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This dissertation offers a new analysis of two derived Biblical Hebrew verbal forms, the Niphal and the Hitpael. Present scholarship on Biblical Hebrew does not agree on the definition of these two stems or the relationship of the stems to one another. As linguistic knowledge expands in the area of passive and middle voice and their interaction with situation aspect (i.e., the contrast between states and activities) new opportunities arise to analyze these verb forms.

In Chapter 1 I outline the issues arising from the Niphal and Hitpael as parts of the Biblical Hebrew verbal system. The two major problems that exist are 1) providing unified definitions for each of the two stems, and 2) explaining the considerable overlap in meaning between the two. An analysis of the state of Hebrew scholarship on the Niphal and Hitpael comprises Chapter 2. I begin with the Niphal and the variation of its meanings, and then critique various methods by which these meanings have been systematized. Ultimately, I arrive at the stative/resultative meaning as definitive for the Niphal. I similarly analyze the Hitpael, looking at the various meanings offered for verbs in the Hitpael and critiquing models offered to unite these meanings. All the various meanings of the Hitpael share an activity sense in common. With these definitions in place, I examine explanations for the widely observed overlap between the meanings of the two stems.

In Chapter 3, I develop a model for the interaction between grammatical voice and situation aspect. I approach the passive voice with a functional model in order to explain some of the phenomena that arise in the Biblical Hebrew Niphal and Hitpael, namely, the existence of
more than one potential passive voice cross-linguistically and in Biblical Hebrew. Any passive construction demotes the primary argument, whether syntactically (position in the sentence) or topically (importance in the sentence). In this light, one can also classify the formal middle voice in many languages as fulfilling a passive function. While these formally distinct verb forms share this function, they each fulfill a distinct function within the passive voice, namely, the formal passive expresses a resulting state-oriented situation aspect, and the middle, an activity-oriented situation aspect.

Chapter 4 demonstrates that the model of a passive voice bifurcated according to situation aspect as developed in Chapter 3 helps explain the Biblical Hebrew data. After I examine all the Niphal, Hitpael, Hitpolel, Hitpalpel, and Nitpael forms in the Hebrew Bible, I include examples in this chapter that contrast the two verb forms and that differ as little as possible in other details such as context and verb inflection. I also look at contrastive Pual forms to narrow down the areas in which the Niphal and Hitpael function. The examples are categorized in order to observe the effect of the number of participants and semantic class of the verb stem. Thus I am able to demonstrate that the Niphal and Hitpael both function as passives, whether they demote the primary argument syntactically or topically. This voice function explains the overlap between the stems. The Niphal operates as a state-oriented passive as is distinct from the Hitpael, which functions as an activity-oriented passive. This situation aspect function demonstrates the distinct semantic area that each stem covers.

In Chapter 5 I compare the use of the Niphal and Hitpael from a diachronic perspective, from the earliest stages of Biblical Hebrew through Ben Sira. The Niphal reliably expresses a resulting state. The Hitpael appears to expand into more areas, as the number of Hitpael neologisms increases. Nevertheless, the Hitpael consistently expresses activity orientation.
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<td>New Revised Standard Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Secondary participant in two-participant verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Prepositional phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTPL</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QTL</td>
<td>qatal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R₂</td>
<td>Second radical of root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH</td>
<td>Rabbinic Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSV</td>
<td>Revised Standard Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
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<td>Sira</td>
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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. THE PROBLEM OF THE NIPHAL AND HITPAEL

1.1.1. The binyanim system

1.1.1.1. Definition of the binyanim

BH, like other Semitic languages, employs a complex system of derived verbal morphology. Each BH verbal root appears in at least one of seven principal derived forms. These forms are called “stems” or “binyanim” (singular, “binyan”). The stems express voice (understood to include reflexivity), intensity, and causativity. Traditionally the stems are set up in the following way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>PASSIVE</th>
<th>REFLEXIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple action</td>
<td>Qal לָלַח he killed</td>
<td>Qal passive (largely disappeared)</td>
<td>Niphal לָלַח he killed himself; he was killed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive (?) action</td>
<td>Piel לְלָח he killed intensely (?)</td>
<td>Pual לָלַח he was killed intensely (?)</td>
<td>Hitpael לְלָח he killed himself intensely (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative action</td>
<td>Hiphil לְלָח he made kill</td>
<td>Hophal לְלָח one has caused him to kill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. System of binyanim (adapted from Joüon-Muraoka §40).

This chart offers more specific information about the stems. The verbal root used in the paradigm is לָלַח “kill.”¹ In the first column we have the “active” forms. The Qal is the most basic. It is unmarked for number of arguments (transitivity) and intensity. The next stem is

¹ While the verb לָלַח “kill,” is used traditionally for demonstrating the paradigm of binyanim, this root does not appear in all these stems in the biblical corpus.
the Piel, which is understood to be “intensive.” Verbs in this stem represent “emphatic” senses that derive from the Qal, such as factitive, declarative-estimative, and pluralizing (Joüon-Muraoka:§52d). Nevertheless, Joüon-Muraoka express the inadequacy of the label “intensive” by adding a question mark.\(^2\) IBHS calls this the “so-called” intensive (§21.2.2a). The Hiphil is the causative stem, derived from the Qal.

The second and third columns are derived from the stems in the “active” column. In the second column we find the passive stems. The Qal has a passive form (the Qal passive, abbreviated Qp) that is only productive in a few verbal forms, and not always clearly distinguishable from the Pual and Hophal. The Pual and Hophal reflect the passive derivation of the Piel and Hiphil, respectively. They bear a phonological and semantic resemblance to their respective active stems. The third column categorizes the reflexive stems. The Niphal is the reflexive form that is derived from the Qal, and the Hitpael, the reflexive derived from the Piel. The Hitpael formally resembles the Piel, as well, because of a doubled second consonant of the verbal root.

More recently, IBHS expresses the general meanings of the stems in a similar grid to the one above (§21.2.2a). Three details distinguish IBHS’s table from that of Joüon-Muraoka. First, the Niphal occupies two squares, the passive and the reflexive of the Qal. Second, the Qal passive is not included. Third, the reflexive column also includes the description “double-status,” which IBHS explains later.

\(^2\) They write, “[T]he question how the function of Piel in relation to other conjugations, notably Qal, should be defined still remains one of the major challenges facing Hebrew an Semitic linguistics” (§52d). See Jenni (1968) for a further critique of this term.
Some problems are apparent in Joüon-Muraoka’s and *IBHS*’s model. First, it predicts stems that do not exist. No reflexive stem relates to the Hiphil (*he made himself kill, he made someone kill himself*). This raises the question: if BH does not have a stem for this meaning, how does BH express such a sense? An additional reflexive mechanism must exist for such cases. Second, not all stems occupy a single square of the table. The Niphal can be reflexive or passive according to Joüon-Muraoka’s translation of the Niphal. Also, the Hitpael also extends beyond the reflexive category. They write that the Hitpael has “the diverse meanings of the Nifal together with the nuances proper to Piel” (Joüon-Muraoka §53i). The Niphal and the Hitpael cannot be contained within the defined boundaries of a single category in this table. Moreover, they seem to overlap these categories in similar ways.

Nevertheless, we can roughly define the stems of Biblical Hebrew along two axes: the unmarked-intensive-causative and the active-passive-reflexive. Hebraists have built this system from abstracting the meanings of stems from the broad range of instantiations of the stems. I have demonstrated some problems with the system; significantly, it does not predict that the Niphal and Hitpael would straddle more than one category. I will turn to the specific issue of the Niphal and Hitpael later. Next, I will now look at actual manifestations of the stems.

### 1.1.1.2. Instantiations of *binyanim*

A more nuanced view of the stems comes into focus when we look at specific instantiations. Only six roots appear in all seven *binyanim*. They are בּוּק bq “cleave, break,” הָלָה lhl “uncover, reveal,” הָלָה hll “be, become sick,” יד yd “know,” יָלָד yld “bear, bring

---

3 The reflexive system of BH lies beyond the scope of this work.
forth,” רַמֵּן pqd “1. attend to, 2. muster, 3. appoint.”⁴ Only גִּלְגֵּל glh “uncover, reveal,” רָאָל yld “bear, bring forth,” and רַמֵּן pqd “1. attend to, 2. muster, 3. appoint,” appear in the Qp, but never as finite verb forms. I will examine the first two of these to understand the stem system from another perspective.

The following chart remakes Joüon-Muraoka’s chart with the root בַּק bq “cleave, break.” The forms of this verb consistently follow the standard phonological pattern of the stems. In order to highlight the meaning of the various stems, I have only included the English translations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>PASSIVE</th>
<th>REFLEXIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple action</td>
<td>Qal: 1. split, cleave; 2. hatch; 3. force a breach</td>
<td>Niphal: 1. split, burst open [intrans]; 2. break forth [intrans]; 3. be hatched; 4. be assaulted; 5. be conquered through a breach that has been made</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive (?)</td>
<td>Piel: 1. split, rip up; 2. make (a storm) break out; 3. tear to pieces; 4. hatch; 5. excavate</td>
<td>Pual: 1. burst (skin) (ptpl); 2. be ripped up; 3. be assaulted (Qal 3)</td>
<td>Hitpael: be burst, cleft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative action</td>
<td>Hiphil: 1. take by assault; 2. break through</td>
<td>Hophal: be taken by assault</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Meanings of bq’ in all binyanim, adapted from KB.

