The Verbs of Motion "Ba" (come) and "Hevi" (bring) in Dictionaries of Contemporary Hebrew[*]

Pnina Trommer

Tel Aviv University, Tel-Aviv, Israel

Avi Gvura, Rama Manor

Beit Berl College, Kfar-Saba, Israel

We focused in this study on two verbs of motion **ba** (come) and **hevi** (bring) used in contemporary Hebrew pointing to a number of semantic shifts occurring in each of them and to categorical shifts that occurred in the verb **ba**. We conducted a semantic and syntactic analysis of these shifts in which we observed: a change in the syntactic valuation of **ba** and **hevi**, the semantic characteristic of the nominal collocations which form their syntactic setting, and the semantic connection between their original and new meanings. The article starts out with a presentation of the original meanings of the two verbs as belonging to the family of concrete verbs of motion. It then presents the semantic shifts each undergoing from designating motion to designating giving, existing, and modality (capability, intent and aspect) and concludes with the categorical shift of the verb **ba** to impersonal (חג"ם) and to discourse marker. It is noteworthy that in each of the shifts observed we noticed relation between the meaning stemming from the shift and the original meaning of **ba** and **hevi** as verbs of motion. We were able to prove that the original meaning is still echoed both in the semantic and category categorical shifts.

Keywords: semantic shift, categorical shift, motion verb, syntactic valency, location of goal

Introduction

Attempting to look up the words **ba** and **hevi** in dictionaries of contemporary Hebrew[1] (both oral and written), the user is struck by their variety of meanings and uses[2].

In our study we will focus on two verbs of motion **ba** and **hevi** and their usage in contemporary Hebrew by observing a number of semantic shifts which **ba** and **hevi** undergoes, and we will observe also the categorical shifts of the verb **ba**.

We will present a syntactic and semantic analysis in which we will point out:

(1) Change in the syntactic valuation[3] of **ba** and **hevi**;

(2) Semantic characteristic of the noun phrases which form their syntactic pattern;

(3) Semantic relation between their original and new meanings.

[1] See Stern, 1994; Choueka, 1997; Rosenthal, 2006; Sivan & Fruchtman-Agmon, 2007; Even-Shoshan, 2010.

[2] This article won't discuss the meaning shifts as expressed in idiomatic phrases.

[3] Syntactic valuation is the number of noun phrases relevant to the verb in its essential syntactic pattern (Rubinstein, 1979). Shatil (2003-2004, pp. 121, 125) proposes a method to describing the modification in the structure verbal bases based on the theory of valuation.

We will start with a presentation of the original meaning of the two verbs belonging to the family of concrete verbs of motion. We will then present the semantic shifts each undergoing from denoting motion to denoting giving, existing, and modality (capability, intent, and aspect) and will conclude with the categorical shifts of the verb **ba** to impersonal (חג"ם) and to a discourse marker.

Classification of Verbs of Motion Into Three Groups

Trommer defines concrete verbs of motion (1983, p.17; 1985 p.55) as verbs marking movement from one physical location (origin) to another (goal) during a measurable length of time.

Slobin defines an event of motion: "There is a moving figure in motion, moving in a particular manner forward along a path that crosses a boundary into a goal location" (Slobin, 2005, p. 308). This definition by Slobin is based on source, goal, and path comparable to Trommer's division to verbs of source, verbs of goal, and verbs of motion from place to place=path.

Trommer (1983, p. 18; 1985, p. 57) divides verbs of motion into three groups:

(1) Verbs mainly denoting the leaving of a place of source represented by the verb **yatsa** (to go outside);

(2) Verbs mainly denoting arrival to the goal. These can be internally classified into two sub groups one represented by the verb **higi'a** (to arrive) and the other by the verb **nikhnas** (to enter);

(3) Verbs denoting the very process of motion represented by the verb **na** (to move).

The principal distinction between these three groups is based on a different arrangement of the motion components in their semantic analysis. The motion in group (1) and (2) verbs results from presupposing their semantic definition while they themselves are static locative verbs, whereas in group (3) verbs the motion from place to place is marked by their semantic specification.

Slobin defines an event of motion: "There is a moving figure in motion, moving in a particular manner forward along a path that crosses a boundary into a goal location" (2005, p. 308). This definition by Slobin is based on source, goal, and path comparable to Trommer's division to verbs of source, verbs of goal, and verbs of motion from place to place=path.

The Verbs "Ba" and "Hevi" as a Subgroup in the Family of Motion Verbs

The verbs **ba** and **hevi** which are the topic of our study, thus according to Trommer, belong to the group of verbs whose main function is marking arrival to the goal represented by the verb **higi'a,** and their motion is represented only by the presupposition of their definition. In other words, both **ba** and **hevi** are static locative verbs. This semantic definition dictates the syntactic setting of these two verbs according to which they are to be completed by the goal complement.

The Syntactic Pattern of "Ba"

NP1+ **ba** + to + NP2 (locative prepositional phrase) (syntactic valuation+2)

(NP=Noun Phrase)

(1) **Tayarim** *rabim* **bau** *hashana* **artsa** (Choueka, 1997).

(Many tourists came this year to the Land).

The Syntactic Pattern of "Hevi"

NP1+**hevi**+NP2+toNP3 (locative prepositional phrase) (syntactic valuation+3)

(2) *Shlosha* **mtossim heviu** *ha yom* **olim hadashim la arets** (Choueka, 1997).

(Three airplanes brought today new immigrants to litterally the Land).

In example (1) the verb **ba** appears in a dual locative setting denoting the moving figure and the goal, and in example (2) the verb **hevi** appears in a triple locative setting denoting the cause of motion, the moved figure and the location of the goal.

