Hebrew Information Structure

New and given information in Hebrew narratives

Bachelor of Arts Thesis in General Linguistics

By Robert Nilsson

February 2013

Lund University

Supervisor: Arthur Holmer

Table of Contents

Kandidatkurs ALSK11

Abstract

This paper will examine information structure used in Modern Hebrew, a Semitic language spoken in Israel. More specifically, the study will look into the methods used by Modern Hebrew native speakers to differentiate between old (active) information and new information in spontaneous speech. The study will offer new insights to different constructions of information structure, relating to active and new information and the use of definite or finite forms, in the spontaneous speech of Modern Hebrew, as well as general insights into narrative discourse and information structure. The study conducted in this paper further proves existing theories about information structure and reasoning behind constructions used by speakers of different languages. Further this paper relates the analysis of the specific strategies applied by Modern Hebrew native speakers to construct a narrative to convey information in a desired way and gives some indication of the method used.

Acknowledgments

Abbreviations

1st	-	First person	NEG	-	Negation
2nd	-	Second person	POS	-	Possessive
3rd	-	Third person	PRES	-	Present tense
M	-	Masculine	F	-	Feminine
PL	-	Plural	PST	-	Past tense
DAT	-	Dative case	A, AG	-	Agent
P, PAT	-	Patient	ACT	-	Actor

1. Introduction

This paper aims to examine the properties and strategies of information structure used in Modern Hebrew (hereafter MH). More specifically this paper will be looking at which methods are used by MH native speakers to differentiate between given information and new information in speech.

1.1 The status of Givenness

When analyzing a phrase, *new information* is that which has not yet been introduced in the current context, as opposed to *given information*, which has been introduced previously by the speaker, or which the speaker can assume is already in the mind of the listener (Lambrecht 1994).

Example:

"A woman is walking in a park"

In this sentence 'A woman' and 'a park' are nouns representing new information. If the speaker then continues:

"The woman stops and then she eats an apple"

The noun "The woman", already introduced in the previous utterance, now turns to *given information*. However, the noun "an apple" is new information. Also, the use of the pronoun "she" is only possible with *given information* since the listener is expected to know what entity the pronoun refers to. This distinction, between *given* and *new information,* seems to be important in all languages of the world (Krifka and Musan 2012).

Given information is also sometimes referred to as *old information* (to contrast with "new"). The terminology can be confusing, since *new information* implies that what was said was completely new to the listener even though the new information might be the name of someone they already know, it was simply new to the current context. Using *old* instead of *given* would only make this confusion greater. A more intuitive term would be "already activated information" but *given* is less awkward to use (Chafe 1976).

Givenness is a status assigned to a noun or rather the noun phrase by the speaker. The nouns of a sentence may have several additional statuses assigned to them. According to Chafe (1976) the status belongs to the referent while the expression of this status, its "packaging", belongs to the noun phrase. Chafe lists these statuses as *givenness*, *definiteness*, *contrastiveness*, *subject*, *topic*, and *point of view*. When it comes to *givenness* the status of the referent is based mainly on what the speaker expects is already in the mind of the listener. These statuses often interact and influence each other, as well as the way they are expressed in natural language. The most obvious influence is expressed by the interaction of *definiteness* and *givenness*; a noun may only be used in the definite form if it also carries the status of being *given information*. For the purpose of this study, *point of view*, *subject*, *topic* and *contrastiveness* will not play a significant role, and therefore only *givenness* will be discussed at length[1].

In English, as well as in many other languages, *givenness* is marked by a different intonation on nouns that are given, than on nouns that are introduced or re-introduced (in addition to overt syntactic definiteness). Additionally, definiteness as well as pronominalization is only used on given nouns (Chafe 1976).

---

[1] For an in-depth discussion on what influences givenness see MacWhinney and Bates (1978) and the previously mentioned Chafe (1976)

In any phrase with one *given* noun and one *new* noun it is preferred, in most languages, to have the *given* noun precede the new noun. This is referred to as the *G > N-principle*.

According to the theory of linearization hierarchies word order is influenced by different hierarchies in which givenness is only one factor.

The Formal Hierarchies:

      structurally simpler > structurally complex

      short > long

The Dominance Hierarchies:

      The personal hierarchy:

      1stp. > 2^{nd}p. > 3^{rd}p. human > higher animals > other animals > other organisms

      > inorganic matter > abstracts

      The semantic role hierarchy:

      agent > patient > recipient > benefactive > instrumental > spatial > temporal

The Familiarity Hierarchies:

      more familiar topic> less familiar topic > comment

      given > new

      definite > indefinite

Siewierska (1993) neatly summarizes them as being based either in formality or in familiarity. Structurally simple constituents should precede structurally complex ones. More familiar constituents should precede less familiar ones; this is where givenness fits in, as a factor of familiarity. A given noun is perceived as more familiar than a new noun. These hierarchies interact with each other to some extent, the personal hierarchy is in a descending order of agency and the higher up a referent is on that list the more likely they are to be found high up on the other list. The reasons behind the ordering are many times related between the hierarchies. The G > N principle is not a strict rule, rather a

commonly observed tendency, using the linearization hierarchies it is possible to consider other factors that may influence the outcome of a study in this field.