⁴ These definitions come from BDB.
Let us first look at the active *binyanim*. The Qal of this root bears three related meanings. Some of the Piel meanings bear a close relationship to the first two of the meanings of the Qal, with various types of “intensification.” For example, the Qal means “split,” and the Piel, “tear to pieces.” We also find the unique meaning in the Piel, “excavate” (Job 28:10), that does not appear in the Qal. The Hiphil of this verb is not causative, namely it does not describe a situation where an entity causes another agent to act. This form appears in military contexts in both verses that it occurs (2 Kgs 3:26; Isa 7:6) and closely resembles the third meaning of the Qal, “force a breach.” Thus we can see a semantic split between the meanings of the Piel and Hiphil, where the former draws from the first two meanings of the Qal, and the latter, from the third meaning of the Qal.

The passive stems of the root יָכַב bqא bear meanings closely related to their active counterparts. The Pual relates clearly to the Piel in most cases. In the first sense of the Pual, “burst,” would be labeled more accurately as a spontaneous intranstive, rather than a passive. The sense “assaulted” of the Pual does not relate to any extant meaning of the Piel but to one of the Qal meanings and the single meaning of the Hiphil, where the Hiphil and Qal overlap. The Qp of this root is also absent. The Masoretes, however, do not generally recognize the Qp stem. As a result it is impossible to tell if the Pual forms were originally Qp forms. The Hophal draws this same sense, “burst,” from the Hiphil, so the Pual and Hophal can be synonymous in cases. Moreover, these areas of semantic overlap relate to the Qal and Hiphil and not to the Piel. The Pual and Hophal largely share the Piel and Hiphil split of the meanings of the Qal, but with some exceptions.
The instances of the root בָּקִים bq in the reflexive stems also bear closely-related meanings. Neither the Niphal nor the Hitpael, however, bears a reflexive sense. The Niphal functions as the intransitive form of the Qal. So while the Qal means, “X splits Y open,” the Niphal means, “X splits open,” with no direct object. This stem also bears a passive meaning, relating to “break, split,” and related to the military sense in the Hiphil, Pual, and Hophal. The Hitpael meaning, “burst,” overlaps with the Niphal (intransitive of the Qal) and the Pual. It does not share the military sense of the Pual and Hophal.

For the root בָּקִים bq, several stems, but not all, function as predicted by Table 1. The Piel derives its meanings largely from the Qal. Most of the Pual meanings derive from the Piel, and the Hophal corresponds well with the Hiphil. The meanings of the Niphal match those of the Qal, and those of the Hitpael, those of the Piel. Some derived stems, however, bear meanings that their more basic, corresponding stem does not have. For example, the Piel bears meanings that do not appear in the Qal. The Pual bears meanings that do not appear in the Piel in the HB.

It is impossible to determine, though, whether these Qal and Piel senses are absent from the HB corpus as a result of historical accident, that is, our corpus happens not to include the Piel, or impossibility, that is, the language does not allow a Piel of this stem. A further problem is that some stems with this verbal root do not precisely fit their predicted sense. For example, the Hiphil does not have a causative sense. Both the Niphal and Hitpael are intransitive, and neither is reflexive. This root is inconsistent with the model of Joüon-Muraoka because 1) derived stems do not always correspond to their simpler counterparts, and 2) stems do not function precisely according to their generalized function.

The next table demonstrates the derived meanings of the root בָּקִים bq "uncover, reveal."
Table 3. Meanings of glh in all binyanim, from KB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOICE</th>
<th>ACTIVE</th>
<th>PASSIVE</th>
<th>REFLEXIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simple action</td>
<td>Qal: 1. uncover; 2. leave, disappear, go into exile</td>
<td>Niphal: 1. expose oneself, be exposed; 2. appear, show, reveal self; 3. be announced, revealed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive (?)action</td>
<td>Piel: 1. uncover, disclose; 2. sleep with</td>
<td>Pual: undisguised, open</td>
<td>Hitpael: 1. expose oneself; 2. become obvious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causative action</td>
<td>Hiphil: deport</td>
<td>Hophal: be deported</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meanings of the Qal fall into two categories, “uncover” and “leave, go into exile,” which are possibly homonomous roots. We should note that the former carries two arguments and the latter, one. In the Piel and the Hiphil, the number of arguments for both meanings is two. The Piel, though, exclusively carries the former meaning, “uncover,” and the Hiphil, the latter, “go into exile.” Hence the Piel keeps the same number of arguments for the first sense (or root, if we assume that they are homonomous), and the Hiphil increases the number of arguments for the second sense. The Pual and Hophal correspond with the same meaning as their active counterparts, according to the definitions in KB. We should note, however, that KB reads against the received text in Nah 2:8. They read an active Qal “go into exile,” rather than a passive Pual, “be carried away (into exile).” In any case, the context suggests that one read it as “exile,” which forces one to assume a different vocalization or allow the “exile” meaning for the
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5 “Argument” is the standard linguistic term for this entity. By “argument” I mean an entity participating in a grammatical relation. For example, the sentence *Gwen hit the baseball,* has two arguments, “Gwen” and “the baseball.” The sentence *Gwen arrived* has one argument (Carnie 2002:166).
Pual. The passive stems, therefore, do not always derive their meanings from their active counterpart.

The Niphal and Hitpael overlap to a great extent. They follow the same meaning as the Piel (Qal) line, “uncover.” Regarding voice, both have reflexive and passive meanings. The reflexive meanings have to do with revealing oneself. The passive meaning of “being revealed” and “becoming obvious” do not appear to coincide on the surface. However, the single Hitpael with the meaning “become obvious” actually could be reflexive or passive in the context (Prov 18:2). Overall, the two appear in contexts of passive and reflexive with the “uncover” meaning of the root. Neither the Niphal nor the Hitpael occupies the single square allotted them in Joüon-Muraoka’s system; the two overlap categories, as *IBHS* suggested for the Niphal.

These two examples of the full system of *binyanim* demonstrate two significant inconsistencies with the more abstract system of Table 1. First, derived stems do not line up exactly with their simpler, corresponding member. The Piel is clearly related to the Qal, but the Piel is not entirely dependent on the Qal for its meanings. The Piel and Hiphil both relate to the Qal, but they may take on different meanings from the Qal. The Pual and Hophal take on the meaning of their active counterparts, but the Pual does not always derive from attested Piel meanings. In deriving meaning from the Qal, the Niphal can represent the passive of all the meanings, as seen in the root הָפַךְ בּוֹq ֶכֶ, or only some of the meanings, as in הַלֵּךְ gַlֵּךְ. The Hitpael may be more limited in how it draws meaning from the Qal. Second, the Niphal and Hitpael do not fall clearly into a single column, for they both display passive and reflexive meanings. The Niphal demonstrates more passive meanings than the Hitpael in the root הַלֵּךְ gַlֵּךְ.
In addition, if the Hitpael expresses passive meanings, then it may overlap in some ways with the Pual, as is shown in Table 2, but not in Table 3.

We can expect that such an abstract system would demonstrate exceptions in concrete instances. Such is the nature of distilling the complex, derived meanings of these stems down to a single, two-dimensional table. Nevertheless, it is valuable to understand where the abstract model tends to give rise to more and less variation. Hiphil and Hophal bear a slightly more stable relationship than Piel and Pual, and a much more stable relationship than Qal and Piel. The Niphal relates clearly to the Qal, and it is unclear if the Hitpael relates more “directly” to the Qal or Piel. The Niphal and Hitpael overlap considerably in meanings, both semantically and in voice. Both roots confirm that to call these two “reflexive” stems oversimplifies their breadth of meanings.

1.1.1.3. Disentangling the binyanim

These problems with the binyan system raise several questions for research. Gaps between the abstracted Table 1 and the more concrete Table 2 and Table 3 present some issues regarding the actual relationships among stems. First, what precisely does “intensive” mean? This question relates more basically to the relationship of the Piel to the Qal, which the above tables demonstrate to be complex. Second, do the passive stems possess meanings on their own, or do they derive their meanings from their active counterparts? This question arises from the fact that the Hophal appears to derive its meaning from the Hiphil in a different way that the Pual does from the Piel. Third, do the Niphal and Hitpael each serve one or more purposes? They
share the function of intransitive, reflexive, and passive in the more abstract table and in the
more concrete manifestations.

One can disentangle this complex web of relationships by beginning with the
relationships of pairs of stems. Comparing pairs of stems allows us to seek the category or
categories that define the relation of two stems to each other. Then we can compare one of these
stems to a third to define another relationship, and then to another, and so on. For example, one
can compare the Qal to the Piel to learn about that distinction. Then one can compare the Piel to
the Hiphil to learn about that distinction. After these two tests, one has two defining
characteristics for the Piel (as well as one each for the Qal and Hiphil) that make up a profile for
that stem.

Once those relationships are defined, one can compare parallel relationships. Thus one
can take the Piel and compare it to the Pual, and take the Hiphil and comapare it to the Hophal.
Then the Piel-Pual and Hiphil-Hophal relationships can be compared and contrasted. The
traditional chart (Table 1) assumes that the Piel-Pual and Hiphal-Hophal relationships are
parallel. By looking at the two relationships individually first, one can determine finer contours
of these relationships, and perhaps define the Hophal and Pual more precisely. This is the
approach taken by Boyd (1993), for example, for the Niphal. Once he defined the Niphal vis-à-
vis the Qal, he spent some time comparing it to the Hitpael. Unfortunately, he was not able to
define that relationship clearly. Further exploration of that relationship would likely yield
helpful results for understanding the Niphal (as well as the Hitpael).