Trommer points out (1985, p. 58) that syntactic constructs that contain the two locative complements characteristic of verbs of motion namely, complement of source and complement of goal are nevertheless not uncommon, and even quite prevalent.

(3) **Bati elekha yashar mimekom avodati.**[4]

(I came to you straight from work).

(4) *Tavi et ha'uga **mehamitbah** la salon.*

(Bring the cake from the kitchen to the living room).

In examples 3–4 the noun phrase is not explicit in the utterance since it is embedded as a personal pronoun in the verb.

The uniqueness of the verbs **ba** and **hevi** stems from their being deictic verbs embodying within them the goal where both addressor and addressee are present concurrently[5]. Thus we may see sentences containing these verbs without an explicit mention of goal resulting in lessened syntactic valuation.

(5) *Yavo!* (Come in) (Sivan & Fruchtman-Agmon, 2007) (Syntactic valuation +1)

(6) *Tavi et hasefer* (bring the book), (syntactic valuation +2)

Semantic Shifts in the Verbs "Ba" and "Hevi"

Our study points to a number of semantic shifts of meaning in the verbs **ba** and **hevi,** some in both verbs and others in one only. In the following examples we will concentrate on each shift (from indicating motion to indicating giving, from denotnig motion to denoting existence, and from denoting motion to denoting modality) demonstrating its relation with the original meaning (a certain locative element which was preserved (Anderson, 1971)[6]) and pointing out the changes in the syntactic pattern.

From Indicating Motion to Indicating Giving (Occurred in the Verb Hevi)

*Haba'al hevi le ishto pra**him*** (the husband brought his wife flowers).

This shift contains the verb **hevi** in a triple syntactic setting: NP1+**hevi**+to NP2+NP3 indicating the giver—Agentive, (Fillmore, 1968) the thing given—Objective (Fillmore, 1968) and the recipient—Dative,[7] (Fillmore, 1968) (syntactic valuation+3)

The syntactic valuation of **hevi** does not change because the goal compliment functions as an object denoting the recipient (see forewords a metaphoric shift).

The shift of **hevi** from indicating motion to indicating giving may also be classified internally: **hevi** indicating gave and **hevi** indicating sold.

---

[4] We would like to point out that in examples where a name of dictionary is not indicated the example is ours.

[5] Compare with Webster's Dictionary (1983) definition of the parallel verb "come": to move from a place thought as "there" to or into a place thought as "here".

(1) In the II person with relation to the speaker "come to me".

(2) In the I person with relation to the person addressed "I will come to see you" (Fillmore, 1966).

[6] Anderson presents a general localistic theory in which all propositions are in fact assorted variations of a locative proposition (propositions of location).

[7] Fillmore (1971) changes the name of the dative case to experience.

Hevi=Give[8]

In the Bible already we find the verb *hevi* complemented in order to indicate the owner, the object given and the goal:[9]

"*Vayavo Yosef ha bayta vayaviu lo et Hamincha asher byadam habayta vayishtahavu lo, artsa*" (Bible, Gen. 43:26). (When Joseph came home they presented to him the gifts that they had brought with them into the house, bowing low before him to the ground).

"*verabim mviim mincha ladonay liyrushalayim umigdanot, liyhizkiyahu melech Yehuda*" (Bible, 2Ch. 32:23) *(And many* bring presents to God, to Jerusalem and precious gifts to Hezekiah King of Judah).

The syntactic pattern is: NP1+hevi+le+NP2+et+NP3+Name of place.

The above syntactic pattern contains both a noun phrase realizing the recipient (to+noun phrase2) and a name of place which brings us back to recognizing **hevi** as a verb of both motion and giving. According to Rubinstein (1982), what we have here is causation within causation: Those who cause the presents to move home/to Jerusalem cause them to be received by the recipient (Joseph/God).

In this kind of syntactic pattern the verb **hevi** indicates giving (thanks to the complement indicating the recipient) along with the original meaning of location (thanks to the complement indicating goal).[10]

Moving from the original usage of **hevi** denoting motion is not far from its use as denoting giving without mentioning a goal.

And indeed, in the Bible we find the verb **hevi** with a complement indicating a recipient but no complement of location: "*ma navi laish*" (Bible, 2S 9: 7) (what can we **give** the man?).

Verse eight may be seen as reinforcing this meaning of giving of the verb **hevi**: "*hine nimtsa beyadi reva shekel kesef venatati leish hhaelohim*" (Bible, 2S 9: 8). (Here I have in my hand a fourth of a Shekel I will give it to the man of God). In this verse the verb **natan** is a synonym of the verb **hevi** in the previous verse**.**

The Biblical synonymy of **hevi** and **natan** is expressed also in Genesis where the servant gives presents to Rebekah's mother and brothers. "*umigdanot natan leahiha*" (Then the servant brought out gold and silver jewelry and articles of clothing and gave them to Rebekah and gave costly gifts to her brother and mother). Here **Natan**—give is parallel of **hevi** of (Bible, Ch. 33: 23) in both instances *Migdanot* (presents) are given.

In contemporary Hebrew we also find the verb **hevi** with a complement denoting a recipient without a locative complement, for example,

(7) *Haba'al hevi leishto prahim* (Trommer, 1983, p. 228).

(The husband brought his wife flowers).

Indeed the Comprehensive Updated Dictionary of Contemporary Hebrew (Choueka, 1997) starts the list of definitions of the verb **hevi** with (giving: brought something for someone, gave or delivered it to him). (Second definition) This meaning is exemplified in the following sentences:

(8) *Ata yachol lehavi li kos mayim bevakasha?* (Chueka, 1997, second definition).

(Can you give/bring me a glass of water, please?).

(9) *Heveti lo matana yafa leyom hahuledt* (Chueka, 1997, second definition).

