

2. The particle *ya*

Hebrew *ya* is a loan of the Arabic vocative particle *yaa* (Zuckerman, 2006). Its usage has changed since being adopted into the language, and has come to differ from that of its etymon in several respects (see §2.4). To illustrate, the 50-odd years old Hebrew utterances in (2) reflect available uses in Arabic (possessive modifier and proper name, respectively), but are marginal at best in contemporary speech:

- (2) a. **ya** mišlati, beyti šeli lelo kirot
VOC my.post my.home mine without walls
O my post, my home without walls.

From the song “*ya mišlati*” by Yechiel Mohar, 1956.

- b. hox **ya** dan ya dan
--- VOC Dan VOC Dan
O Dan, O Dan.

From the sketch “*ha-hesped*” by Dan Ben-Amotz, 1959.

2.1 Data

I collected a sample of 200 instances of *ya* through a search of the Israblog Corpus for two orthographic forms: יא and יה. For both forms, I filtered out uses other than the particle, consisting mainly of exclamations (e.g. איוו יא), transcriptions from other languages (e.g. יה ריט ‘yeah right’), and gematria.¹ I also filtered out uses in the Arabic loan expression *yaa allaah* ‘O god’. In addition, this sample doesn’t include instances of the sequence *ya xatixat*, which will be discussed separately. The form יא yielded overall more relevant results than יה (186 of 200 in my sample). Other orthographic forms are attested but are difficult to find consistently (e.g. י adjoined to the following word).

2.2 Structural properties

The particle *ya* always occurs with a complement following it. Together they form a **vocative**, which may appear in isolation or as part of a longer utterance. These *ya* phrases meet three of the criteria proposed by Jensen (2004) for identifying vocatives: they refer only to the utterance’s addressee(s), only ever trigger 2nd person agreement, and appear to have a special intonation contour.² Because my data is written, intonation contours can only be guessed at based on punctuation, which varies widely between speakers. Even so, there is a recurrent use of commas, ellipses or parentheses separating *ya* and its complement from the utterance in which they appear, suggesting a special contour. As for agreement, the occurrence of relative clauses of the

¹ In Hebrew Gematria, the traditional system of assigning numerical values to letters, יא represents 11 and is used to refer to the sophomore year of high school, to various chapters in the Old Testament, to certain dates and addresses, etc.

² Jensen provides an additional three criteria for identifying vocatives across languages, but emphasizes that not each criterion is relevant to every language.

type *še-kmo(t).PN* ‘that is like PN’ in the complement of *ya* provides evidence for a constraint. While this type of clause can in principle include any pronoun, in the complement of *ya* it only appears with a 2nd person pronoun, as shown in (3). Throughout this chapter, I use ~ for invented examples, and ?? for unacceptable/infelicitous utterances:

- (3) a. **ya** axbarey internet **še-kmotxem**
 VOC mice.of internet that-is like.2PL
 You internet rats.
- b. ~axbarey internet **še-kmotam**
 mice.of internet that-is like.3PL
 Those internet rats.
- c. ~??**ya** axbarey internet **še-kmotam**
 VOC mice.of internet that-is like.3PL

As mentioned above, a *ya* vocative may appear as part of a longer utterance. This can be any kind of utterance (declarative, interrogative, imperative, etc.), and anywhere within the utterance, even interrupting a phrase as in (4). They are most often adjoined at the end (106 of 200) of or interrupting (54) an utterance, with occurrences at the start (21) of an utterance or in isolation (19) comprising only a minority of cases.

- (4) hitkavanti ya tipšim la-historya šel ha-am ha-yehudi
 I.meant VOC fools to.the-history of the-people the-Jewish
 I was talking, you fools, about the history of the Jewish people.

Retrieved 7.8.16 from <http://www.mynet.co.il/Ext/App/TalkBack/CdaViewOpenTalkBack/0,11382,L-3798577-2,00.html>

The complement of *ya* is typically a lexical predicate (169 of 200), either a noun, an adjective or a present participle (beynoni). Although adjectives and present participles in Hebrew are difficult to tell apart from nouns, we may look as evidence at near-minimal pairs such as those in (5) and (6):

- (5) a. ani ercax otxa ya **xafran**
 I will murder ACC.you.MSG VOC digger.MSG
 I’ll kill you, you blabbermouth.
- b. az mi sam zayin alexa bixlal ya **xofer**
 so who puts.MSG (a) dick on.you.MSG at all VOC digging.MSG
 So who gives a shit about you at all, you jabberer.
- (6) a. ken ya **tipeš**
 yes VOC fool.MSG
 Yes, stupid.
- b. lo ya **metupaš**
 no VOC foolish.MSG

No, silly.

Retrieved 6.8.16 from <https://www.fxp.co.il/showthread.php?t=13954868>

Different complex phrases also occur as the complement of *ya* (27 of 200). These include lexical predicates with their objects, modified by one or more adjectives, and/or modified by a relative clause:

- (7) a. kama giki me-cidam - ya cofey Star Wars
how much geeky of-their.side VOC viewers.of
How geeky of them – you watchers of Star Wars.
- b. lexi tevakši me-ima šelax ya xucpanit ktana
go.IMP ask.2FSG from-mother yours.FSG VOC cheeky girl small.FSG
Ask it from your mother, you little brat.
- c. ya **lesbit** **še-lo** **šava** **klum**
VOC lesbian that-not worth.FSG nothing
You worthless lesbian!

From “ha-ax ha-gadol” (the Israeli version of the Big Brother reality TV show), Tahounia to Levana, 17.7.13

In contrast to the above, degree modifiers and possessive modifiers virtually never occur in the complement of *ya*. There were zero instances of a degree modifier in my sample, and a search yielded only a single result, an occurrence of the degree modifier *kim ’at* ‘almost’. There were 12 instances of a possessive modifier; however, in all but one of them the complement was an Arabic word and in most there was further use of Arabic in the utterance, suggesting that these were in fact cases of code-switching. An example is provided in (8), with Arabic words in bold:

- (8) ya **binti**, ze šum davar, **be-šayuni** šum davar, **tašali** ya **binti**
VOC my.girl it (is) nothing in-my.eyes nothing come.IMP VOC my.girl
It’s nothing, my child. I swear it’s nothing. Come, my child.

