FOUR TOPICS IN MODERN HEBREW GRAMMAR*

I. Idem per idem

A relative clause that repeats exactly the content of the main clause is called idem per idem in Hebrew grammar because such a clause does not explain anything if interpreted literally. Its most famous example is the biblical אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי אֲנִי (Exodus 3: 14) ‘You can call me as you want,’ lit. ‘I am who I am.’ The use of idem per idem in the Hebrew Bible was studied by Ogden (1992). Some of his conclusions are valid for Modern Hebrew, as I will demonstrate. Peretz (1967: 146–148) ascribes two meanings to idem per idem relative sentences: 1. In some contexts they express a general, vague reference, if the speaker does not want to refer more precisely to the content. In the example given by Peretz: מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵת (הָיָה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, מ), ‘he entered the place that he entered,’ the author used idem per idem in order not to mention the Holy of Holies, whose name was taboo. 2. In other contexts idem per idem sentences express ‘decisiveness,’ according to Peretz, and his example is: מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵתוֹן מֵת (הָיָה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, ה, מ), ‘what has been done, has been done and it is impossible to change it.’

The aim of this paper is to describe the functions of relative sentences of the idem per idem type in modern literary Hebrew more closely.

* The paper is based on an earlier lecture presented by the author at the Plenary Session of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Cracow Branch, held on 17 December 2007.

1 The term idem per idem is used by Ogden (1992). His definition of the term is insufficient, since it confines the identity of the main and the relative clause to the same verb used in both of them.

2 Lagarde (cf. Ogden 1992: 109) interpreted biblical instances of the idem per idem type in the same way.

3 Peretz reads לָאִים, my translation follows Blackman who reads לָאִים.

1. “It does not matter”

In most instances an *idem per idem* sentence means ‘It does not matter.’ Examples of this use are given below:

1. Here [...] in the care of these two Turks, nothing bad will happen to him, irrespective of what would be there (יהיה بشם האר יתייה) (ראובני 61). (ראובני 61)
2. He will not go to her to make his peace with her, he will not make the first step, irrespective of what will happen (יהיה ושיהיה) (רַעְבְּנִי 63).
3. He will not relinquish her, irrespective of what she will be like (יהיה ושיהיה) (רַעְבְּנִי 72).
4. You cannot get anything out of them, irrespective of how much they put in them (שיכניסו כמה בהם) (רַעְבְּנִי 216).
5. It was enough for him to feel the steps of an approaching person, whoever it was (שיהיה מי המתקרב) [...] immediately he stopped talking. (ראובני 126)
6. Let the evening be wonderful. It does not matter how much it will cost (שיעלה כמה עלה) (באר 216).
7. Turn wherever you want (תפנה לאשר תפנה) it does not matter (ראובני 119).
8. This tree, the bush, or whatever it is (שהמה ייהיה) (גרוסמן 216).
9. Whoever he is (שיהיה מי), even the greatest misbeliever, once he will surely go. (ראובני 287).
10. [...] irrespective of what his job was (שהמה ייהי) (הסיפור 218).
11. [...] irrespective of what the thing that I wanted to check was (הדבר ושיהיה) (הראבין 200).

In the passages cited above the *idem per idem* sentences mean that what is stated in them does not affect other events. The יקתול form is used even if the reference is to the past (ex. 5, 10, 11) or to the present (ex. 8–9). The jussive form of the verb can be used (ex. 5, 10).

The *idem per idem* construction expresses here the condition for other events that is cancelled. The construction can mean ‘it does not matter’ without this conditional sense in the context: ‘Everything is indifferent to him, he thinks “Come what may”, he is ready to go anywhere’ (389). The possible paraphrases of *idem per idem* sentences of this kind are: ‘Whatever you tell her, every time she will tell [...] again and again’ (238 קרנר). ‘Whatever happens, I will try to stay’ (224 קרנר). ‘I will go wherever’ (171 הרפס). ‘he is shuffling along, irrespective of how much he hastens’ (9) (הסיפור 85). ‘come (on us) what may’ (85) (הסיפור 85). ‘the feeling of pride is developed in human beings, irrespective of where they are’ (129).
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2. ‘It must be accepted’

*Idem per idem* sentences are used to say that what is stated in them must be accepted because it cannot be changed. This use is illustrated by the following examples:

1. I will come back when I want (אובא מתי שבתא) [and you must accept that].

2. I must accept what happened (היה שהיה מה). (223)

3. You must accept what happened (משוער是什么). (40)

4. You must accept the fact that you have bought it (קנוי是什么). (242)

5. Unfortunately, it is impossible to cancel / change / withdraw what he has been done (עשהは何). (381)

This use is defined by Peretz as ‘decisiveness.’ Polish *idem per idem* sentences have a similar meaning: *Jestem, jaki jestem* means ‘you must accept what I am like.’

