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4. Hebrew, Spoken Israeli Hebrew and the Hebrew verb system

4.1. Hebrew and Spoken Israeli Hebrew

‘Hebrew language’ is a broad term, which includes Hebrew as it was spoken and written in different periods of time and as it is spoken and written today. From a diachronic perspective, the Hebrew language can be divided into several historical periods, as will be described below:

- Biblical Hebrew: Biblical Hebrew represents mainly written texts from a limited period of time (approximately 12 to 6 century BC), but there is evidence according to which Biblical Hebrew also had spoken varieties (Saenz-Badillos 1993:52).

- Mishnaic Hebrew: Mishnaic Hebrew is dated between the first and fourth centuries. Like Biblical Hebrew, it had a written variety, originally based on Biblical Hebrew, but with adjustments to Aramaic, spoken at that time. It is also claimed to have had some spoken varieties (Saenz-Badillos 1993:164).

- Medieval Hebrew: Medieval Hebrew is dated between the 7th and the 15th century. It was not an independent entity, but rather a mixture based on forms both from Biblical and from Mishnaic Hebrew (Saenz-Badillos 1993:51-52, 204). These varieties were developed by Jewish writers, and have linguistic characteristics that are dependent on the writer’s social and cultural background, and on the author’s literary needs (Saenz-Badillos 1993:204, Kuzar 2001:129).

- Modern Hebrew: Modern Hebrew is defined differently by different scholars. Saenz-Badillos (1993:269) uses the term ‘Modern Hebrew’ and mentions that Modern Hebrew is also divided into periods, of which the latest one is called Israeli Hebrew. He calls the first sub-period of Modern Hebrew ‘the period of transition’, and mentions that
some scholars (without mentioning names) consider this period as beginning in the sixteenth century, when Hebrew started to be used as a language for plays and written documents with some adjustments to modern needs. The next sub-period of Modern Hebrew begins in the nineteenth century, and Saenz-Badillos prefers to refer to it as Modern Hebrew. Modern Hebrew is the term used also by Coffin-Amir and Bolozky (2005), Berman (1978), and Schwarzwald (2009:61) when addressing the latest Hebrew version spoken in Israel. As mentioned above, Saenz-Badillos considers Modern Hebrew as beginning at the end of the nineteenth century, simultaneously with Jewish settlement in Palestine. Since the Jewish settlers in Palestine had different backgrounds and they spoke a variety of languages, the only communication system they could use was Hebrew, in which they were all to some extent knowledgeable. Many changes and innovations were needed in order to turn Hebrew into a language for daily communication. The most remarkable change was in the creation of new words, which aimed at adapting the language to everyday needs (Saenz-Badillos 1993:270). Hebrew was officially recognized in 1922 as one of Palestine’s official languages. With the establishment of the State of Israel, Hebrew was announced as the country’s official language, together with Arabic. Since Hebrew was the teaching language in schools, children started speaking Hebrew as their main language, and it slowly acquired native speakers, turning it into a mother tongue. Consequently, the number of Hebrew native speakers grew quickly, and a new variety of the language was developed. This process was associated with debates regarding the characteristics of the language. Some scholars supported the direction of the language by normative approaches. It was finally decided to use the grammar of Biblical Hebrew as the basis of the new Hebrew variety, with some components based on Mishnaic Hebrew, such as syntactic structures and the verbal tense system, although the latter also included Biblical Hebrew structures. The instruction of Hebrew in schools was strict and followed the normative approach (Saenz-Badillos 1993:272-273). Rosen (1977:17), as opposed to Berman, Coffin-Amir and Bolozky,
and Saenz-Badillos, rejected the term Modern Hebrew, since linguistically, he claimed that ‘modern’ should represent a linguistic entity, which should command autonomy towards everything which preceded it, while this is not the case in Hebrew.

- Other proposed names: Rosen (1977) reviews the identity of Hebrew from the nineteenth century (p. 15-29). He details the names, which were proposed for Hebrew, and explains why they were accepted or rejected. He rejects the term Neo-Hebrew, because the prefix ‘neo’ was used previously for Mishnaic and Medieval Hebrew (p. 15-16). He also rejects the term Modern Hebrew, as mentioned in the previous paragraph. Rosen also advocated Spoken Hebrew as one of the possible proposals. This term emphasizes the fact that Hebrew became spoken as opposed to its previous varieties, even though its writing system resembles that of the classical language. But he insists that many structural and functional characteristics of written Hebrew are similar to their parallel spoken varieties, and rejects this term as well (p. 18). Israeli Hebrew, according to Rosen, is the most common and widely accepted term, because it represents the non-chronological nature of Hebrew, as well as its territorial independence (p. 18). Rosen adopts the term Contemporary Hebrew from Tene (1968) for its neutrality, and suggests the broadening of this term to Contemporary Israeli Hebrew (p. 19). After the Second World War speaking Hebrew turned into the standard. This is also the standard that is taught in Hebrew schools today in Israel and outside the country as well.

In this study I use the term Israeli Hebrew, which refers to the language spoken in Israel. It is further sub-classified as Spoken Israeli Hebrew, for the reasons detailed below.

Israeli Hebrew has become a spoken language at the beginning of the twentieth century. It is mostly agreed that until that time Hebrew was not a dead language, since it was used in prayers, as well as in secular literature and formal correspondence, although it did not have native speakers, and it was not used for everyday communication. Therefore, the
term ‘emergence’ is preferred over ‘revival’ to describe the process of Hebrew becoming a spoken language and having native speakers (Izre’el 2002b:217-218). Yet, there is no consensus on this issue.