Skopeteas and Fanselow (2010) conducted a study examining the influence of the *G > N-principle* on word order; participants were shown series of pictures, first a person or thing was introduced and in the next picture they would do something or have something done to them. For example the first picture could be of a boy just standing there and in the next picture the same boy is pushing a man. The participants were then asked to describe the pictures. In sentences where the agent was *given* and the patient was *new* (AG/GIV, PAT/NEW) the word order would always be canonical and exhibit the basic word order of that language, be it SVO, SOV, or any other order.

A picture might be possible to describe like in 1a and 1b. 1b shows the passive construction and is highly unlikely to be used by an English speaking person since both preferences are violated. In the example "the boy" has been introduced previously and is thus possible to refer to using the definite form.

For example:

(1) (a) "The boy pushes a man"   (agent > patient, given > new)
    (b) "A man is pushed by the boy"   (patient > agent, new > given)

However, when the pictures elicited a response in which the *given* character was presented as the patient and the *new* as the agent (PAT/GIV, AG/NEW), maybe the first picture would again be of a boy but the following picture would be of a man pushing the boy. Then the choice of construction was less straightforward and both the examples shown in 2a and 2b would be viable. Again the second sentence shows the passive construction, which in this case is more likely to be utilized by an English speaking person.

Kandidatkurs ALSK11

For example:

(2) (a) "A man pushes the boy"   (agent > patient, new >given)
    (b) "The boy is pushed by a man"   (patient > agent, given > new)

The choice between possible word orders in describing a situation with AG/GIV, PAT/NEW conditions, as in example (1) above, is generally straightforward for English speakers. (1b) and (2b) show the passive construction, the most common way for English speakers to maintain the G > N principle, although in 1b the passivization has the opposite effect and instead breaks the G > N principle. Given the choice between 1a and 1b most native English speakers would show a preference for 1a. This is due to the G > N principle and a preference for the agent to precede the patient working towards the same goal[2]. However, 2a and 2b show the competing of these same two principles, leading to a more varied choice of word orders in speakers' responses since both options are more or less equally valid, they both maintain one principle while breaking another. The study resulted in a categorization of languages according to what strategies they used for maintaining the G > N principle. These approaches were basically either reordering or passivization.

Passivization is used in English and when a speaker of a language that utilizes passivization such as English is faced with the uncomfortable situation of having to describe a given noun as a patient (PAT/GIV) of a new noun (AG/NEW) they would likely do so by making the given noun the subject, and retaining the basic word order of their language, resulting in a passive construction (as in 2b and 1b above). In a passivization strategy the focus is on the verb and how it handles arguments. Moving the

---

[2] The preference for the positions of the patient and the agent is of course dependent on the language. A VOS language, for example, is likely to have a different preference from English (SVO).

agent to a postverbal adjunct position, thereby maintaining the preferred word order while still maintaining the G > N principle. Passive constructions are used for many other things also, for an in-depth discussion of passive constructions and their use see (Keenan 1985).

However the choice of 2b over 2a is not set in stone, the speaker may choose to use 2a even though it violates the *G > N-principle.* The choice to do so might be influenced by a number of factors such as the ones described by the theory of linearization hierarchies.

Some languages use reordering instead of passivization. Reordering means the moving of an argument in the phrase so as to satisfy some condition, like to maintain the G > N principle. Reordering is possible in English but is not commonly invoked by a givenness asymmetry (Skopeteas and Fanselow 2010). While English does have a case system that makes grammatical roles explicit in some situations, it is not used all the time, and often the word order is what English speakers use to tell what role a referent has ("Mary helped John" is different from "John helped Mary"). It could also be argued that with passivization, reordering becomes licensed and so is just another form of reordering. The effect of passivization is essentially that one constituent is moved from one position to another, but there is a clear difference between a strategy to use reordering without passivization and one with passivization so they will be referred to by those terms.

1.2 Background about Hebrew

Ancient Hebrew is a Semitic language, whereas MH is considered (by some) to have lost its connection with the Semitic roots in the modern process of its revival (19th century). In addition to its Semitic characteristics, MH can be argued to exhibit great Germanic influences (through Yiddish and / or German) as well as Russian, French and English influences (for further discussion see Zuckerman 2008, as it appears in Kalifon 2012)

Although linguists tend to relate to MH as an SVO language, in fact the language has a great degree of flexibility in its choice of word order. This property is made possible due to the rich verb morphology of MH. Nonetheless, the most unmarked word order is often cited as SVO word order. This is in difference to Ancient Hebrew which is considered to have had a VSO word order in its spoken form.