Also rare in the complement of *ya* are proper names. There were 6 instances of proper names in the sample. Of these, two were celebrities’ names clearly used not to refer to their namesake but as an ad-hoc predicate, evoking features associated with the named persona.³ This is the case in (9a), which describes the old-fashioned singer Yehoram Gaon in a drug-induced “trip”, as a metaphor for bewilderment or being out of one’s depth. Some of the other instances – such as the one in (9b) which involves the numeral *exad* ‘one’ (more on this in §2.4) and a nickname – seem to be uses of the same strategy. However, without additional context and a deeper familiarity with the persons involved, this is impossible to determine conclusively.

- (9) a. lo, ya **yoram gaon** al tripim
no VOC on trips
No, you Yoram Gaon on an acid trip.

³ The strategy of using names as ad-hoc predicates is not a unique feature of *ya* vocatives, nor is it unique to Hebrew. Consider utterances such as *That’s so John of you*.

- b. ya **sparda** exad... tagid šalom tihiye menumas
 VOC one.MSG say.IMP hello be.IMP polite.MSG
 You Sparda... say hello, be polite.

2.3 Function

Traditionally, vocatives have been described as serving two major functions: **calls**, which are “designed to catch the addressee’s attention”; and **addresses**, which “maintain or emphasize the contact between speaker and addressee” (Zwicky, 1974, p. 787; see also Schegloff 1968; Zwicky, 2004). The data shows that *ya* vocatives are not actually used as calls. The first indication of this is that they only rarely appear where one would expect a call, at the beginning of an utterance (approximately 1 in 10 instances). Additionally, *ya* vocatives can co-occur in an utterance with straightforward calls such as proper names or “title” predicates. In these cases, the *ya* vocative follows the call, as in (10). In fact, this type of predicate, as well as other common call forms (e.g. *axi* ‘my brother’, *adoni* ‘sir’, *gveret* ‘miss’), don’t occur in the complement of *ya*, as demonstrated in (11)-(12). While the unacceptability of (11b) might be attributed to a register clash, this does not account for (12b). Finally, the evaluative and therefore subjective nature of *ya* vocatives (more on this below) makes them ill-suited for use as calls. Intended addressees may not share the speaker’s evaluation, especially if it’s negative; hence they may not recognize the call is directed at them.

- (10) a. **roy**, ya ganav, ya xucpan, ani ohevet otxa
 VOC thief.MSG VOC cheeky guy I love.FSG ACC.you.MSG
 Roy, you cheeky thief, I love you.
- b. **šofet** ya šarmuta halevay ve-tamut hayom
 referee.MSG VOC slut if only and- will die.2MSG today
 Referee, you bitch, I wish you die today.

Retrieved 7.8.2016 from

http://football.org.il/Association/LawSystem/Pages/DecisionDisciplinaryCourt.aspx?DECISION_ID=95911

- (11) a. axot! efšar viyagra?
 nurse.FSG can Viagra
 Nurse! Can I get a Viagra?

Retrieved 16.8.2015 from <http://www.ynet.co.il/articles/0,7340,L-4463304,00.html>

- b. ~??**ya** axot! efšar viyagra?
 VOC nurse.FSG can Viagra

- (12) a. tagid, nahagos, eyfo ze kolxis?
 say.IMP cabby where it (is) Colchis
 Say cabby, where is Colchis?

Retrieved 16.8.2015 from <http://www.tale.co.il/59-למי-ליון-המירון-בהמשכים/סיפורים-לפי-נושא-סיפורים-בהמשכים>

- b. ~??tagid, **ya** nahagos, eyfo ze kolxis?

say.IMP VOC cabby where it (is) Colchis

As for addresses, Zwicky's original definition might be too vague, in that it lumps together uses which are intuitively very different, such as the ones in (13).⁴ Davies (1986, p. 93) argues for a finer distinction, between vocatives with an **identifying** function, which are "used to indicate just who is being addressed"; and those with an **expressive** function, "which indicate something of the speaker's view of or attitudes towards his addressees".⁵ These two functions are respectively exemplified by the two utterances in (13):

(13) a. ~Welcome, **linguists**, to the annual meeting.

From Zwicky (2004), p. 1, example A2

b. ~Tell me, **sweet/pretty**, if that's soft enough for you.

From Zwicky(1974), p. 791, example (39)

Returning to *ya* vocatives, over half of them (106 of 200) are explicitly expressive, with overtly evaluative predicates as their complements. These uses are not limited to one end of an evaluative spectrum, as the examples in (14) show. Moreover, an evaluative interpretation is available even with an apparently neutral predicate. That this is the intended interpretation may be made clear by the context. In my sample, this includes orthographic cues such as exclamation marks, emoticons and unorthodox spelling, all demonstrated in (15):

(14) a. en ani pašut metorefet alayix ya **muxšeret** ya **madhima!**
is not I simply crazy.FSG on.you.FSG VOC talented.FSG VOC amazing.FSG
No, I'm just crazy about you, you talented amazing girl!

b. ya **idyot,** matay tiklot še-ata lo racuy?
VOC idiot.MSG when will get.2MSG that-you.MSG not wanted.MSG
You idiot, when will you realize that you're not wanted here?

(15) a. **ixs** ya streyt!
yuck VOC straight
Ew, you heterosexual!

b. **tehenu** ya kciot =)
enjoy.IMP VOC meatballs
Enjoy, you meatballs =)

c. **xxxx meta alexa** M ya **satlann!**
--- dying.FSG on you.MSG VOC pothead.MSG
Haha, I love you M, you pothead!

⁴ In later work, Zwicky (2004) mentions different kinds of exclamation marks as functions related to vocatives, though it is unclear where cases like the one in (13b) are to fall under this classification.

⁵ Davies discards Zwicky's call/address distinction in favor of the identifying/expressive distinction. Here I will retain both.

To sum up the above, *ya* vocatives are not used as calls but as addresses, and emotionally expressive ones at that. This suggests that the function of *ya* is marking a predicate as an expressive/evaluative address. To test this, we could omit *ya* from attested utterances, leaving only the complement. Cases with an intrinsically evaluative predicate are expected to still be interpretable as expressive, hence changing minimally or not at all. Cases with a neutral predicate are expected to no longer be interpreted as expressive, becoming unacceptable or changing their meaning. This is borne out in (16) and (17), respectively. It is interesting to note, however, that the occurrence of a *še-kmo(t).PN* relative clause preserves the expressive vocative interpretation, suggesting it serves a similar function to *ya*. More on this in §2.4.