The genetic connection between Israeli Hebrew and previous layers of Hebrew has been controversial among researchers. Wexler questions the classification of Israeli Hebrew as a Semitic language (1990). He opposes Hebrew ‘revival’ theories and claims that Hebrew from the nineteenth century onwards is a newly created language, based on Slavic languages, mainly Yiddish\(^1\), with some additional impact from German, English, Spanish and French. This is because it leans to a more Indo-European semantics, some syntactic relations, as well as vocabulary. Horvath and Wexler (1994) claim that the verb system of Israeli Hebrew is heavily affected by Yiddish, and that it is mostly European rather than Semitic in the semantic roles of its patterns (p. 250-257). According to these views, Israeli Hebrew is a new language rather than a revived one. Zuckermann (2006) argues that Israeli Hebrew, which he refers to as ‘Israeli’, is a result of a hybridization process. According to his theory, Israeli (Hebrew) is a hybrid language that contains elements both from Semitic and from Indo-European languages. He claims that there were two main contributors to the establishment of Israeli (Hebrew), which were Yiddish and Hebrew in its earlier forms. He suggests that secondary contributors were also involved in the process, and these were European languages and Arabic (Zuckermann 2006:58-59). Zuckermann claims that most morphological forms of Israeli are Hebrew, and thus Semitic, whereas its phonology, including syllable structure and intonation, is European (2006:60-61). He also refers to Israeli (Hebrew) as a new language. Izre’el considers Israeli Hebrew Semitic, but one which emerged by creolization-like processes, and that is characterized by a large European impact (1986, 2002b:228, 232, 2003:88-89). He also calls it a new language, as opposed to a ‘revived’ one, and classifies it as Semitic. Other scholars also compare the emergence of Israeli Hebrew to the process of creolization (Bar-Adon 1965:84, 1975:42, Ben-David 1985:165). Kuzar (2001:135-136) conceives

\(^1\) Wexler claims that Yiddish is also a Slavic language.
Israeli Hebrew as a mixture of components originating in different sources, some of which resemble creolization processes. The morphological component of Israeli Hebrew, as well as the mechanism of lexical innovations, is based on Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew. Israeli Hebrew phonology, he claims, comes from Yiddish. Other components, mainly vocabulary and syntax, represent European languages, in particular Yiddish, but also Russian, French, German and English. Kuzar also prefers the term ‘emergence’ to ‘revival’, thereby agreeing that Israeli Hebrew is a new language.

Rosen (1977:24) considers Israeli Hebrew a Semitic language, having inherited Semitic means of expression in categorical systems, where the latter resemble European languages. By that, he agrees to the term ‘revival’, arguing that the incorporation of inherited Semitic means of expression into Israeli Hebrew constitutes its revival process. Saenz-Badillos (1993:277) states that Israeli Hebrew morphological structure and basic syntax are pure Semitic, and on that basis agrees that Israeli Hebrew is a Semitic language.

Israeli Hebrew, like other languages, also has subtypes characterized by different registers and ways of communication. Subtypes are influenced by ideas about norms and standards. Examples of such subtypes are:

- Normative Hebrew: Normative Hebrew is a form of looking at the language as based on strict rules of grammar, which are defined by the historical layers of the language. Normative Hebrew nowadays is governed and directed by the Academy of the Hebrew Language (see http://hebrew-academy.huji.ac.il/) and it has been used as a basis to teach the language in schools, and its use in newspapers (a trend that has been abandoned in the last decade or two) and on radio and television. Some of the language varieties that are mentioned below rely on the normative rules and try to follow them. These are mainly Literary Hebrew and school teachers’ Hebrew and sometimes courtroom Hebrew and Hebrew of the media, excluding the newspapers. The Academy of the Hebrew Language produces new
words in Hebrew, either for existing terms, as substitutes for loan words, or for new terms. The Academy of the Hebrew Language also publishes its decisions regarding Hebrew language patterns and structures in its quarterly journal *leshonenu laam*. The decisions are based on historical rules of Hebrew, as well as on some spoken standards. In many cases, the decisions of the Academy of the Hebrew Language are only written norms, which are not in use in the spoken variety. In other cases, the decisions are well accepted among Israeli Hebrew speakers, and are integrated into the language. There is no detectable pattern as regards the question which words are well accepted and which are not, and it is hard to predict which word will eventually integrate into the language and which will not. Rosenthal (2001:10-12) claims that the normative approaches did not manage to dictate daily speech, because they started inhibiting the development of the language. This was in particular salient as compared with the development rate of technology, which entailed the need for new technological notions in the language. The spoken standards came to the fore in the last three decades of the twentieth century, and started taking control over the dictated norms. Israeli authors initiated the use of spoken standards in their writings. Slang dictionaries began to appear. The spoken language had acquired a more respected status. The media and journalists commenced using spoken norms as well, which had a great impact on the language. New words were still produced by the normative bodies, but they were less and less accepted by the public. The speakers themselves produced the words and terms they were using. In the last thirty years, out of the many words, which were absorbed in the language, only a few were invented by official language bodies. In order to be accepted into the language, these usually need to answer a widespread and important need, and their foreign counterparts have to be inconvenient for use in Israeli Hebrew. This happened, for example, in computer technology.

---

2 *Leshonenu laam* is a popular periodical for the Hebrew Language, issued by the Academy of the Hebrew Language

3 Spoken standards are language forms that are very common in speech, but are not necessarily normative
when the Hebrew words *XomRa* and *toXna* replaced their English counterparts ‘hardware’ and ‘software’, respectively. In other cases, words, which were invented by official language bodies, were rejected by the speakers. For example, the word *matsie* ‘barbecue’ was announced by the Academy of the Hebrew Language a few years ago as the Hebrew term for *mangal*, which originally comes from Arabic *manqal*, having the same meaning. The suggested Hebrew word is based on a combination of a root (*tslj* ‘roast’) and a pattern, like many other Hebrew words. The most dominant meaning of the suggested pattern is an instrument, which perfectly fits its meaning. Yet, this word was not accepted among Israeli Hebrew native speakers, and was not accommodated in the language; the word *mangal* is still the only word used in the spoken language for ‘barbecue’. Furthermore, this word is so rooted in the language, that it was developed further into a verb *mingel* ‘to barbecue’, combining its consonantal skeleton and integrating it with a verb pattern. An example for the opposite process is the word *kaletet*, which was suggested by the Academy of the Hebrew Language for the commonly used loan word *kaseta* ‘cassette’ in the tape-recorder and video-player era. This word was also based on a combination of a root (*klṭ* ‘absorb, comprehend’) and a pattern, whose most dominant meaning is names of illnesses, which appeared to be a quite strange choice. For an unexplained reason, this word was well accommodated and commonly accepted, and the word *kaseta* disappeared from the spoken language completely. Appendix 3 shows the distance between the Academy of the Hebrew Language and the spoken language. Although it presents vocabulary, and not grammatical structures, the gap between the authorities and the native speakers is very clear. This gap is also preserved when grammatical structures are involved. The appendix is meant to serve as an indicator exhibiting this gap.