3. ‘I do not want or I am not able to be more precise’

Another use of *idem per idem* is exemplified by the following passages:

1. He noticed the glance that Hasan Bek gave him when he said something (שהאמר מה אמר) to his servants. (219)

2. The officials were sitting inside and doing something (שהשהו מה עשו). (377)

3. The policeman reported to somebody (שהדיווח לאיש). (117)

4. They sat down just anywhere (שהשהו באשר). (213)

5. They went somewhere (הלכו באשר). (338)

6. He tried for some time (שהשתדל באשר). (35)

7. Bracha returns from somewhere (שחוזרת מה מקום). (276)

8. He returned from such a place (שהשאף מה מקום). (110)

9. If she told it (שה源源 מה אימ). (273)

10. He will do it (שעשה מה_Array). (8)

11. He said it (שהאמר מה). (154)

12. It happened (שהורי מה). (241)

13. They found it (שמצאו מה מצאו). (406) [i.e. the corpse].

14. Each one wished me something (שהיאלי לי כל אחד מה שיאלי): uncle Zelig said: […]. (296)

15. This [that I described above] happened (שה eventData מהEventData). (398)

16. I asked somebody (ששאל מה שאלו). (398)

17. The Germans finished by doing it (שהגיעו לאן מהגרים). (21) [i.e. they caused war].

18. I did it (שה源源 מה Array). (23) [i.e. I hurt my boy friend].

19. They did it (שהעשו מה 아마). (213) [i.e. they had sexual intercourse].
The *idem per idem* sentence is used:

a. if there is no need or possibility to be more precise, i.e. neither speaker nor hearer knows details (ex. 1–7, 16). The possible paraphrases are: משמע (ex. 1), משמע ומשמע (ex. 2), משמע ומשמע (ex. 3), משמע ומשמע (ex. 4), משמע ומשמע (ex. 5),

b. if a more precise formulation appeared in the immediate context and the hearer remembers the details (ex. 8–11, 15), or he will be informed of them in the following passage (ex. 12, 14). The possible paraphrases are: משמע (ex. 8), משמע (ex. 9),

c. if the speaker does not want to use more precise expressions (in order not to violate the taboo), although the hearer can guess what is meant (ex. 13, 17–19), as in Yoma 5, 3.

It seems that Polish *idem per idem* sentences have the meanings b and c.

II. The absolute infinitive

According to Glinert (2004: 225, 530, 544) the absolute infinitive is used in Modern Hebrew only in a few idioms: "he went far," "he rose early," "he stressed repeatedly." Incidentally, Glinert wrongly considers "לך" and "קום" to be absolute infinitives: these are construct infinitives, and the absolute ones are "הלך" and "חום". So the only correct statement made by Glinert that refers to the absolute infinitive, is that this form is a part of a construction expressing repetitive action. Rosén (1966: 315) suggests that the absolute infinitive exists only in biblical Hebrew. Aronson Berman (1978: 313) points out three functions of this form in Modern Hebrew: modal and intensive, as in "she will surely come," "they went completely away," and iterative with the verb "וּדֶשֶׁב" (like Glinert). Coffin and Bolozky (2005) claim that the absolute infinitive is not productive in Modern Hebrew, i.e. only a few verbs have this form, for example in the idiom "וּדֶשֶׁב" "to and fro." According to these authors, in other uses the absolute infinitive has modal meaning.

Everything that the authors cited above say about the absolute infinitive is right only with regard to spoken Hebrew. In written literary Hebrew the absolute infinitive is productive, i.e. many verbs are used in this form. The use overlooked by the grammarians concerns simultaneous action (cf. Joüon, Muraoka 1996: 425):

*הָלוֹך* (53) 'she walked stamping'; *לְדוֹרְךָ* 'going very slowly, and at the same time stumbling' (120) 'someone once again pulled the sheet and at the same time he was humming' (277) 'the horses were galloping' and when galloping they were jingling' (115).