- (16) a. ~lexi tevakši me-ima šelax **xucpanit** **ktana**
 go.IMP ask.2FSG from-mother yours.FSG cheeky girl small.FSG
 Ask it from your mother, little brat.
- b. **~idyot**, matay tiklot še-ata lo racuy?
 idiot.MSG when will get.2MSG that-you.MSG not wanted.MSG
 Idiot, when will you realize that you're not wanted here?
- (17) a. ~??me-eyfo naxateta aleynu **orex-din** **meduplam**
 from-where landed.2MSG on.us lawyer certified.MSG
- b. ~axbarey internet **še-kmotxem**
 mice.of internet that-is like.2PL
 You internet rats.
- c. ~??axbarey internet
 mice.of internet

2.4 Related forms

Two Hebrew forms which merit mentioning in relation to *ya* are the numeral *axat/exad* 'one' and the relative clause *še-kmo(t).PN* 'that is like PN'. Both of these forms not only co-occur with *ya* (as well as with each other), but also share with it the function of marking predicates as expressive/evaluative, though unlike *ya* they are not limited to vocatives. This secondary function of *axat/exad* arises most visibly when its literal meaning is redundant, that is, when directed at a singular addressee or at the speaker herself, as in (18a-b). The literal meaning of *še-kmo(t).PN* is always redundant, seeing as anything is trivially like itself. Its function is demonstrated in (18b-c), as well as in (3b) and (17b) above.

- (18) a. eyze kin'a yeš kan. targi'i. merira **axat**
 which envy there is here relax.IMP bitter.FSG one.FSG
 Such envy here. Take it down a notch. Bitter lady.

Retrieved 11.6.2016 from <http://www.ynet.co.il/articles/0,7340,L-4254050,00.html>

- b. aval ata betax lo ta'ane li... meohevet **axat** **še-kmoti...**
 but you.MSG surely no reply.2MSG to.me in love.FSG one.FSG that-is like.me

But you probably won't answer me... Silly me, so in love...

Retrieved 10.8.2016 from <http://stage.co.il/Stories/648275>

- c. oy va-avoy lehakat orvim **še-kamohem.** Adele mithapexet be-kivra
my, oh my flock.of crows that-is like.3PL turning.FSG in-her.grave
My, oh my, those crows. Adele is turning in her grave.

Retrieved 10.8.2016 from http://www.tapuz.co.il/forums/viewmsg/2077/180293210/הגדול_האח_בדור/האח_הגדול

Moving on to languages other than Hebrew, the most obvious comparison to make is to Arabic *yaa*, the etymon of Hebrew *ya*.⁶ As briefly mentioned above, the two forms differ in contemporary usage. Like Hebrew *ya*, Arabic *yaa* is followed by a complement (known as *al-munaadi* ‘the called’) within a vocative, which may appear in isolation or anywhere within an utterance. However unlike its Hebrew counterpart, Arabic *yaa* allows in its complement, in addition to indefinite nouns, also proper names and possessed nouns, as well as free relatives and demonstratives (Moutaouakil, 1989). The distinction between the forms is even more pronounced when looking at their discourse functions. While it mirrors the use of Hebrew *ya* in emotionally expressive addresses, Arabic *yaa* is also used freely in calls, and in addresses with no evaluative interpretation. Finally, although this chapter is not concerned with social aspects of speech, it is safe to say that using *ya* is at the very least a stylistic choice in Hebrew, associated with an informal register and with specific speaker communities. Arabic *yaa* has no such connotations.

Based on the above, it appears that Arabic speakers make use of a general vocative form for their expressive vocative needs. In various other languages, specialized forms serving this function have been identified and described. Corver (2008) discusses evaluative vocatives in what he terms the *you idiot!*-construction, looking at a dozen-odd predominantly Germanic languages and dialects. The construction consists of a 2nd person pronoun, which manifests in different cases across languages, followed by a noun. Like Hebrew *ya* phrases, it is used exclusively in emotionally expressive, either positive or negative addresses.

The fact that *ya* can occur with adjectives and participles while *you idiot!*-constructions cannot is probably due to the behavior of these lexical categories in Hebrew, rather than to some special quality of the vocative form. What may be more interesting is the intrinsic expressivity, or lack thereof, of the noun. Corver argues that only emotionally expressive, or epithet nouns may occur in this construction. If true, this is an essential difference from *ya*, which can take neutral predicates and temporarily imbue them with expressivity. However, my intuition is that this is also a possible use of *you idiot!*-constructions, at least in English, albeit one that is employed infrequently. An example of this use is Larry's response in (19). If this is indeed the case, then the only qualitative difference between expressive/evaluative vocatives in Hebrew and in the languages discussed by Corver is a structural difference. While Hebrew has a specialized particle

⁶ Naturally, the use of *yaa* is not necessarily identical in all dialects of Arabic, but the qualities I discuss here stand as quite robust generalizations.

to mark expressive vocatives, these other languages mark them using a specialized syntactic construction:

- (19) Dan: You think love is simple. You think the heart is like a diagram.
 Larry: Have you ever seen a human heart? It looks like a fist, wrapped in blood! Go fuck yourself! **You writer!** You liar!

From the film 'Closer' written by Patrick Maber, 2004

3. The construct form *xatixat*

The form *xatixat*, also pronounced *xatxat*, is the word *xatixa* 'piece' inflected for the **construct form** (smixut). Normally, this type of inflection is restricted to the genitive construction called the **construct state**. That *xatixat* has function(s) beyond its literal sense is made evident by attempting to replace it with a near synonym like *pisa* 'slice'. That these functions are unique to the construct form can be seen by attempting to paraphrase it in another genitive construction (called the free state), using the preposition *šel* 'of'. Utterances with regular uses of *xatixat* retain their meanings when paraphrased, as in (20). Other utterances change their meaning or become unacceptable, as in (21):

- (20) a. M ilec oti le'exol **xatixat** steyk
 forced.MSG me to eat (a) piece.of steak
 M made me eat a piece of steak.
- b. ~M ilec oti le'exol **pisat** steyk
 forced.MSG me to eat (a) slice.of steak
 M made me eat a piece of steak.
- c. ~M ilec oti le'exol **xatixa šel** steyk
 forced.MSG me to eat (a) piece of steak
 M made me eat a piece of steak.
- (21) a. N hofi'a- ve-natna **xatixat** hofa'a nehederet
 performed.FSG and-gave.FSG (a) piece.of show wonderful.FSG
 N performed- and gave an amazing performance.
- b. ~??N hofi'a- ve-natna **pisat** hofa'a nehederet
 performed.FSG and-gave.FSG (a) slice.of show wonderful.FSG
- c. ~??N hofi'a- ve-natna **xatixa šel** hofa'a nehederet
 performed.FSG and-gave.FSG (a) piece of show wonderful.FSG