MH is a half pro-drop language, allowing the covertness of pronouns under some conditions, and requiring their overt appearance in others. The omitting of pronouns is made possible due to the rich verb morphology which reveals important syntactic information.

Hebrew was selected for this study because of it not having been studied in this manner before. Also MHs unique status of being a revived language gives rise to an interesting perspective when examining results. Does MH have more in common with the Indo-European, mainly Germanic, languages which heavily influences it or is it closer to its Semitic roots (such as Arabic for a modern language)?

2. Method

Participants: two native Hebrew speakers, aged 20 – 30, females, university education. The participants volunteered for the study.

Material: The Pear Story film; the film shows a brief story about picking pears, and people meeting and interacting in relation to those pears. There is no spoken dialogue in the film, and it is therefore accessible for speakers of any language. During the course of events depicted in the film several characters and items are introduced, interact with eachother, time passes, and some items can be considered re-introduced (a man picking pears, the tree he is in and the baskets he uses, they are important to the story but are only in view in the beginning and end of the film).This makes the film suitable for study of approaches used to introduce, present and refer to characters and items in a narrative.

The film was created for the purpose of examining narrative construction in different languages. Several researchers, along with Chafe produced the film with this purpose. The film was shown to many speakers of several different languages (including e.g., English, Greek, Japanese and Persian), who were then asked to retell, in their native language, what they had seen in the film, The recordings of these narratives were then transcribed and analyzed in a number of different research studies, and their results published in "The Pear Stories" (Eds.: Chafe, 1980). The study presented in this paper has aimed to reiterate the method used in those earlier studies.

Unfortunately, the exact conditions that were employed in previous studies have not been exactly replicated. The exact conditions of the original studies were not well documented, and are quite likely to have varied between the different experiments that were conducted over a long period, in different locations, languages, and by different researchers. Despite these difficulties, the current study relies on the assumption that such possible differences in methodology would have little to no effect on the results of the experiment. Hopefully,

if inconsistencies are present, they would be insignificant and would not dismiss the study's conclusions.

The participants were shown the original "Pear Story" clip, via YouTube (http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bRNSTxTpG7U). After viewing the clip participants were asked to retell the story presented therein. The retelling of the story was recorded via the *SoundRec* program by each participant (independently). The audio file was thereafter sent via e-mail for further analysis.

Analysis: the recorded material was transcribed via the ELAN annotation tool[3], and the transcribed text was translated. A native Hebrew speaker volunteered to ensure the accuracy of the translations and transcriptions.

In the analysis of the results special attention was directed towards the information structure used by native speakers of MH: how *givenness* and word order interact, the strategies used by native MH speakers to achieve their uttered syntactic constructions, and what word order is preferred in descriptions of AG/NEW, PAT/GIV situations. Selected pieces will be glossed and presented to the reader, and further elaborated on in the following sections[4].

---

[3]Available at http://tla.mpi.nl/tools/tla-tools/elan/ (Retrieved on 2013-02-18)

[4] The full transcriptions and translations are available in the appendix.

3. Results

Participants:

One of the participants had a more structured and formal speech than the other and also used rather short sentences (especially in comparison with the other participant). The other participant used many breaks and uttered many fillers, such as "ehm", "eeh", etc., and could be generally characterized as approaching the task in a more casual manner.

3.1 AG/GIV

Not surprisingly canonical MH SVO word order was consistently maintained in situations with AG/GIV, PAT/NEW in accordance with the findings of Skopeteas and Fanselow (2010). For example, note the ordering of elements presented in (3):

(3)	Ha-sipur	matxil	be-ze	she-ikar	she-kotef	agasim
	the-story	begin.PRES	in-that	that-(a) farmer	that-pick.PRES	pear.PL
	The story begins with a farmer picking pears					

New: ikar, agasim. Given: sipur (introduced from context)

In the above example in (3), which presents the first sentence uttered by informant 1, the noun "story" ('*sipur*') is the subject of the phrase, and it is presented with the definite article "the" ('*ha-*'). When asked to describe a story, the story itself must have been interpreted as given information in the participant's mind, expected to be accessible by the listener as well.

Canonical MH word order was also maintained in situations with AG/GIV, PAT/GIV, as presented in (4) below:

(4)

(a)	az	hem	korim		lo	laxzor
	so	they	call.PRES.PL.M		3rd.M.DAT	to-return
	so they call for him to come back					

Given: hem, lo

In (4a) the noun "they" ('*hem*') is the subject of the phrase, "call" ('*korim*') is the verb, and "him" ('*lo*') is the object. The sentence exhibits the unmarked SVO word order of MH.