- Literary Hebrew: the Hebrew of literature, written until the late eighties to the early nineties of the twentieth century. This is a written form of Hebrew, usually perceived as a high language, which is different from the spoken variety, as well as from more recent literary works.
• Literary Israeli Hebrew: the Hebrew of literature, written from the mid nineties of the twentieth century onwards. This type of Hebrew includes newer structures and vocabulary, and differs from one author to another. It always appears in a written form.

• School teachers’ Hebrew: This type of Israeli Hebrew is used by school teachers in Israel. It is characterized by a tendency to normativity, a higher register of speech and a different intonation than the standard speech. It is produced mostly via the spoken channel.

• The Hebrew used in the media: This type of Hebrew is written in journals and newspapers and is also spoken on radio and television. This type can have both written and spoken forms; the former, as mentioned above, would appear in journals and newspapers, while the latter would be used on radio and television programs, sometimes as speech read out from paper, sometimes as pre-planned, semi-spontaneous speech.

• Courtroom Hebrew: This type of Hebrew is characterized by juridical contents, and can appear both in spoken and in written forms. Trials are held using the spoken variety of this type of Hebrew, whereas in court protocols and verdicts the written variety is used.

Most of the available literature on Israeli Hebrew refers either to written forms of Hebrew or to normative forms of the language, and hardly deals with spoken forms which is the more natural and spontaneous language form used for ordinary communication.

This research deals with Israeli Hebrew in its spontaneously spoken form, which is naturally produced by Israeli Hebrew native speakers to communicate with each other in everyday life during informal events. It will be referred to as Spoken Israeli Hebrew (SIH hereafter). This is a natural variety of the language, and it is not governed by a specific context, as opposed to other varieties of Hebrew, in particular written varieties, and also some other spoken varieties, which basically have specific contexts of use and are not completely natural. Such contexts can be juridical contexts, television interviews, etc. SIH is used in a variety of occasions
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and subjects, formal and informal. Being natural and spontaneous, SIH often does not follow the Normative Hebrew rules, and it contains a mixture of slang expressions and street language, together with higher register phrases and spoken standards, depending on the context. All these varieties constitute SIH daily speech, and are treated in this research as one complex. Since native speakers know their language best, their speech is analyzed without being corrected according to any normative approach, so as to gain an understanding of what the spoken language system is all about, and how it is different from the norm.

4.2. The Hebrew verb system

4.2.1. General

A wide range of literature has dealt with the verb system of Hebrew over the years. Most of it presents diachronic descriptions. A more traditional view of the language is found in textbooks (Gesenius 1909, Blau 1967, 1975, Glinert 1994, Schwarzwald 2001). The descriptions in the literature refer to all Hebrew periods (Biblical, Mishnaic, Modern-literary). I found only one research study, which points at ‘inconsistencies in the verb tenses’ of spoken Hebrew (Borochovsky Bar-Aba 2008:267-269), but does not provide a detailed analysis or an explanation for the ‘inconsistencies’. Also, the examples in this research, although taken from spoken Hebrew, are presented in traditional pronunciation (‘ani ‘eša‘er ‘I will stay’ as opposed to the spoken form: ani iSaeR). None of the mentioned literature deals with the verb system of Spoken Israeli Hebrew, which seems to be thoroughly different from what is described in the literature, thoroughly. There is only one book that is concerned explicitly with the spoken variety of Israeli (Hebrew) at all (Zuckermann 2008).

Hebrew is considered a derivational morphology language, characterized by synthetic structures. Words in the language are constructed by a combination of a root and a pattern (see definitions below). The root is consonant al, whereas the pattern contains vowels, and sometimes can also contain consonants in addition to the vowels. No
pattern contains only consonants, and all patterns must contain vowel(s). Consonants in a pattern are optional and will always constitute an addition to the vowels. The pattern has reserved locations in-between the vowels (and consonants, if present), where the consonants of the root should be integrated. Roots are the main building blocks of Hebrew morphology, and most of the words in Hebrew are based on the combination of a root and a pattern. Combinations of roots and patterns in Hebrew are presented in Examples 1-4 below.

(1) Combination of roots and patterns in the verbal and nominal systems of Hebrew

**ktb** is a consonantal root. It consists of three radicals, *k*, *t* and *b*, bearing the general meaning of ‘write’.

Table 4-1 below presents four Hebrew verbal patterns; the dominant meaning of each pattern is given next to it; $C_i$ represents a root consonant, and stands for the first, second and third radicals.