The special functions of *xatixat* should not be mixed with the nonliteral sense of uninflected *xatixa*, which denotes an attractive woman. This sense of *xatixa* likely originated as a loan-translation of Arabic *šaqfa*; literally 'piece' but used to denote an attractive woman. Curiously, nonliteral *šaqfa* has been adopted as a loanword as well, pronounced in Hebrew *šafa* (the *q*-dropping is characteristic of Palestinian Arabic pronunciation). The male counterpart *xatix* is a

case of back-formation in which the masculine derives from the feminine form through deletion, and appears to have outlasted the now dated *xatixa*: the Israblog Corpus gives 10 results for *hi xatixa* ‘she’s hot’ vs. 323 for *hu xatix* ‘he’s hot’.

3.1 Data

I collected a sample of 200 instances of *xatixat* through a search of the Israblog Corpus for two orthographic base forms: *התיכת* and *התכת*, corresponding to the pronunciations *xatixat* and *xatxat*, respectively. For both forms, I filtered out regular construct state uses. For *התכת*, I also filtered out the homograph *xataxt(a)* ‘you cut.PST’. In addition, this sample doesn’t include instances of the sequence *ya xatixat*, which will be discussed separately. The form *התיכת* yielded overall more relevant results than *התכת* (173 of 200 in my sample).

3.2 Structural properties

In §3.3 I argue that *xatixat* has two distinct functions apart from its regular sense. Structurally, however, these two functions behave uniformly, such that the only relevant distinction is between the regular, or construct state use; and the evaluative/expressive use.

As mentioned above, the evaluative uses I discuss here are unique to the (singular) construct form *xatixat*. By and large, a Hebrew noun in construct form is always followed by a phrase, traditionally labelled the **supporter** (contrasted with the construct form noun, labelled the supportee). Evaluative uses of *xatixat* also require a supporter, but the phrases which fill this role are far more diverse than for regular use. For obvious extralinguistic reasons, literal *xatixat* is most likely to be followed by a nominal phrase denoting an inanimate tangible (though note the figurative uses in 25a-b). It goes to show just how far the other uses of *xatixat* are divorced from its literal sense, that they are almost twice as likely to be followed by an animate (76) or an abstract (74) than by an inanimate tangible (43). Moreover, they can be followed by different syntactic categories. As demonstrated below, evaluative uses allow supporter phrases headed by adjectives or present participles (beynoni), in addition to nouns:

- (22) a. ata xatixat šlili, ve-ze mamaš meacben oti axi
 you(‘re).MSG piece.of negative.MSG and-it’s really irritating me my.brother
 You’re being downright negative, and it’s really pissing me off, bro.

Retrieved 3.8.2016 from <https://www.fxp.co.il/showthread.php?t=3599315&page=12>

- b. ve-nizkarti še-muzika mitnageš li im aravit ve-ze xatixat **mecik**
 and-I that-music clashes to me with Arabic and-it’s piece.of annoying
 remembered
 And I remembered that music classes clash with Arabic, and that’s really annoying.

Literal *xatixat* is also unlikely to be followed by plurals. This can be attributed to the availability of the plural form *xatixot*, coupled with the conceptual implausibility of a single piece coming from several sources. Conversely, in evaluative uses the plural form is unavailable, and the singular form occurs with plurals as supporters:

(23) a. az kfecu lehagid šalom xatixat **mexoarim**
 so jump.IMP.PL to say hello piece.of ugly.PL
 So drop by to say hello, you ugly mugs.

b. ~??az kfecu lehagid šalom **xatixot** mexoarim
 so jump.IMP.PL to say hello piece.of ugly.PL

So far, we have focused on the ways evaluative uses of *xatixat* differ from regular use. But evaluative *xatixat* also departs from more general patterns pertaining to the Hebrew construct state. The construct state is a type of noun phrase which consists of a noun inflected for the construct form, the supportee, followed by a genitive nominal phrase, the supporter (e.g. Ritter, 1991; Siloni, 2001). When construct states are the subjects of verbs or are modified by adjectives, it is the first noun’s features which the verb or adjective agree with in gender and number. And when construct states are definite, in “standard” speech the definite article *ha* ‘the’ can only attach to the supporter, and not to the first noun. In colloquial speech this is not always maintained, and the definite determiner may attach either to the first noun or to the supporter. Regular use of *xatixat* fits these patterns. Note the feminine inflection on the verb in (24a), which agrees with *xatixat* and doesn’t agree with *meyda*:

(24) a. mem zot xatixat meyda še-**yexola** lešaxpel ve-lehafic et acma
 meme is piece.of information that-can.FSG to copy and-to spread ACC itself.FSG
 A meme is a piece of information that can copy and spread itself.

b. xatixat **ha**-bitaxon ha-acmi še-hayta xasera
 piece.of the-security the-of self that-was.FSG missing.FSG
 The piece of self-confidence that was missing.

In contrast to the above, evaluative *xatixat* isn’t a “well-behaved” construct form. In these uses, it is the supporter which determines agreement with verbs and adjectives, and the definite article only ever attaches to *xatixat*. Note the masculine inflection on the adjective in (25a) and the verbs in (25b):

(25) a. O amar še-ze xatixat ciyur **mexoar**
 said.MSG that-(it) is piece.of drawing ugly.MSG
 O said that it’s one hell of an ugly drawing.

b. **ha**-xatixat xara karega **bazaz** ve-**rošeš** xaci me-ha-texniyon
 the-piece.of shit just now looted.MSG and-bankrupted.MSG half of-the-Technion
 The piece of shit just looted and bankrupted half of the Technion.