However, since MH is a half pro-drop language it is not uncommon to exclude the person in the overt expression of an utterance describing an action; namely, to present a verb without its agent. For example, note the omitting of the 3rd person "he" in the example appearing in (5):

(5)

(a)	Ala		od	pa'am
	rise.PAST.3rd.M		more	once
	(he) rose once more			

In this phrase appearing above in (5) the verb "rise" ('*ala*') includes the lexical information of tense (past), gender (male) and person (3rd), therefore the pronoun may be omitted.

3.2 AG/NEW

In all instances of new information being introduced, the noun phrase with the new information always appeared late in the phrase, not only after the verb, but after the whole Vp. Either a construction was used where the *new information* was the object or they would appear as subject but with a scrambled position. Most notably, the new information would appear late even when it was both agent and subject of the phrase, causing a word order quite different from the canonical (SVO) word order. This property may be observed in (6a) and (6b):

(6)

(a)	beintaim	ovrim		lemata	ish	im	xamor
	in-the-meantime	pass.PRES.3rd.PL.M		down	man	with	donkey
	At the same time a man is passing underneath with a donkey						

New: Ish, xamor

(b)	aval	hem	lo	osim		im	ze	shum	davar
	but	they	NEG	do.PRES.3rd. PL. M		with	that	any	thing
	But they don't do anything at all								

In (6a) the noun phrase "man with a donkey" ('*ish im xamor*') is both the subject and semantically the agent, as well as new information. In the situation described the man is leading a goat (called "donkey" ("*xamor*") by this participant). In the scene he is the agent in the sense that he is leading the goat past the tree, but the verb chosen to describe this action pass/walk by ("*ovrim*") is not describing him as an agent but rather just an actor. A similar example can be seen in (7a) and (7b):

Kandidatkurs ALSK11

(7)

    (a) nimtsaim   sham   shlisha banim axrim   al   ha-derech

          be.M.PL   there   three   boys   other.PL   on   the-road

          There are three other boys on the road there.

New: banim

    (b) hem   ozrim   lo   lakum

          they   help   3rd.M.DAT   stand-up

In (6b) the three helpful boys are introduced by the verb "to be" in its plural male form ("*nimtsaim*"). In both (6a) and (7a) the subjects of the phrase are new and appear after the verb phrase and then in both cases in the immediately following phrase, now having been introduced to the context, they do something in a canonical SVO word order as seen in (6b) and (7b). Note that in both cases the *given information* is referred to using pronouns.

Another common construction observed was the use of a generic pronoun, uttered in order to make the *new* information the object of the phrase. This principle may be seen below in (8):

    (8) Ve-az   ro'im   yeled magi'a

        and-then   see.PRES.PL.3rd boy   arrive.PRES.3rd

        al   ofanaim

        on   bicycle

        And then you see a boy arrive on a bicycle

New: yeled, ofanaim.

In (8), the speaker makes use of the *generic pronoun*; a verb in its male plural form, without any overt lexical item to which it should refer in the given clause (quite like the Swedish "man" or the English "you", "they", and most recently –"she"–). In the above

example the generic pronoun refers to anyone watching the film. By having "*ro'im*" with a *generic pronoun* the subject can be moved to the end of the sentence.

3.3 Lack of AG/NEW, PAT/GIV

There is only one example of a sentence in which a *new* noun was introduced as an agent while having as its object a *given* noun. The sentence is presented in (9).

(9) xolefet   al   panav   yalda   al   ofanaim
    Passes   on   his-face   girl   on   bicycle
    a girl on a bike crosses his path
    New: yalda

In (9) the girl ('*yalda*') is the new information and also the agent of the phrase. And "his face" ("*al panav*") is the patient, the face is not exactly *given information* since it has not been mentioned before, but since it belongs to a given referent, which we can expect to have a face, it can at least be considered *accessible.* As with all phrases with AG/NEW the word order in (9) is VP > S.

It was more common instead to introduce a noun in one sentence and immediately in the next sentence describe its actions towards another noun. This was seen earlier in (6) and (7) another, clearer, example of this behavior is presented in (10).