Defining the discrete relationships between pairs of stems, and thus building up the
profile of each stem, is the key to understanding the stem system. This method allows us to
define our “grid” more and more accurately as we look more closely at the binary relationships among the binyanim. In this work, I will define the relationship between the Niphal and Hitpael, with the goal in mind of building profiles for each of these stems. I begin with the relations of the Niphal and Hitpael to one another. Since these are both passive/reflexive/middle stems, I will also compare them to the active stem, usually the Qal. In addition, I will bring in the Pual to compare to the Niphal and Hitpael in order to define their profiles more precisely. The Pual overlaps formally with the Hitpael, in that they share the doubling of the second radical. In Table 1 the Pual sits on the same row as the Piel and Hitpael for this reason. The Pual shares many passive functions with the Niphal, as well. Thus, in order to define the Niphal-Hitpael relationship more precisely, I have examined all the extant Puals in my corpus, and I will bring the Pual into consideration throughout this study. Furthermore, since the Qal passive (Qp) overlaps in the passive, I have also studied the examples of that binyan. So while this dissertation seeks to define the Niphal and Hitpael relationship, studying their interaction with the Pual and Qp allows for more precision in the principal goal of the present work.

In this dissertation, I seek the answer to what function the Niphal and Hitpael serve. While allowing them to straddle two categories is not necessarily a problem, establishing a more accurate definition for them is desirable. I will establish a definition for these stems that will group together intransitive, passive, and reflexive in a more coherent category. Once this is established, I will present how the two stems differ. We saw that the definition of “intensive” has problems of its own when defining the Piel. Furthermore, that the Hitpael is a more “intensive” equivalent of the Niphal does not seem to be consistent. Therefore, I will look to
another semantic function, verbal aspect, in order to distinguish these two stems more consistently.

1.1.2. The form and function of the Niphal and Hitpael

The Niphal and Hitpael bear distinct, formal morphological characteristics. In the suffixing inflectional form, the Niphal bears the prefix י n-, and the Hitpael, a prefixed ה it- and a doubling of the second root consonant. In the prefixed inflectional form, this characteristic prefix of the Niphal assimilates to the first root consonant, usually doubling the root letter, and the Hitpael prefixed form typically includes a ה t- between the inflected prefix and the root, and a doubled second root letter.

The functions of the two stems, though, are not as distinct. The two forms overlap to some extent, while each stem bears some unique meanings. For example, the Niphal, but not the Hitpael, can focus on the result of an action (2.2.2.2), and the Hitpael, but not the Niphal, can bear an iterative meaning (2.3.2.5). Nevertheless, both potentially bear a passive meaning (sections 2.2.2.1 and 2.3.2.3), middle meaning (sections 2.2.2.4 and 2.3.2.2), and reflexive meaning (sections 2.2.2.3 and 2.3.2.1). Thus the problem of these two binyanim is two-fold: 1) What meanings are exclusive to the Niphal and Hitpael, respectively? 2) Is there a way to distinguish between the Niphal and Hitpael in the overlapping area?

Scholars of BH tend towards one of two ways of characterizing them. One method is evidenced by more exegetically-minded scholars, who often do not distinguish strongly
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6 Semitic roots generally possess a root of three consonants, and we find prefixes, suffixes, and infixes attached to this root.
between them when they appear on the surface to mean the same thing (e.g., Mitchell 1987:33 n.3). In the overlapping area, the difference between the two forms is subtle. Moreover, the distinction is not always readily available in the target language, and likely does not make a difference exegetically. Some Biblical Hebrew grammarians, such as Joüon-Muraoka, Jenni (1973), and Boyd (1993), follow a different method, presenting strong differences between the two. They begin with a model of rather rigid relationships among the verb stems. These relationships come from cross-linguistic studies of Semitic and other languages, all of which demonstrate their own paradigm of verbal relations. Not all grammarians follow this method, however; some, such as Bicknell (1984) and Siebesma (1991), do not see clear semantic distinctions among the stems.

Each of these tendencies, appropriate for certain applications, should not be taken too far. If one assumes that these distinct forms fulfill essentially the same function, that is, they contribute identical information to the expression, one is confronted with the question of why the author decided to vary the forms at all. Such perfect synonyms present an inefficient model for the language. If one assumes relations between the binyanim that are too distinct and rigid, one may not recognize the considerable overlap that the forms demonstrate. Furthermore, if the relations that one gleans from cross-linguistic studies do not take the individual case of Biblical Hebrew into account, how the Niphal and Hitpael in the particular case of this language may relate to one another may elude explanation. For example, Ancient Greek demonstrates a productive middle voice. The Niphal also demonstrates a middle voice usage. This does not mean that the Biblical Hebrew (BH) Niphal will function the same as the
Ancient Greek middle voice. In order to avoid these two extremes, a definition of these binyanim must be subtle enough to work consistently, even in contexts where it appears that the author could use either form.

For this dissertation I am following the approach of the Hebrew grammarians who begin with a notion of discernable contrasts among the stems. Nevertheless, I interact with exegetes who analyze certain passages. The goal of this dissertation is to define the Niphal and Hitpael, which falls in line with the grammarians’ goal of a general definition of the stems. Nevertheless, the Niphal and Hitpael do not appear in a vacuum. In order to glean meaning from these stems, I look into particular instances of these stems. For these specific instances, the exegetical approach is an aid to understanding. Overall, though, the primary goal is a general description.

Hebrew grammarians have defined these stems according to basic synchronic, basic diachronic, or tendency models. I look at these approaches in Chapter 2 (section 2.2.3 for the Niphal, and section 2.3.3 for the Hitpael). The first model of the Niphal, represented by Jenni (1973), Boyd (1993), and Creason (1995), regards each stem as having a basic meaning in the context of BH. Most often voice establishes the meaning of the stem, for example, the Hitpael is basically reflexive, or the Niphal is basically middle. Since the meanings of the stems do not vary much, the relationships among the stems is more stable. The second model,
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7 Similarly, one cannot assume from the outset that the Biblical Hebrew binyanim function identically to those of Modern Hebrew. The forms appear identical, but the earlier manifestations do not necessarily function the same as their Modern counterparts. We cannot assume this identity of functions even within the biblical corpus, since the HB comprises a long history. I look at the function of the Niphal and Hitpael in diachronic perspective in Chapter 5.

8 This goal is distinct from Bicknell’s (1983) work in that she did not include the Hitpael in her study.
represented by GKC and IBHS, understands a more complex development of the stems.

Scholars who advance this view hypothesize that verbs in the history of the language began with a concrete meaning, similar to the synchronic approach, but the stem developed further meanings by the stage of BH. These approaches claim that there are essential connections among stems, but the vicissitudes of time rendered the relations less clear in some specific instances in BH. Nevertheless, all the uses of a stem in the stage of BH can be traced back to an original meaning. The third model, which we see in van der Merwe et al. (1999) and Grüneberg (2003), does not advocate an essential meaning of stems, but looks to statistical tendencies to describe each stem. A stem can bear multiple meanings depending on context, so proponents of this view look to what a stem means in different contexts to determine what the most common meanings are. Stems do not relate to one another consistently in this view.

A clear definition of grammatical voice is required to define the Niphal and Hitpael. I lay out this issue in Chapter 2: in section 2.2.1 for the Niphal and section 2.3.1 for the Hitpael. Early Hebraists, such as GKC, appear to have looked to classical languages for definitions of these voice categories in BH. As a result, they tended to define the passive and middle from the standpoint of the paradigm of Indo-European family. Definitions of the passive and middle voices that are adequate for explaining Indo-European languages, however, will not necessarily explain BH data. For example, in Indo-European languages, passivization of intransitive verbs is considered exceptional to the extent that the category of intransitive verbs is not well explained in some models of passivization. However, BH presents many examples of intransitive passives. (See sections 4.3 and 4.4.) This state of Hebrew scholarship indicates the need for a fresh look at the middle and passive voices.
1.1.3. The meaning of the passive and middle voices

Cross-linguistically the passive and middle voices present their own problems, similar to the ones demonstrated by the Niphal and Hitpael, above. First, the voices demonstrate independent forms with particular syntax; second, their functions overlap in some areas. We can see the distinction among the active, middle, and passive voices in English, exemplified respectively in the three following sentences.

1. The chef cut the bread (easily). [active]
2. The bread was cut (easily) (by the chef). [passive]
3. The bread cuts *(easily) (*by the chef). [middle]

Example 3 demonstrates that in the English middle, the adverb is ungrammatical without the adverb and cannot appear with an agentive “by” phrase. Nevertheless, the English middle and passive demonstrate several distinctions. First, the verb takes a different morphological shape in each voice. Second, the passive voice is more flexible about other sentential elements, such as an adverb and an agent by-phrase, while the middle requires the former and does not allow the latter. Third, the passive sentence refers to an event, focusing on the fact that the bread was cut, while the middle focuses on how it was to cut the bread.

The passive and middle voices demonstrate overlapping functions at the same time. Both sentences differ from the active one because they have the bread as the subject of the sentence. The chef plays a lesser syntactic role in the sentence, whether relegated to an optional prepositional phrase in the passive or disallowed by the middle. Both voices deal
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9 In linguistic notation, parentheses indicate optional elements. An asterisk outside the parentheses indicates that the phrase is ungrammatical without the element in parentheses. An asterisk inside the parentheses indicates that the phrase is ungrammatical with the element in parentheses.
with the participants in the actions in similar ways. With the underlying object as the subject, and the underlying subject at most optional, these voices highlight the underlying object. The active, in contrast, highlighted the subject. So while the passive and middle voices overlap in some aspects of syntax and highlight the same participant in the action, other syntactic elements distinguish the two voices.

1.1.4. Niphal and Hitpael as passive and middle

I have chosen to address the problem of voice in Hebrew scholarship by turning to modern approaches to the passive and middle voices. Modern linguists have data available to them that GKC did not. Moreover, modern definitions extend beyond the classical languages in order to understand this phenomenon more broadly. With models that reflect a wider range of languages, linguists have updated their understanding of voice in Indo-European and now show that languages may evidence a broader range of voice phenomena than was claimed earlier. Furthermore, new paradigms of voice demonstrate further intricacies and subtleties of these forms. By moving into a broader cross-linguistic paradigm, we see new details of these voices come to light.