**Table 4-1: Patterns of the Hebrew verb system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$C_1aC_2aC_3$</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hiC_1C_2iC_3$</td>
<td>Causative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$hitC_1aC_2a(C_2b)eC_3$</td>
<td>Reciprocal / reflexive</td>
<td>The pattern also requires a duplication of the second radical of the root in the orthography, as well as an insertion of the consonant <em>t</em> at the beginning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_1iC_2a(C_2b)eC_3$</td>
<td>Agentive</td>
<td>The pattern also requires a duplication of the second radical of the root in the orthography.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above **ktb** root in these four patterns in the spoken language looks as follows. For simplicity reasons, all forms represent suffixed forms, third person, masculine, singular. Phonological variants are
mentioned, but are not discussed, as they are outside the scope of this study.

katav  ‘write’; b is realized as v

ixtiv / extiv  ‘dictate’ (literally: make someone write something); k, b are realized as X, v, respectively. h is not pronounced in Israeli Hebrew speech. Usually, there is a vowel lowering of i to e in the first syllable.

iktatev  ‘correspond’ (literally: wrote to one another); the second t should have been doubled according to the traditional approach, but double (geminated) consonants in Israeli Hebrew speech are pronounced as single consonants. h is not pronounced in Israeli Hebrew speech.

kitev / xitev  ‘cc, copy’ (literally: send someone a copy) or ‘subtitle’; the second t should have been doubled according to the traditional approach, but double (geminated) consonants in Israeli Hebrew speech are pronounced as single consonants; b is realized as v; k is realized as either k or X.

Table 4-2 below presents some nominal patterns; the dominant meaning of each pattern is given next to it.

### Table 4-2: Patterns of the Hebrew nominal system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Dominant Meaning</th>
<th>Abbreviated form / comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>miC1C2aC3</td>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>LOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haC1C2aC3a</td>
<td>Nominal action</td>
<td>ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1C2oC3et</td>
<td>Penultimate stressed syllable family</td>
<td>GEN – general. This is a collection of nouns, having the stress on the penultimate syllable, as opposed to Israeli Hebrew default stress on the last syllable. These nouns have the same morphological behavior, but they do not share any common meaning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1aC2C3an</td>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>AGN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meC1uC2a(C2b)aC3</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>BEN – a passive participle pattern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above *ktb* root in these five nominal patterns in the spoken language looks as follows:

- **miXtav** ‘a letter’; *k, b* are realized as *X, v*, respectively.
- **aXtava** ‘a dictation’; *k, b* are realized as *X, v*, respectively; *h* is not pronounced.
- **któvet** ‘an address’; *b* is realized as *v*; the penultimate syllable is stressed.
- **katvan** ‘a typist’; *b* is realized as *v*.
- **meXutav** ‘an addressee’; *k, b* are realized as *X, v*, respectively; geminated consonants, representing double pronunciation, are pronounced as single consonants.

Examples 2–4 show verb formation from foreign words in Israeli Hebrew.

(2) Extraction of roots – (i)

The process of extracting roots from foreign words is very common in Israeli Hebrew, and works in all fields, but is most dominant in professional jargons. For example, the debugging process, which is used in computer programming, underwent the same process, as follows:

- **dIbUg** ‘debug’ (English)
  - take out the consonantal skeleton *dbg*, form a root
  - take the new root *dbg* and put it into the *Piel* pattern *C₁iC₂a(C₂b)eC₃*
  - form a new verb *dibeg* ‘debug’ (gemination of the second consonant is eliminated in speech)

The consonantal skeleton of this word fits perfectly into Hebrew, as it has exactly three radicals. Thus, the construction of the verb *dibeg*
‘debug’ in Hebrew was a relatively simple task. Yet, other new verbs may be more difficult to cope with.

(3) Extraction of roots – (ii)

Hebrew has the abstract noun *dijun* ‘discussion’ and the verb *dan* ‘to discuss’ (root *djn*, the second radical is a weak consonant and is thus covert). But the more widespread word for ‘discuss’ in everyday speech is not *dan* but rather *diskes*, which was formed by taking out the four dominant consonants from the English word *discuss* (*d*, *s*, *k*, *s*) and putting them into a verb pattern in the following way:

\[
\text{*diskVs* ‘discuss’ (English)} \quad \text{(English)}
\]

- take out the consonantal skeleton *dsks*, form a root
- take the new root *dsks* and put it into the *Piel* pattern \( C_1iC_{2a}(C_{2b})eC_3 \rightarrow C_iC_2C_3eC_4 \)
- form a new verb *diskes* ‘discuss’

The *Piel* pattern actually enables four radicals in its deep morphological structure, which fits perfectly to this case. Thus, two different radicals were located in this pattern instead of duplicating the second radical.

As a result, Hebrew presents two co-existing verbs with apparently the same meaning. In fact, double verbs are not needed, unless there is some difference between them. Over the years, the original verb *dan* ‘discuss’ has turned into a higher-register verb, and is mostly used in courtrooms and in the media, or in teacher – student interactions. The verb *diskes* ‘discuss’ is the most commonly used in everyday language.

(4) Extraction of roots – (iii)

The word *fax* was introduced into Israeli Hebrew with the introduction of fax machines. The noun was borrowed as is from English, and is pronounced in Israeli Hebrew *faks*. It was needed to form a verb, which would mean ‘to fax’. The following steps would be expected:
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\( \text{fks} \) ‘fax’ (English)

\( \rightarrow \) take out the consonantal skeleton \( \text{fks} \), form a root

\( \rightarrow \) take the new root \( \text{fks} \) and put it into the Piel pattern \( C_1iC_{2a}(C_{2b})eC_3 \)

\( \rightarrow \) form a new verb * \( \text{fikes} \) ‘to fax’

Apparently, this would be a classical process of creating a new verb, since the word ‘fax’ contains exactly three consonants. But there was a problem, as the word \( \text{fikes} \) already existed in Israeli Hebrew with the meaning of ‘to focus (a camera)’, which was constructed the same way from the English word focus. The solution was to duplicate the last consonant of the triple skeleton and obtain the form below. This is one of the many strategies that Israeli Hebrew speakers use to integrate verbs into patterns.