---

[8] Netser (2007, p. 65) points out that verb **hevi** in its colloquial uses may take the place of a number of verbs, among them the verb *natan (give)*:***hu hevi li beita, stira, tsiyun shalili*** (*he gave me a kick, a slap, a failing grade*).
[9] In the example the thing given to the recipient is a ***mincha*** (*a gift*).
[10] An alternative possibility is that the prepositional phrase may be interpreted as marking the location or the person to whom the gift is presented at his location. If the preposition **le** is seen as denoting location then the complement *habayta liyrushalayim* (to home, to Jerusalem) should be considered an apposition.

(I gave/brought him a nice birthday gift).

It is noteworthy that in the above usage the original meaning of **hevi** as a verb of motion has not disappeared completely and Kuzar (1992, p. 105) indeed points out that in certain situations the meaning may be ambiguous. A natural response of a speaker whose language has not undergone similar categorical shifts to the question *matay **tavi** li et hakesef* (when will you bring me the money?) (bring=give), may be: ***meayin** ani tsarich le**havi** lecha oto* (Where should I bring it from?).

According to Goldberg (1995), many verbs conveying directional motion may be used metaphorically. She visualizes the giving as an event in which the given object moves from the giver to the recipient. Indeed in the Hebrew Academy's Q & A site[11] it is indicated that in the case of the verb **hevi** the emphasis is on transferring from place to place whereas in the case of the verb **natan** the emphasis is on transferring from speaker, addressor to addressee or recipient.

All the examples in this section deal with transferring a concrete object without remuneration, following is a discussion of the use of **hevi** as giving in exchange for money namely selling.

Hevi=sell

The act of selling is a type of giving in exchange for payment[12] and the following examples appear in a pragmatic context of selling and buying. A customer at HaCarmel Market in Tel Aviv tells the sales person:

(10)***Tavi li** kilo agvaniyot*.

(**Give me** a Kilo of tomatoes).

In other words, sell me a kilo of tomatoes. In the following example as well the meaning of the verb **hevi** is sold.

(11) *bikashti **mehamokher** le<u>h</u>em tari. Hu **hevi** li le<u>h</u>em yavesh*. (Chueka, 1997, 18 definition).

(I asked the sales person for a fresh bread and he gave **(**sold**)** me dry bred).

A Shift From Denotnig Motion to Denoting Existence (Occurring in the Verb Hevi)

The following examples present a semantic shift occurring in the verbs **ba** and **hevi** from their original meanings to designating existence and causing existence.

From denoting motion to denoting existence or formation of a concrete object (in the verb ba)

(12) *hakochav haba* (a Channel Two TV program)

(The next Star).

The syntactic pattern is: NP1+**Ba** (syntactic valuation +1).

The proof that **ba** signifies existence stems from the fact that we are dealing with a TV program which is a sort of sequel to the show *kochav nolad* (A Star is Born)[13]. The meaning of the verb **nolad** (born) is coming into existence[14], thus the meaning of **haba** in the collocation *hakochav haba* is "He will come into being, into existence".

---

[11] At the Hebrew Academy site, a question is asked how is **hevi** different from **natan**? *The* Academy's answer is that there is a difference between the two. In the sentence: ***heveti lekha et** hasefer* (I brought you the book), the emphasis is on transferring the book from one place to another as it was, for example, at the house of the speaker he took it from there and gave it to the recipient in another place. In the second sentence, however, ***natati lekha et hasefer*** (*I gave you the book*), the emphasis is on handing over the book from speaker to recipient. Of course, some overlapping between both actions and this partial overlapping is perhaps the reason that **hevi** is replacing **natan** in the spoken tongue.

[12] Borochovsky (1996, p. 56) analyzes the verb **makhar** (sold) as a verb denoting a number of actions: gave an object and received money in exchange.

[13] See Borochovsky (2003, p. 35) on the importance of context in determining the meaning of a verb.

[14] See Borochovsky (2001, p. 156) on the formula of the proposition of existence.

From denoting motion to denoting existence of a concrete object (the verb hevi)

(13) ***Taviu*** *shisha,* ***Taviu*** *shiv'a,* ***Taviu*** *shmona yeladim.* (Rosenthal, 2006)[15].

(Give birth six, seven, eight).

(14) *ekh* ***mevi'im*** *kazot be'ita.* (Rosenthal, 2006)[16]

(How do you give (**meviim**) a kick?).

Syntactic pattern is: NP1+**hevi**+NP2 (nominal valuation +2)

The syntactic valuation of **ba** and **hevi** in examples 12-14 was lessened; their syntactic pattern lacks a noun phrase that might be interpreted as goal. The most general location of destination—the world—can be reconstructed on the basis of the dictionary definition of the synonymous verbs **nolad/holid**.

Nolad=**yatsa le'avier aolam** came into the world (Chueka, 2010); **holid** = **hevi la'olam** (caused to come into the world) (Even-Shoshan, 2010).

Metaphorical shift[17] **from denoting motion to denoting existence of a new situation in the world**[18]

In the original usage of the verbs **ba** and **hevi** the moving figure possessed limbs responsible for the motion signified by these verbs. This was expressed by the syntactic pattern in which the noun phrase assuming the role of syntactic subject is of the (+alive) type: people and animals.[19]

Metaphorical motion was found in these verbs concerning figures of the (-alive) type who do not possess limbs responsible for the motion signified in their original meaning.

In examples 15-17 the subjects of the verbs **ba** and **hevi** brought about a state of affairs in the world (circumstances, conflict, and inflation), metaphorical goal location is a new state of affairs (delinquency, alienation, and collapse).