(10)

(a)　　ve-az　　　megi'a　　　　　　　　me-ha-tsad　　ha-sheni　　yeled　al ofanaim

　　　　and-then　　arrive.PRES.3rdM.　　　from-the-side　the-second　boy　on bicycle

　　　　and then from the other side arrives a kid on a bike

New: yeled, ofanaim

(b)　　ba-hatxala　　　hu　　otser　　　　　ve-ro'e　　　　　　　　she-ha-ikar

　　　　in-the-beginning　he　　stop.3rd.M. PRES　and-see.3rd.M. PRES　　that-the-farmer

　　　　da'ato　　　　　　musaxat　　　betoxh　　ha-ets
　　　　attention.POS.M　　diverted.F　　inside　　the-tree
　　　　At first he stops and sees that the farmer (he) is distracted by the tree

In the (10a) the boy on a bike ('*yeled al ofanaim*') arrives for the first time in the narrative, and is positioned clearly after the verb and the object giving the sentence a Vp > S word order. In the second sentence canonical word order is restored and the boy, by now an active referent in the minds of speaker and listener, is now pronominalized as "he" ('*hu*') and appears before the verb.

4. Discussion

4.1 AG/GIV

In every sentence with AG/GIV, canonical SVO word order was maintained in accordance with the findings of Skopeteas and Fanselow (2010). The givenness status of the patient did not seem to have any effect on the word order, so sentences with AG/GIV, PAT/GIV as well as sentences with AG/GIV, PAT/NEW both had SVO word order. This suggests that in MH the givenness status of the agent of a phrase is what matters.

4.2 AG/NEW

It is hard to compare this data with the data found in Skopeteas and Fanselow 2010 because of the lack of phrases where a *new* noun is the agent and a *given* noun is the patient, there was only one such phrase and the object is a prepositional phrase (as opposed to an argument, which would be a more prototypical patient). Additionally the object is in the form of a fixed expression making it less than ideal for analysis in the framework of the theories used in this paper.

It is likely that the design of the study makes uncomfortable, but possible, constructions less common as a way for the informants to express themselves. In the study the informants are able to freely choose what narrative construction to use to retell the story. They are able to select how to present different bits of information in separate, or the same, clause depending on their preference for what to focus on and the level of attention to detail they feel like. And so given the choice they are unlikely to choose to use a phrase with AG/NEW and PAT/GIV. This shows us that speakers clearly prefer some ways of expressing themselves over other ways, and make use of several avoidance strategies to not express things like *new* agents acting on *given* patients. The present

approach works well in addition and in contrast to the approach used by Skopeteas and Fanselow (2010) where the study was designed to elicit a desired response for analysis.

Again the givenness status of the patient does not seem to matter. There is no clear difference between phrases with AG/NEW, PAT/GIV and sentences with AG/NEW, PAT/NEW.

4.3 VP > S and biclausal strategy

Despite the lack of AG/NEW with PAT/GIV two strategies for dealing with the position of new information is visible in the data. Always when introducing new information, that information would appear last in the phrase, indicating a preference for the G > N principle. The new information can be both subject and agent and still appears after the verb phrase, causing a Vp > S word order and in some cases a VOS word order. The data collected in the current study, and especially that which was presented in (6) and (9) strongly indicates that Vp > S word order is a common alternative for MH speakers for maintaining the G > N principle.

There are no morphological differences between phrases with AG/NEW and phrases with AG/GIV but there is a clear difference in sentence structure as the subject (or Vp) is often moved to a non-canonical position in phrases with AG/NEW. In sentences with AG/GIV the canonical word order was maintained.

Vp > S word order in MH can likely be used for other purposes as well, but examined with *givenness* in mind the G > N principle seems to be an important factor. All cases of *new* information appear late in the phrase, either as objects or as the subjects of a Vp > S phrase.

Additionally in some cases when the participants were describing a situation with AG/NEW, PAT/GIV they would split the description into two clauses, one in which the

new referent is introduced either as an object or as an agent in a Vp > S structure, and another in which it acts in a canonical structure. This is clearly a strategy for dealing with the introduction of new information, especially if you consider the information value of the verbs used in the introducing phrases such as "you see" ("*ro'im*") or "there is" ("*nimtsaim*") ; they serve only to introduce the new noun.

Compare this with German (a language which has influenced MH) from the data in Skopeteas and Fanselow (2010:321):

(11)

> {A boy stands annoyed on a staircase…}
> … und plötzlich schubst ihn ein Mädchen von hinten.
>   (PAT/GIV)
> '… and suddenly a girl pushes him from the backside

Just like in MH the agent is moved to appear late in the phrase, the structure is Vp > S just as in MH, but in German there are a few salient differences. The agent argument can only be moved if it is a pronoun, in MH seemingly any Np is allowed to be reordered. German is a Verb second language, the second constituent of any phrase is always a verb, there always needs to be a first constituent preceding the verb but it does not need to be a subject. In placing a non-subject first in the phrase German speakers license the use of a word order different from canonical German word order, where the subject is first, and instead places the subject last. The main point of "und plötzlich" is to allow for the subject to appear later in the phrase. In MH there is no such need and phrases are allowed to start with the verb. Additionally the verb in MH contains information about the subject so even in phrases with Vp > S order the listener knows some things about the subject such as its gender and whether it is a single individual or a group.

