחַי בְּרָאשֵׁי הַצָּאָדָה וַיַּחֲנֵֽהוּ lakhôc 'And when you copied the settlement at the man asked him, 'What are you searching for?' And he said, 'I (am) searching (participle) for my brothers' (Gen. 37.15b–16a).

4. Expression of Imperfective and Progressive

The progressive and imperfective aspects are not only semantically similar, but also developmentally related: progressive constructions are a regular source of imperfective verbs (Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca 1994:127–129). It is therefore not surprising that the imperfective/future conjugation and the predicative participle overlap in meaning and function in Biblical Hebrew. For example, compare the following: way-yîsîlôhî hû 'îš lêmôr ma-ttabqêš. way-yômer 'et-âlay 'ânôkî mabaggêš 'And the man asked him, “What are you searching (imperfective/future) for?” And he said, “I (am) searching (participle) for my brothers” (Gen. 37.15b–16a).

However, the shift of the Hebrew TAM system from aspect to tense prominence (Stassen 1997:495–499; Heine 2005:294) already in Biblical Hebrew has made the predicative participle the preferred means for the expression of progressive situations in past time, though some past progressive imperfective/future forms still appear.

The above-described shift, along with the imperfective/future’s appropriation of the volitive functions of the jussive and cohortative forms in the post-biblical period, led to a restriction of the imperfective/future form in indicative clauses. The progressive-aspect participle became the preferred indicative form not only for progressive and habitual situations, but also for vivid past narration and expected future events (see Pérez Fernández 1992:134–138). Compared to Biblical Hebrew, however, there is an increased use of periphrastic constructions (using the perfective/past copular form) for tense distinctions with the progressive form.
Shemot, MitPallel al Ha-Holim 'We-lomer, Ze Hay-ze Met 'When he was praying for the sick he would say, “This one is going to live and this one is going to die”’. (Mishnah Berakah 5.5; see Pérez-Fernández 1992:137).
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Aspect: Modern Hebrew
Like tense, aspect is a category related to the expression of temporality. Aspect encodes “different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation” (Comrie 1976:3).

Tense and aspect encode topological relations between two time intervals. In main, unembedded contexts, tense relates speech time (S) to reference time (R), the time which the statement is about (Reichenbach 1947); tense is thus a deictic category. Aspect relates event time (E), the time of the described event/state, to R; this relation has to do, for instance, with whether the boundaries of the event are included in the reference time or not. Referring to the boundaries of the event time is only one facet of what is commonly covered by aspect. This temporal relation has been dubbed ‘grammatical aspect’ or ‘viewpoint aspect’ (Smith 1991; Klein 1994:99–119; Demirdache and Uribe-Extendarria 2000). Other properties having to do with the internal temporal structure of events are (i) whether or not an event involves change in time, i.e., stative vs. dynamic; (ii) whether an event holds at a moment or at an interval, i.e., punctual vs. durative; (iii) whether an event has built into it a terminal point, or can be protracted indefinitely, i.e., telic vs. atelic.

These three properties are used to classify event descriptions into aspectual classes. An attempt at such a classification dates back to Aristotle’s distinction between kinésis and energeia. The ascpctual classes commonly featuring in the literature are states, activities, accomplishments, and achievements (Ryle 1949:149–153; Vendler 1957; Kenny 1963; Dowty 1979: chapter 2). These are referred to as ‘lexical aspectual classes’. Here is an illustration of the properties making up the classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>Dynamic</th>
<th>Durative</th>
<th>Telic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accomplishment</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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