(15) ***hanesibot hevi'u*** *et habiat* ***le'avaryanut*** (Stern, 1994, p. 111, specifying literary language)[20]

(The circumstances have brought about the daughter's delinquency).

(16) **hasikhsukh** benehem he<u>h</u>mir ad **lidei** <u>liydey</u> **netuk** mu<u>h</u>lat ben hamishpa<u>h</u>ot (Chueka, 1997, definition 8 under **Ba** reached a situation).[21]

(The conflict between them continued to worsen until it brought about complete separation between the families)

(17) *Hainflatsya* ***hevi'a*** *et hamedina liydei hitmotetut.* (kuzar, 1992, p. 104)

(The inflation caused the country's collapse).

In examples 18–19 the location of the metaphorical goal is the person to whom the circumstances refer.

(18) ***Ba 'a alay tsara*** *gdola* (Chueka, 1997, definition 6 under **Ba**: Happened, took place).

---

[15] Amir (1992, p. 156) points out that "in lower levels of Hebrew speech the expression **lehavi** (to bring) is replacing to give birth this is borrowed from substandard Arabic usage" Sivan & Fruchtman-Agmon (2007) also present **hevi yeladim laolam** (brought children into the world in the meaning of bore children).

[16] Rosenthal (2006) explains **hevi** in this example as acreated (=existence) and also as made (kind of pro-verb) (Rubinstein, 1998, p. 114; Rodrigue-Schwarzwald & Sokoloff, 1992).

[17] Goldberg (1995, p. 83) and Borochovsky (2003, p. 33) denotes indicates that many of the verbs marking motion serve metaphorically to denote changes of situation of any kind rather than just motion from place to place (Lakoff, 1993, p. 220).

[18] See Borochovsky (2001, p. 30) on proposition of existence in a location.

[19] See Shatil (2003-2004, p.125).

[20] Stern considers as literary language the language of journal articles featured in journals such as **Ha hinuch** (Education), and **Maalot**.

[21] The following facts should be paid attention to: (1) in the paraphrase given by Chueka the verb **higi'a** appears as parallel to **ba** (See section: Classification of Verbs of Motion Into Three Groups—the verb **ba** as belonging to same subsection as section as **higi'a**; (2) the metaphorical goal of **higi'a** in the paraphrase is a situation instead of a place.

(A big tragedy had happened to me).

(19) ***Hevi alav asson*** (Sivan & Fruchtman, 2007; Chueka, 1997).

(He brought a disaster on him).

Examples 16-19 deal with the existence of a new state of affairs in the world deemed by the writer/speaker as negative[22] (conflict, inflation, trouble, and calamity).

It is noteworthy that in examples 18-19 the location of the metaphorical goal is a specific place (I=an entity in the world; he=an entity in the world) presented by means of the prepositional phrases **alay** (to me), **alav** (to him), which expand the syntactic pattern of the verbs **ba** and **hevi**.

The next examples display the existence of a mental entity in a location which is the mind of the person doing the thinking.

(20*) **ba** li **ra'ayon**. (Rosenthal, 2006)

(I've got an idea).

(21) ***ba*** li ***hagig/hirhur*** (thought, reflection)**; ba'a** li ***machshava /he'ara***

From Denoting Motion to Denoting Modality[23]

Semantic shift from motion to modality is expressed in a significant change in the syntactic construction of **ba** and **hevi**: In the original syntactic construction they were complemented by the goal complement, while in the new construction they are complemented by a verb in the infinitive.

From denoting movement to denoting giving permission to act (=a verb of causing ability to act)

Shift from denoting motion to denoting permission to act is realized in the verb **hevi** and is complemented by a verb in the infinitive.[24]

In colloquial speech this usage is exemplified in the following sentences:[25]

 (22) ***Tavi lanu lifnot*** yemina (Zinger, 1992, p. 27)[26]

(Allow us (bring us) permission to make a right turn).

(23) *tikansi pnima giveret, ulay **misheu yavi lakh lashevet**.*

(Go further in, lady may be someone inside there: will allow you to sit down (a concerned passenger to a woman carrying a baby at the front of a crowded bus) (Kuzar, 1992, p. 105).

The verb **hevi** in the above examples is complemented by an infinitive verb denoting a certain action along with a prepositional phrase denoting the recipient. In this syntactic pattern, the verb **hevi** marks giving

---

[22] According to Rubinstein (1998, p. 152), *sikhsukh* (conflict, example (16)), *hitmotetut* (collapse, example (17)), **tsara** (trouble, example (18)), **asson** (disaster, example (19)) *belong to a type of evaluating nouns* referring to actions or occurences taking place in the world and not to real objects. In other words, they refer to whole propositions and to things in the world to which such propositions refer to.

[23] According to Livnat (2011, p. 161) in linguistic terminology modal components are defined as components connected with expressing of opinion or position of the speaker in relation to the preposition.

[24] A similar syntactic pattern regarding complementing with the infinitive in order to convey a meaning of aspect and intention to act can also be seen in the case of the verb **ba (**see the following sections: From denoting motion to denoting intent to act; From denoting motion to denoting aspect of starting an action).

[25] Zinger (1992, p. 27) points out that the new meaning of the verb **hevi** as give is influenced by the verb **gab** (bring) in spoken Arabic in the Imperative especially, **gib li** (give me). Amir (1992, p. 151) adds that the phenomenon of direct borrowing from the Arabic spoken here was quite prevalent during the years of the British Mandate in Israel it later disappeared, and started again on a large scale at the wake of the 1967 War which renewed contacts between speakers of Arabic and Hebrew and the mutual substandard absorption of the two languages.

[26] It should be noted that this usage was not presented in dictionaries of contemporary Hebrew examined by us (see note 1).

permission to someone to act[27]. Complementing the infinitive verb along with the verb **hevi** categorizes it in the family of verbs causing action.

