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Abstract

The paper proposes that the same functional categories which determine the inflection of the Biblical Hebrew finite verb also determine the feature specification of the Biblical Hebrew infinitive. This proposal depends both on demonstrating that the infinitive is a verb, rather than a noun (or a verbal noun), as traditionally assumed, and on showing that the functional categories that embed the infinitive are clausal rather than nominal. The article starts by examining the traditional distinction between the Infinitive Absolute and Infinitive Construct, and makes an argument for a single infinitive, with two allomorphs. The former is a verb marked as [+Mood], while the latter is marked as [–Mood], and both are also specified for two other clausal functional categories: T and Asp/Mod. These two latter categories determine a 4-way classification of finite/infinitival verbs: [+T+Asp/Mod], [+T–Asp/Mod], [–T+Asp/Mod], [–T–Asp/Mod]. This classification determines a concomitant 4-way alternation of attachment options of subject and/or object clitics to the verb: [+subj.cl.+Obj.cl.], [+subj.cl.–Obj.cl.], [–subj.cl.+Obj.cl.], [–subj.cl.–Obj.cl.], and moreover accounts for the distribution of the different verb forms.

Keywords

finiteness – event nominals – infinitive – clause – mood – tense – aspect – modality – Biblical Hebrew

1 Introduction

Biblical Hebrew (BH) verbal forms manifest rich inflection within the finite clause, encoding the functional categories of temporality (T), mood (Mood), grammatical aspect (Asp), and modality (Mod). These categories have been widely discussed in the literature, and their relative role is still under debate.
(recently Hatav 1997, 2008, Joosten 2002, Cook 2006, 2012 and others). In particular, Asp and Mod have proven hard to disentangle in BH, and the present work will reflect this by assuming a composite Asp/Mod category. But what has not so far been proposed is that the same categories regulate the use of the infinitive as well. It is the aim of the present paper to demonstrate the function of these categories within the infinitive clause. I argue that BH has a single infinitive category, which is specified for different combinations of T, Mood, and Asp/Mod, giving rise, in addition to the finite (Fin) construction, to various infinitival constructions: Nom-inf, Poss-inf, and PRO-inf. The examples in (i) illustrate, using the same verb *remember*, the Fin and infinitival constructions in their typical functions. The Fin construction is a clause in the indicative mood, or in a variety of irrealis moods (imperative / jussive / cohortative), and Nom-inf is an irrealis root clause. Poss-inf and PRO-inf are embedded clauses with a variety of functions, and their distribution will be discussed in detail below.¹ Poss-inf often functions as a temporal adverbial, and PRO-inf—as a purpose adverbial:²

1 The distinction between these two constructions, which serves the base of the distinction between the Modern Hebrew Gerund and Infinitive, was presented in Doron (2016). This distinction had not been made before in Biblical studies.

2 Unless stated otherwise, all Biblical translations are from the New King James Version (NKJV). The fricative allophones of *b, g, d, k, p, t* are transcribed as the stop allophone with a diacritic ([b̥, g̥, d̥, k̥, p̥, t̥]). Three vowel qualities are distinguished, in accordance with the Tiberian tradition, e.g. *ā* vs. *a* vs. epenthetic *ă*. Glosses use the following abbreviations: *ACC*—Accusative

(1) a. Fin
   i. Indicative

   וַיִּזְכֹּר יְזֵפֶּה שֵׁם חָלְמוֹת יְהוֹסֵפֶּה תַּאֲשֶׁר חָלְמָה בָּלָהוֹ מִיָּהוֹ (בָּרָאשִׁי מֵהוֹ) (Wayyizkōr yōsēp̄ ṭē ha-hālōmōt ṭāšēr hālam and.remembered.3MS Joseph ACC the-dreams that dreamt.3MS lā-hēm to-3MP

   Then Joseph *remembered* the dreams which he had dreamed about them. (Gen. 42:9)

   ii. Imperative

   זָכֹר לַהֲנֵבָדֵד קָיָה לַהֲרָבֹא עַל יַאֲבָרָהַמ לַגֵּיָהָק Remember.1MP.2MS to-servants-poss.2MP to-Abraham to-Isaac u-lā-yāsāqōb and-to-Jacob

   Your servants, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. (Deut 9:27)
b. Nom-inf

דבר ואת-ים השבטים ולכָּנָו(שמות ב 7)

zāḵōr ʔet yōm haš-šabbāt
remember.INFABS ACC day.cs the-sabbath
lo-qaddaš-ō
to-sanctify.INF-ACC.3MS
Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. (Ex. 20:8)

c. Poss-inf

על נְהָרִים בִּבּלָהָיָם וְיָשַׁבְנֻהְם מִבְּבַל וַהֲנֵיהֶם (תהלים קלח ר י)

ʕal nahārōṯ bāḇėl šām yāšaḥnū gam bāḵīnū
on rivers.cs Babylon there sat.1p also wept.1p
bo-zoḵr-ēnū ʔet šiyyōn
in-remember.INF-POSS.1P ACC Zion
By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down and wept when we remembered Zion. (Ps. 137:1)

d. PRO-inf

וּהְיוּתֵיָה בִּנְהָיָה וַעֲרָאִיתֵי לֶבֶרִית לַעֲלֹה בִּי לָאֲלֹהֵי וּבֵן תּוֹחֵי (בראשית)

wəhāyəṯā haq-qɛšɛt be-ʕānān u-raʔīt-hā
and.be.MOD.3FS the-rainbow.F in.the-cloud and-will.see.is.ACC.3FS
li-zkōr bərīṯ šōlām bēn ʔēlōhīm
to-remember.INF covenant.cs eternity between God
u-bēn kol nepeš hayyā
and-between all soul living
The rainbow shall be in the cloud, and I will look on it to remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature. (Gen. 9:16)

The article is constructed as follows. Section 2 introduces the two allomorphs of the BH infinitive. Section 3 introduces the different infinitival clauses constructed from the infinitive, and their different morphosyntax and distribution. Crucially, the functional categories specifying the infinitive are clausal rather than nominal: an overt or implicit subject Determiner Phrase (DP) is
present. Section 4 further argues for the clausal rather than nominal nature of these constructions, by showing that the infinitive is a verb rather than a noun or a verbal noun—which was the category assigned to it by the traditional literature of the Bible. Section 5 briefly mentions the rise of nominalizations which eventually replaced the Poss-inf structure in post-Biblical Hebrew. Section 6 concludes.

