

University of Groningen

Naar een morfosemantiek van het modern Hebreeuws. Naar een fonologische, morf fonologische en morfosemantische beschrijving vande lexikale eenheid.

Gebhard, Arjeh

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:

1989

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Gebhard, A. (1989). *Naar een morfosemantiek van het modern Hebreeuws. Naar een fonologische, morf fonologische en morfosemantische beschrijving vande lexikale eenheid.* s.n.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

SUMMARY

TOWARDS A MORPHOSEMANTIC DESCRIPTION OF MODERN HEBREW

In this book an attempt has been made to develop a theory of linguistics, based on the semiotics and logic of Ch.S.Peirce's *Collected Papers* (ed.1978), with Modern Hebrew as the object language.

In the author's opinion existing theories of linguistics do not offer an adequate vocabulary for the description in lexical semantics of what is generally accepted as the unique structure of the lexical unit in Semitic languages such as Modern Hebrew.

The descriptive problems involved in present day lexical-semantic research of Modern Hebrew are illustrated in 1.1.0.

Ch.S.Peirce's views are today once again the subject of scientific interest, - for example in literature studies - and his influence on, among other things, pragmatics, in linguistics is unmistakable.

Yet the question remains as to whether his semiotics, as a general theory of signs, can be used as a theoretical framework for the development of a theory of linguistics.

This question is given a general answer in 1.2.0.

Following that, 1.3.0 offers a description of these semiotics and Ch.S.Peirce's accompanying logical system, which together form the linguistic-theoretical framework.

The main features of this framework are these:

- a. the lexical unit, described according to the 'spheres' of the semiosis, triadically, dyadically(binary) or monadically, depending on the logical construction of the linguistic statements, which can be either deductive, inductive or abductive.
This is also the case with the determination of the various levels of description in phonology and semantics. Distinctions are made between monadic, so called statistic phonology and semantics, dyadic(and monadic) static phonology and semantics, and triadic(including dyadic and monadic) dynamic phonology and semantics;
- b. phonological and semantic systematics as defined on the different levels of description form a whole together. Thus phonology, for example, defined separately, can only be introduced into a set of semantics after having been subjected to the so called rule of inversion. Inversion restores the unity of the phonological and semantic representation of the lexical unit;
- c. lexical units are described as they occur in each immediate present use of language, which for example determines the concept of tempus;
- d. the above mentioned levels of description for phonology and semantics correspond to the mental processes of the user of the language, i.e. the pseudo-systematics, the coding and de-coding of the lexical unit which are regarded as being abductive and are thus accepted as being grounds for possibilities. These form the starting point for the description of the systematics of language. The difference between these two lies primarily in the logical level of argumentation of, respectively, the user and the researcher of language. The user employs simple syllogisms and analogue reasoning, whilst the researcher applies logically valid reasoning to statements in language whereby pseudo-systematics tend generally to consist of regularities and linguistic systematics of rules which are always valid;

e. because of the very nature of the specific linguistic theoretical framework the results of existing phonological and semantic research cannot simply be incorporated into the linguistic description.
This is especially valid for concepts with origins in the traditional grammar of Biblical Hebrew.

The research itself starts in 2.0.0 with a phonological description of the lexical unit. This results in the description of regularities in phoneme-alternance and isophony and the establishment of, for example a rule of segmentation/concatenation for the root, pattern and affix; no morphology is involved in this process.

The aforementioned regularities and rules, which are based on the pseudo-systematics of the user, are subsequently elevated to the rank of morpho-phonological rules within the central-systematic interweaving of root and pattern and links with affixes. The most important criterion for central-systematics here is the calculation of the potentiality of these interweavings; this is done with a statistical research of the roots, (6.0.0).

It is highly significant that so called exceptions to the phonological rules in phoneme-alternance and isophony, generally occur in peripheral interweavings. The afore-mentioned regularities, elevated to rules, then go on to form the basis for the classification-criteria for the morpheme reserve.

An interesting result of this classification-research is the fact that only four classes of stem-pattern morphemes are found in the language, namely: QOTĒL, QĒTĒL, QATUL and QATIL; the QĒTĒL-class especially consists of a large number of alternants and allomorphs.

There are initial difficulties with classification research involving complex-stems, i.e. stems with a root-affix such as the *m-* in *midbar* or the so called doubling of the middle radical. This is because it is not yet possible, using the afore-mentioned morpho-phonological rules, to determine immediately whether a stem-pattern consists solely of vowels or of vowels and consonants, as the *mišqal* (or *binyan*) of traditional grammar, which are known here as lexeme-patterns. A morpho-phonological theory is therefore needed, consisting of a combination of deductive statements concerning the morphemes and their relation to one another within the lexical unit.

These relationships can be symmetrical and progressional or regressional asymmetrical; they are governed by the morpho-phonological rules for vowel and consonant alternation and by rules of contraction/detraction, etc.

Thus the relationship between for example root and stem-pattern turns out to be symmetrical.

This morpho-phonological theory, which determines the structure of the lexical unit using morpho-phonological rules, is not a separate level of description: the morpho-phonology in 3.0.0 is part of the phonology in 2.0.0.