It is noteworthy that in the above shift the meaning of giving discussed in section—From Indicating Motion to Indicating Giving—is also revealed, in the above example, however, metaphorical giving is dealt with. The meaning of giving depicted in the above construction mediates between the original meaning of **hevi** as motion verb and its meaning discussed in that section (See section: Hevi=Give—the opinions of Kuzar (1992) and Goldberg (1995)).

From denoting motion to denoting intent to act

The verb **ba** in the syntactic pattern in which it is complemented only by an infinitive[28] serves also to denote intent as may be seen in the following example:

(24) *likrat hasof kshea'ni ba lalekhet, ani megale pitom musika tova me'od* (Rosenthal, 2006).

(Towards the end as I intend to go I suddenly discover very good music).

Rosenthal (2006) places this example under definition two of **ba** meaning "intending to, about to take action". The word **pitom** is proof that what we have here is an intent to act, since upon hearing the good music made the speaker change his intent of leaving.

From denoting motion to denoting aspect of starting an action[29]

In the following example also **ba** is complemented only with an infinitive:

(25) *Kshebati leha'alot et hadvarim al haktav, ra'iti sheyesh la'rokh otam betsura shone bemiktsat* (Chueka, 1997).

(When I was about to write the things down I noticed that I should edit them a little differently).

The meaning arising from this example reveals a shift from denoting motion to denoting aspect. The phrase **bati leha'alot et hadvarim** means I started to bring up the things and thus semantically we can classify the verb **ba** as belonging in the family of aspect verbs.

The semantic relation between the original meaning of **ba** and the meanings discussed in examples 24-25 is expressed in the conceiving of the infinitives (**lalechet/leha'alot**) as the aim of the action, the goal of the action we are about to carry out.

Categorical Shift (Discourse Marker, Impersonal=הג"ם)

What is a categorical shift?[30] Words from a certain grammatical category change in certain syntactic contexts, their original morpho-syntactic behavior and behave according to a grammatical category other than the original one.[31] Indeed, in the new dictionaries of contemporary Hebrew, we can find words which undergo categorical shifts and are recorded as one of the new meanings of the word (usually in slang). The noun **shiga'on** (madness) undergoes a categorical shift to adverb and this movement is already recorded for example in Chueka's dictionary (1997) as meaning number four: Hadugmanit hazot nir'et **shiga'on** (this model looks stunning). The adjective **gadol** (big) undergoes a categorical shift to an interjection exclamation **gadol**! Kibakti

---

[27] See Kuzar (1992, p. 104) claims that the model **A gave B+infinitive verb** model as in the sentence: **Danny gave Rina to go** is an abbreviation of gave her permission.

[28] See the part of Shift to Impersonal, the use of **ba** complemented by infinitive along with the prepositional phrase le+noun.

[29] See Borochovsky (2003, p. 31) on metaphorical use of motion verbs from marking motion to marking aspect of beginning or end.

[30] On categorical shifts see Rubinstein (1975), Shlesinger (1990), Shlesinger (2000), Trommer (2000-2001), Trommer (2003-2004), Trommer (2004), Trommer (2005).

[31] Hopper (1991) refers to this as de-categorialization.

100 babhina (great! I got a 100 on the exam).

In our research we found two categorical shifts in the verb **ba**: a shift to discourse marker and a shift to a kind of impersonal (=חג"ם).

Shift to Impersonal

What is impersonal (חג"ם)?

The name חג"ם was given by Rosen (1977, p. 220) to "a class of Hebrew words lacking any function except for appearing in sentences of the following model: adverb+**חג"ם**+to+noun +infinitive verb. For example, achshav kedai lamemshala le'atsia et hahok la Knesset miyad (it is now worth the government's while to present this bill to the Knesset immediately). Rosen considers this class of words to be an additional part of speech to those accepted in traditional Hebrew grammar and includes in it words like **keday** (worthwhile)**, efshar** (possible, possibly), **haval** (pity, shame), **dai** (enough), **lamma** (why), as well as a number of expressions in an adjectival form: **tov** (good), **ra** (bad), **ratsui** (desirable), **yafe** (pretty), **nae** (goodlooking)**, Kar** (cold), **ham** (hot), **noah** (convenient, comfortable) etc.[32]

The verb "ba" shifting to חג"ם

(26) ***ba li lehaki*** (Rosenthal, 2006 based on Sportsline, 2004).

(I feel like throwing up).

(27) *lo **ba lo lehit'amel** hayom* (Stern,1994).

(He does not feel like working out today).

(28) ***Ba li lishon*** (Chueka, 1997).

(I feel like sleeping).

(29) ***Ba li** latest **levalot*** (Even Shoshan, 2010).[33]

(I feel like going out on the town).

In the above mentioned syntactic structures the verb **ba** cannot be conjugated according to gender and number.

ba'a li lishon (I feel like slleping); ***ba'u li lishon***.

We may detect a vestige of verbal use in the fact that it is conjugated according to tense: Hayom lo **ba** li lalekhet leseret, mahar ulay **yavo** li.

According to Trommer (1999, p. 33), this use of **ba** points to a modal expression (expressing the speaker's emotional involvement) concerning the action marked by the complementing infinitive verb. According to Stern (1994, p. 89) the expression: **ba le+personal pronoun+infinitive verb** is very prevalent in colloquial Hebrew meaning "wanted very much", "desired".

An abbreviated pattern of the above usage: **ba+le+personal pronoun** (ba li, ba lo, ba la) is prevalent in the spoken language especially in that of children. And indeed in Sivan and Fruchtman's dictionary (2007), the

---

[32] Kuzar (1992) comprising Rosen (1977) includes verbs as well in the חג"ם group and indeed our research points to a shift of verbs to חג"ם.