2 One infinitive category, two allomorphs

The theoretical issues raised by the BH infinitive have not yet been tackled. Existing literature assumes two separate infinitives, traditionally called the *Infinitive Absolute* and the *Infinitive Construct*. The two are distinguished by their form and distribution, and are described as two separate categories, treated separately in separate chapters of the traditional grammar books of the Bible.3

Historically, the Infinitive Absolute is the original infinitive, also found in Akkadian (Blau 1979: §30), while the Infinitive Construct has been claimed to originate in a different Proto-Semitic form, related to the imperfective (Bauer and Leander 1922: §43). Yet, synchronically, I would like to propose that the two are actually syntactically conditioned allomorphs of a single infinitive category of BH.4 Derivationally, the Infinitive Absolute is the basic allomorph, as it is found in all the seven Hebrew verbal templates, whereas the Infinitive Construct is only derived in the active and middle templates, but not in the passive.5

The derivations are shown in the following table:6

---

3 For example, the Infinitive Absolute is described in Gesenius (1910: §113), Joüon (1923: §123), and Waltke and O’Connor (1990: §35), whereas the Infinitive Construct is described in Gesenius (1910: §§114–115), Joüon (1923: §124), and Waltke and O’Connor (1990: §36).

4 This allomorphy is indistinguishable in some cases from the *Absolute vs. Construct* state allomorphy in the nominal system. Hence the traditional terminology *Infinitive Absolute—Infinitive Construct*, which is otherwise very confusing, since the infinitive is verbal rather than nominal. For example, the noun *šālōm* ‘well-being’ has the construct allomorph *šəlōm* in e.g. the possessive construct *šəlōm ṭəhɛḵā* ‘your brothers’ well-being’ (Gen. 37:14). This allomorphy identical in form to the allomorphy *šəmōr* ‘observe. *infabs*/šəmōr* ‘observe. *inf*’ in the Simple Active template in table 2 (the *inf* allomorph is found e.g. in *lə-bilti šəmōr miswōt-āw* ‘by not observing His commandments’ (Deut. 8:11)).

5 There are only two potential counterexamples: *hullɛdɛt* ‘be-born-birth.*inf*’ in Gen 40:20 and *hukkabbēs* ‘be-laundered.*inf*’ in Lev. 13:55.

6 In addition to the exponents shown in the table, the Infinitive Absolute of some verbs in derived templates also has exponents constructed by analogy to the Simple Active template, e.g. *nilhōm* ‘fight’, *yassōr* ‘chasten’.
The basic allomorph, the Infinitive Absolute, serves as the citation form of the verb, and in adverbial uses (typically bare of arguments). The adverbial infinitive either directly modifies the inflected verb (3a–b), as described in Callaham 2014, Hatav 2017, and references therein, or it modifies the VP (3c–d).

(3) a. ראה ראיתו את-נני עמי-flash�� אสรรע (שמוט ג)
    rāʔō rāʔīṯī ʁēṯ ʔōnī ʔamm-i ʔāšer
    see.INFABS saw.IS ACC oppression.CS people-POSS.IS that
    in-Egypt

    I have surely seen the oppression of My people who are in Egypt. (Ex. 3:7)

b. שבע אשבע אליך-áltuח ראותו את-נני עמי caravan-2MS as.the-season living
    šōb ʔāšūḇ ʔēl-ēkā kā-ʕēṯ hayyā
    return.INFABS return.MOD.ISS to-2MS as.the-season living
    wə-hinne ʔān la-śārā ʔištekā
    and-behold son to-Sarah wife-POSS.2MS

    I will surely return to you when the season comes round again, and
    behold, your wife Sarah will have a son! (NET; Gen. 18:10)
c. וַיְכָשְׂרוּ הַמָּיִם מֵעַל הַאֲדָמָה הַלָּאֹשׁ (בְּמִדְיום ת üç)
  wayyāšubū  ham-mayim mē-ʕal hā-ʔārɛṣ hālōk
  and.receded.3MP  the-waters  from-upon  the-earth  go.INFABS
  wā-šōḇ  and-return.INFABS
  And the waters receded continually from the earth. (Gen. 8:3)

d. בְּיוֹם הַהוֹדוֹת אֶפֶכְוָיָא לִנִּי אָל-אִשָּׁר בֵּרַח אָל-יִשָּׁר אֶל-בִּית הָהֹלֵל (שָׁמִי ג12)
  bay-yōm hahū  qaقيم  ṣēl  ṣēl  ṣē  ḫāṣer dibbatī  ṣēl
  in.the-day  that  will.perform.IS  to  Eli  ACC  all  that  spoke.IS  to
  bēt-ō hāhēl wə-kalē  house-POS.3MS  begin.INFABS  and-end.INFABS
  In that day I will perform against Eli all that I have spoken concerning
  his house, from beginning to end. (1 Sam. 3:12)

For the purposes of the present article, I will mostly ignore the adverbial use
(3), where the infinitive is “bare” of any functional category, and hence is not
clausal and does not introduce a subject.7 I will only be interested in the uses
of the infinitive which involve clausal constructions with functional categories,
and hence a subject. The point of the present article is to show that there are
two types of such constructions, one classified together with finite clauses as
having conversational force, and the other—as lacking such force. A second
dimension classifies clauses as having temporal anchoring, and others as lack-
ing it. We will see the implications of this classification in the next section:

| +Mood     | −Mood     |
|-----------|-----------|
| +T        | Poss-inf (1c) |
| −T        | PRO-inf (1d) |

7 I consider adverbial also the “sequential use”, where the Infinitive Absolute, together with its
internal arguments, is conjoined to a previous clause and interpreted within the scope of the
latter’s inflection and subject:

(i) וְזֵאת מְנַשֶּׁה לָהֵם לִקְחָהוֹת (רַוחֲעִישׁ ט20)
  zōt  naʕăšē  lā-hem  wə-hahāyē  ṣōtām
  this  do.MOD.IP  to-3MP  and.let.live.INFABS  ACC-3MP
  This we will do to them: we will let them live (Josh. 9:20).
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Two types of infinitival clauses

The present section discusses the two different uses of the infinitive which involve clausal constructions, i.e. the verb together with all its arguments and functional categories.

3.1 [+Mood] infinitival clauses

The first construction is a clause with imperative force (including notional jussive and cohortative). The allomorph of the infinitive in this construction is the Infinitive Absolute. According to the analysis proposed here, this is due to the fact that the only functional category specified in this construction is Mood, with an [-finite] value interpreted as imperative force. Since the T and Asp/Mod categories in the clause are unspecified, there is no inflection to alter the citation form of the infinitive, nor, as we discuss below, to provide an attachment site for subject and object clitics. And as there is no temporal anchoring of the verb to the speech act, these sentences tend to be generic in interpretation unlike the discourse-bound interpretation of the finite imperative (iai).