A final point distinguishing the evaluative uses of *xatixat* has to do with scope. Construct states are prone to ambiguities, in that an adjective can be construed as modifying either the first noun or the following phrase, provided that they agree in gender and number. To illustrate, the construct state in (26a) can either refer to a piece of a colorful metal, or to a colored piece of a colorless metal. In contrast, evaluative use of *xatixat* is unambiguous in similar constellations, such that the adjective is always construed as modifying the phrase following *xatixat*. That is,

xatixat necessarily takes wide scope over the adjective. Thus, the consequent in (26b) asserts that black is a way of life that's depressing to a high degree, and (26c) expresses contempt towards the referent for being small and pathetic, not for being a girl (more on these functions in the next section). This is demonstrated most clearly when *xatixat* co-occurs with the colloquial item *axla* 'excellent' (from Arabic *axlaa* 'sweetest'), probably the only adjective in Hebrew which may occur pre-nominally. In these cases, *xatixat* necessarily precedes *axla*, as in (26d):

- (26) a. ve-yeš lo **xatixat** **matexet** **civonit** al ha-madim lehoxiyax et ze
 and- to. piece.of metal colorful. on the-uniform to prove ACC it
 there's him FSG
 And he has a colored piece of metal on his uniform to prove it.
- b. im šaxor hu derex xayim- zo **xatixat** **derex** **xayim** **dikonit**
 if black is. way.of life (it) is. piece.of way.of life depressive.
 MSG FSG FSG
 If black is a way of life- then it's quite a depressing way of life.
- c. at **xatixat** **yalda** **ktana** **ve-patetit**
 you're.FSG piece.of girl little.FSG and-pathetic.FSG
 You're a pathetic little girl.
- d. ani xošev še-hem **xatixat** **axla** **lehaka**
 I think.MSG that-they (are) piece.of excellent band
 I think they're a really excellent band.

Retrieved 25.8.2016 from <https://www.fxp.co.il/showthread.php?t=2705459>

3.3 Function

Intuitively, the primary contribution of evaluative *xatixat* is evaluative/expressive, but in some cases it does contribute propositional content as well, serving as an **intensifier**. The most straightforward of these cases are those in which *xatixat* appears with a gradable adjective or with a noun modified by such an adjective, as in (22a) and (26b), respectively. Yet there are other cases as well. Although most often associated with adjectives, intensification and more generally degree modification have also been described in relation to nouns (Bolinger, 1972; Doetjes, 1997; Kennedy & McNally, 2005; Morzycki, 2009; Sassoon, 2007). In essence, some nouns are considered "gradable" in that they are linked to a particular dimension of measurement, or scale. The noun *hoca'a* 'expense' in (27) is such a noun, because different expenses can be measured and ordered by their "expensiveness". In (27b), the use of *xatixat* asserts something about an expense's position on this scale, namely that it's over some contextually-established standard. This is why (27c), which includes an explicit contradiction to this assertion, is unacceptable:

- (27) a. ve-et ha-kesef bizbazti al sxar-dira ve-ha-xayim be-Tel Aviv
 and-ACC the-money I spent on rent and-the-life in-Tel Aviv
- b. (še-zo xatixat hoca'a)

that-is piece.of (an) expense

And I spent the money on rent and living in Tel Aviv (which is quite an expense).

- c. ~(še-zo xatixat hoca'a, ??aval lo hoca'a mašmautit
 that-is piece.of (an) expense but no (an) expense significant.FSG
 (which is quite an expense, but not a significant one).

In other cases, *xatixat* occurs with nouns that are not gradable per se, but may be linked to ad-hoc scales based on prototypicality (Sassoon, 2007). These can be viewed as measures of similarity to an envisioned prototypical member of the category denoted by the noun. For example, the noun *caleket* ‘scar’ in (27’a) is probably not associated with a scale of “scarness”, but one could think of a prototypical scar (perhaps one that is large and gruesome). Here, the use of *xatixat* appears to assert that the addressee’s scar is closer to such a prototypical scar than would be expected. A similar thing happens in (27’b), where the prototypical *diyeta* ‘diet’ might be one that is very strict and effective.

- (27’ a. xatixat **caleket** yeš lexa
 piece.of scar there is to.you
 Quite the scar you’ve got there.

- b. fak, ha-benadam avar xatixat **diyeta..**
 fuck the-man passed.MSG piece.of diet
 Fuck, the guy went through one hell of a diet.

Both the propositional and the expressive contributions of this use of *xatixat*, henceforth **intensifier** *xatixat*, are somewhat vague, and are only fully determined by context. Propositionally, intensifier *xatixat* asserts that the referent is positioned further than some standard along some scale, but the standard and the scale are both undetermined. Expressively, it conveys a general excitedness or heightened emotion, but is undetermined for polarity, etc.

There are instances of evaluative *xatixat* which don’t seem to function in the way described so far. For example, the utterance in (28a) doesn’t necessarily imply that the referent is rich (or a bitch) to a high degree, and in fact the use of *stam* ‘just/simply’ hints that she is not. In (28b), the context makes clear that not only is the referent not gay to a high degree, he isn’t even minimally gay. In (28c) there is no predicate at all, hence there is no associated degree to be modified. Additionally, the utterances in (28) all express an unambiguously negative stance of the speaker towards the referent(s). Although in (28a-b) this stance is retrievable from the predicate (necessarily for *kalba*, optionally for *homo*), in (28c) it only follows from the use of *xatixat*.

- (28) a. M – stam xatixat kalba ašira
 just piece.of (a) bitch rich.FSG
 M – just a rich bitch.

- b. omer li hikarti mišehi ulay ba-erev nikanes le-ohel... keilu xatixat
 says. to I met someone. maybe in.the- we’ll to-(a) tent as if piece.of
 MSG me FSG evening enter

homo mi omer davar kaze le-xavera šelxa le-šeavar
 gay.MSG who says.MSG (a) thing like this to-(a) girlfriend yours formerly

Says to me: I met a girl, we might go in a tent tonight... Like, you fag, why would you say that to your ex-girlfriend?

c. oy atem xatixat... stam gever. ata lo... ata beseder ata
 --- you.MPL piece.of not man you. no you. alright you.
 really MSG MSG MSG

Oh, you're all such... just kidding, man. Not you... you're ok.