\( \rightarrow \) duplicate the last radical of the root \( \text{fks} \) to receive the root \( \text{fkss} \)

\( \rightarrow \) put the new root \( \text{fkss} \) into the pattern \( C_1iC_{2a}(C_{2b})eC_3 \) \( \rightarrow \)
 \( C_1iC_2C_{3a}eC_{3b} \)

\( \rightarrow \) form a new verb \( \text{fikses} \) ‘to fax’

Like most of the new verbs in Israeli Hebrew, all the verbal examples present verbs in the Piel pattern. Yet, there are new verbs, which are integrated into the language via the Hitpael pattern, which also enables four radicals in its morphological deep structure. For example, the word \( \text{istalbet} \) ‘relax, have a good time’ in its combination with a particle as in \( \text{istalbet al} \) ‘make fun of’ was found in this research. This word was formed in the Hitpael pattern from the root \( \text{slbt} \), which was extracted from the word \( \text{stalbet} \) ‘relaxation’, originated in Arabic. This word has no counterpart in the Piel pattern. Its integration into the Hitpael pattern is probably due to the similarity between this pattern and the original word \( \text{stalbet} \), and similarly to the form \( \text{iklik} \) ‘to click’ which was discussed above.

Hebrew also displays analytical structures. This means that in some cases, words are constructed by an agglutination of a stem and an affix or an agglutination of two words. In many cases, the basic
stem or the agglutinated words can themselves be a combination of a root and a pattern, although in some cases the stems or words can be basic. The latter situation occurs in the nominal system, whereas the former situation occurs also in the verb system, where all verb stems are an earlier combination of a root and a pattern, see explanation below. For the manner of constructing words in Hebrew, see examples 5-7 below.

(5) Concatenated combinations of root + pattern and stem + affix in nouns:

**hšb** is a consonantal root with the general meanings of ‘think’ and ‘calculate’. **maC₁C₂eC₃** is a nominal pattern, which usually denotes instruments in Hebrew. The pattern contains the vowels *a* and *e*, and the consonant *m*. *C₁*, *C₂* and *C₃* are the locations in the pattern, which are reserved for the consonantal root. Integration of the root into the pattern produces the noun **maxSev** ‘computer’ (*b* is realized as *v*), as shown in Figure 4-1 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root: X</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>/down</td>
<td>/down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pattern: m</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>C₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=</td>
<td>/down</td>
<td>/down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word: m</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4-1: Integration of roots into patterns in Hebrew*

This word is further used as a stem to formulate another Israeli Hebrew word by adding a suffix of diminution [stem]-**on** as shown in Figure 4-2 below:
Figure 4-2: Inflectional word formation in Hebrew based on a derivational stem

(6) Combination of a stem and a suffix:

*milon* 'dictionary' is an Israeli Hebrew word, which was constructed from the word *mila* 'word' (the stem) and a suffix [stem]-*on*, which means either diminution or a group of items. The resulting word served again as a stem in the construction of the new word *milonit* 'a digital handy dictionary', by the addition of another suffix [stem]-*it*, which denotes also diminution. The process progressed as shown in Figure 4-3 below:

![Figure 4-3: Inflectional word formation in Hebrew](image)

(7) Combination of two words:

Israeli Hebrew has the word *RamzoR* 'traffic light', which was constructed from the two words *Remez* 'hint, signal' and *oR* 'light' as shown below. The word *Remez* 'hint, signal' was originally a combination of the root *rmz*, carrying the basic meaning of 'hint, signal', with one of the patterns belonging to the penultimate stressed syllable family. The word *oR* 'light' is basic, and cannot be further parsed into components.

*Remez* 'hint, signal' + *oR* 'light' ⇒ *RamzoR* 'traffic light'

---

4 The word *mila* was originally formed out of the root *mll* which carries the meaning of 'wording' integrated into a pattern.
The vowel change $e \to a$, and the omission of the second $e$ vowel in the obtained word are phonologically governed, and are thus not discussed here.

The basic forms in the verb system of Hebrew are purely synthetic, i.e. verbs are always constructed by a combination of a consonantal root (see below) and a pattern (Blau 1967, 1975). The forms obtained constitute a stem, to which affixes are attached to obtain more specific details, such as gender, number and person, as well as aspect and mood. The agglutination of these affixes can sometimes cause phonological changes in the stem, but these are out of the scope of this study, and hence will not be discussed here.

In order to form a Hebrew verb, two components are needed: A consonantal root and a pattern. The consonantal root is a building block of the verb and noun systems in Hebrew. It usually consists of three radicals, but in some cases can also consist of four, five or even six radicals. Five or six radicals in a root are relatively rare, and are mainly limited in use to professional jargons. But four-radical roots are quite widespread in Israeli Hebrew. Some roots may seem to have only two radicals, but this primarily happens when one of the three radicals is a weak consonant, such as a semi-vowel, a duplicated root consonant or a glottal consonant, which tends to be dropped in most of the locations where it appears (Aronoff 1994:190). Radicals usually represent a general meaning, and radicals by themselves are not independent. They cannot be pronounced, and they do not stand alone without being integrated into a pattern, which assigns their specific meaning. A pattern in the Hebrew verb system is called **Binyan** (plural: **Binyanim**); a pattern in the Hebrew nominal system is called **Mishqal** (plural: **Mishqalim**). Patterns are claimed to have constant meanings, but studies have shown that there are many exceptions to this claim, and that patterns can carry a dominant

---

5 Nouns, on the other hand, can be both derivational and inflectional. They can be constructed by a combination of a root and a pattern, a combination of a stem and a prefix / suffix, or they can be basic (Aronoff 1994:131, Hetzron 1997:323).
meaning, and also recessive ones (Blau 1967, 1975, Horvath and Wexler 1994:254-255). A pattern in normative Hebrew can also entail a duplication of one of the radicals, namely the second, and/or the insertion of a consonant in addition to the vowels mentioned above. Gemination of any consonant in Israeli Hebrew, representing double pronunciation of this consonant, is always pronounced as a single consonant in speech\(^6\), but since Israeli Hebrew makes use of Hebrew orthography, the gemination is represented in the Hebrew vocalized orthography. Yet, the patterns, which contain the duplication, are the ones which are usually used for inserting new verbs into the language. Examples for the construction of Israeli Hebrew verbs and nouns with roots and patterns are presented in 4.2.1 above. Most of the roots cannot combine with all patterns, i.e. most of the roots can appear in only some of the patterns, but not in others. Roots that combine with all patterns constitute a small minority of the lexicon.