I will call this construction Nom-inf, since it includes a nominative subject, either a null pro (an addressee-oriented logophoric pronoun according to Portner’s 2004 analysis of the imperative), as in (4a), and also (1b) above, or a lexical DP, as in (4b–f), an option found cross-linguistically in imperative clauses (Mauck et al. 2005). As is to be expected of imperative clauses, they are typically root clauses (Palmer 2001). This might be true even when introduced by verba dicendi as in (4d), since practically all reported speech in the Bible is direct quotation, constructed as a conjunction of root clauses, which is possible for imperatives as well (Maier 2010).

(4) a. šāmōr rōmāš yōm haš-šabbāt lə-qaddəš-ō
observe.INFABS ACC day.CS the-sabbath to-sanctify.INF-ACC.3MS
Observe the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. (Deut. 5:11(12))

---

8 The same is true in Arabic, where the qatāli form which corresponds to the Infinitive Absolute also serves as an imperative (Wright 1874: Vol. 1, p. 62).

9 As is known from the literature (Portner 1997 and references therein), Mood is the category which determines the conversational force of a root clause (Indicative, Imperative, etc.).

10 This contrast is reminiscent of the contrast between the generic lō+Modal negation and the eventive ?al+Jussive negation among Fin clauses.
b. This is the law of the grain offering: The sons of Aaron shall offer it on the altar before Lord (Lev. 6:7[14])

The sons of Aaron shall offer it on the altar before the Lord. (Lev. 6:7[14])

And this is the law of the grain offering: The sons of Aaron shall offer it on the altar before Lord. (Lev. 6:7[14])


d. Then the Lord said to Moses, the man must surely be put to death; all the congregation shall stone him with stones outside the camp. (Num. 15:35)

Then the Lord said to Moses, the man must surely be put to death; all the congregation shall stone him with stones outside the camp. (Num. 15:35)


e. Let a man meet a bear robbed of her cubs, rather than a fool in his folly. (Prov. 17:12)

Let a man meet a bear robbed of her cubs, rather than a fool in his folly. (Prov. 17:12)

f. Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die. (Is. 22:13)

Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die. (Is. 22:13)
I illustrate with simplified structures the Fin vs. Nom-inf imperative, where the former but not the latter includes specification of T and Asp/Mod functional layers (TAM for short):

(5) a. Fin Imperative (=1a)

\[
\text{\textit{zəḵōr} \textit{la-ʕăḇāḏe-ḵā} ... remember.IMPR.2MS to-servants-POS.2MP}
\]

Remember Your servants ... (Deut 9:27)

```
\begin{tikzpicture}
    \node (V) at (0,0) {$zəḵōr$};
    \node (Mood) at (0,-1) {$\text{Mood+TAM-P}$};
    \node (V+TAM) at (-1,-2) {$\text{V+Mood+TAM}$};
    \node (V+Mood) at (1,-2) {$\text{V+Mood}$};
    \node (Voice) at (0,-3) {$\text{VoiceP}$};
    \node (pro2) at (0,-1.5) {$\text{pro}$_2};
    \node (la-ʕăḇāḏe-ḵā) at (0.5,-2.5) {...};

    \draw[->] (V) -- (Mood);
    \draw[->] (Mood) -- (V+TAM);
    \draw[->] (V+TAM) -- (V+Mood);
    \draw[->] (V+Mood) -- (Voice);
    \draw[->] (pro2) -- (Mood);
    \draw[->] (la-ʕăḇāḏe-ḵā) -- (Mood);
\end{tikzpicture}
```

b. Nom-inf Imperative (=1b)

\[
\text{\textit{zāḵōr} \textit{ʔɛṯ yōm haš-šabbāṭ} ...}
\]

Remember the Sabbath day ... (Ex. 20:8)

```
\begin{tikzpicture}
    \node (V) at (0,0) {$zāḵōr$};
    \node (Mood) at (0,-1) {$\text{Mood}$};
    \node (V+Mood) at (-1,-2) {$\text{V+Mood}$};
    \node (Voice) at (0,-3) {$\text{VoiceP}$};
    \node (pro2) at (0,-1.5) {$\text{pro}$_2};
    \node (ʔɛṯ yōm haš-šabbāṭ) at (0.5,-2.5) {...};

    \draw[->] (V) -- (Mood);
    \draw[->] (Mood) -- (V+Mood);
    \draw[->] (V+Mood) -- (Voice);
    \draw[->] (pro2) -- (Mood);
    \draw[->] (ʔɛṯ yōm haš-šabbāṭ) -- (Mood);
\end{tikzpicture}
```
3.2 [-Mood] infinitival clauses

The infinitive allomorph in the second type of construction is the Infinitive Construct. This allomorph allows the attachment of pronominal clitics, something that is strictly disallowed in the Nom-inf construction, built with the Infinitive Absolute allomorph. As we will see below, this difference is due to the fact that subject and object clitics attach to the relevant functional categories—T and Asp/Mod respectively—which are present in the second type of construction but not in the Nom-inf construction.

The first subtype, familiar from other languages, has a null pronominal anaphor subject (PRO), typically controlled by another DP in the linguistic context. This is the PRO-inf construction. We will see below that it does not have temporal specification, i.e. its T is unspecified, yet it does have Asp/Mod specification. As it is not specified for T, or Mood, the subject is not assigned case, and is hence PRO. As it is specified for Asp/Mod, but not T, it allows object but not subject clitics.

The second subtype, Poss-inf, has an overt subject with possessive case.\(^{11}\) I will argue that this construction is temporal and includes specification of the functional category T, though not of the category Asp/Mod. As it has T specification, but not Asp/Mod, it allows subject but not object clitics. It is distinguished from finite clauses, which have both T and Asp/Mod specification (and hence both subject and object clitics). I assume that it is non-finite T which assigns possessive case to the subject, in parallel to the non-finite -ing functional category which assigns accusative case to the subject of Acc-ing gerunds in English according to Reuland’s 1983 analysis.\(^{12}\)

In the following examples of PRO-inf and Poss-inf, notice the Infinitive Construct allomorphs \(rəʔō\)'see' and \(šūḇ\)'return' in (6) and (7), which differ from the corresponding Infinitive Absolute allomorphs \(rāʔō\) and \(šōḇ\) of the same verbs in (3) above.

---

\(^{11}\) The possessive case is a marked case of the subject in other languages as well, such as Alaskan Yup’ik (Abney 1987:28), Finnish (Kiparsky 2001), Ladakhi, Lak, Niue (Lander 2011:590), Tagalog (Aldridge 2006, Collins 2017), Tzutujil Maya (Abney 1987:31), and others.