Retrieved 16/8/2015 from <http://www.kipa.co.il/community/show/2904914>

I propose that the cases in (28) demonstrate a second, distinct function of evaluative *xatixat*. This use of *xatixat* involves no degree modification; rather it is solely evaluative, and specified for negative stance. It can either amplify the expressivity of an intrinsically negative item, or imbue an emotionally neutral item with (necessarily negative) expressivity. The latter case may give rise to an ambiguity between the two functions of evaluative *xatixat*. Thus, out of context (29a) can be interpreted either as asserting that the referent is a leftist to a high degree, or as expressing the speaker's contempt towards him (and leftists in general). These two readings are respectively brought out by the two possible continuations in (29b) and (29c), each of which explicitly cancels the competing interpretation:⁷

(29) a. hu xatixat smolani
 he (is) (a) piece.of leftist.MSG
 He's a leftist.

Retrieved 29.3.2015 from <http://www.kol-barama.co.il/live/72037/>

b. hu xatixat smolani, ~kmo še-carix
 he (is) (a) piece.of leftist.MSG like that-needed
 He's a hardcore leftist, just like he ought to be.

c. hu xatixat smolani, ~aval lefaxot lo kiconi
 he (is) (a) piece.of leftist.MSG but at least no extreme.MSG
 He's a bloody leftist, but at least he's not hardcore.

This second function of *xatixat*, henceforth **negative** *xatixat*, displays a different usage pattern than the intensifier with regard to their referents, and particularly to their referents' animacy. Intensifier *xatixat* is rarely used when the referent is a person: out of 104 instances of evaluative *xatixat* referring to persons, only 9 are unambiguous uses of intensifier *xatixat*, compared to 87 uses of negative *xatixat*. This may be due to the risk of the hearer mistaking it for negative *xatixat*, a highly undesirable communicative result.⁸ In contrast, out of 92 instances referring to

⁷ The two also appear to be characterized by somewhat different pronunciations and intonation patterns. (29b) is likely to have a main accent (and possibly more than one) on *xatixat*, and an intonation break after *smolani*. (29c) is likely to have *xatixat* reduced to *xatxat*, and noticeably prolonged fricatives in both *xatxat* and *smolani*.

⁸ Another possibility is that *xatixat* has negative connotations when applied to people due to the objectification involved in referring to a person as an inanimate object. These connotations might even be the driving force behind

nonpersons, 65 are clear uses of intensifier *xatixat*, compared to 15 uses of negative *xatixat*. It's possible that inanimate objects, events and abstracts don't evoke in speakers quite the same strong emotions that other people do. This difference naturally carries over to use in vocatives. Intensifier *xatixat* virtually never occurs in vocatives (3), and when it does it is only with unmistakably positive predicates following it. Again, this can be attributed to the risk of miscommunicating a negative stance. Negative *xatixat* is much more common in vocatives (29).

3.4 Related forms

There are forms in spoken Hebrew which serve a similar role as *xatixat* on either of its two evaluative functions, though there may not be forms which do both.⁹ For intensifier *xatixat*, there are numerous adjectives which can serve as adnominal degree modifiers, e.g. *amiti* 'real', *recini* 'serious', *metoraf* 'crazy', etc. Other, more specialized forms are the Arabic loanwords *axu-šarmuta* 'the slut's brother' (and its many related forms) and *waxad* 'one',¹⁰ which like *xatixat* occur pre-nominally.

For negative *xatixat*, the picture is more complex. The most powerful tool speakers have at their disposal for expressing negative stance is offensive language, or **taboo words**. These are "sanctioned or restricted on both institutional and individual levels under the assumption that some harm will occur if (they are) spoken" (Jay, 2009, p. 153). In Hebrew, this class includes forms like *xara* 'shit', *zayin* 'dick', *kus* 'cunt', *mizdayen* 'fucking', (*ben*) *zona* '(son of a) whore', *muštan* 'urinated.PAS', etc. Second in line are content words which denote undesirable qualities like stupidity and ugliness, or evoke them through association (Allan, to appear). Some common Hebrew words that match this description are *mexoar* 'ugly', *mefager* 'retarded', *masriyax* 'stinking', *efes* 'zero', *kalba* 'bitch', *zevel* 'garbage', and *kof* 'monkey'. Incidentally, all of the above forms frequently co-occur in utterances with negative *xatixat*.

What makes *xatixat* unique is that it directly expresses negative stance without being a taboo word, and without having any actual conceptual content. This is what allows the special use in (30), from the children's TV show "*ha-kalmarim*". In this scene the speaker tries, and emphatically fails, to insult his addressee. This is effectively conveyed to the audience through the use of *xatixat* which, for the story's purposes, doesn't technically count as an "insult":

(30) šapošnikov, ata yodea še-ata xatixat ###...
 you. know. that- piece.of
 MSG MSG you're.MSG

the grammaticization of negative *xatixat*, especially considering the existence of similar forms in other languages (see §3.4).

⁹ One that comes to mind is the English loanword *fucking*, which, similarly English, is almost unlimited in its applications.

¹⁰ The Arabic loanword *waxad* 'one', which occurs pre-nominally and is used as an intensifier, should not be confused with the "native" *exad/axat* 'one' (described in §2.4) which occurs post-nominally and is used to express emotional evaluation.

šapošnikov,	ata	yodea	še-ata	xatixat	###...	metupax.	ma?!
	you.	know.	that-	piece.of		well	what
	MSG	MSG	you're.MSG			groomed.MSG	
lama	ani	omer...	ani	lo	macliyax	leha'aliv	otxa.
why	I (am)	saying.	I	no	succeeding.	to insult	ACC.you.
		MSG			MSG		MSG

Shaposhnikov, you know you're a piece of (gibberish)... Shaposhnikov, you know you're really (gibberish)... well-groomed. What?! Why am I saying... I can't manage to insult you.

From the television show "ha-kalmarim", second season, special Purim episode

Turning to languages other than Hebrew, the first forms that come to mind are ones with a literal sense akin to *xatixat*, which similarly express negative stance. Examples are English *piece of shit*, Italian *pezzo di merda* 'piece of shit', and Yiddish *štik fon drek* 'piece of shit'. However, all of these forms are strictly limited, in that they always include a tangible, likely dirty and smelly, material; this is predominantly feces, followed by dirt and garbage. Unlike *xatixat* they never include animate or abstract items, and they cannot imbue a neutral term with emotional expressivity.

A far more flexible form is the *a N of a N*-construction, or the Expressive Binominal NP, discussed by Foolen (2004) in a variety of Germanic and Romance languages. Examples of this construction are English *an angel of a child*, Dutch *een boom van een kerel* 'a tree of a man', and French *un diable d'homme* 'a devil of a man'. Under Foolen's analysis, use of the construction conveys a general emotional expressivity, the specifics of which (e.g. polarity) are determined by the first noun.