5. Conclusion

Unfortunately, due to the limited scope of the current study only two native speakers of MH participated. Nonetheless, the collected transcribed material between them is large and comprehensive enough to deduce initial assumptions and offer insights as to what might be of particular interest in the character of MH information structure.

The study presented in this paper indicates that MH native speakers comply with the G > N principle. Further support of the findings discussed by Skopeteas & Fanselow (2010) was provided by phrases such as the ones presented in (3), (6), (8) and (9). The results also suggest that given the choice, speakers of MH and maybe other languages as well, would prefer to not utter a phrase with AG/NEW, PAT/GIV as that would cause a conflict between the preference to keep the agent first and the preference to keep new information first. Instead they employ several different narrative strategies to avoid the construction of such awkward phrases. These include splitting the phrase into two clauses: one which introduces the *new* referent and one in which the *new* referent, now *given,* performs some action. Also possible is to use an introducing verb, such as "you see" or "There is" in order to introduce the referent before it acts.

It would be interesting to conduct a more focused study, similar to the one in Skopeteas and Fanselow 2010, where the study was designed to elicit a specific response, to more clearly determine how rare it is for new nouns to appear as subjects, in canonical word order (expressed as sbj/first in their paper) in MH. Since the study presented in this paper did not produce many sentences with AG/NEW, PAT/GIV the nature of such phrases in MH is still not entirely clear even though this paper has managed to shed some light onto their nature.

MH does not have a strict word order, the most basic and canonical word order is SVO, but it is also common that MH speakers use a Vp > S word order. The results from this

study have shown that one reason for using Vp > S word order is to present the *given* information last, or at least late in the phrase, after the verb phrase.

6. References

Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. "Givennness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics, and Point of View", in Li, Charles N. (ed), Subject and Topic. New York: Academic press, INC. pages 25 – 56

Kalifon, Yaelle. 2012. Etymology of Hebrew Nouns : Re-examining the origins of the language of Israel Available at: http://www.lu.se/lup/publication/2798418 Retrieved: 2013-01-14

Keenan, Edward L. 1985. Passive in the world's languages in Shopen, Timothy. (ed), Language typology and syntactic description: vol 1, Clause structure. Cambridge : Cambridge Univ. Press. pages 243 – 281

Krifka, Manfred and Musan, Renate. 2012. "Information Structure: Overview and linguistic issues", in Krifka, Manfred and Musan, Renate (eds). The Expression of Information Structure. Berlin: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen

Lambrecht, Knud. 1994. Information structure and sentence form: Topic, focus and the mental representations of discourse referents. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

MacWhinney, Brian and Bates, Elizabeth. 1978 Sentential Devices for Conveying Givenness and Newness: A Cross-Cultural Developmental Study. Department of Psychology. Paper 201http://repository.cmu.edu/psychology/201

Skopeteas ,Stavros and Fanselow, Gisbert 2010. "Effects of givenness and constraints on free word order", in Zimmermann & Féry (eds), Information Structure: Theoretical, Typological, and Experimental Perspectives. Oxford: OUP, p. 308 – 331

Kandidatkurs ALSK11

Siewierska, Anna. (1993), "On the Interplay of Factors in the Determination of Word Order", in J. Jacobs et al. (eds.), Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research. Berlin: Waiter de Gruyter, 826-46.

Wallace L. Chafe (ed), 1980 The Pear Stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production . Ablex publishing corporation, New Jersey

Zuckermann, G., (2008). Israeli, a Beautiful Language: Hebrew as Myth. Tel Aviv, Israel: Am-Oved publishers Ltd.

Ethnologue report for Hebrew [Digital resource],
available:http://ethnologue.org/show_language.asp?code=heb
Retrieved: 2013-01-19.