The classification-research into the complex-stems is completed after the argumentation of the morpho-phonological theory in 3.6.0.

Here the fact that there are only four classes of stem-pattern is confirmed.

The descriptive way is now open for semantic research: the classes of morphemes are established, as are the relationships between the morphemes.

As the results of the (morpho)phonological research are now introduced into the semantics, one should bear the relationships between the different levels of description in mind, the relationship between (morpho)phonology and (morpho)semantics as a whole and the relationships between the morphemes in the lexical unit.

Logically, the above-mentioned rule of inversion must now be applied.

This rule reverses all the morpho-phonological relationships, which have been introduced into the morpho-semantics.

Indeed, it will then be possible to affirm the applicability of this rule to morpho-semantics.

(Morpho)semantics use the same criteria for description, and these are applied according to a theoretical framework just as with (morpho)phonology. Amongst other things this is expressed in the drawing up of semantic regularities and morphosemantic rules, which are represented formally in so called factor-diagrams.

These factor-diagrams, representing phonological environments in (morpho)phonology which appear when inflection and derivation occur in actual linguistic usage, are the formalized notation of the phonological regularities and the morpho-phonological rules. In (morpho)semantics these factor-diagrams represent semantic circumstances.

Semantic circumstances can be actions, states or apperceptions, or a combination of these under conjunctive circumstances. They are represented in each immediate present usage by a lexical unit, which is one of the factors within these circumstances. Other lexical units may form factors, although lexical units with the same root, possessing the same morphosemantic root feature, are the most relevant as far as linguistic systematics is concerned.

When an 'agent factor' occurs in the section containing lexical units with 'common' roots, e.g. a lexical unit with a stem-pattern of the QOTĒL class, the circumstance is an action. With a 'root-class' or designation with only a non-agent-factor, i.e. a lexical unit of the QĒTĒL class, the circumstance involved is a state.

For example, lexical units with simplex-stems, i.e. without root-affixes and with stem-patterns of the morpheme-classes of QATUL and QATIL, represent apperceptions to which a respectively regressional and progressionally temporal aspect is connected.

An aspect is here defined as a pseudo-systematic concept which, when specified, draws linguistic-systematically relevant relative differences.

Tempus is described using immediate presents in which 'past tense' and 'future tense' are apperceptions, such as *'adom*(red) and *sagur*(closed).

In this way a distinction is drawn on strictly lexical-morphosemantic grounds between action, state and apperception, without having to introduce a durative concept of time.

Even though for the user of a language the difference between action and state is undoubtedly of an absolute nature, in a linguistic-systematic sense one can only speak of a relative distinction.

In the case of an action the focal point(focus), is the agent-factor, and with a state it is the non-agent-factor; the relation between agent and non-agent is always symmetrical.

These circumstances cannot yet be described as syntax, although a development for describing the sentence is certainly possible.

Nor is this a depth-structural case-study using surface-structural lexical-morpho-phonological criteria.

Whilst an 'emotional' feature is ascribed to the root and an 'energetic' feature to the stem-pattern, the root-affix feature is 'logical'.

The root-affixes are morphosemantically defined as focus and topic, which are further specified as, respectively: individual/collectional, different/equipollent, and transpositional/compositional/impositional.

The specifications of the focus govern the relative distinctions; if, with focus setting, the agent-factor is individual, then the non-agent-factor is collectional, or vice versa.

Topic-setting is linguistically-systematically relevant in conjunctive circumstances, which are represented by complex-stems with root affixes.

The relationship between these separate circumstances is either symmetrical or asymmetrical; this shows up here as being either compositional or transpositional/impositional.

In a composition of circumstances all the individual circumstances take the topic-setting and are descriptively central; in a transposition or imposition not all the circumstances take the topic-setting.

Using the specifications of logical features mentioned above as fixed descriptive criteria, it is possible to describe all seven root-prefixes, the root-infix (that is the doubling of the central radical) and the root suffixes (i.e. the reduplications).

In the morphosemantic theory, (5.2.0), the morphosemantic features of the root-, stem- and affix-morphemes are included as deductive statements.

They are illustrated using lexical examples. In the process it becomes clear that many problems involved in the description of lexeme patterns such as *hiqṭil*, *niqṭal*, *qiṭél* etc. - problems which to a large extent have as yet remained unresolved - do not occur.

The statements of the morphosemantic theory are inductively verified with each lexical example, after which the specified features are tested against C.S. Peirce's views in so far as they have not been dealt with in the summary of his semiotics, (1.3.0).

This research is limited to the description of the morphosemantic features of root-affixes. Other affix-morphemes such as stem-affixes used in derivation and the lexeme-affixes used in inflexion, are not discussed.

At any rate the descriptive scope of the theory sufficiently warrants the choice of the theoretical framework; a substantial number of descriptive problems surrounding the (morpho)phonology and (morpho)semantics of the lexical unit, have now been resolved or simply no longer occur.

This theory is by no means limited to the description of the lexical unit in Modern Hebrew.

A suitable name for the theory might be the *Triangle Theory*, this has been suggested by the many triangles in the formalized notation of the factor diagrams representing the morpho-phonological and morphosemantic rules.