The Hebrew Resultative Constructions Conundrum

Danny Kalev[*][1]

[1]Tel Aviv University (TAU) – Israël

Résumé

I will argue that new future resultative constructions based on past tense forms are now emerging in Hebrew and discuss two research questions:

- How do these constructions differ from Hebrew's future tense and imperative mood?
- What are the motivations for the seemingly counter-intuitive choice of past tense forms?

The Future Resultative Construction employs past tense forms to denote a future state ensuing from a previous action. *xasaxta* (lit. 'you saved') in (1) conveys the future state of having saved 300 shekels (due to a future purchase). By contrast, Hebrew's future tense (2) bears no such resultative reading:

(1) *ha-mexir ecle-nu: 900.* ***xasaxta****: 300* (Mobile Website)

DEF-price at-1.PL 900 **save.PST.2.SG.M** 300

'Our price: 900. Your saving will be: 300'

(2) *nipagesh maxar*

meet.FUT.1.PL tomorrow

'We'll meet tomorrow'

The Military Imperative Construction consists of second person past tense forms and a temporal upper-bound. It requires that the addressee shall be in a future state of having executed the command (3). By contrast, Hebrew's imperative mood (4) merely asserts the command:

(3) *daka **hikaftem** ta-ma'ahal!*

minute *encircle.PST.2.PL.M* ACC.DEF-camp

'Be in a state of having run around (lit. you ran around) the camp in a minute!'

(4) *takifu ta-ma'ahal!*

encircle.IMPERATIVE.2.PL ACC.DEF-camp

---

[*]Intervenant

'Run around the camp!'

I argue that the use of past tense forms is motivated: the future state is the *point of reference* R from which the event E is viewed (Reichenbach 1947). E is a *relative past* of R in a Perfect's formulation E-R. De Swart schematizes resultatives as an eventuality *e* immediately followed by a state *s*. (2007: 2278). Thus, the past tense forms in the above constructions reflect the anteriority of *e* to *s* iconically.