\(^{12}\) It has often been noticed that the BH Infinitive Construct subsumes properties of both infinitives and gerunds in other languages. PRO-inf subsumes both the English infinitive and the PRO-ing gerund. Poss-inf parallels the English Acc-ing gerund, despite the morphological difference between accusative and genitive. Poss-inf does not parallel the English Poss-ing, which is a nominal rather than a clausal construction (Pires 2001, 2006, 2007; Moulton 2004).
The possessive case of the Poss-inf subject is overtly marked for pronominal subjects, in particular the 1st person singular and the 3rd person masculine singular, where the possessive marking differs from accusative marking of the corresponding object clitics in the PRO-inf construction. Thus, the 1st person object clitic -ēnī in (8a) differs in form from the 1st person subject clitic -ī in (8b), and the 3rd person object clitic -ēhū in (9a) differs in form from the 3rd person subject clitic -ō in (9b):
(8) a. PRO-inf

Do you intend to kill me as you killed the Egyptian? (Ex. 2:14)

b. Poss-inf

And the plague shall not be on you to destroy you when I strike the land of Egypt. (Ex. 12:13)

(9) a. PRO-inf

And they committed him to Gedaliah ... that he should take him home. (Jer. 39:14)

b. Poss-inf

The covenant of the Lord which He made with our fathers, when He brought them out of the land of Egypt (1 Kings 8:21)

The two constructions contrast sharply in distribution. All the (b) examples in (6)–(9) above are temporal adverbials, and none of the (a) examples are. This is not an accident, as it is the case in general that temporal prepositions only take Poss-inf complements, never PRO-inf complements. I attribute this to fact that Poss-inf clauses include T specification in their structure, whereas PRO-
inf clauses do no. Thus only the former can serve as the Specifier of the main clause T head (Cinque 1999). PRO-inf clauses function as purpose clauses, as in (6a) and (9a), i.e. they are Asp/Mod phrases (AM for short) which are adjuncts to the Asp/Mod head of the main clause:13,14

(10) a. Poss-inf
Spec of T: temporal adverbial (cf. 6b)

\[
\text{TP} \longrightarrow \text{PP} \quad \text{TAM-P} \\
\text{P} \quad \text{TP} \quad \text{V+TAM} \quad \text{VoiceP} \\
| \quad V+T \quad | \quad | \\
\text{wa-ki} \quad \text{VoiceP} \quad \text{ʔāmar} \quad \text{pro}_3 \mspace{1mu} \text{VP} \\
\text{raʔōt} \quad \text{šāʔul} \quad \text{VP} \quad \text{ψ \text{ʔel} \text{ʔaḥnēr}} \\
\text{ψ \text{ʔet dāwid}}
\]

Purpose clauses are part of infinitival clauses which “are a group which displays a characteristic future-oriented, irrealis semantics” (Portner 1997: 183). Yet, as argued by Wurmbrand (2001, 2014), the seeming temporal relation of the infinitival clause to the main clause is not due to T but to Mod, which determines the inherent future orientation of purposes.

Purpose clauses are distinct from rationale clauses (Jones 1985, Verstraete 2008), which can be expressed by the Poss-inf construction. The latter describes a result event, as in (i) below, not necessarily the outcome and agent’s intentions, unlike the intentional/modal characterization of purpose clauses:

(i) Poss-inf: rationale clause

\[
\text{TP} \longrightarrow \text{PP} \quad \text{TAM-P} \\
\text{P} \quad \text{TP} \quad \text{V+TAM} \quad \text{VoiceP} \\
| \quad V+T \quad | \quad | \\
\text{wa-šamərū} \quad \text{derek} \quad \text{יהוה ləmaʕan} \quad [\text{hāḥi} \text{יהוה} \quad \text{ʕal} \text{ʔaḥrāhām} \\
\text{and.Keep.MOD.3MP way.CS Lord} \quad \text{for} \quad [\text{bring.INF Lord} \\
\text{ʔet} \quad \text{ʔēṣer dābər} \quad \text{ʕal-āw}] \\
\text{on Abraham ACC that spoke.3MS on-3MS] \\
\text{that they keep the way of the Lord, ..., that the LORD may bring to Abraham what} \\
\text{He has spoken to him (Gen. 18:39)}
\]

One syntactic difference which distinguishes purpose and rationale clauses is that only the former allow an additional controlled empty category (glossed as \(e_j\) in the following example):
b. PRO-inf
Spec of Asp/Mod: purpose adverbial
\(\text{wayyērēd} \quad \text{YHWH} \quad \text{li-rəʔōt} \quad \text{ʔet hā-ʕūr}\)
came.down.3MS Lord to-see.INF ACC the-city
The Lord came down to see the city (Gen 11:5)

Infinitival clauses also function as complements, and as such are selected by different types of verbs. Poss-inf clauses are propositional TPs, and are hence selected by propositional attitude verbs, such as know (Gen. 19:35, Jer. 15:15), remember (Jer. 22.2, 18:20), consent (Gen. 19:21), hear (1Sam 14:27), see (Is. 52:8), illustrated in (11a). PRO-inf clauses are Asp/ModP, and hence complements of aspectual verbs, e.g. begin (Judg. 20:39), repeat (1Sam 15:35), stop (1Sam. 23:13), finish (Lev. 16:20),\(^\text{15}\) or modal verbs such as be able (Deut 7:22),

\[\text{TP} \quad \text{V+TAM+TP} \quad \text{AM-P} \]
\[\text{wayyērēd} \quad \text{YHWH} \quad \text{AM-P} \]
\[\text{PP} \quad \text{AM-P} \quad \text{AM VP} \]
\[\text{P} \quad \text{AM-P} \quad \text{AM VP} \]
\[\text{li-} \quad \text{V+AM} \quad \text{VoiceP} \quad \text{V YHWH} \]
\[\text{rəʔōt} \quad \text{PRO VP} \]
\[\text{ʔet hā-ʕūr} \]

\(^{15}\) ter Meulen (1995) notes that aspectual verbs such as begin, stop, continue, can have infinitival complements if they describe an event-external change.
want (1 Sam. 19:2), intend (Ex. 2:14), plan (Deut. 19:19), refuse (Num. 20:21),
give up (1 Sam. 27:1), order (2 Sam. 17:14), prevent (Num. 22:16), illustrated in
(11b).16