Thus, I will survey linguists’ understanding of the passive and middle voices in Chapter 3. First, I will examine the passive and middle separately. More precise definitions of the two voices will allow us to analyze the Niphal and Hitpael more accurately. Second, I will look at how the two voices interact cross-linguistically. Linguists, such as Keenan (1985), Boeckx (1998:344), and Cornelis (1997:56), including some Hebraists, such as Siebesma (1991) and Creason (1995), have suggested that verbal aspect (specifically, situation aspect) may bear on the distinction between the passive and middle.
In Chapter 3 I will examine the role of aspect as a potential line of bifurcation between the passive and middle, as well as between the Niphal and Hitpael. Situation aspect provides this distinction, which I discuss in section 3.6. I begin with the models of Comrie (1976), Smith (1991), and Pustejovsky (2005). The primary dichotomy expressed by situation aspect is state vs. activity, and this dichotomy affects other elements of the sentence. Take the following English examples:

4. a. I know (the answer).
   b. *I am knowing (the answer).

5. a. I go (to the store).
   b. I am going (to the store).

English *know is a state and go is an activity. In English, activities are allowed in the progressive form, but not states. This contrast demonstrates the salience of situation aspect in English.

I further demonstrate in Chapter 3 the extent to which situation aspect can distinguish between the passive and middle voices. More precisely, the passive voice can offer formal options to focus on the state resulting from an action on the subject, and the middle, the activity preceding this final state of the action on the subject. This contrast explains many of the syntactic features that accompany the passive and middle voices cross-linguistically. More importantly for this dissertation, however, situation aspect offers a solution to the distinction of the Niphal and Hitpael, even in areas of apparent overlap.
1.2. Hebrew Data Analysis

In the course of this study, I have analyzed all the Niphal (4,119 instances) and Hitpael forms (835 instances) in the Hebrew Bible in order to establish the categories of these two stems. In addition, I have examined all the Hitpolels (114 instances), Hitpalpels (21 instances), Hotpaals (8 instances), and Nitpaels (3 instances). I begin my analysis under the assumption that a formal distinction reveals a functional distinction. In other words, when I see contrasting forms in very similar contexts, I will begin by assuming that the distinct words carry different meanings.\(^\text{10}\) Then I look for contextual clues—if available—that illuminate why one might be used over another.

This assumption arises from what linguists call minimal pairs. Originally a technique in the linguistic field of phonology, minimal pairs present two words or phrases that differ in only one sound. If the variable element can signal a change in meaning, then the linguist knows that the sounds are salient phonemes in the language. For example, the English words *bin* and *bean* demonstrate that the vowels represented by *i* and *ea* are distinct English phonemes.

The minimal pairs I will look in this study of BH are not phonological but morphological, that is, related to verb forms. Examples of sentences that minimally differ between the Niphal and Hitpael forms represent the core of my analysis. By using minimal pairs, I will demonstrate what the Niphal and Hitpael express in the contexts where they appear. Here is a pair of such examples.

\(^{10}\) This approach opposes Mitchell’s assumption that differing verb forms do not necessarily indicate distinct meanings (Mitchell 1987:33 n.3).
6. **wayyiqtol**
   
   hāḏām wōištō
   
   And the person and his wife hid (Hitpael) (Gen 3:8).

7. **Niphal**
   
   wōë hábō
   
   So I hid (Niphal) (Gen 3:10).

These sentences share similar subjects (Adam and his wife in sentence 6 and Adam in sentence 7), the same inflection (**wayyiqtol**), and describe the same action. The clearest distinction is the verb stem. I will present in Chapter 4 more such pairs of sentences that contrast between the Niphal and Hitpael. The goal is to eliminate external variables, such as verb tenses, as much as possible, so that the only contrast remaining is between the Niphal and Hitpael.

Chapter 4 organizes the data according to participants and situation aspect. I begin with roots that assume two participants in their basic event schema. I further divide this section according to the semantic role of the participants, an Agent and Patient (section 4.2.1), and an Experiencer and Theme (section 4.2.2). The Agent transitives represent more typically transitive events, while the Experiencer transitives are considered less transitive. The next group I look at are one-participant situations, first basic statives (section 4.3), and then basic intransitive actions (section 4.4). All the sections point towards a reduction of agency in the subject in both the Niphal and Hitpael, and a situation aspect distinction between the two stems.
1.3. **HEBREW: BIBLE, BEN SIRA, AND INSCRIPTIONS**

“Biblical Hebrew” as a language represents some difficulties from the outset. BH is the language represented by the Hebrew of the HB. However, the language of the Hebrew Bible is not homogenous. The books of the HB were written over the course of approximately 1000 years, and older writings were continually copied and revised during this time. Thus we find diachronic variation. Additionally, we find a variety of genres in the HB, such as poetry and prose. Finally, the HB may demonstrate geographical variation, mainly between northern and southern dialects, though these are not always discernable.¹¹

In addition to the Hebrew found in the HB, we find contemporaneous Hebrew in other sources, namely, the Hebrew inscriptions and the book of Ben Sira (abbreviated, Sira). Hebrew inscriptions were written roughly around the historical mid-point of the composition of the HB, and their language thus resembles the language of the HB. Sira was written later, roughly around the time the last of the writings of the HB were composed, but the language of Sira is similar to the language of the latest strata of BH. Thus we find that BH is not homogenous within the HB, nor is the language fully contained within the HB.

A study that claims to study “Biblical Hebrew,” as the present dissertation does, must consider the above issues. I will focus here on the language of the HB. Nevertheless, I have also included the inscriptions and Sira in my corpus. The inscriptions include eight Niphals and one Hitpalpel.¹² Sira displays 362 examples of the Niphal and 142 Hitpaels (among which I am

---

¹¹ Helpful studies concerning dialect and diachrony in BH are included in Young (2003).

¹² Some Niphals are difficult to determine with certainty, since in the *yiqtol* form they look identical to other *binyanim*, such as the Qal or Pual.
including Hitpolel and Hitpalpel). I will address historical developments directly in Chapter 5, although I will bring in the idea of chronology throughout this work. Moreover, I have been conscious of genre and dialect during my study, and such distinctions will be brought up with the appropriate examples.

Once we understand this distinction between the Niphal and Hitpael, we will understand the language and text of the HB better. I will present examples that commentators have remarked on, and demonstrate how the distinction arose based situation aspect. More importantly, I will show verses that have not been remarked on, or that have generated controversy, and will present a new way of gleaning more precise meaning from the biblical text.

1.4. Basic Definitions

Before beginning this study, I will define some important terms. The term “root” refers to the (usually) tri-radical, lexical base in BH that carries the semantic meaning of the word. The terms “stem” and binyan include the derived verbal forms, e.g., Niphal, Hitpael. When discussing the inflected verb forms, e.g., qatal, yiqtol, wayyiqtol, I will refer to them as the “tense-aspect-mood” forms, or “TAM,” for short.

Another set of terms I will use will be semantic roles. These terms classify participants in a situation according to the role that they play. Every referent belongs to a semantic category. The principal categories in this discussion include Agent, Experiencer, Patient, Theme, and Mover.

1. An Agent initiates or does an action, and it often affects another entity.
2. An Experiencer feels or perceives events.
3. A Patient undergoes a change in state.
4. A Theme provides a stimulus to an Experiencer.
5. A Mover undergoes locomotion.\(^\text{13}\)

The roles “Location” and “Goal” will be used less often in this study.

I also make use of terms for the historical strata of BH. For this study, I have defined the strata of BH in the following way: Archaic Biblical Hebrew (ABH), up to approximately the seventh century; Classical Biblical Hebrew (CBH), from about the seventh to the sixth centuries; Exilic Biblical Hebrew (EBH) from about the sixth to fifth centuries; and Late (Post-Exilic) Biblical Hebrew (LBH), from the fifth to about the fourth centuries. ABH includes the texts Gen 49; Exod 15; Num 23-24; Deut 32-33; Jdg 5; 2 Sam 22/Ps 18; Ps 68; Hab 3 (Sáenz-Badillos 1996:56-57).\(^\text{14}\) CBH includes 1-2 Sam; 1-2 Kgs; Amos; Deut; Exod; Gen; Hab; Hos; Isa 1-39; Jdg; Josh; Lev; Mic; Nah; Num; Obad; Zeph. EBH includes Ezek; Isa 40-66; Jer; Lam. LBH includes 1-2 Chr; Dan; Qoh; Est; Ezr; Hag; Job; Joel; Jon; Mal; Neh; Ps 119; Ruth; Song; Zech.

Some books pose particular problems. Job is particularly difficult to date. Clines argues that the themes of the text reflect some ideas of Jeremiah and Second Isaiah. Thus it

\(^{13}\) No set of definitions for semantic roles is accepted as universal. I have defined these roles based on Manney (2000), Carnie (2002), and Kearns (2000). The latter two describe the roles as closely as possible to scholarly consensus. My Patient resembles Carnie’s and Kearns’s Theme, and my Theme resembles Kearns’s Stimulus (Manney 2000:62-63; Carnie 2002:168-69; Kearns 2000:189).

\(^{14}\) Robertson, though, does not find that Gen 49 or Deut 33 include the linguistic criteria of ABH, though he cannot exclude these texts from ABH (Robertson 1972:155).
was likely composed during that period or later (Clines 1989:lix). Pope claims that the “best guess for the date of the Dialogue” is the seventh century as he attempts to navigate pre-critical and modern interpretations of dating the text (Pope 1965:xxxvii). According to linguistic dating methods, Robertson finds that the language of the book of Job represents ABH (Robertson 1972:153). I consider Job to be LBH along with Clines and Crenshaw because of the later ideas the book discusses.