The Expressive Binominal NP, henceforth EBNP, might superficially resemble intensifier *xatixat*, but a closer examination reveals dissimilarities. First off, the evaluative function of *xatixat* can't be emulated by replacing it with another noun in the same position. Conversely, EBNPs can have a variety of items in the first noun's position fulfilling much the same roles. Secondly, while *xatixat* and the EBNP both contribute a vaguely general emotional expressivity which is then fleshed-out in context, they differ in the ways this fleshing-out takes place. The contribution of *xatixat* relies on the following phrase, such that only material that is given explicitly can be modified, and in a fairly straightforward fashion (augmented or brought into focus). With EBNPs, the first noun's contribution is less straightforward and more subtle, having more to do with impressions or associations than with explicit literal meaning. Lastly, EBNPs exist in Hebrew independently of *xatixat*, with the two forms even co-occurring, as in (31). It is worth noting that the construction in Hebrew appears as *N šel N*, with the genitive preposition *šel* 'of', and not in the construct state. This is a closer reflection of the way the construction appears in Germanic and Romance languages.

- (31) a. ha-šaxaf levan- ha-kanaf, xatixat **behema** **šel** **šaxaf**
 the-gull white.MSG the-wing piece.of (a) beast of (a) gull

The glaucous gull, a real beast of a gull.

Retrieved 13.8.2016 from <http://www.birds.org.il/he/article-page.aspx?articleId=679>

- b. ani lomedet be-xatixat **xaltura šel bet sefer**
I (am) studying.FSG in-piece.of (a) sham of (a) school
I go to a shoddy sham of a school.

One more form I feel is worth mentioning is English *hell of a~helluva~hella*, which seems to share the general expressivity, wide applicability and informal register of intensifier *xatixat*. Indeed, each of the two forms appears to be a common choice for translating the other in its respective language. This is demonstrated in (32), which shows half a dozen nearly identical Hebrew translations, all using *xatixat*, of an English utterance containing the form *hell of a*. The most striking feature shared by *xatixat* and *hell of a* is their availability in modifying both nouns and adjectives, although *hell of a* appears to display somewhat different forms with each, as shown in (33):

- (32) a. (ze) xatixat mivca nekudati
it's piece.of (an) operation pointed.MSG

Retrieved 13.8.2016 from (1) <http://www.inn.co.il/News/News.aspx/280419>; (2) <http://www.ch10.co.il/news/54389/>; (3) <http://www.ynet.co.il/articles/0,7340,L-4547092,00.html>; (4) <http://www.kikar.co.il/קרי-נתפס-החיכת-מבצע-נקודתי/>; (5) <http://www.haaretz.co.il/news/politics/1.2382314>; (6) <http://www.srugim.co.il/83940--גון-קרי-הוקלט-בסתר-החיכת-מבצע-נקודתי>

- b. It's a hell of a pinpoint operation.

Retrieved 13.8.2016 from <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/post-politics/wp/2014/07/20/fox-confronts-kerry-with-hot-mic-comment-on-israel-hell-of-a-pinpoint-operation/>

- (33) a. Ranking system is hella dumb / ~??helluva dumb / ~??hell of a dumb

Retrieved 13.8.2016 from <https://steamcommunity.com/app/730/discussions/0/618459405713633814/>

- b. video proves he was a hell of a dumbass / ~helluva dumbass / ~??hella dumbass

Retrieved 13.8.2016 from <http://www.theprp.com/2016/01/31/news/petition-to-have-down-removed-from-download-festival-launched-following-anselmos-racist-outburst/>

The sequence *ya xatixat*

As discussed in the previous sections, the vocative particle *ya* may occur with a complex phrase as its complement, and evaluative *xatixat* may occur in vocatives. It is therefore unsurprising that the two forms occur together.

Data

I collected a sample of 100 instances of the sequence *ya xatixat* through a search for the following orthographic forms: combinations of either יא or יה with either of החיכת or החתכת, as well as the adjoined יהחיכת and החתכת. Of these, 37 were instances collected while searching for *ya* and *xatixat* and not included in their respective samples, as described above.

Structural properties and function

Recall from the previous sections that (i) *ya* is an evaluative vocative particle which is virtually restricted from appearing with degree modifiers, including intensifiers; and that (ii) evaluative *xatixat* is ambiguous between an intensifier which rarely occurs within vocatives, and a negative marker which often does. With that in mind, we predict that negative *xatixat* will occur alongside *ya* much more often than intensifier *xatixat*. This prediction is borne out, with 95 out of 100 instances being unambiguous uses of negative *xatixat*, and with only a single unambiguous use of intensifier *xatixat* in the sample.

In the rare case that *ya xatixat* is followed by an overtly positive predicate, it may still turn out to be a use of negative *xatixat*, with the predicate interpreted ironically, as in (34a). In other cases, the speaker intends to use *xatixat* as an intensifier and is misinterpreted as using it negatively, as in (34b):

- (34) a. lenakot šerutim lo hayiti mekabelet otxa ya xatixat **ga'on**
to clean toilets no I would accept.FSG you.ACC VOC piece.of genius
I wouldn't hire you to clean toilets, genius.

Retrieved 3.9.2015 from

<http://www.mako.co.il/nTalkbacksPage/vgnnextchannel=f274d8176f37c410VgnVCM100000290c10acRCRD&page=2&vgnextoid=0892a8175290d410VgnVCM100000290c10acRCRD&>

- b. etmol amarti la-yeled šeli, ma ha-inyanim ya xatixat **xamud.**
yesterday I said to.the-kid mine what (are) the-issues VOC piece.of cute.MSG
az hu omer li, az hu ne'elav
so he says.MSG to.me so he (is) insulted.MSG

Yesterday I said to my kid “what’s up you cutie”. So he says to me, turns out he’s insulted.

From the radio show “šay ve-drór”, 23.11.2010

The way the sequence *ya xatixat* is used, as described above, is predictable from the functions of its components, described in previous sections. However, word sequences that are in principle predictable can still prove to be conventionalized (Ariel, 2008; Bybee, 2006; Erman & Warren, 2000). The highly frequent use of *ya xatixat* suggests that it’s not simply a chance co-occurrence of two unrelated forms. Even taking into account the fact that many of the same predicates regularly appear alongside *ya* and *xatixat*, the sequence *ya xatixat* occurs much more often than might be expected.