As opposed to nouns, and as mentioned above, verbs can only be formed by using a root and a pattern. When a new verb is created, a consonantal root must be retrieved, no matter if the original word, for which a verb is needed, has a root or not. This is accomplished by simply taking out the consonantal skeleton of a word and obtaining an artificial root, which can be combined with a pattern. In many cases, such words are foreign, and do not consist of three consonants. In other cases, the obtained artificial root is parallel to an existing Israeli Hebrew root. Having inherited morphological abilities to naturally combine roots and patterns to yield new verb constructions, Israeli Hebrew speakers seem to have been using strategies, which enable them to overcome these problems and to still form new verbs without difficulty. They include some of the following methods: duplication of the last radical of the root, duplication of two radicals of the root, secondary root formation using a consonant of a word affix and omission of a consonant if there are too many consonants in the

\(^6\) The gemination is represented by an intra-letter point in the vocalized orthography; in Hebrew non-vocalized orthography and in speech, there is no representation of the germinated consonant.
source word. The most common verb pattern in Hebrew for creating new verbs is $C_1iC_2a(C_2b)eC_3$ (Piel)\(^7\), which due to the duplication of the middle radical, actually enables more than three radicals. Verbs which are not formed in the Piel pattern are usually integrated into the $hitC_1aC_2a(C_2b)eC_3$ (Hitpael) pattern. Some examples for such new verbs are presented in 4.2.1 above. Very few verbs are integrated into the language via other patterns. For example, ivRiz ‘shirk’ (Hifil pattern), nignav ‘was amazed’ (Nifal pattern) – both are slang expressions – and iklik ‘click’ (Hifil pattern). Integration of the latter via the Hifil pattern is probably meant to preserve as much as possible the original sound of the word click, which is best preserved in this pattern.

The basic stems in the IH verb system that are formed by a combination of a root and a pattern may take three different forms, depending on the affixation they undergo: two basic stems which inflect with suffixes, and a basic stem which inflects with prefixes. The first two stems are referred to by traditional scholars as ‘past’ and ‘present’ stems, but are referred to here as ‘suffixed’ and ‘participle’ forms, respectively. The third stem is referred to in the traditional literature as the ‘future’ stem, but is referred to here as the ‘prefixed’ form. In traditional literature, there is an additional stem for the imperative forms, but these are not referred to here for reasons which will be provided later.

When suffixes and prefixes are added to the stem, a further specification of person (only with suffixed and prefixed stems, but not with participles), gender and number is obtained. According to the traditional approach, these inflections denote tense too. But I would like to withdraw from this approach, and mention that they denote aspect and mood rather than tense, for reasons which are detailed in

\(^7\) Since geminated consonants are represented in the vocalized orthography, they are noted in the patterns. This is only for formal purposes; in speech these consonants are pronounced as single consonants. In the case of a quadri-consonantal root, the third root radical would always take the place of $C_{2b}$, both in the orthography and in speech.
Section 5 below. For verb formation with stems and affixes, see Examples 8-10 below.

The examples below show the formation of verbal forms in IH from a stem and an inflection. The stems must be an earlier combination of a root and a pattern. The third person male singular in the suffixed forms is inflected with a null or zero (ø) morpheme, as well as the male singular in the participle forms.

The presented examples are in the Piel pattern, but the other patterns inflect in an identical way.

(8) Formation of verbal forms in IH – suffixed forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb stem (suffixed form):</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Suffix:</th>
<th>= Inflected verb:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fikses ‘fax’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>⇒ fikses ‘fax’ (3-M-SG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fikses ‘fax’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>⇒ fiksesa ‘fax’ (3-F-SG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fikses ‘fax’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>⇒ fiksesu ‘fax’ (3-PL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fikses ‘fax’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>ti⁸</td>
<td>⇒ fiksasti ‘fax’ (1-SG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fikses ‘fax’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>⇒ fiksasta ‘fax’ (2-M-SG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(9) Formation of verbal forms in IH – participles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb stem (participle):</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>Suffix:</th>
<th>= Inflected verb:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mefakses ‘fax’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>⇒ mefakses ‘fax’ (M-SG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mefakses ‘fax’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>et</td>
<td>⇒ mefakseset ‘fax’ (F-SG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mefakses ‘fax’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>im</td>
<td>⇒ mefaksesim ‘fax’ (M-PL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mefakses ‘fax’</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>ot</td>
<td>⇒ mefaksesot ‘fax’ (F-PL)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁸ The suffixes ti and ta, when attached to the stem, change the preceding vowel from e to a. These are phonological changes, and they are not discussed here.
(10) Formation of verbal forms in IH – prefixed forms

\[
\text{Verb stem (prefixed form):} + \text{Prefix} = \text{Inflected verb}^9.
\]

- **fakses** ‘fax’ + **je** ⇒ **jefakses** ‘fax’ (3-M-SG; 1-SG\(^{10}\))
- **fakses** ‘fax’ + **te** ⇒ **tefakses** ‘fax’ (3-F-SG; 2-M-SG)
- **fakses** ‘fax’ + **ne** ⇒ **nefakses** ‘fax’ (1-PL)

4.2.2. Hebrew verb patterns

4.2.2.1. The traditional approach

Most of the traditional scholars claim that Hebrew has seven verb patterns or *Binyanim* (Blau 1967, 1975, Tsarfaty 2004:101, Coffin-Amir and Bolozky 2005). A few point out additional, minor verbal patterns, such as *šifʕel* (Junger 1987, Coffin-Amir and Bolozky 2005:6-7). This tradition is applied to Israeli Hebrew as well, although no statistics of verbal pattern occurrences has ever been collected to show the use of these patterns in the spoken language. The seven traditional verb patterns in Hebrew are presented in Table 4-3 below. Their prefixed and suffixed stems are presented, together with their most dominant meaning. Additional comments are attached as well.