Psalms pose problems, as well, because of their heterogeneity. Some Psalms appear later (e.g., Psalm 119), while others are quite early (e.g., Psalms 18; 68). Most do not provide enough data for dating, so I have not placed the book in any particular stratum. The book of Proverbs poses a similar problem. Some parts, such as chapters 10-29, may have been in circulation since the 10th century, while other parts, such as 1-9 may have been composed much later (Clifford 1999:6; Murphy 1998:xx). The language itself is very difficult to date, so I have not included it in any stratum. Nevertheless, I examine examples from the books of Psalms and Proverbs in my study.

---

15 See also Crenshaw (1992:863-864).

16 Clifford writes, “It is in any case impossible to offer precise dates for the origin of sayings which relate to a pattern of life which lasted for more than a millennium” (2003:438). Along the same lines, Fox writes, “The notion of ‘dating’ a text, a traditional concern in Bible studies, is not quite germane to the book of Proverbs” (Fox 2000:6). Neither proposes a date for the language of Proverbs.
CHAPTER 2. NIPHAL AND HITPAEL IN HEBREW

SCHOLARSHIP

2.1. PROBLEMS: NIPHAL AND HITPAEL

The Niphal and Hitpael demonstrate remarkable similarities in the areas of the passive voice, the middle voice, and the reflexive, while at the same time, they operate in areas exclusive one from another. As we will see below, the Niphal expresses nuances that the Hitpael does not, and vice-versa. The Niphal and Hitpael thus carry meanings unique to each one, in spite of some overlap. These unique and overlapping meanings cause problems for defining the two stems.

We find another problem with the Niphal and Hitpael that raises similar kinds of questions. Each stem conveys a range of meaning that scholars cannot easily classify in a single category. As we will see below, the formal unity of each of the stems prompts many Hebraists to search for a unified category for each one.

Scholars tend to take one of three approaches, or a combination of approaches, towards unifying a stem’s various meanings. One is a diachronic method. This approach asserts that a stem began with a meaning or meanings, and then through historical development took on additional meanings. Another approach looks at the overall stem paradigm to find each stem’s place relative to other stems. This paradigm may be represented by a table with active-reflexive-passive on one axis, and simple-intensive-causative on the other axis. They then fill each space on the table with a stem. The third approach looks at the various meanings instantiated by the stem synchronically and looks for the best category or paradigm that will explain most if not all of these meanings.
Once a scholar posits a definition of a given stem, he or she must demonstrate how it interacts with other stems according to theoretical model and the empirical data. Few scholars have extensively compared the Niphal and Hitpael side-by-side, and those who have, have only done so to a limited extent. Nevertheless, I will present the implications for the Niphal/Hitpael overlap based on those theories. All the following theories I discuss define the Niphal and Hitpael, as well as their relationships to each other and/or other stems.

In the study of BH, reflexive is referred to often in discussions of the passive and the middle. A cover-term for these functions would be helpful. Furthermore, I will show how closely they are related in BH.

2.2. DEFINITION OF NIPHAL

2.2.1. Problem of the Niphal

The broad range of meanings in the Niphal was noticed early on. According to Lambert, “Le nifal est la forme verbale qui présente les significations les plus diverses” (Lambert 1900:196). Nevertheless, many scholars agree that the Niphal, like other stems, is not only unified formally, but also functionally. Scholars constantly navigate the tension between multiplicity and singularity of meaning.

I offer Creason’s questions, which accurately reflect the state of the study of the Niphal.\(^1\) He writes,

All work since [Jenni’s] time has attempted to answer the three questions which are implicit in Jenni’s article: 1) Does the Niphal have a single meaning and if so, what is it? 2) Are there examples of the Niphal which are directly related to the

\(^1\) Creason mentions the *Niphal* in this quotation. I will also look at these questions with respect to the *Hitpael* in section 2.3.1.
Piel or Hiphil, or can all Niphals be directly related to the Qal? 3) What is the relationship of the Niphal to the other passive and/or reflexive stems (Creason 1995:362).

Question (1) regards how well one can define the Niphal with a single category. The question originates in the universal observation that the Niphal can be translated many ways. Some scholars have approached the stem by looking for a single, linguistic category that will include a majority of the various uses of the Niphal. Others simply list the various meanings, often observing how often given meanings occur.

Question (2) examines how the Niphal relates to the active stems. A problem arises when a Niphal that involves two participants is derived from a root that involves only one participant in the Qal. Paradigms of the stems usually assume that a root can potentially occur in any stem. Holes in the verbal paradigm, though, confound a consistent explanation of the derivational paradigm. Usually, we imagine the Niphal as having two participants, one that is expressed as the subject, and another that is optionally expressed. Moreover, the action underlying the Niphal example may involve two participants in the Piel or Hiphil. One must confront the issue of whether the Niphal was derived from the Qal or Piel/Hiphil. A similar situation may arise if, for example, an occurrence of the Qal of that root is not extant, but a Piel or Hiphil of the same root exists. Hebraists try to describe how the Qal, Piel, and Hiphil relate to the Niphal in such irregular cases.

Along similar lines to question (2), question (3) addresses how the Niphal relates to other passive/reflexive stems. The complex system of passive stems in BH poses a problem to Hebraists. Multiple, overlapping passives raise the question of why BH needs more than one passive. Moreover, one must ask whether more than one passive form of the same root may bear identical senses.
In the following study of the Niphal I will examine the various uses of the Niphal recognized by scholars. Then I will look at how these same scholars seek to unify these meanings into a single category. Finally, I will present how scholars have proposed to determine the status of the underlying Agent of the Niphal as Hebraists address Creason’s question (1). In effect, this section will survey scholars’ answers to Creason’s questions (1) and (2), while the end of the chapter will look more closely at question (3).

2.2.2. Species of Niphal

2.2.2.1. Passive

Scholars recognize that the Niphal occurs as a passive in some circumstances, but they differ subtly in how they define the passive. In general, Hebraists highlight the role of the Niphal subject to define the passive.

Joüon-Muraoka see the Niphal as essentially reflexive, but they accept non-reflexive uses of the Niphal. They seem to understand the passive as an equivalent to the active, but where the underlying Patient occurs in the subject position. They list נולג “be born” and נקבר “be buried” as examples of the passive Niphal (Joüon-Muraoka:§51c). They see the passive function as distinct from the reflexive and middle and list those functions separately.

In contrast, Siebesma defines “passive” more broadly so that reflexive is not immediately excluded (Siebesma 1991:167-68). He distinguishes “passive form” from “passive translation.” The passive form is “a verb form of which the grammatical subject undergoes a certain action, (or of which the grammatical subject is the object of that action), expressed by the verb form.

__________________________

2 I am using the term “species” according to its usage in IBHS (e.g., §23.1g).
The passive *translation* arises if the passive *form* must be translated as passive in the target language. The following pair of examples demonstrates this distinction.

1. wayŏhî baḥašī hallaylāh wayyeḥeṣad hāʔiš wayyillāpēṭ
   and.was in.the.middle.of the.night and.was.afraid the.man and.turned:Ni:WAYY
   In the middle of the night, the man was afraid and turned over (Ruth 3:8)

2. yillāptû ʼorḥôt darkâm
   turns:Ni:YQTL paths.of way.their

Both of these cases demonstrate a passive verb *form*, though they are not passive *translations* in English. The agent is “the person performing the action, or from whom the action proceeds, need not be mentioned” (Siebesma 1991:34). Siebesma’s definition, like Joüon-Muraoka’s, asserts that the subject of the passive undergoes an action and remarks that the status of the Agent is not clear. As a result, if the Agent is the same entity as the Patient the passive verb form expresses a reflexive notion.

Grüneberg follows Siebesma’s description of the Niphal passive, but further contrasts it with the Niphal middle. He writes, “The niphal as passive, then, is marked by subject deletion or demotion.” Such a description reflects Siebesma’s. Grüneberg further distinguishes the passive from the middle, for example, the “self-move middle.”³ Grüneberg writes, “However [passive Niphal] differs from e.g. the self-move middle in that under passivization the Patient of the corresponding active remains a Patient (something is done to it), whereas in the middle the Patient becomes an Actor (it does something)” (Grüneberg 2003:58). Here is an example of the passive Grüneberg cites (2003:58).

³ Grüneberg synthesizes Boyd’s definition of “self-move middles” when he writes, “[T]hey are verbs of motion (which thus regularly stand parallel to other verbs of motion, and admit directional prepositional phrases; that they describe an action done with one’s body, not to it; and that the subject is Actor, not Agent and Patient” (Grüneberg 2003:48).
3. ‘élleh tôldōt haśšāmáyim wōhā’āres bahibbār’ām
these generations.of the heavens and.the earth in.create:NI:INFC
These are the generations of the heavens and the earth when they were created (Gen 2:4).

Here is an example of the middle that Grünberg cites (2003:58).

4. bayyôm hazzè nībqōû kāl-ma’yōnōt tōhōm rabbh wā’ārubbōt
in.the day the.this split:NI:QTL all-springs.of deep great and.windows.of nīptāhû
the heavens open:NI:QTL

On that day all the springs of the great deep split, and the windows of the heavens opened (Gen 7:11).

The middle and passive both demote the subject. The Patient (the passive subject’s semantic role) has something done to it, while an Actor (the middle subject) does something. Thus the semantic role of the passive subject is essential to distinguish the passive meanings of the Niphal from the middle.