[33] The use of **ba** in examples 26-29 should be distinguished from that of examples 24-25 above: (24) *likrat hasof kshe**a'ni ba** lalekhet, ani megale pitom musika tova me'od* (towards the end when I get ready to go I suddenly discover very good music) (Rosenthal, 2006); (25) *Kshe**bati leha'alo**t et hadvarim al haktav, ra'iti sheyesh la'rokh otam betsura shona bemiktsat* (When came to write the things down I saw that they should be edited a little differently) (Chueka, 1997). Both these examples remind us of **ba** in a categorical shift to חג"ם, but this is not the case here, since in these examples the verb is conjugated for number and gender: *kshehu* (when he **ba** lalekhet / *kshehi*) (*when she **ba'a** lalekhet keshehem*) (*when they*) ***baim** lalechet*. Such a conjugation is impossible in the case of חג"ם. Furthermore **ba** is complemented with the verb infinitive only, whereas when used as a חג"ם it receives a prepositional phrase+noun as well as complements.

phrase **ba lo** appears and is defined as "felt an immediate wish for something".

The ties between the original meaning of **ba** and the modal meaning of the above phrase are apparent in the following reconstruction. The categorical shift of the verb **ba** to חג"ם had two shifts:

(1)A semantic metaphorical shift:

ba li heshek lif'ol (I had an desire, wish).

The complement **li** (to me) realizes the location of the goal, the subject **heshek/ratson** realizes the moving figure whereas the infinitive verb **lif'ol** is the minimizing modifier of the subject **heshek/ratson**.

(2) An ellipsis of the noun:

heshek/ratson (desire/will) occurs and is replaced by its modifying complement **lif'ol** (to act). The dropped subject **heshek/ratson** leaves its mark in the modal expression[34] arising from the חג"ם model.

Shift to Discourse Marker

What is a discourse marker?

Discourse markers are words and expressions developed in spoken language. Their sources are a number of linguistic categories: adverbs, adjectives, and verbs. These words and expressions assumed a pragmatic function in discourse. In their new role, their original meaning is not fully preserved, however, it is possible to link the function they fulfill in the discourse (procedural meaning) to their source (conceptual meaning)[35] (Livnat, 2013, p. 643).

Livnat (2012, p. 347) points out that the transfer from a conceptual to a procedural function is linked with a grammaticalization, where beside their original meanings various textual functions connected with discourse structure are also put into effect such as those related to the speakers' inter-relations, inter-communication, as well as their thought processes.

Hopper and Traugott (2003) emphasize that in the process of grammaticalization elements clearly belonging to major grammatical categories (verbs and nouns) may in various settings lose their morphological and syntactic features characterizing those categories and may assume characteristics of secondary grammatical categories (prepositions, conjunctions, personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns, and discourse markers).

Maschler (2002, 2009) points out that in order for an utterance to serve as discourse marker it must comply with both semantic and structural conditions. Semantic condition refers to the fact that the utterance must lend itself to meta-linguistic interpretation in the context in which it appears. It must refer to something in the contextual reference, in the context of participant interaction, and cognitive processes among the speakers. Structural condition refers to the fact that the utterance must appear at the outset of an intonation unit, at a point where changing of speakers' turns takes place or in the event that the same speaker continues to speak right after each intonation outline except for in the case of continuing intonation.

The verb "ba" shifting to discourse marker

The verb **ba** functioning as discourse marker loses its main verbal feature, i.e., its tense declension, and

---

[34] See the part From Denoting Motion to Denoting Modality which dealing with a semantic shift of **ba** from denoting motion to denoting modality in syntactic structure of **ba** complemented by a verb infinitive with no complement of goal, for example, *likrat ha sof ksheani ba lalekhet ani megale pitom muzika tova meod* (towards the end when I am about to go I suddenly discover very good music).

[35] The procedural meaning is pertaining to the way the entire utterance or certain of its components are explained, This may be concerning the context, but it does not impact the truth value of the utterance and does not contributes to the logical meaning. The conceptual meaning of a dictionary entry is the one traditionally identified with the semantics, i.e., it contributes to the logical meaning of the utterance in which it appears and affects its truth value.

appears only in the imperative marked for person and number (**bo, boi, bo'u, and bona**)*.* It functions procedurally as an interjection, word of goading or spurring to act. It fulfills the semantic stipulation for discourse marker by being an interpersonal discourse marker in participant interaction in the discourse as well as the structural stipulation. It appears at the beginning of an intonation outline at the point of speaker exchange (according to Maschler, 2002, 2009) as illustrated by the following examples:

(30) I will hear someone calling: ***bo nelekh, bo nishma, bo natus*** (Rosenthal, 2006).

(31) ***Bo'i na'azov*** *et ha-Inyan* (Chueka, 1997, definition 5).

(Let's leave the matter).

(32) ***Bo'u nisha'er*** *hayom babayit* (Chueka, 1997, definition 5).

(Let's stay home today).

(33) ***Bo nom'ar*** *sheeineni mehasidav hagdolim* (Even-Shoshan, 2010).

(Let's say that I am not one of his great fans).

In the above examples from the dictionaries we have consulted a syntactic pattern in which the verb **ba** in the said usage is complemented by a verb in the future tense in the first person plural. Namely, the speaker himself participates in the action he wishes to expedite; this is analogous to the lengthened Biblical imperative form **hava**.[36]

Trommer (2000) presents an example in which the verb **ba** is complemented by the second person imperative:

(34) ***bo hena, uf*** *mikan!* (Trommer, 2000, p. 236).

(Come here, go out of here).