(11) a. Poss-inf
   Complement of propositional attitude verb
   zāḵartī l-āḵ ... lekt-ēk ūḥār-ay
   remember.is to-2fs go.1INF-POSS.2FS behind-is
   I remember your following me (Jer. 2:2)

   TAM-P
   _V+TAM_ VoiceP
   _zāḵartī_ pro1 VP
   PP VP
   _lāḵ_ V TP
   V+T VP
   lekt-ēk pro2rs VP
   V ūḥāray bammidbār

   b. PRO-inf
   Complement of Modal/Aspectual verb
   ūḥattā ūmēr lō-horg-eṇī
   you intend.ptc to-kill.1INF-ACC.IS
   You intend to kill me. (Ex. 2:14) cf. (8a)

---
16 Additional examples are given in Doron (2018).
Aspectual and modal verbs in the (11b) structure are control verbs expressing root modality (Ability, Deontic). When the same verbs modify the aspectual and modal dimension of a state/event which is not determined by the actions or abilities of an agent, their modality is interpreted as alethic (metaphysical), they do not have an agent, and function as raising verbs (Hacquard 2011). The following examples describe the beginning (a), repetition (b), possibility (c) of an event/state, independently of an agent. The non-agentive subject of the complement raises from the infinitival clause, leaving a trace (t) which is an empty category different from PRO, yet like PRO is restricted to case-less positions:

(12) 

a. לַדָח pro [לְלוֹהֵי] tōyōṯ Ashton God.black "[bronder wih] pro [לְלוֹהֵי] tōyōṯ Ashton God.black [hāḏal pro3ms li-[ḥyōṯ t3ms la-sārā ḥōrah
ceased.3ms pro3ms to-[be.INF t3ms to-Sarah period.M
kan-nāšīm] as.the-women"
Sarah had passed the age of childbearing (Gen. 18:11)

b. wat.tōseph ham-milḥāmā li-[ḥyōṯ t3fs] and.recurred.3fs the-war.3s to-[be.INF t3fs]
And there was war again (Gen. 19:8)
(13) Complement of a raising Modal/Aspectual verb

\[
\text{wat-tōsep} \quad \text{ham-milha}\text{mā, li- [hyōt t_i]}
\]

And there was war again (Gen. 19:8)

The importance of the examples in (12) is in demonstrating the clausal nature of infinitives with null subjects.

3.3 The morpho-syntax of the various verb forms

Unlike the Nom-inf construction, which is restricted to root clauses, the PRO-inf and Poss-inf constructions are embedded clauses, i.e. never have conversational force of their own. This fact has been encoded by their including no specification of the functional category Mood. Yet they can acquire conversational force and function as main clauses through a fronted \textit{wh}-element such as \textit{ma} ‘what’ in (14):
Another morphosyntactic distinction has been attributed above to the categories T and Asp/Mod—i.e. the variation between the different infinitive constructions, and the contrast between them and the Fin construction, in allowing the cliticization of subject and object pronouns as part of the morphology of the verb. The following table summarizes the allowed cliticization options in the different constructions, and examples are given in (16)–(17) below:

| + Subj cl. | – Subj cl. |
|---|---|
| + Obj cl. | Fin | PRO-inf |
| – Obj cl. | Poss-inf | Nom-inf |

The verb in the PRO-inf construction can have object clitics (16b, 17b) but clearly not subject clitics, since, for case reasons, it does not have an overt subject of any kind. On the other hand, the verb in the Poss-inf construction can have an overt object. But crucially—not in the form of a clitic (16c, 17c). This is surprising, since both subject and object clitics appear with a Fin verb (16a, 17a):

(16) a. Fin

הוגים יאשר תamespaceים עליננתקם (יחוקנאљ ב) (14)

hag-gōyîm ṭāšer hōšēṯī-m la-fēnē-hēm
the peoples that brought.out.1S-ACC.2MP to-eyes-POSS.3MP
the Gentiles, in whose sight I had brought them out (Eze. 20:14)
b. PRO-inf

\[ \text{lo-hōṣīʔ-ām mē-ʔeres mīṣrāyim} \]
\[ \text{to-bring.out.INF-ACC.3MP from-land.cs Egypt} \]
\[ \text{for bringing them out of the land of Egypt (Ex. 12:42)} \]

\[ \text{b. PRO-inf} \]

\[ \text{lo-hōṣīʔ-ām mē-ʔeres mīṣrāyim} \]
\[ \text{to-bring.out.INF-ACC.3MP from-land.cs Egypt} \]
\[ \text{for bringing them out of the land of Egypt (Ex. 12:42)} \]

\[ \text{c. Poss-inf} \]

\[ \text{ba-hōṣīʔ-ī ʔōṯām mē-ʔeres mīṣrāyim} \]
\[ \text{when-bring.out.INF-POSS.IS ACC.3MP from-land.cs Egypt} \]
\[ \text{when I brought them out of the land of Egypt (Lev. 23:43)} \]

(17) a. Fin

\[ \text{lō raʔūti-kā} \]
\[ \text{NEG saw.IS-ACC.2MS} \]
\[ \text{I have not seen you (Job 8:18)} \]

\[ \text{b. PRO-inf} \]

\[ \text{wayyāḇō ham-mɛlɛḵ li-rʔōṯ-ō} \]
\[ \text{came.3MS the-king to-see.INF-ACC.3MS} \]
\[ \text{the king came to see him (2 Sam. 13:6)} \]

\[ \text{c. Poss-inf} \]

\[ \text{ʔaḥārē raʔōt-ī} \]
\[ \text{after see.INF-POSS.IS ACC face-POSS.2MS} \]
\[ \text{since I have seen your face (Gen. 46:30)} \]

The ungrammaticality in the (c) examples above is not due to “heaviness” of two combined clitics, since even if the subject is not a pronominal clitic but a full lexical item, an object clitic is impossible in the Poss-inf construction:
(18) Poss-inf

wayyāšem YHWH la-qayin ṭōt lə-biltī hakkōt ṭōtō kol

and.put.3MS Lord to-Cain mark to-NEG kill.INF ACC.3MS any

mōs?-ō

find.PTC.MS-POSS.3MS

And the Lord set a mark on Cain, lest anyone finding him should kill him.  
(Gen. 4:15)

* lə-biltī hakkōt-ō kol mōs?-ō

to-NEG kill.INF-ACC.3MS any find.PTC.MS-POSS.3MS

(19) Poss-inf

bə-šolh-ēnī mōše

when-send.INF-ACC.IS Moses

I was forty years old when Moses the servant of the LORD sent me ... (Josh. 14:7)