These definitions reveal the difficulty in how to relate the passive to the reflexive and middle. The last two, Siebesma and Grünberg, see the importance of the semantic role of the Niphal subject. Siebesma describes this role without naming it, while Grünberg calls it the Patient. Joüon-Muraoka’s definition allows the three voices to coexist in the Niphal, but does not explain further. Siebesma, though, subsumes all three meanings of the Niphal under the rubric “passive form,” since all three demote the underlying subject and possess an overt subject that undergoes an action. Grünberg, while he agrees with Siebesma’s definition of passive, adds a semantic distinction, saying that the passive subject does not do anything (unlike the

4 This Patient/Actor contrast does not clarify some situations. For example, in the English sentence, “The horse was led into the barn,” the structure is passive—it cannot be middle (*The horse led into the barn)—but the subject is an Actor according to Grünberg’s definition (the horse does something). Perhaps this contrast does not exist in BH, but positing these semantic categories as universal confuses the issue when the categories do not apply consistently in BH.
Actor role of a self-move middle who does something) but exclusively undergoes the action, that is, it is a Patient.

2.2.2.2. Resultative-adjectival

Several scholars recognize a resultative or adjectival use of the Niphal. The adjectival use means that the Niphal is describing a state, and a resultative meaning conveys the final result of an action. The resultative and adjectival uses overlap considerably, as often an action results in a state.

Scholars differ in how the resultative-adjectival use relates to the passive use. The adjective relates to the state that the Patient has ended up in as a result of the action represented by the verb. Akkadian evidences a form that looks similar to the Niphal and that expresses the resulting state of a verb on the Patient of the verb, and this analogue can help us understand the Niphal in BH.

Bicknell does not define BH passives via subject role, but sees the BH passives as essentially resultative. She writes, “I propose that passive clauses in Hebrew signify the result of an action or a resultative state without reference to agency” (Bicknell 1984:5). She understands that the active and passive show different aspects of an event. More specifically, the passive demonstrates “the result of an action or process,” whereas the active does not

-----------------------------

5 The Niphal, Qal passive, Pual, or Hophal verb all instantiate her understanding of “passive” (Bicknell 1984:4).

6 She does not believe that the non-agency of the subject is the essential function of the passive (Bicknell 1984:5).
necessarily point to that result (Bicknell 1984:129). The adjective reflects the result of the action without reference to the Agent, so the adjective describes the Patient by default.

Bicknell is able to explain more idiosyncratic meanings of that Niphal by combining her “resultative” definition of the passive. She writes, “...[T]he resultative aspect [of the Niphal] is more obvious etymologically: *ptl* ‘wrestle’ (from ‘be twisted’), *lhm* ‘fight’ (from ‘become joined, engaged’), *šb*‘swear’ (from ‘be bound by seven, be sevened’)” (Bicknell 1984:128). These meanings of the Niphal developed according to the resultative sense of the passive that she proposed.

For Creason, the resultative use of the Niphal falls under the stative use. When Creason says that the Niphal can be stative (among other meanings), he further develops the notion of “stative”: “This use is also called the adjectival or the resultative use” (Creason 1995:360). Creason perceives the link between what some have called adjectival and resultative, and what he calls “stative.” He discusses the “adjectival” use of the Niphal later, where he says it refers to “a resulting state” (Creason 1995:382). Such a connection resembles Bicknell’s “resultative state” closely, but Creason sees stative/resultative alongside passive, reflexive, etc., meanings. The Niphal does not indicate resulting state by nature, according to Creason’s definition.

The Niphal originated historically as a stative adjective on analogy with Akkadian, according to Testen (1998). He understands that the Akkadian N-stem is “not far removed” from

\[\text{\textsuperscript{7}}\text{In this way, she resonates with Jenni when he claims that the Niphal often means “has become.” See section 2.2.3.2.1. They both see that the Niphal focuses on the end result of the action.}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{8}}\text{Creason may be referring to IBHS or Bicknell in this statement. IBHS describes the “adjectival” use of the Niphal (IBHS: §23.3a).}\]
the original Semitic N-stem (Testen 1998:128). Since Proto-Semitic likely possessed this stative adjective N-stem, the BH Niphal could originate in the same way as the Akkadian N-stem. The Akkadian N-stem “describes the entry of the entity to which the adjective refers (viz. the patient of the corresponding G-stem finite clause) into this state” (Testen 1998:137). He calls this the verbal adjective. Significantly, the adjective applies to the Patient of the corresponding G-stem verb. While this relationship of the verb to the Patient did not force the N-stem to take on passive meaning, it nudged the form in this direction, as the form indicated that the Patient is entering a state (i.e., ingressive aspect) derived from the corresponding adjective (Testen 1998:138). Once the verbal adjective category disappeared, the N-stem was derived from the G (Testen 1998:140). Thus the sense of a Patient reflecting the state of the verb in the Niphal derives from an originally adjectival function.

Scholars recognize that the Niphal demonstrates a resultative function. Bicknell includes the resultative as integral to her definition of the passive, while Creason places this function alongside the passive. Testen believes that the resultative function arises from the Proto-Semitic origin of the Niphal. Creason studied the Aktionsart of the overall BH stem system, which develops the resultative aspect of the passive that Bicknell suggests. Testen demonstrates that the origin of the Niphal was stative, that is, it described the state of the underlying Patient of the verb with the same stem.

---

9 The “N-stem” is the Semitic verb stem that includes a prefixed /n/. The BH Niphal is its descendant. The “G-stem” is the Semitic basic stem (from German “Grundstamm”), which is the unmarked, active stem. The BH Qal descends from it.
Technically, “resultative” belongs in the category of “aspect.” This new direction for defining the Niphal/passive may also help unify multiple “senses” of the Niphal.\(^\text{10}\) Examination into defining the Niphal by situation aspect would seem crucial.\(^\text{11}\)

### 2.2.2.3. Reflexive

Two definitions of reflexive are used by Hebraists. The broader definition allows the subject to corefer with another argument of the sentence, which may be the direct object or the object of a preposition. The more narrow definition only allows coreference between the subject and the direct object. Moreover, in the narrow definitions the semantic role of the subject is paramount.

GKC present a broad definition. They begin their discussion with a broad range of meanings of the Niphal, most of which bear some direct or indirect connection with the reflexive (GKC:§51c). Among these are included נלחה “thrust oneself against,” נistar “hide oneself,” נים “take heed to oneself,” and_na`aneh “answer for oneself.” The former two would have an Agent-Patient as the subject, while the second two would have an Agent-Benefactor in the subject. In addition, certain verbs referring to “emotions which react upon the mind” appear in the Niphal, where the subject is an Experiencer, such as נהמ נידרש “allow oneself to be inquired of,” which occurs in

\(^{10}\) I do not intend to suggest that this is a new parameter, but that defining the Niphal according to this characteristic is new.

\(^{11}\) To understand “state” as an aspect, see my explanation, section 3.2.
Isa 65:1 and Ezek 14:3 as an example of this usage. In these definitions GKC assume an identity between the Agent and another argument. Furthermore, they link the categories of the Greek middle and reciprocal into the reflexive function of the Niphal.

Boyd (1993) and Grüneberg (2001), who depends partially on Boyd, present a narrow definition of reflexive. Boyd has three criteria for defining the reflexive.

1. The subject of the niphal must have referential identity with either the subject or the direct object of the base construction.

2. The nature of the action in the niphal must be the same as that in the base stem. . . . If an action is such that the subject of the verb cannot be an agent, then agent patient coreference is precluded [criterion (3)]. Similarly, if the type of action excludes the semantic role of patient, agent patient coreference is not a possibility.

3. The subject of the niphal must have agent-patient coreference (Boyd 1993:129-31).

The situation must coincide with all three criteria for a Niphal to be considered reflexive rather than passive or middle. The first and the third criteria both define the reflexive vis-à-vis coreference. The first criterion refers to syntactic coreference, while criterion 3 refers to semantic coreference. Criterion 2 limits what types of base actions allow a reflexive to be derived. The reflexive thus does not overlap with the middle in Boyd’s model because the passive subject

---

12 The tolerative use, according to Grüneberg, represents a modality of the standard passive. He writes, “Recent studies suggest [the tolerative] is a nuance of the passive; this seems entirely correct. For the passive is strictly neutral concerning the attitude of the Patient to the action described . . .” (Grüneberg 2003:61). The tolerative does not differ with respect to participants, syntax, or semantic class. Rather, it takes the form of a standard passive, but offers more information about the Patient’s role in the event. So rather than the Patient being a participant in the event, like a standard passive, the tolerative further bears the notion that the Patient is a willing Patient. A standard passive of שָׁחַר dru would mean, “he was sought,” while a tolerative would be translated, “he allowed himself to be sought.” At first glance, this resembles a reflexive usage of the verb “allow”; however, Grüneberg is claiming that the modal “allow” could be included in the meaning of the Niphal. In the end, the Niphal allows this interpretation because it is “neutral” with respect to the attitude of the Patient, and it would be a passive in either case.

13 Joüon-Muraoka similarly include these various meanings into the general category “reflexive.” In spite of the variation of meaning, they state, “The principal meaning, reflexive, is often preserved” (Joüon-Muraoka:§51c). Thus they see reflexive at the base of all these senses of the Niphal.
bears the dual role of Agent and Patient, while a middle subject is an Actor. (See section 2.2.2.4.)

The semantic-role diathesis model posited by Boyd provides the foundation of Grüneberg’s distinction between middle and reflexive, that is, in reflexive constructions the subject retains both roles of Agent and Patient (Grüneberg 2003:35-40). The middle subject takes on a new semantic role, an Actor. (See section 2.2.2.4.) Grüneberg classifies several verbs as middles that are often considered reflexive, such as the “self-move” and “grooming” middles, which only leaves six stems with occurrences that could be considered reflexive (Grüneberg 2003:62-65). With this narrower definition of reflexive in place, Grüneberg looks at the few remaining examples of reflexive Niphals.