The one who spurs does not see himself as participating in the action he wishes to expedite but wants to make others carry out a certain action. Paralel Instances may be found in the Bible:

"**Bo** daber el par'o melekh Mitsrayim" (go tell Para'o the king of Egypt) (Bible, Ex 6:11).[37] In the Mishnah, there are only a few examples of using the goading imperative: "kah lekha zeitim u**bo va'asem beveit habad**" (take olives and prepare them at the olive press) (Mishnah, Bava Bathra 10:7); "**Bo'u** vehaiduni" (come and let me testify) (Mishnah, Shvuot 3: 8). In the Talmud: **Bo ure'e** is a common opening to intensify attention to what is being said.[38] **Bo ure'e shelo kemidat hakadosh baruch hu midat basar vadam** (Evan-Shoshan, 2010).[39]

We should point out that in example (34) **bo** hena **uf** mikan! The discourse marker **bo** is complemented by the goal complement **hena** which reminds us of the original conceptual meaning of the verb **ba** as motion verb focusing on the goal location. **bo** in the above usage retains its original meaning as a diectic verb since the

---

[36] In the Bible the word **hava** (let us) is used as word of goading to act where the speaker causes himself to participates in carrying out the said action. Thus the action to be carried out is marked with a verb in the first person plural in close proximity to the word **hava** Thus we find in the story of the building the tower of Babel (Bible, Gen.11:3,4,7). **Hava nelabna** levenim (Let us make bricks), **Hava nivne** lanu ir (build us a city). **hava nerda unvale** sham sfatam (let me then go down and confound their speech there).

[37] Man (1954, p. 3) calls this pseudo goading, i.e., a preparatory action preceding the main action: in order that you can speak to par'o you have to come to him first. Namely, coming to him is the preparatory action to the principal action—speaking to him. There is also a verse that says so outright: Bo el pa'ro vedibarta eilav (come to to par'o and say to him (Bible, Ex9: 1).

[38] According to Livnat (2012, p. 357), this is a procedural function connected with the term evaluation which pertains to calling the attention of the listener to important points in the discourse.

[39] See Sivan & Fruchtman-Agmon (2007) who bring the phrase ***Bo ure'e (come and see) in the language of Hazal (***our sages of blessed memory), the meaning is Pay attention! According to Man (1954, p. 10), in the Talmud the use of the goading words **bo /bo'u** is quite prevalent especially to express goading with cooperation on the part of the one doing the goading: *bou venahazik tova laavotenu (let* us be grateful to our forefathers) (Mishnah, Avoda Zara 5).

addressee is requested to concentrate on the subject at hand and to be focused on the addresser as if saying: "come on, pay attention to me, come and be at the place where I am at".[40]

Indeed, in the Bible we find parallel usage: "**Bo hena** veeshlha otcha el hamelech" (Come here and so I shall send you to the king) (Bible, 2S. 14: 32). Man (1954, p. 5) sees in this use a development from pseudo goading to real genuine goading from goading to action to goading to awakening. According to him, this is used to tell another that in order to fulfill the main task it should be preceded by preparatory action. If the speaker in the new meaning is to lay a mission on someone, he asks him to approach (in other words, the original meaning of **bo** as motion verb is preserved). In its new meaning, however, **bo hena** signifies procedural meaning carrying with it an meaning concerning certain components of the utterance—verbs in the future or the infinitive signifying the action the speaker wants speeded up.

It should be noted that in colloquial Hebrew the phrase **bo hena** has become a single lexeme **– bo'na** - and indeed Rosenthal's Comprehensive Dictionary of Slang lists this lexeme an entry by itself for example,

(35) *bo'na lama ata lo yored.*

(Why don't you come down).

Conclusion

In this article we present a few semantic shifts of the verbs of motion **Ba** and **Hevi** in contemporary Hebrew: from denotnig motion to denotnig giving, from denotnig motion to denoting existence, metaphorical shift from denoting motion to denoting existence of a new situation in the world, and from denoting motion to denoting modality. We present also two categorical shifts of the verb **Ba** to a discourse marker and to an impersonal.

It is noteworthy that in each of the shifts observed we noticed the relation between the meaning stemming from the shift and the original meaning of **Ba** and **Hevi** as verbs of motion. We succeeded to prove that the original meaning is still echoed both in the semantic and categorical shifts.

References

Amir, A. (1992). Sub standard absorption channels. *Leshonenu la-Am, 43* (4), 56-157.

Anderson, J. M. (1971). *The grammar of case towards a Lokalistic theory of the language*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Bible. (1980). Jerusalem: Koren Publishers Jerusalem LTD..

Borochovsky Bar Aba, E. (1996). Verbs indicating a collection of actions. Proceedings from *The eleventh and twelfth annual meeting of the Israeli circle of members of the European Linguistic Society* (pp. 53-60). Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University.

Borochovsky Bar Aba, E. (2001). *The verb–structure, meaning and use*. Beer-Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev pres:.

Borochovsky Bar Aba, E. (2003). Semantic shifts and syntactic analysis—A study of motion verbs. *30 to Ilash—anthology of articles to in honor of Ilash Israel Association of Applied Linguistics, 26-42.*

Choueka, Y. (1997). *Rav-Milim* (*Long words*). *Dictionary of Contemporary Hebrew*. Israel: Center for Educational Technology.

Even-Shoshan, A. (2010). *The New Dictionary*. Jerusalem: Kiryat-sefer Ltd..

Fillmor, C. J. (1968). The Case for Case. In H.Bach (Ed.), *Universal in Linguistic Theory* (pp 1-88).New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Fillmor, C. J. (1971). Types of lexical information. In D. D. Steinberg & L.A. Jakobovits (Eds.), *Semantics* (pp. 370-392). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fillmore, C. J. (1966). Deictic categoties in the semantics of come. *Foundations of Language, 2*, 219-227.