---

\(^9\) In three forms (second person female singular and second and third person plural) a suffix is used in addition to the prefix. The suffix –*u* is attached to the second and third person singular to obtain the plural form, and the suffix –*i* is attached to the second person singular to obtain gender (female). Yet, since this happens only in part of the forms, this stem is referred to as a ‘prefixed’ form.

\(^{10}\) In IH only, but not in traditional Hebrew.
### Table 4-3: Hebrew traditional verb patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern name</th>
<th>Dominant meaning</th>
<th>Suffixed form</th>
<th>Prefixed form</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paal / Qal</strong></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>$C_1aC_2aC_3$ + [suffix]</td>
<td>[prefix] + $C_1C_2aC_3$</td>
<td>Can also appear as [prefix] + $C_1C_2aC_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nifal</strong></td>
<td>Middle voice &amp; incohesive</td>
<td>$niC_1C_2aC_3$ + [suffix]</td>
<td>[prefix] + $C_1a(C_2b)aC_3$</td>
<td>Sometimes passive of Qal;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hifil</strong></td>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>$hiC_1C_2iC_3$ + [suffix]</td>
<td>[prefix] + $C_1C_2iC_3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hufal</strong></td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>$huC_1C_2aC_3$ + [suffix]</td>
<td>[prefix] + $uC_1aC_2aC_3$</td>
<td>Passive of Hifil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piel</strong></td>
<td>Agentive</td>
<td>$C_1aC_2a(C_2b)eC_3$ + [suffix]</td>
<td>[prefix] + $C_1aC_2a(C_2b)eC_3$</td>
<td>Passive of Hifil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pual</strong></td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>$C_1aC_2a(C_2b)aC_3$ + [suffix]</td>
<td>[prefix] + $C_1aC_2a(C_2b)aC_3$</td>
<td>Passive of Piel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hitpael</strong></td>
<td>Reciprocal &amp; reflexive</td>
<td>$hitC_1aC_2a(C_2b)eC_3$ + [suffix]</td>
<td>[prefix] + $C_1aC_2a(C_2b)eC_3$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two passive patterns, **hufal** and **pual** are characterized by the vowel $u$, which appears in their first syllable. This phenomenon of a first-syllable $u$ representing the passive is also typical in Arabic (Abu-Shaqra 2007:128), except that in Arabic, passive forms are pattern-internal, which means that the formation of passive forms is not achieved by a separate pattern, but by a conversion of a vowel in each of the existing patterns into the vowel $u$ (Abu-Shaqra 2007:128).

The two passive patterns and the passive-oriented forms of the **Nifal** pattern were observed in this study in negligible numbers. Although a large variety of literature on the Hebrew verb system refers to the passive patterns as part of the system, this study suggests that these patterns can be excluded from the Spoken Israeli Hebrew verb system. Out of thousands of verbs and verb phrases, which were collected in this study, only a few (~0.27%) were passive forms, and these were observed in more formal conversations rather than in spontaneous speech. This may hint at a degeneration process for these two patterns in Israeli Hebrew, as they are not productive, and thus cannot be considered as valid verbal patterns of the language. They can be used, though, to form nouns and adjectives, by using their participle patterns, for example: **metuman**
‘octagon’, *mesukan* ‘dangerous’ (both are *Pual*-PTCP-M-SG; the first one is a noun, root *tmn*, the second is an adjective, root *skn*) or *munaX*, *musag* ‘term’, *muSlam* ‘perfect’ (*Hufal*-PTCP-M-SG; the first two are nouns, roots *nwħ*, *sjg*, respectively, the second is an adjective, root *šlm*). These formations can be regarded as noun patterns rather than verb patterns, similarly to the other nominal patterns in the language.

No additional productive patterns were found in the research besides the five classical ones. The *šifʕel* pattern, which is claimed to be a separate (yet, minor) verb pattern in Modern Hebrew by some researchers (Junger 1987, Coffin-Amir and Bolozky 2005:6-7) has proved to be unproductive in a preliminary field research (Dekel 2009b:13), and was not observed in this study either. One new, non-standard verb form was found in a pilot study held prior to this research (Dekel 2009a). This form was an agglutination of a noun with a verb suffix. Such forms may hint at a trend towards a more analytic verb formation in SIH, but it appeared only once, and hence, could not be treated as a global phenomenon or a separate, independent pattern.

### 4.2.2.2. Current system

The results of this study thus suggest that the verb system of SIH is a complex of only five, and not seven patterns. It seems that the two passive patterns should be excluded from the grammar of the verb system of SIH, as they are completely unproductive, and although some of their participle forms do occur, their occurrences represent nominal entities only. The main semantic functions of the verbal patterns correspond to other layers of Hebrew and to other Semitic languages, but in some cases different or additional functions to those of traditional grammars are observed. The *Nifal* pattern, for example, does not express any passive forms of the *Qal* pattern in SIH, but it does in traditional Hebrew. Phonological changes of patterns, compared with their traditional counterparts, are also found to a great extent. Similarly to traditional Hebrew, geminated consonants are always pronounced as single consonants in speech. Traditional scholars agree that both pharyngeal
fricatives \( X \) and \( ? \)’ are not present in modern speech. Also the glottal consonants, which exist in writing, and are considered to exist in Modern Hebrew, are not present in SIH speech. The vocalic distribution of the causative pattern hifil shows a vowel lowering of the first vowel from \( i \) to \( e \). The traditional \textit{dagesh lene}\textsuperscript{11} rule, the absence of which under certain conditions turns the stops \( p, b, k \) (historically also \( t, d, g \)) into the fricatives \( f, v, X \), respectively, is ineffective, and very frequently occurrences of \( p, b, k \), are mixed up with \( f, v, X \), their corresponding fricatives. Table 4-4 below presents a suggested new verb system for SIH, based on real data. The table reflects phonological and morphological changes. The suggested ‘tense’ system will be discussed later in this thesis.