To illustrate, consider the word *metumtam/metumtemet* ‘stupid’, which has 24,461 instances in the Israblog Corpus. Of those, 141 are in *ya* phrases (approximately 1 in 173), and 192 are in supporters of *xatixat* (approximately 1 in 127). If the two forms *ya* and *xatixat* were independent of one another, that is, if the occurrence of the sequence *ya xatixat metumtam/metumtemet* was up to chance, then we would expect to find only a single instance of it in the corpus ($24,461 * 1/173 * 1/127$). Instead, we find 26 instances. Similar findings are obtained for every

form which occurred more than once in the samples of both *ya* and *xatixat*, as shown in Table 1.¹¹

Table 1 – expected and actual occurrences of predicates with *ya xatixat*

Predicate	Total occurrences	Occurrences with <i>ya</i> (frequency)	Occurrences with <i>xatixat</i> (frequency)	Expected occurrences with <i>ya xatixat</i>	Actual occurrences with <i>ya xatixat</i>
<i>metumtam/metumtemet</i> ‘stupid’	24,461	141 (1 in 173)	192 (1 in 127)	1	26
<i>xara</i> ‘shit’	27,217	172 (1 in 158)	324 (1 in 84)	2	51
<i>ben/bat zona</i> ‘son/daughter of a whore’	4934	411 (1 in 12)	127 (1 in 39)	11	20
<i>mefager(et)</i> ‘retarded’	14,048	172 (1 in 82)	122 (1 in 115)	1	25
<i>kalba</i> ‘bitch’	5495	100 (1 in 55)	100 (1 in 55)	2	6
<i>šamen/šmena</i> ‘fat’	14,241	125 (1 in 114)	44 (1 in 324)	0	9
<i>pustema</i> ‘bimbo’	1636	79 (1 in 21)	58 (1 in 28)	3	11
<i>mizdayen(et)</i> ‘fucking’	2482	94 (1 in 26)	58 (1 in 43)	2	18

Although the sequence *ya xatixat* doesn’t have a specialized function independent of the forms comprising it, its high frequency points to it being a conventional collocation, stored in speakers’ memories. This can be expected to surface in a special phonological reduction, as well as in resistance to change over time (Bybee, 2006). Because my data is written, variation in phonological realizations can only be guessed at based on orthographic alternations. The alternation that springs to mind is between *חתיכה* and *חתכה*, respectively corresponding to the pronunciations *xatixat* and *xatxat*. I predict the reduced form *xatxat*, and accordingly the orthographic form *חתכה*, to surface in greater proportions within *ya xatixat* collocations than elsewhere. The few occurrences found in the Israblog Corpus seem to support this prediction: the form *חתכה* occurs in 10 out of approximately 600 *ya xatixat* collocations; and in 27 out of 2000~3000 uses of negative *xatixat* elsewhere. Another suggestive alternation is between the

¹¹ The results for *kalba* and *šamen* should be taken with a grain of salt, due to the polysemy of *kalba* (equivalent to English *bitch*) and the homography of *šamen* and *šemen* ‘oil’. These inflate the total number of occurrences for the two forms, leading to a decrease in the expected number of occurrences with *ya xatixat*.

sequence יא חתיכת and the adjoined form יחתיכת, where the latter possibly represents a reduced vowel in *ya*.¹²

List of References

- Allan, K. To appear. The pragmeme of insult and some allopracts. In Keith Allan, Alessandro Capone and Istvan Keszkes, eds., *Pragmemes and theories of language use*. Cham: Springer.
- Ariel, M. (2008). *Pragmatics and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
- Bolinger, D. (1972). *Degree words*. Walter de Gruyter.
- Bybee, J. (2006). From usage to grammar: The mind's response to repetition. *Language*, 82(4): 711-733.
- Corver, N. (2008). Uniformity and diversity in the syntax of evaluative vocatives. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics*, 11(1): 43-93.
- Davies, E. E. (1986). English vocatives: A look into their function and form. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 19: 91-106.
- Doetjes, J. (1997). *Quantifiers and Selection: On the Distribution of Quantifying Expressions in French, Dutch and English*. Doctoral dissertation, Leiden University.
- Erman, B., & B. Warren. (2000). The idiom principle and the open choice principle. *Text*, 20: 29-62.
- Foolen, A. (2004). Expressive binominal NPs in Germanic and Romance languages. *Studies in linguistic motivation*, 28: 75-100.
- Jay, T. (2009). The utility and ubiquity of taboo words. *Perspectives on psychological science*, 4(2): 153-161.
- Jensen, B. (2004). Syntax and semantics of imperative subjects. *Nordlyd*, 31(1): 150-164.
- Kennedy, C. & L. McNally. (2005). Scale structure, degree modification, and the semantics of gradable predicates. *Language*, 81(2): 345–381.
- Linzen, T. (2009). *Corpus of blog postings collected from the Israblog website*. Tel Aviv University.
- Morzycki, M. (2009). Degree modification of gradable nouns: size adjectives and adnominal degree morphemes. *Natural Language Semantics*, 17(2): 175–203.

¹² It should be noted that *ya* adjoins, with varying frequency, to other forms as well: יבן זונה, יהומו, ימניאק, יהומו, יבן זונה. Whether this means that the sequences of *ya* and each of these forms are also conventionalized to some extent, or that *ya* is acquiring a clitic form (perhaps only in writing), is a question I won't attempt to resolve.

- Moutaouakil, A. (1989). *Pragmatic functions in a functional grammar of Arabic*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Ritter, E. (1991). Two functional categories in noun phrases. *Syntax and semantics*, 25: 37-62.
- Sassoon, G. (2007). *Vagueness, gradability and typicality: A comprehensive semantic analysis*. Doctoral dissertation, Tel Aviv University.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1968). Sequencing in conversational openings. *American anthropologist*, 70(6): 1075-1095.
- Siloni, T. (2001). Construct states at the PF interface. *Linguistic variation yearbook*, 1(1): 229-266.
- Zuckerman, G. (2006). Direct and indirect speech in straight-talking Israeli. *Acta linguista Hungarica*, 53: 467-481.
- Zwicky, A. M. (1974). Hey, what's your name!. *Chicago linguistic society*, 10: 787-801.
- Zwicky, A. M. (2004). Isolated NPs. *Talk presented at the Stanford Semantics Fest 5*.