---

[40]And indeed according to Hopper (1991, p. 22), one of the characteristics of the grammatization process is the "principle of persistence" according to which when a lexical form turns into a grammatical one the original meaning of the lexeme does not entirely disappear. See also footnote (37) above.

Goldberg, A. E. (1995). *A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. The University of Chicago: Chicago.

She'lot-Teshovot (Question- Answer). (2014). Retrieved from http:// *hebrew-academy.huji.ac.il/*

Hopper, P. J. (1991). *Approaches to grammaticalization 1*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Bengamins Publishing Company.

Hopper, P. J., & Traugott, E. C. (2003). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics.

Kuzar, R. (1992). Replacement of natan by hevi in colloquial Hebrew. *Leshonenu La Am, 43*, 103-106.

Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (Ed.). *Metaphors and thought* (2nd ed.). Cambridge：Cambridge University Press.

Livnat, Z. (2011). *The rhetorics of a scientific article*. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press.

Livnat, Z. (2012). Achshav now as a discourse marker: Segmentation and evaluation. *Helkat Lashon*, (43-44), 246-366.

Livnat, Z. (2013). *Introduction to the theory of meaning: Semantics and pragmatics. Open University, 2*, units 7-10.

Man, Y. (1954). On the use of goading verbs. *Leshonenu A special volume,* 3-12

Maschler, Y. (2002). The role of discourse markers in the construction of multivocality in Israeli Hebrew talk-in-interaction. *Research on Language and Social Interaction, 35*, 1-38.

Maschler, Y. (2009). *Metalanguage in interaction: Hebrew discourse markers*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Bengamins Publishing Company.

Mishnah. (2008). *Shisha Sidre Mishnah* (six books of the Mishnah). Israel: Yediot.

Netzer, N. (2007). *Hebrew in jeans*. Beer-Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev.

Rodrigue-Schwarzwald, O., & Sokoloff, M. (1992). *A Hebrew dictionaty of linguistics and philology*. Even-Yehuda: Reches.

Rosen, H. (1997). *Ivrit Tova* (Good Hebrew). Jrusalem: Kiryat Sepher.

Rosenthal, R. (2006). Dictionary of Israeli sleng. Jeruzalem: Keter Books.

Rubinstein, E. (1975). Categorical shifts of adjectival phrases in colloquial Hebrew. In O. Uzi & F. Ben-Ziion (Eds.), *Sefer Rosen* (*Rosen book*) (pp. 100-106). Jeruzalem: Kiriat Sefer.

Rubinstein, E. (1979). Syntactic valuation and semantic valuation. *Leshonenu, 43*, 3-19.

Rubinstein, E. (1982). Couse by Couse. Balshanut ivrit h̲ofshit.(Hebrew linguistics) *Journal for Hebrew Descriptive Computational and Applied Linguistics, 18*, 63-68.

Rubinstein, E. (1998). *Syntax and semantic: Studies in biblical and modern Hebrew*. Tel-aviv: Tel Aviv University.

Shatil, N. (2003-2004). A method of examination the renewal of verbs in spoken Hebrew—The verb halakh. *Leshonenu la-Am, 54* (b-c), 120-139.

Shlesinger, Y. (1990). Categorical shifts in functional particles. Hebrew linguistics. *A Journal for Hebrew Descriptive Computatuonal and Applied Lunguistics, 28-30*, 213-218.

Shlesinger, Y. (2000). *Journalistic Hebrew*. Beer Sheva: Ben-Gurion University of the Negev Press.

Sivan, D., & Fruchtman-Agmon, M. (2007). *Ariel dictionary*. Kiryat-Gat: Kori'm.

Slobin, D. I. (2005). Linguistic Representations of motion events: What is signifier and what is signified? *Iconicity Inside Out: Iconicity in Language and Literature, 4,* 307-322. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Stern, N. (1994). Dictionary of Hebrew verbs. Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press.

Trommer, P. (1983).The *verbs of motion in contemporary Hebrew—Semantic and syntactic study* (Ph.D. dissertation, Tel Aviv University).

Trommer, P. (1985). Obligatory complements of motion verbs. *Balshanut ivrit H̲ofshit, Journal for Hebrew Descriptive Computational and Applied Linguistics, 23,* 55-80.

Trommer, P. (1999). Semantic shifts as a cause of linguistic poverty of the lexicon of Israeli Hebrew. *Helkat Lashon, A journal for theoretical and applied linguistics, 27,* 20-35.

Trommer, P. (2000). Categorical shifts in Israeli Hebrew—general guidelines for research. *Helkat Lashon, A journal for theoretical and applied linguistics, 29-32,* 222-242.

Trommer, P. (2003-2004). Exchanged part of speech: A means of expressing sensitivities. *Leshonenu La-Am 54, (b-c)*, 98-105.

Trommer, P. (2004). Noon-Questioning interrogative pronouns. *30 to Ilash—anthology of articles to in honor of Ilash Israel Association of Applied Linguistics,* 123-140.

Trommer, P. (2005). Categorical Shifts in adjectives in Israeli Hebrew. In M. Bar-Asher & M. Florentin (Eds.), *A study in samaritan, Hebrew and Aramaic presented to Abraham Tal* (pp 307-335). Jerusalem: Mosad Biyalik.

Webster, N. (1983). *Webster's new twentieth century dictionary* (2nd ed.). New York: Simon and Schuster.

Zinger, M. (1992). Tavi li , ba li (bring me, I feel like). *Politics-Israeli Periodical, 46,* 27.

Ziv, y. (2001). It's not at all simple' discourse markers in colloquial Hebrew. *Hebrew Linguistics, 48,* 9-17.