Narrative 1

Ok, ha-sipur matxil be ze she-ikar, she-kotef agasim. Hu.. Ze matchil be-ze she-hu betox ha etz... ve-kotef. yored lemata ba-sulam ve-maniax et ha-agasim betox sal. yesh lo kvar sal exad male ve-hu memale ba-sal ha-sheni ve yesh sal shlishi she-omed rek. Eeh.. hu xozer xazara le-mala ba-sulam ve-kotef od agasim me-ha-etz. benta'im ovrim lemata ish im xamor, aval hem lo osim im ze shum davar. Emm.. ve-az megi'a me-ha-tsad ha-sheni yeled al ofana'im. Ba-hatxala hu otser ve-ro'e she-ha-ikar, da'ato musaxat betox ha-ets, az hu rotse lakaxat agas exad. eeh.. Aval az hu ro'e she-hu be'etsem yacxol lakaxat et kol ha-sal ve-lo yikre klum az hu ma'amis et ha-sal al ha-ofanaim ve roxev hal'a kama she-yoter maher. Eem.. xolefet al panav yalda al ofanaim ve.. ha-mifgash mesiax et da'ato ve-hu nofel me-ha-ofnaim vegam meabed et hakova ba-tahalix. nimtsaim sham shlosha yeladim axerim al ha-derex ve-hem ozrim lo lakum, ozrim lo leesof et ha-agasim she-hitpazru al kol ha-kvish. Ma'amisim shuv pa'am et ha-sal al ha-ofanaim ve-hu mamsix hal'a. hem mitkadmim od kama tse'adim ve-koltim she-hu ibed et ha-kova shelo az hem kor'im lo la'atzor, ve-yeled exad nigash lehaxzir lo et ha-kova, Ve-betmura hu noten lo shlosha agasim. eem.. hu mamsix hal'a ha-yeled al ha-ofanaim ve hashlosha ha-axerim mamshixim lehitkadem ba-kivun she-mimeno hu hegi'a; zot omeret ha-kivun shel ha-ikar. bentaim ha-ikar yored shuv pa'am me-ha-ets im ha.. od agasim she-hu kataf. eeh hu ba lehaniax otam ba-sal ve-ro'e she-sal exad xaser lo ve-bidiuk az megi'im shlosha yeladim she-oxlim agasim ve.. nir'a keilu hu xoshed ba-hem, aval be'etsem po ha-sipur nigmar.

Translation 1

Ok. The story begins with a farmer picking pears. He.. It starts with him being in the tree... and picking. climbs down the ladder and puts the pears in the basket. He's already got one basket full, and he's filling up the second basket, and there's a third basket which is left empty. Eeh.. he goes back up the ladder and picks more pears from the tree. At the

same time a man is passing underneath with a goat. But there is nothing happening with that. Umm.. And then from the other side arrives a kid on a bike. At first he stops and sees that the farmer.. he's occupied with the tree so he wants to take a pear. eeh.. but then he sees that actually he can take the entire basket and nothing would happen. So he loads the basket on the bike and rides on as fast as possible. Eem.. a girl on a bike crosses his path. And the encounter distracts him and he falls off the bike and also loses his hat in the process. There are three other boys on the road there. They help him up. Help him pick up the pears that have scattered all over the road, load up the basket on to the bike again and he rides on. they progress a few more steps forward and realize he's lost his hat so they call for him to stop and one boy approaches (him) to return (him) the hat, and in exchange he gives him three pears, one for each boy. eem.. he rides on, the kid on the bike. And the other three continue to progress in the direction from which he came, meaning the direction of the farmer. In the meantime the farmer climbs back down from the tree with the.. more pears that he's picked. eeh.. He goes to place them in the basket and notices that one basket is missing (from him). And just then arrive three boys (that are) eating pears and.. it looks like he suspects them, but basically this is where the story ends.

Narrative 2

Tov... Az eeh.. tsafiti beseret me'od mesha'amem ve'arox. Ehh. she-misheuu bikesh memani litspot bo. emm.. ve ze holex emm.. kaxa. Ze… ha-seret hetxil be'etsem be-kri'ah shel tarnegol ehm... tmunat nof kazu ve az ehh.. hitmakdu yoter be... ish eh.. mevugar. Nira li arba'im va-mala, ehh.. kotef eh. agasim me ha-ets Ehh.. hu gam mepil et exad ha-agasim ve... lo yoda'at hu sham ose mashu sviv ha-agasim. hu az yored lemata. hi echad- echad ha agasim shefshaf otem im ha.. otoh! im ha.. ? nikra.. mitpachat shelo eeh.. mitpachat aduma kzaot. akitser mesha'amem beyoter eh.. Ala od pa'am, pitom shom'im ezo shehi ez o ehh.. go'ah ve az ro'im ez miskana she-olexet ehh.. leyad eh.. eh.. leyad ha-be'alim shela, lo yodat ma hu bishvila pashut hu gorer oto, ve hem xolfim ovrim leyad ha... ha-ish im ha-sulam ve ha-agasim Ve-holxim me-ha. eehh.. ve az ro'im oto.. lo, ve-az ro'im yeled eh.. megi'a al ofanaim gam im eize sug shel mitpaxat, im kova muzar. yeled eh muzar ba-klali. pashut lakax et exad ha sakim, pile'ax lahem. Pile'ax le.. pileax oto, sam al ha ofanaim ve nasa lo tox kedei she-hu kaxa im ha-ofanaim, eh.. hu ro'e mimulo overt gam al ofanaim yalda im tsamot she-.. niret kmo xaredit ba-hatxala ulai ki ha-eixut shel ha-seret haita lo kol kax tova. ve hu kanir'eh merov she-hu hitmagnet me ha-mar'e hayafe shela eh.. hu pashut eh.. lo yoda'at. histakel aleya, ve ze garam lo, lo zoxerat ma, ha-kova af, hu lo histakel ehh.. ze xasam lo et ha ofanaim, histabex nafal ve az hu hetchil lelatef le-atsmo et ha regel ki hu ratza.. kanir'e hu kival sham eize maka oh mashehu kol ha-agasim kamuvan eh.. hitpazru lahem al ha-ritspa ve az haita sham shlishiyat banim. Exad im ehh.. ping-pong kaze. ve exad ehh.. blondini namux. ve od eize exad ve.. be mabat rishon ze hya nir'ah keilu hem.. biryonim keilu hem ba'im la'asot lo mashehu ra, aval davka hem azru lo ve herimu lo et ha-agasim ve exad azer lo la'amod ve tafax lo kaze al ha-regel lenakot mimeno et kol ha-avak. ve hem eh.. mamash eh xamudim ve-azru lo lisoa. hu hitxil liso'a hem hitxilu lalexet ve az hem ro'im she be'etsem ha-kova shelo nish'ar al ha ritspa. Az, eh.. ha-hu im ha-ping-pong hitxil eh.. lishrok ve-az hu halax elav ve hexzir lo et ha-kova ve-betmura hem hevi'u lo shlosha, eh..