Sometimes the infinitive construct is used in this structure: וְלָכָה לְדוֹרְךָ וְלָכָה (269) – the infinitive absolute

In the sentences cited above the main action is expressed by the finite verb (הלכה, לוחשת, התהילה) or participle (ההולכת), the simultaneous action is expressed by the absolute infinitive and the simultaneousness of the two is expressed by the repetition of the main verb in the absolute infinitive. One can express a simultaneous action without repetition of the main verb in the absolute infinitive:

יהיו היא, וירוד עלה' (220 מספרים)

Rarely the infinitive absolute is used for two simultaneous actions performed by different subjects:

ואכול צובוט הלחם Manor, צובות והאיש 9; השתמטה ופוסוח דלוג (220 מספרים)

The absolute infinitive is used in order to conjoin two verbs expressing two independent simultaneous actions (as above) or two verbs expressing one action and the adverb modifying it (as below):

ורוס הלוך סרו רגשותיה (250 מ);$היטב הַבְהֵר להבהיר (194 מספרים) והתלהב הלוך הלכו' (313 מספרים)

Other functions of the infinitive absolute in Modern Hebrew are as follows:

1. The infinitive absolute can be used to express an opposition, as in biblical Hebrew (Joüon, Muraoka 1996: 423): והלאה צוותא, לא שמיעafi, אוכלים." (63 מספרים)

2. The infinitive absolute is sometimes used instead of an ordinary infinitive construct:

a. as a complement of a preposition (that is not attached to its complement): הלך, 'without uttering' (28 מ), מה, מארבן, 'in order to work and live together' (91 מספרים). This use is very rare in biblical Hebrew (Joüon, Muraoka 1996: 421),

b. as a complement of a modal verb: אל כית לבנה, 'I could not look' (352 מספרים). This use is common in biblical Hebrew (Joüon, Muraoka 1996: 420).
In spoken Hebrew we would say: לא י놀וים על הבש ובל ה춰ץ. Rarely the infinitive absolute of Qal is used with the finite verb in a given binyan: פצח נפתח ‘we surely will be destroyed’ (205) – as in biblical Hebrew (Joüion, Muraoka 1996: 426).

III. A generic or vague subject

1. A verb in the 3rd person plural masculine

Let us define a generic human subject as ‘all / many people,’ and a vague human subject as ‘someone, some unidentified people.’ The distinction exists in the grammar of the Hebrew language, although usually the two kinds of unspecified reference are included under one heading of ‘vagueness, generality’ (cf. Tzadka 1981: 192). In Modern Hebrew both of them can be expressed by the passive voice, which has been already studied by others (Taube 1997; Tzadka 1981: 193; Glinert 2004: 139). Both can be expressed also by the verb in the 3rd person masculine plural form without a subject marked independently (by a noun or pronoun): פצח נפתח ‘her luggage was taken from her’ (ראובני 175) and נפתח את הכורח את המ forEaches the hedgehogs: לצא ‘it is said / people say that all Russian citizens in France have been forced to join the army’ (generic subject). There is no noun or pronoun in the context that could be the subject of the verbs נפתח ‘[they] took,’ אומרים ‘[they] say,’ הכריחו ‘[they] force,’ and that is why the forms must be interpreted as having a vague or generic subject. This issue has been studied by others (Glinert 2004: 139). An interesting example is זוכרים ‘the first male partner is somebody that is remembered’ (בואי 79). Here the masculine form זוכרים expresses the general feminine subject, because only women can here be referred to.

2. The pronoun ‘you’ (singular)

A generic human subject (but not a vague human subject) can be also expressed by forms of the 2nd person singular: זוכרים ‘you could think that it was cold’ (cf. Tzadka 1981: 194). There is no participant of the speech act that could be addressed with the pronoun אתה ‘you (singular masculine).’ Such use of the pronoun means ‘everyone who was there, would think that it was cold.’ One may use the 3rd person plural masculine form in this sentence: זוכרים ‘you find,’ although this particular verb has a special form expressing a generic subject, which is more often used: זוכרים ‘you find.’ In the sentence נפצעים ביחוד בינו אומרים אתה שאחת מהתתקלות האינדיקל האנגלי, שנחשב ‘this one, which is typical of all members of one nation, and which you / one find in communities of the Britons, the Swedes [...]’ one may use ואתה而不是 ‘you find’ instead of אתה ‘you find.’ The 2nd person singular pronoun with no referent participating in the speech act means ‘everyone would
behave / react similarly in a given situation’ and that is why the 2nd person pronoun expresses a generic subject, but not a vague one. For example, the sentence כל מה שנע קירו מחצית cannot be reworded as "they called the police" 139) gives three examples of an unspecified subject / agent and translates them as follows:

המשטרה את הזעיקו 'One / you called the police’ [lit. ‘They called the police’].

המשטרה את עקת הז אתי 'One / you called the police’ [lit. ‘You called the police’].

עקה הז המשטרה 'The police were called.’