Although reflexive Niphals are rare, Grüneberg believes, “. . . it is unlikely that the reader would have been in doubt that this was the correct understanding” (Grüneberg 2003:65). Thus the reflexive, as an exceptional use of the Niphal, could easily be discerned by the ancient readers and native speakers of BH in those cases where the Niphal represented a reflexive. Grüneberg does not explain this assumption, however. Like the passive/middle distinction, the

---

14 In writing about the Hitpael, Creason strongly opposes the view that semantic roles distinguish active and passive verbs (Creason 1995:348-49).

15 For example, טבש g‘l “redeem” can mean “redeem oneself” (Lev 25:49) and הבש mkrt “sell oneself” (Lev 25:39).

16 Grüneberg’s use of the word “reader” seems to imply the text’s original reader here. Elsewhere he makes the point that “reader” may transcend the original context, and that others may understand the text who were not in that original context (Grüneberg 2003:4-6).

17 Nevertheless, he also tends to subsume the reflexive distinction under the more primary passive role of the Niphal. He writes concerning this distinction in the root הבש mkrt “sell,” “However what seems clearly the case is that any reflexive force is again a nuance of the passive: the texts are concerned with the fact that the person ends up sold, not with who might be doing the selling” (Grüneberg 2003:63). Thus the reflexive is a “nuance” of the passive.
reflexive/middle distinction is based on the semantic role of the Niphal subject, which would have been perceived easily by the original reader.

The semantic roles of the referents of the situation underlie the distinction between the broad and narrow views of the reflexive. GKC represents the broad view, and Boyd, the narrow. For the broad view, the subject may corefer to another entity without any notice of the semantic role that the referent plays, such as Benefactor (e.g., “answer for oneself,” “take heed to oneself”) or Experiencer (“sigh”) or Patient (“thrust oneself against,” “hide oneself”). In the narrow view, the reflexive is defined principally by the semantic roles the referents play, e.g., the two referents must corefer to an Agent and Patient in the Niphal subject. Moreover, the semantic roles of the referents distinguish between the reflexive and the middle according to this view. (See section 2.2.2.4.)

2.2.2.4. Middle

Hebraists describe some uses of the Niphal as “middle.” Different Hebraists look to different levels on which the middle functions in order to define it. Hebraists define the BH middle of the Niphal according to the use of the middle in other languages, the effect on the subject, the semantic role of the subject, and the type of action. Definitions vary broadly. Some of them result in a middle voice subsumed in or closely related to the reflexive, while others separate the middle and reflexive into mutually exclusive categories.

GKC define the middle according to the use of middle in classical languages. They note that some of the reflexives in BH parallel middle and deponent verbs in Greek and Latin, and they understand the middle as “the meaning of the active, with the addition of to oneself (sibi),
for oneself, e.g. יְָֽאֻּל [niš‘al] to ask (something) for oneself . . . ” (GKC:§51c).\(^{18}\) This example falls in with the examples in the last section, 2.2.2.3, and it demonstrates how the middle is subsumed in GKC’s broad category of reflexive for the Niphal.\(^{19}\) In GKC the reflexive and middle meanings coincide, with the middle as a subset of the reflexive.

The authors of IBHS describe the middle such that “the action or state expressed by the verb affects the subject” (IBHS:§23.1h). They appear to have extracted this definition of the middle voice from the middle in Greek, similarly to GKC and Joüon-Muraoka. They understand that the middle can include passive nuances, that is, when an external Agent is clearly discernable from the context, yet they distinguish the two. This distinction is difficult with their definition, which seems to include passive. However, the middle is more process-oriented and non-agent oriented in their estimation (IBHS:§23.2.2a).

Creason defines the middle as a blend of reflexive/reciprocal (which he calls “double-status”\(^{20}\)) and inchoative. He defines middle and inchoative as follows:

The term “middle” has not only been applied to verbs which refer to double-status situations, it has also been applied to verbs which refer to inchoative situations. An inchoative situation is one in which an object undergoes a change of state and this change occurs either as a result of a process internal to the object or as a result of an action taken by some other object (Creason 1995:390).

\(^{18}\) GKC explicitly tie the Niphal to the Hitpael at this point. See below (section 2.3.2.1).

\(^{19}\) Joüon-Muraoka cites this same word as an example of the middle, יְָֽאֻּל niš‘al “ask for oneself” (Joüon-Muraoka 1996:§51c).

\(^{20}\) Creason is likely borrowing the definition of double-status from IBHS. The latter includes in the double-status uses the reflexive, benefactive, reciprocal, and tolerative. The reflexive uses are self-explanatory, but the rest bear a vague relationship to the Greek middle. BH does not use the Niphal often for benefactive as Greek uses the middle for benefactive (IBHS:§23.4d). The Niphal can be used for reciprocal, but IBHS does not note this usage in Greek (IBHS:§23.4e). “Tolerative” and “causative-reflexive” are meanings of the Niphal, and IBHS mentions the latter use in Greek (IBHS:§23.4h).
Thus “middle” combines two types of situations: double-status and inchoative. In Creason’s system the two types of verbs that the middle has been applied to do not seem to be unified. Even though he says that the Niphal and Hitpael are “primarily middle” (Creason 1995:288), the Niphal is usually inchoative and the Hitpael, double-status. Since the middle consists of varied functions in itself, middle stems can tend towards one or the other type of middle.

While the above scholars do not draw a clear line between the middle and reflexive, the following scholars see them as mutually exclusive. Boyd defines the middle by the semantic roles of the participants in the situation. He builds his solution on a multi-tiered model of what he calls “diathesis change,” based on Geniušienė’s (1987) analysis of the reflexive and middle in Russian and Baltic languages. He subscribes to a multi-tiered model that considers three levels in the process of diathesis: 1) the referents, 2) their place in the syntax, and 3) the semantic role of the referents. Boyd claims that the middle Niphal involves a transformation of the semantics as well as the syntax, that is, the participants in the action change their semantic role (Boyd 1993:74). Middles are defined by the fact that their subject fulfills a single semantic role, that of Actor. He writes, “The subject of a middle is both the controller of the action and the entity most affected by the action. The semantic role of actor fits this description nicely” (Boyd 1993:113-14). For Boyd the definition of the middle comes down to the semantic role of the middle subject.

Grüneberg (2003) accepts Boyd’s semantic role approach, but he also emphasizes the role of the semantic class of the verb. He claims that the middle voice applies to a finite set of semantic categories. He bases this lexical approach on Suzanne Kemmer’s (1993) cross-linguistic study of the middle, where she noted that the middle occurs with overwhelming
frequency in a finite set of semantic classes.\textsuperscript{21} Grüneberg examines the Niphal middle, enumerating nine semantic categories drawn from Kemmer (1993).\textsuperscript{22} The first category is “benefactive,” which she defines as something done for one’s own benefit. This includes the roots סָמַר “watch” and שָׁמַע “ask” (Grüneberg 2003:46). Second, he mentions actions that are reciprocal, such as בָּדָע hrb “destroy” (2 Ki 3:23) and שָׁפַת šp̄t “go to court with” (Grüneberg 2003:47).\textsuperscript{23} He further generalizes and notes that the reciprocal meaning only occurs in the semantic categories of struggling, meeting, and talking together (Grüneberg 2003:48). The third category he cites is “grooming” (גֵרָה qr̄h “shave one’s head” [Jer 16:16]), which also includes dressing verbs (גָּרָה zr [“girded (with)”, גָּלוּ הָלִי glh [“undress”]) (Grüneberg 2003:48). While he claims that these are middle, he allows that they could be considered reflexive, since the evidence is scant. Fourth, Grüneberg offers “self-move” verbs, which includes verbs of separation מָלַע ḥl “go up” and פָּתַח pt̄h “open”, and hiding מִמְנָנִים t̄mn, etc. (Grüneberg 2003:48-50).\textsuperscript{24} He offers “body posture” as a fifth category, which includes many

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{21} Bean advocated this approach earlier: “The concept of the semantic field may be used to further the study of the Hithpa‘el. By separating the verbal roots in which the stem occurs from the literary settings, the roots themselves or, more precisely, the actions and states represented by the roots, may be made the object of study” (Bean 1975:122).
  \item \textsuperscript{22} Kemmer (1993) will be discussed at length below (section 3.4.2.1).
  \item \textsuperscript{23} Grüneberg notes that שָׁפַת šp̄t also appears with a passive sense.
  \item \textsuperscript{24} Regarding self-move middles, Grüneberg depends on Boyd’s analysis of the hiding verbs, and the latter is weak (Boyd 1993:176-83). Boyd offers many examples of hiding verbs, but only offers conclusions without analysis. He assumes the examples are clear when they are not. For example, מַהֲבֹּת nahb̄êtem in Josh 2:16 could either be translated as a reflexive or as a self-move middle, depending on how one decides to assign the semantic roles. A Hiphil parallel would be Josh 6:17. Thus either a middle or a reflexive reading is possible; neither is excluded. The former example seems to be an exact counterpart of the participants and semantic roles as the latter example, except that in the former, the addressees are to hide themselves. This contradicts Grüneberg’s statement: “For in hiding . . . one does not normally do to oneself what one might do to another to hide them, but moves to a place where one cannot be seen” (Grüneberg 2003:50).
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
verbs such as הָנַךְ *kpp “bow” and לַעֲמֹר *smk “be supported” (Grüneberg 2003:50-51). Verbs of gathering and assembling represent a sixth group, which is related to the self-move verbs, while their requirement of more than one participant makes them related to the reciprocal verbs, too (Grüneberg 2003:51). Spontaneous events are the seventh category. This category differs from the above in that it arises from the way an event is viewed and not from the semantics of the root.\(^{25}\) Thus נָחַר *pth (“open”) “implies that the event could have been spontaneous,” not that opening is inherently a middle-type action (Grüneberg 2003:52). The eighth category, emotion, is seen with the verbs יָגְנֶה *nḫm (“take revenge; be comforted”) and יָנָה *qna (“groan”). The ninth and final category, committing oneself/performative speech action, is manifested in the verb נֹשֵׂב *šb (“swear”) (Grüneberg 2003:55). A Niphal must belong to one of these lexical categories to be considered middle.