* ba-šolh-ēnī mōše

when-send.INF-ACC.IS Moses

The ban against an object clitic in the Poss-inf construction is thus not morphophonological but morphosyntactic. I have assumed that it is the functional category Asp/Mod which licenses the object clitic, both in the Fin clause and in the PRO-inf clause. The Asp/Mod category is unspecified in the Poss-inf construction, hence the lack of object clitics. As has often been remarked in the literature, object clitics attach to inflection which is characteristically verbal (e.g. in Romance, Cardinaletti and Shlonsky 2004). 17

I summarize in (21) the morpho-syntactic characteristics of the different finite and infinitival clauses, where the relevant functional categories are ordered by the hierarchy in (20):

---

17 Indeed the participle, which is inflected as a noun, mostly takes genitive marked object clitics:
The biblical Hebrew infinitive

The Hebrew grammatical tradition, ever since the Rabbinic and Karaite grammars of the middle ages, views the infinitive absolute as verbal, and the infinitive construct as nominal (Eldar 2014, Gaash 2018). The European grammatical tradition views both infinitives as mixed nominal/verbal categories (Gesenius 1910, Joüon 1923, Waltke and O’Connor 1990, Arnold and Choi 2003, and others). But, as already argued in Doron (2018), a careful analysis shows that the infinitive is verbal, and has no nominal properties whatsoever. This claim can actually be substantiated on two counts. First, the lexical category of the infinitive is V rather than N, not even a deverbal N. Second, the functional categories specifying V are clausal rather than nominal—similarly to what has been shown by

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{Phrasal category} & \text{Projected by functional categories} & \text{Mood morphology} & \text{Verb} & \text{Subj. case} & \text{Subj. clitic} & \text{Obj. clitic} \\
\text{Fin clause} & \text{TAM-P} & +\text{Mood+T+Asp/Mod} & \pm\text{Indic.} & \text{Finite} & \text{Nom} & + & + \\
\text{Nom-inf} & \text{MoodP} & +\text{Mood–T–Asp/Mod} & –\text{Indic.} & \text{Inf. Abs.} & \text{Nom} & – & – \\
\text{Poss-inf} & \text{TP} & –\text{Mood+T–Asp/Mod} & – & \text{Inf. Constr} & \text{Poss} & + & – \\
\text{PRO-inf} & \text{Asp/Mod} & –\text{Mood–T+Asp/Mod} & – & \text{Inf. Constr} & – & – & + \\
\end{array}
\]

4 The clausal nature of the infinitive construction

The participle exhibits noun/verb duality, and there are also a few cases where it heads a finite clause with accusative object clitics:

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{i}) & \quad \text{mōṣʔ-ī} & \text{find.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{ii}) & \quad \text{məp̄alləṭ-ī} & \text{deliver.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} & \text{hate.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{iv}) & \quad \text{šōlḥ-ī} & \text{send.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \end{align*}
\]

Yet the participle exhibits noun/verb duality, and there are also a few cases where it heads a finite clause with accusative object clitics:

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{i}) & \quad \text{mōṣʔ-ī} & \text{find.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{ii}) & \quad \text{məp̄alləṭ-ī} & \text{deliver.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} & \text{hate.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{iii}) & \quad \text{məšanʔ-ī} & \text{hate.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{iv}) & \quad \text{šōlḥ-ī} & \text{send.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \end{align*}
\]

Yet the participle exhibits noun/verb duality, and there are also a few cases where it heads a finite clause with accusative object clitics:

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{i}) & \quad \text{mōṣʔ-ī} & \text{find.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{ii}) & \quad \text{məp̄alləṭ-ī} & \text{deliver.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} & \text{hate.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{iii}) & \quad \text{məšanʔ-ī} & \text{hate.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{iv}) & \quad \text{šōlḥ-ī} & \text{send.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \end{align*}
\]

Yet the participle exhibits noun/verb duality, and there are also a few cases where it heads a finite clause with accusative object clitics:

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{i}) & \quad \text{mōṣʔ-ī} & \text{find.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{ii}) & \quad \text{məp̄alləṭ-ī} & \text{deliver.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} & \text{hate.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{iii}) & \quad \text{məšanʔ-ī} & \text{hate.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{iv}) & \quad \text{šōlḥ-ī} & \text{send.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \end{align*}
\]

Yet the participle exhibits noun/verb duality, and there are also a few cases where it heads a finite clause with accusative object clitics:

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{i}) & \quad \text{mōṣʔ-ī} & \text{find.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{ii}) & \quad \text{məp̄alləṭ-ī} & \text{deliver.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} & \text{hate.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{iii}) & \quad \text{məšanʔ-ī} & \text{hate.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{iv}) & \quad \text{šōlḥ-ī} & \text{send.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \end{align*}
\]

Yet the participle exhibits noun/verb duality, and there are also a few cases where it heads a finite clause with accusative object clitics:

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{i}) & \quad \text{mōṣʔ-ī} & \text{find.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{ii}) & \quad \text{məp̄alləṭ-ī} & \text{deliver.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} & \text{hate.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{iii}) & \quad \text{məšanʔ-ī} & \text{hate.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{iv}) & \quad \text{šōlḥ-ī} & \text{send.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \end{align*}
\]

Yet the participle exhibits noun/verb duality, and there are also a few cases where it heads a finite clause with accusative object clitics:

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{i}) & \quad \text{mōṣʔ-ī} & \text{find.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{ii}) & \quad \text{məp̄alləṭ-ī} & \text{deliver.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} & \text{hate.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{iii}) & \quad \text{məšanʔ-ī} & \text{hate.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{iv}) & \quad \text{šōlḥ-ī} & \text{send.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \end{align*}
\]

Yet the participle exhibits noun/verb duality, and there are also a few cases where it heads a finite clause with accusative object clitics:

\[
\begin{align*}
(\text{i}) & \quad \text{mōṣʔ-ī} & \text{find.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{ii}) & \quad \text{məp̄alləṭ-ī} & \text{deliver.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} & \text{hate.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{iii}) & \quad \text{məšanʔ-ī} & \text{hate.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \\
(\text{iv}) & \quad \text{šōlḥ-ī} & \text{send.PTC.MS-POS.I.S} \end{align*}
\]
Pires (2001), (2006), (2007) for the English PRO-ing and Acc-ing gerunds, i.e. that they are clausal rather than nominal.  

First, the infinitive assigns accusative case to its direct object, as could be seen in all the examples above, where the infinitive had a direct object. Moreover, object clitics attached to the infinitive are always accusative rather than genitive. In the case of nominal forms, such as the participle, one mostly finds genitive object clitics (fn. 18).