\begin{table}[h]
\begin{center}
\textbf{Table 4-4: SIH verb patterns}
\end{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Pattern name & Dominant meaning & Suffixed form (phonetic) & Prefixed form (phonetic)\textsuperscript{12} & Comments \\
\hline
Paal / Qal & Neutral / basic & \( C_1aC_2eC_3 \) + [suffix] & \( [\text{prefix}] + C_1C_2aC_3 \) & Can also appear as \( C_1C_2aC_3 \) \\
\hline
Nifal & Middle voice & \( niC_1C_2aC_3 \) + [suffix] & \( [\text{prefix}] + C_1aC_2eC_3 \) & No passive forms of Qal were found in this pattern \\
\hline
Hifil & Causative & \( iC_1C_2eC_3 \sim eC_1C_2C_3 \) + [suffix] & \( [\text{prefix}] + C_1C_2C_3 \) & Also agentive meaning, e.g. \textit{iklik} ‘to click’ \\
\hline
Piel & Agentive & \( C_1aC_2a(C_2b)eC_3 \) + [suffix] & \( [\text{prefix}] + C_1aC_2a(C_2b)eC_3 \) & \\
\hline
Hitpael & Reciprocal & \( itC_1aC_2aC_3 \) + [suffix] & \( [\text{prefix}] + itC_1aC_2a(C_2b)eC_3 \) & Also change of state, e.g. \textit{itpantSeR} ‘be spoiled, fail’ \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

When any of the consonants in the verb pattern is a glottal consonant – as mentioned above it is not pronounced. See examples 11-13 below.

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{Dagesh lene} is a dot inserted in six Hebrew letters denoting their occlusive pronunciation; without the \textit{dagesh lene}, three of these letters are pronounced as fricatives, whereas the other three remain plosives. In Israeli Hebrew speech, the original \textit{dagesh lene} rule is ineffective; therefore the plosives and their fricative counterparts are mixed up.

\textsuperscript{12} Some of the prefixed forms can also get a single suffix, in addition to their prefix. As these are the minority of forms, prefixed forms are still referred to by that name, but they include also the prefixed forms with the suffixes.
The examples below show the absence of glottal consonants in SIH, which according to the traditional approach are present in speech. The absence of double consonants is also presented.

(11)

(ʔ)amaRti leXa || (G-12-4-1:138)
say (ʔmrb-Qal-SUF-1-SG) to+you
‘I told you’

The glottal stop, which appears in brackets, is present according to the traditional approach, but is omitted in SIH speech. The absence of the glottal consonants happens in all locations in the word, i.e. in word-initial, word-middle or word-final.

(12)

(ʔ)eX (h)em (m)ıtla(h)avim | (G-8-1-3:299)
how they enthusiastic (V-lhb-hitpael-PTCP-M-PL)
‘they are so enthusiastic’

None of the glottal consonants in the words of this expression is pronounced in SIH speech. Also the first m of the last word is not pronounced, since the preceding word has a final m. This yields two consequent m’s, which is not possible in SIH.

(13)

(ʔ)u lo (ʔ)ıtXil (l)iS(ʔ)ol | (G-4-2-3:859)
he not start (ʔl-hifil-SUF-3-M-SG) ask (ʔsʔl-Qal-INF)
‘he did not start asking’

Also in this expression, none of the glottal consonants in the words is pronounced in SIH speech. Similarly to the previous example, the first l of the last word is not pronounced, since the preceding word has a final l. This would yield two consequent l’s, which is not possible in SIH.

The distribution of patterns in the study is presented in Table 4-5 below:
Table 4-5: Distribution of verb patterns in SIH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern Name</th>
<th>Research group</th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>Total number</th>
<th>Total percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paal / Qal</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3947</td>
<td>59.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nifal</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hifil</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>13.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piel</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>8.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hitpael</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>3.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb phrases</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>10.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passives</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>3441</td>
<td>3166</td>
<td>6607</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distribution shows that Qal forms are significantly more widespread than any other verb pattern in the language. These Qal forms include auxiliary forms with the root הָיָה 'be'. Even if we ignore these forms, the number still remains significantly high. Surprisingly, Hifil forms are more widespread than Piel forms. Piel is the main pattern via which new forms are integrated into the language, and thus one would expect that it would be more widespread. Over 10% of common verbal usage contain constructions of two, sometimes three, verbal forms in a sequence, which denote one meaning. This may hint at a trend towards more analytical constructions in SIH.

In addition, not all traditional person inflections exist in SIH. The following table shows the distribution of person and gender inflections in the SIH verb system. The traditional division of person and gender is presented in the table, but only the SIH inflections are noted. It is apparent that some person inflections, as well as gender inflections have merged in SIH. The inflections that exist both in SIH and in traditional theories, are marked with ✓. Participle forms inflect only for gender, but not for person, both in traditional Hebrew and in SIH. These are noted as 'Same as <person>-<number>-<gender>'. Inflections that in SIH have merged with other inflections, are noted 'Merged with <person>-<number>-<gender>'.
Table 4-6: Distribution of person and gender inflections in SIH verb system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Suffixed forms</th>
<th>Participles</th>
<th>Prefixed forms</th>
<th>Imperatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-SG</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Merged with 3-SG-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-PL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-SG</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as 1-SG-M</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as 1-SG-F</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merged with Prefixed forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-PL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as 1-PL-M</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as 1-PL-F</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merged with 2-PL-M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-SG</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as 1-SG-M</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as 1-SG-F</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-PL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same as 1-PL-M</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Same as 2-PL-F</td>
<td>Same as 1-PL-F</td>
<td></td>
<td>Merged with 3-PL-M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>