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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. 

\[ \text{save.PST.2.SG.M 300} \]

‘Our price: 900. Your saving will be: 300’

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:

\[ \text{takifu ta-ma’ahal!} \]

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

(1) \text{ha-mexir ecle-nu: 900. xasaxta: 300} (Mobile Website)

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

(2) \text{nipagesh maxar}

meet.FUT.1.PL tomorrow

‘We’ll meet tomorrow’

(3) \text{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) \text{takifu ta-ma’ahal!}

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