Second, the infinitive has no nominal morphological inflection of gender, number, or definiteness. The infinitive is case marked in a few examples by the accusative ḥāṯ, as in (22a), but so are Fin CPs as in (22b):

(22) a. בָּאת הָאֵל גִּידֵךְ לָכֵי הָאֵלִים אֵלָי (מִבּ 27)
   wa-ḥēṯ ḥāḏā’ittū
   and-go.out.1INF-POSS.2MS
   yāḏāʕtī
   knew.1s

b. לָאָכָהֵז חַכָּשֶׁת רֶשְׁאַת תֶּאָתְפִצְקֶה רָּבְדִּמֵבָךְֹהַהְיָוַה (תֵרֶם 7)
   zōḵōr ḥāṯ āl tīškah ḥēṯ ḥāser
   remember.IMPR.2MS NEG forget.JUSS.2MS ACC that
   hiqṣap̄tā ḥēṯ YHWH ḥēlōh-ēḵā bam-midbār
   provoked.2MS ACC Lord God-POSS.2MS in.the-desert
   Remember! Do not forget how you provoked the Lord your God to wrath in the wilderness (Deut. 9:7)

18 In English, Poss-ing gerunds are nominal.
19 Modern Hebrew allows nominalized verbs to assign accusative case as well, which is a marked option crosslinguistically. This phenomenon originates in Medieval Hebrew under Arabic influence (Blau 1990, Goshen-Gottshtein 1951/2006). Yet it is not found in Biblical Hebrew, where forms such as ḥāḇa ‘love’, which were later recategorized as nouns, are still infinitives:

(i) בָּאת ḥāḇa יָוִה יִשְׂרָאֵל לְבָּלֵּים (מִבּ 9)
   ba-ḥāḇaṭ YHWH ḥēṯ yisra’ēl laḇālām
   because-love.1INF Lord ACC Israel forever
   Because the LORD has loved Israel forever (1 Kings 10:9).

20 There are few cases where the infinitive happens to have feminine morphology, such as love in the previous footnote. There are even fewer cases where the infinitive is preceded by the article the.
Third, the infinitive is not modified by adjectives but by adverbs, such as the adverbs ḥēṭēḇ ‘well’, ʕōḏ ‘more’, and mahēr ‘at once’ in (23):

(23) a. wāʔekkōṯ ʔōt-ō ṭāḥōn ḥēṭēḇ ʕād ʔāsēr Ḍaq
   and-crushed.IS ACC-3MS grind.INFABS well until that fine
   ła-ʕāpār
to-dust
   ... and crushed it and ground it very small, until it was as fine as dust
   (Deut. 9:21)

b. ?al tōsēp dabbēr ḋēl-ay ʕōḏ bad-dāḇār
   NEG repeat.JUSS.2MS speak.INF to-1s more in.the-matter
   ḥaz-ze
   the-this
   Speak no more to Me of this matter (Deut. 3:26)

c. lo ʕōṯō mahēr
   NEG be.able.MOD.2MS destroy.INF-ACC.3MP at.once
   you will be unable to destroy them at once (Deut. 7:22)

Fourth, despite the genitive case marking of its subject, the infinitive in the Poss-inf construction is not a noun. It does not head a construct state phrase. Unlike the nominal construct where the construct state (CS) noun must be absolutely adjacent to its complement, the same is not true of the infinitive in the Poss-inf construction. No adjacency required. The subject of the infinitive is separated from the verb in many examples, something which never happens in a construct. This is exemplified in the following examples where the subject is separated from the infinitive verb hakkōṯ in (24a) by the accusative pronoun ʔōtō, similarly in the other examples in (24):

(24) a. lə-biltī [hakkōṯ ʔōtō kol mōṣʔ-ō]
to-NEG [kill.INF ACC.3MS any find.PTC-POS.3MS]
   ... lest anyone finding him should kill him. (Gen. 4:15)
b. 

\[ \text{wa-yəhī \ kə-[nōah \ ūl-ēhem \ hā-rūaḥ] \ wayyiṯnabbəʔū } \]

and-was.3M as-[rest.INF on-3MP the-spirit] and.prophesied.3MP

and it happened, when the Spirit rested upon them, that they prophesied (Num. 11:25)

c. 

\[ \text{ha-[məšōl \ b-āḵem \ šiḇīm \ ?īš] } \]

Q-[reign.INF at-2MP seventy \ man]

[Which is better for you] that all seventy ... reign over you ...? (Judg. 9:2)

d. 

\[ \text{wə.hāyā \ lā-[nūs \ šāmmā \ kol \ rōṣēaḥ] } \]

will.be.3MS to-[flee.INF there \ any \ murder.PTC.MS]

that any manslayer may flee there (Deut. 19:3)

We now turn to showing that embedded infinitival clauses have the distribution of embedded clauses rather than nominal projections. They are found as complements of prepositions, but only prepositions which take clausal arguments, including Fin CPs, for example the preposition \(kə\) — ‘as’ expressing similarity:

\[ (25) \]

\[ \text{a. \ lō \ tēṣē \ kə-ṣē} \]

NEG \(go.out.MOD.3FS \) \(as-go.out.INF \) \(the.slaves.MP \)

she shall not go out as the male slaves do (Ex. 21:7)

\[ b. \text{umāšaḥtā \ ?ōṯām \ ka-ʔăšɛr \ māšhūtā \ ?ēt } \]

anoint.MOD.2MS \(ACC.3MP \) \(as-that \) \(annointed.2MS \) \(ACC \)

father-POSS.3MP

You shall anoint them, as you anointed their father (Ex. 40:15)

Prepositions like \(ṣīm\) ‘with’, which only take DPs complements and do not take Fin-CP complements, also do not take infinitival clauses. On the other hand, prepositions like \(yaʔan\) ‘since’, which do not take nominal complements in Classical BH but do take Fin-CPs, also take infinitival clauses:
The biblical Hebrew infinitive

(26) a. 

\[ \text{Yaʕan hitmakker-əḵā la-ʕăśōṯ hā-raʕ bə-šēnē YHWH} \]

since betook.INF.POSS.2MS to-do.INF the-evil in-eyes.cs YHWH

hu-ənī mēbī ?ēl-ekā rāʕā

behold-1s bring.PTC.MS to-2MS calamity

Because you have sold yourself to do evil in the sight of the Lord, behold, I will bring calamity on you. (2 Kings 21:20–21)

b. 

\[ \text{Yaʕan kī niḵnaʕ mip-pān-ay lō ṭābī} \]

since that submitted.3MS from-face-POSS.1S NEG bring.MOD.1S

hā-raʕā ba-yām-āw

the-calamity in-days-POSS.3MS

Because he has humbled himself before Me, I will not bring the calamity in his days. (1 Kings 21:29)