yo! hu hevi lahem shlosha agasim, exad le-kol exad ehh.. ve-az eh... haiyta tmuna she-ro'im et ha.. et ha-ish im ha-agasim yored me-ha-sulam ve pitom hu kolet she-po rak ehh.. sak exad mal'e, sak exad rik, ve she-exad ha-sakim be'etsem ne'elam lo, ve-az al ha-derex roi'm et ha shlishiya ha-zot overet, exad axrei ha-sheni. eh kshe-hem oxlim eh kol exad agas. ve zehu. Meratek.

Translation 2

(good/fine). So.. I watch a very long and boring movie. Ehh.. That I've been asked to watch (by someone) emm.. and it goes emm.. ...like this. It's.. the movie basically starts with a call of a rooster ehh.. on (a) ehh.. this scenery And then, ehh.. they focused more on a.. man, ehh.. elderly (man). I think over forty eh.. picking eh.. pears from the tree. Ehh.. he also drops one of the pears and.. I dunno. there was this whole thing with the pears. He then climbs down, there was this one.. one of the pears rubbed them with a.. it! with the.. what do you call it? his handkerchief ehh.. this red handkerchief. Anyway, extremely boring. eehh. (he) climbed back up again, suddenly you hear this goat ehh.. mooing. And then you see this poor (looking) goat walking ehh beside ehh.. eh.. next to its owner, (or I) don't know what he is for her(it) He's just dragging her (it) along, and they go past the.. man with the ladder and pears. And (they) walk on by. Ehh. and then you see him.. no then you see a kid ehh.. arriving on a bicycle also with some sort of handkerchief, with a weird hat. Generally ehh.. a weird looking kid. Just took one of the sacks, nicked (to) them, nicked to.. nicked it put it on the bike and rode on as he's like that with (on) the bike, eh.. he sees across from him also passing on a bike a girl with braids that... looked like an orthodox at first maybe because the quality of the movie wasn't so good and he apparently, since he was so magnetized by her beautiful appearance eh.. he just eh.. I dunno, he looked at her, and it cause him (to), I don't remember what.. the hat flew (off), he wasn't looking, ehh... It blocked his bike, got tangled, fell (off). And then he started petting his leg because he wanted.. apparently he got some blow there or something. All the pears of course eh.. spread (themselves) all

across the floor (ground). And then there was this trio of boys. One with.. eh.. this ping-pong. and one ehh.. short blonde. and (then) another one. aand.. at first glance it looked like they were bullies, like they were going to do something bad, but they actually helped him and picked up his pears, and one helped him stand, and like pated on his leg to clean off all the dust from him. And they were eh.. very eh.. cute. and helped him ride he started riding, they started walking and then they see that actually his hat was still on the floor. so the one with the ping-pong started, ehh.. to whistle, and then he went to him and returned (him) his hat and in exchange they brought him three, eh.. yo! He brought them three pears. One each eh.. and then eh.. there was this scenery where you see ehh.. the man with the pears climbing off the ladder And suddenly he realizes that there's only one sack empty, one sack (is) full, and that one of the sacks is actually missing (from him) And then (by the way manner?) you see that trio passing by, one after the other ehh. as they eat ehh.. each eating a pear. and that's it. Fascinating.