As a rule, Glinert (2004) does not provide in his grammar the context of the sentences, so we can assess his interpretation only on the basis of his gloss translations and comments. I agree that when using the passive voice one can drop “any type of subject” (i.e. both generic and vague). Glinert calls the second example “generic you,” but leaves the first one without any label. So we can infer that for Glinert the two first sentences are synonymous. Morag (1990) pointed out that the sentence полиישת את המשטרה לא היא משטר at is unacceptable if one means, for example, that ‘Yesterday an accident happened and the police were called by somebody.’ Hebrew has the 3rd person plural masculine for a vague or generic subject, and the 2nd person singular for a generic subject. To sum up, Glinert should interpret the first sentence as expressing a vague or generic subject (so the alternative gloss should be added: Somebody called the police, Some people called the police), and the second one as expressing only a generic subject. The grammars by Coffin and Bolozky (2005) and by Aronson Berman (1978) do not mention the Hebrew generic ‘you.’ Tzadka (1981: 194) does not differentiate between a generic and vague subject (both of them are called by him סתם, and does not explain when the 2nd person singular can be used instead of the 3rd person plural.

Sometimes the generic human reference cannot be expressed by the verb in the 3rd person plural:

לא כל כ ניצים, השראה דוגמת, לוחמל פחת של ואוש XIV: 33 'when you are a respectable doctor, it is not a great pleasure to meet suddenly someone who knew you when you were a shoemaker.’ The pronoun ‘you’ has here generic reference, but it cannot be replaced with the verbs in the 3rd person plural, because ‘you’ is the subject of the nominal clause הוא איש רוח, the object of the verb (רוכב), and the suffixed modifier of the verbal noun (בחיות). The 3rd person plural masculine pronoun can express generic (or vague) reference only if it is contained in the finite verbal forms: ‘Some / most people say.’ The citation from בואי is a better example for an adjective with general reference. Bare adjective in plural masculine form...
what is the sense of dying as an ugly person?’ (24) – here the
general subject of ‘to die’ is not expressed overtly, but its implied subject is
‘they’ (of generic reference), as it is seen in the form ‘ugly’ (plural
masculine), which agrees with the subject of the verb ‘to die’. One cannot express
a generic or vague reference by 3rd person plural masculine pronouns: *
‘People tell me,’ but not * ‘I say to people / to everyone.’

Another example of the Hebrew generic ‘you:’

‘How does one feel if that is indeed one’s
son?’ (152) (שמיר, 152). The example shows that the generic ‘you’ can be com-
bined with the generic ‘they’ in one sentence, and here the use of the generic ‘you’
instead of the generic ‘they’ used in the first clause is due to its syntactic role: the
possessive pronoun of generic reference cannot be expressed by the generic ‘they.’

There are Hebrew idioms containing the imperative of generic reference, for
example לוכוובארצא ‘it is very hard to explain him’ (393), lit. ‘Go [2nd
sing. masc.] and explain him!’ or ‘Try to explain him!’ The pronoun ‘you’ con-
tained in the imperative forms has generic reference here.

The grammars suggest that only the masculine form of the pronoun ‘you’ can
have generic reference. But let us consider the sentence:
שהואמסתכלכשהוא,השחרעולהכאילומרגישהאתהלא(‘When he is looking at you [fem.
sing.], you feel as at daybreak’ – here a woman is telling a man
about her erotic feelings which the interlocutor cannot share with her. The use of
את ‘you [fem. sing.’ with generic reference confines the scope of the generic
subject to women and the sentence means: ‘Every woman would feel the same
in this situation.’ But the feminine pronoun את with generic reference is used by
women (talking to men) even if a man can be a referent of the subject:
יהודמבחורהעלאאתיהיהיתאתליוכריםשהםshrבעגעאדםבנייש(‘there are
such people that at the moment when they approach you, you are
already sure’ (181); ראובני, 181). The masculine pronoun את of generic reference
is used by a man talking to a woman: ‘One can never be sure of his opinion’ (145)
(cf. Glinert 2004: 66). So we can formulate the rule that the gender of the Hebrew generic ‘you’ agrees with the
sex of the speaker, and not of the hearer. Sometimes the rule is not observed and
a woman can use the generic את when talking to a man: ‘and when one is looking at the fields’ (261).