The quantifier kol ‘all’, typically constructed with noun phrases, is found in the construct with infinitival clauses, but so it is with Fin CPs:

(27) a. 

\[ \text{Lēšụm aḥalām bēl raʕām aḥalām (M"A H T 52)} \]

li-šəmōaʕ ʔăl-ēhɛm bə-ḵōl qorəʔ-ām ?ēl-ekā

to-listen.INF to-3MP when-any call.INF-POSS.3MP to-2MS

to listen to them whenever they call to You (1 Kings 8:52)

b. 

\[ \text{wayyōšaʕ YHWH ʔēṯ dāwiḏ bə-ḵōl ṭāsēr hālāk} \]

and.saved.3MS Lord ACC David where-any that went.3MS

So the LORD preserved David wherever he went (2 Sam. 8:6)

Other nouns, such as yōm ‘day’, which are constructed to infinitival clauses, are also constructed to Fin CPs:

(28) a. 

\[ \text{Lēmāʕan tīzkôr ʔēṯ yōm šēt-ḵā} \]

for remember.MOD.2MS ACC day.cs exit.INF-POSS.2MS

me-ʔeřeʃ miṣrayim

from-land.cs Egypt

that you may remember the day in which you came out of the land of Egypt (Deut 16:3)
Moreover, like Fin CPs, infinitival clauses function as relative clauses. (29a) has a Fin CP relative clause, (29b)—a PRO-inf relative clause, and (29c)—a Poss-inf relative clause.

(29) a. Fin

כל בשר אשאירו ליהוה (בערביה 15)

kol bāsār ṭāšer yaqrīḇū la-YHWH

all flesh [that bring.MOD:3MP to-Lord t]

all flesh which they bring to the Lord (Num. 18:15)

b. PRO-inf

لةם לא-עקול

leḥem le-ʔeḵōl

bread to-[eat.INF t]

bread to eat (Gen. 28:20)

c. Poss-inf

כוס לשתה יקנס (שםיה 1)

mayim li- štōt ḥā-ʕām

water to- [drink.INF the-people t]

water for the people to drink (Ex. 17:1)

Finally, negation is found with infinitival clauses, and it can be shown to take scope over the entire clause rather than just modifying the infinitival head. Only clausal scope can give the correct reading in (30). Sacrificing to the Lord is the purpose of sending off the people, not the purpose of not-sending off the people. Therefore, negation attaches to the full clause *letting the people go to sacrifice to the Lord* rather than to the head *letting go*. In Modern Hebrew, the negative *bilti* has grammaticalized into a prefix which attaches to lexical items, in particular adjectives.
But let Pharaoh not deal deceitfully anymore in not letting the people go to sacrifice to the Lord. (Ex. 8:25[29])

5 The emergence of event nominals

As this paper has demonstrated, Biblical Hebrew makes heavy use of the infinitive. This correlates with the dearth of event nominals in the Bible. Yet their number increases towards late Biblical Hebrew, in the Second Temple period, a tendency that multiplies in Rabbinic Hebrew (Ben-Asher 1976), where they completely supersede the Poss-Inf construction.

Event nominals often started off as nouns referring to concrete entities, and their abstract event denotation developed later. In the Bible, the noun malkūt for example is not interpreted as 'reign', but as 'kingdom'. In this early interpretation, it does not have an argument structure, but, which is interesting, probably neither does it have argument structure under the event interpretation, which it later developed. In other words, even under the later interpretation it functions as a Simple Event Nominal in the terminology of Grimshaw (1990). Indeed, event nominals in the Bible, and also in RH, never have accusative-marked direct objects, which only emerged in Medieval Hebrew. Biblical event-expressions assigning accusative case are not event nominals but infinitives (cf. footnote 20).

The following examples illustrate the replacement of the infinitive in the Poss-inf construction in the early Bible (the book of Kings), by the event nominal (in the book of Chronicles, late Biblical Hebrew).

(31) a. Poss-inf

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{baš-šānā hā-raḥibītā lī-mloḵ šəlōmō ʔal yišrāʔēl in.the-year the-fourth to-reign.INF Solomon on Israel } \\
\text{in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel (1 Kings 6:1)}
\end{align*}
\]
b. Event Nominal

\[
\text{bi-šnát hā-ʔarbāʕim le-malkūt dāwīd}
\]

in-year.cs the-forty to-reign.cs David

In the fortieth year of the reign of David (1 Chronicles 26:31)

Late Biblical Hebrew also saw a blurring of the distinction between the two allomorphs of the infinitive (Absolute and Construct), as reported by Fassberg (2007), Morrison (2013), Mor (2015, to appear), and others. Rabbinic Hebrew has a single infinitive allomorph, different from both Biblical allomorphs, and its distribution is that of the Biblical PRO-inf.

It seems reasonable to assume that it was the collapse of the Mood specification in the verbal system of post-Biblical Hebrew, which launched the demise of the Nom-inf construction. As to the replacement of Poss-inf by event nominalization, this is not a trivial development. I conjecture it could have been due to the introduction into Hebrew of the category D, which could have replaced the category T as the head of propositional event complement/adjuncts, favouring combination with event nouns rather than infinitive verbs. This will hopefully be the topic of further research.

6 Conclusion

The article has shown how the morphosyntax of the different infinitival clauses determines their distribution. Nom-inf clauses are root clauses with irrealis Mood, hence have the conversational force of imperatives. PRO-inf and Poss-inf clauses are not specified for Mood, and thus have no conversational force. They therefore must be embedded clauses. The lack of T specification, in addition to the lack of Mood specification, determines that the PRO-inf clause cannot be interpreted as an independent proposition, but is rather interpreted as part of the event denoted by the main clause, since it depends for its temporal anchoring on the temporal specification of the main clause. The Asp/Mod specification of the PRO-inf construction allows it to function as complement of aspeccual and modal verbs, and as adjunct to Mod/Asp heads, i.e. as purpose clauses. The Poss-inf clause, on the other hand, contains a specification of T, and hence denotes a separate proposition from the one denoted by the main clause. Accordingly, it functions as a complement of propositional attitude verbs or a temporal / rationale / result adjunct. The specification of T and/or Asp/Mod in an infinitival clause has also been shown to explain the various possibilities of subject and object cliticization in the various clauses.
In sum, the paper has shown that the same functional categories which determine the inflection of the Biblical Hebrew finite verb also determine the feature specification of the Biblical Hebrew infinitive.
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