One may think that the generic ‘you’ was introduced to Modern Hebrew un-
der the influence of English. But this is not so. It is found in Ch. N. Bialik
(103), M. Smilensky (128), G. Shofman (216) and other
writers active before the era of the domination of English. The pronoun ‘you’ used
in biblical law (for example in the Decalogue: ‘if one is short’ (88).

can function only as a subordinate or main clause with a generic subject: ‘it
is possible to eat in it if one is tired’ (183), (אלטרס, 183).
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(Tzadka 1981: 194). On the other hand, in the story קיסם by Reuveni (56–68) the excessive use of the generic ‘you’ is to characterize the language of Americans. Only rarely is the 3rd person singular pronoun used with generic reference.8 ‘Only through self-resignation can one achieve eternal life.’ The subject of the form זוכות ‘[they] achieve’ has generic reference, but this reference cannot be expressed by the 3rd person plural pronoun suffixed to the reflexive noun (i.e. the form זבש would not have generic reference), so the singular pronoun (‘he’) is used. Instead of combining two kinds of generic pronoun one can use here the generic ‘you’:

יבוש אתו עצמך, due to the fact that the generic ‘you’ can perform any syntactic function.

IV. The aspectual function of the form יקטול

As is well known, in biblical Hebrew the form יקטול referring to the past or present expresses an iterative or durative action (Joüon, Muraoka 1996: 366–368). Modern Hebrew grammars do not mention this function of יקטול form, so one may infer that יקטול has lost its aspectual meaning. But this is not the case. If the context points to the past or present time reference, one can use יקטול to express an iterative or durative aspect. In the translation of the examples cited below I mark by [d] and [i] the verbs in the יקטול form that expresses aspect:

1. Durative state or action in the present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ריקה עדיין היא</td>
<td>she has still no obligations, and that is why she is sad [d]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רפהל יושב וכתוב, רפאל ויתרם</td>
<td>Raphael is sitting and writing, and he is writing [d] his Pentateuch day and night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>רוח לא תנשב</td>
<td>wind does not blow [d]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>לביה ירהש רע</td>
<td>her heart is plotting [d] evil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ביתם מסביב ישתרע ריק</td>
<td>an empty space spreads [d] around their house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>למה זה חדל ענה</td>
<td>‘why on earth her husband is going [d]’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>יד פוקה עברי לב</td>
<td>‘does a Hebrew heart throb [d] in their chest?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>מה他说 what are you saying [d], doctor?</td>
<td>‘can you hear [d]?’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Iterative state or action in the present

without this restrained joy which appears [i] on the face of a woman’ (474 מפסרים)

occasionally it happens [i] sometimes’ (457 מפסרים)

like this which girls wear [i]’ (453 מפסרים)

everything that is done [i] at home’ (407 מפסרים)

it happens that according to her advice and taste the problems of clothes are resolved [i]’ (354 מפסרים)

sometimes he joins [i] together the tips of his forefinger and thumb’ (272 מפסרים)

does it seethe [i] sometimes?’ (147 מפסרים)

? do you go [i] to the house of the Beinstocks?’ (518 מפסרים)

3. Iterative state or action in the past

the voices of joy [...] fell [i] on her head like strokes of disdain and they scared [i] her soul’ (353 מפסרים)

that were not performed [i] on week days’ (321 מפסרים)

it happened sometimes that she suddenly felt [i] wild greed’ (295 מפסרים)

As we can see in the examples, יקטול expresses an iterative action, not exclusively a habitual one. In this respect it resembles the construction פעל (Piela 2008).

4. Durative action in the past

her right hand was keeping [d] the hand of Uri’ (91 סיפור)

The use of יקטול to express iteration or durativity is not compulsory: one can always use the ordinary forms קטל (for the past), קוטל (for the present), that do not express aspect, and express the aspect in many other ways (Piela 2008). If the context of יקטול points to a future time reference, the form does not express any aspect (only a future tense), as in biblical Hebrew (Joüon, Muraoka 1996: 366). The aspectual use of יקטול with a present or past time reference declines in modern Hebrew.
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Streszczenie

Cztery zagadnienia gramatyki współczesnego języka hebrajskiego

1. Zdanie względne, które nie zawiera żadnej nowej informacji o składniku zdania głównego, którego jest określeniem, wyraża następujące znaczenia we współczesnym hebrajskim:
   a. ‘jest to nieistotne, nie ma wpływu na inne zdarzenia’, b. ‘musi to być zaakceptowane, bo się nie da tego zmienić’, c. ‘nie chcę albo nie mogę bardziej szczegółowo tego opisać’. 
2. Infinitivus absolutus jest formą produktywną w hebrajszczyźnie literackiej i oprócz funkcji wymienianych w opracowaniach pełni też takie, jak: a. służy do wyrażenia czynności jednoczesnej z inną czynnością, b. może być dopełnieniem przyimka lub czasownika.

3. Podmiot ogólny można wyrazić w hebrajskim przez zaimek 'ty' (w obu rodzajach, zależnie od płci mówiącego).

4. Forma הָעַל w odniesieniu do przeszłości lub teraźniejszości wyraża aspekt duratywny lub iteratywny.