The variation among scholars’ definitions of the middle demonstrates how complex the middle voice is. GKC fit voice under their category of reflexive. IBHS compares the BH middle to Greek and Latin; it defines the voice like a passive that is more process-oriented. For Creason, the middle has two essential functions, inchoative and double-status. Boyd and Grüneberg define the middle according to the semantic class of the subject, and Grüneberg additionally requires that the verb belong to one of a specific set of semantic classes. The grammatical, semantic, and lexical levels of the sentence all play a part in the middle, and all should be considered in defining the middle.

\(^{25}\) I will discuss below the effect an author creates when he chooses the middle voice (section 3.6). See Bakker (1994).
The above scholars additionally show that comparison to other languages is necessary for understanding the middle. Earlier scholars until IBHS were mostly limited to comparing the middle of BH to the middle in Classical languages. Hebraists who draw from Kemmer and Geniušienė, however, benefited from a broader pool of languages.

2.2.2.5. Reciprocal

The reciprocal is an uncommon use of the Niphal. Some Hebraists posit that the Niphal appears with this meaning, albeit only in a few instances, while others are silent on the issue of reciprocals. GKC demonstrate that “reciprocal” can be expressed by the Niphal, e.g., נזרה ויתנש* niḏbar “speak to one another,” נישפ* nišpat “go to law with one another,” and נזרא nô`āś “counsel, take counsel” (GKC:§51d). To these examples, Joüon-Muraoka adds נזרא nô`äd “meet each other” (Joüon-Muraoka:§51c).

Grüneberg (2003) sees the reciprocal as a subgroup of the middle (the second category he lists), for example, חרב hrb (“destroy,” 2 Ki 3:23) and שפט špt (“go to court with”) (Grüneberg 2003:47). Furthermore, the reciprocal meaning only occurs in the semantic categories of struggling, meeting, and talking together (Grüneberg 2003:48). The reciprocal, in all Hebraists’ accounts, is a minor, limited function; some Hebraists do not analyze it when they define the Niphal (e.g., Jenni [1973], Creason [1995:360-88]).

Thus some Hebraists have noted the reciprocal as a meaning of the Niphal. Those who analyze the Niphal as potentially reciprocal group those instances in with another meaning. According to Grüneberg’s work, the reciprocal tends to fall in with middle in other languages.
2.2.2.6. Denominative

Scholars appear to use the category “denominative” in the same way, although they do not define the term explicitly. A denominative verb is derived from a root normally associated with a noun. This use of the Niphal is rare, which makes it of marginal interest to Hebraists. Often scholars have trouble fitting this use into a category with other uses.

GKC list a few examples of denominative Niphals. For example, נזרו nizkar “be born a male” (Exod 34:19) from zækär “man,”26 נלבב nilbaḥ “obtain a heart (sense)” (Job 11:12) from לֹּבָּב lēḇāḇ “heart,” and נני בה nīneḥ “bear a son” (Gen 16:2; 30:3) from בן bēn “son.”27 Within GKC’s definition of the Niphal as “reflexive” (GKC:§51g), however, the denominative Niphals do not fit, as they do not imply any reflexivity.

IBHS notes denominative uses of the Niphal. The denominative uses of the Niphal are “. . . probably related to its ingressive-stative and causative-reflexive functions” (IBHS:§23.5b). I interpret this to mean that the subject of a denominative Niphal caused himself or herself to arrive in a state represented by the noun of the same root. The denominative examples of the Niphal accord with the definition of the Niphal in IBHS.

Although IBHS often informs his discussion, Creason explicitly leaves denominatives out of his study. He writes, “We exclude, of course, denominative Niphals from consideration” (Creason 1995:368 n. 146). Further study in these areas is required in order to determine how his model can be upheld in the face of these—albeit rare—exceptions.

26 GKC (as well as HALOT p. 270) read הָזָּקָר hazzākār rather than the Niphal, and this is the only occurrence of this verb.

27 The verbs in these examples could equally come from נב bnh “build (up).” In that case, the Niphals would express a standard passive sense instead of a denominative.
While it is clear that these examples of the denominative, and consequently this sense of the Niphal, are rare, a theory of the Niphal would ideally incorporate these senses. Denominatives occur in the Piel, Hiphil, Niphal, and Hitpael stems, so one may rightly ask what difference the stem makes.\textsuperscript{28} \textit{IBHS} has incorporated the denominatives into its definition of the Niphal well. I will address the denominative Niphal and Hitpael in section 04.3.4.

\textbf{2.2.2.7. Summary of Niphal species}

This section has enumerated what scholars have identified as the potential uses of the Niphal, which include passive, resultative-adjectival, reflexive, middle, reciprocal, and denominative. A single scholar’s system may or may not include all of these uses, as he or she may choose to classify a particular occurrence differently than another scholar. For example, Boyd and Grüneberg reclassified many reflexive uses as middles according to their definition of middle. Moreover, scholars hierarchize these uses differently. For example, GKC used reflexive as the overarching category that included the other uses. In contrast, Bicknell saw “resultative” as essential to the passive and as the category from which the other meanings developed.

At this point, I am not attempting to systematize the different meanings of the Niphal, but to present the breadth of definitions Hebraists present. Scholars universally recognize that the Niphal presents formal unity despite such disparate functions. This formal unity motivates their search for a functional unity by hierarchizing or otherwise coordinating the meanings of the Niphal into a coherent whole.

\textsuperscript{28} Creason observes, “However, the Niphal is like the Hithpael in that there are denominative verbs in each stem” (Creason 1995:292 n. 20). This overlapping region could offer some further insight into the distinction between these two stems.
The functional categories that are being used here largely originate in Indo-European languages. As a result, one must be cautious in applying them directly to BH. Additionally, we see here that the functions of the Niphal overlap with other stems in the case of the denominative, and later we will see significant overlap with the Hitpael (section 2.4). It is important, therefore, to explore further what categories arise from the specific uses of the Niphal that may be unique to that stem.

2.2.3. Towards unity of the Niphal

Scholars seek unity in the Niphal in different ways. One can describe the two major types of models broadly as diachronic and synchronic. In diachronic models, the Niphal began with a particular meaning that developed into the various other meanings. Synchronic models present a more general, abstract category to unify all, or at least most, of the meanings of the stem.

Within the two main approaches, we see further variation. The preceding section, 2.2.2, showed how much scholars differ in how they define the meanings of the Niphal. Below, I will show that diachronic approaches assume different trajectories of development, namely, reflexive to passive, or a single medio-passive use to various uses, or a semantic system to one no longer based on semantics. Within the synchronic approach, the direction in abstracting a single category, or a limited number of categories, for the Niphal can differ. Disparity among the models for identifying the Niphal challenges us to define the best functional category for understanding the stem.

29 Grüneberg is the main exception since his model is based on Kemmer (1993).
2.2.3.1. **Diachronic**

2.2.3.1.1. **Reflexive to passive**

From the point of view of GKC, the basic reflexive sense of the Niphal in early Hebrew broadened to include a passive sense later in the history of BH. In their diachronic explanation, the Niphal extended beyond the reflexive and became the passive of the Qal transitive (and the passive of Piel and Hiphil where the Qal is intransitive or absent) as a “consequence of a looseness of thought at an early period of the language,” (GKC:§51f).

GKC claim that the Niphal bore a reflexive meaning that originally excluded a passive meaning (they determined this earlier meaning with only the evidence of the later period, which raises some problems). This claim is problematic. First, without direct evidence of a Niphal in Proto-Hebrew, we must turn to parallel languages with a corpus that attests to the reflexive meaning GKC claim for BH. GKC, however, do not offer such evidence; they draw almost entirely from Greek and Latin examples. Second, GKC do not explicitly justify why the Niphal would have begun as a reflexive to become a passive, and not vice-versa. Perhaps such a decision was made based on the number of occurrences for passive and reflexive Niphals, the number of roots in the Niphal with passive or reflexive meanings, or the breadth of possible passive and reflexive senses. Another possible reason is complementary distribution with the Qal passive. They admit that the passive Niphal “became tolerably common,” but insist that the passive is secondary to the reflexive use of the Niphal (GKC:§51h). Third, their model of

---

30 Lambert echoes this assertion, although ambiguity exists as to whether “primary” and “secondary” meanings relate to historical development or to some other hierarchy (Lambert 1972:§663, §665).

31 Cf. IBHS (section 2.2.3.1.2).
linguistic development depends on “looseness of thought” to explain how the reflexive
broadened to include passive meanings. They do not explain this tendency they call “looseness.”

2.2.3.1.2. *Medio-passive to various*

Like GKC, *IBHS* presents the theory that the various meanings of the Niphal evolved
from a primary meaning, but in the case of *IBHS*, the original meaning was “medio-passive.”
The authors of *IBHS* describe the methodology thus: “[W]e shall abstract as best we can a
primary meaning from the stem’s many uses and theorize the course of secondary developments”
(*IBHS*:§23.1f). In their section on the Niphal, the authors of *IBHS* claim that the medio-passive
is that “primary meaning.” They seek a model from which they can deduce the many meanings
of the Niphal as developments from a single category. They employ a diachronic model to this
end in order to explain the inclusion of the disparate uses of the Niphal.

Behind *IBHS*’s model lie two assumptions. First, a diachronic model best explains the
development of the various usages of the Niphal. This is true, but assumes the model is based on
the broadest historical data available. As with GKC, such models rely on evidence from earlier-
attested Semitic languages, but *IBHS* does not offer data to suggest that the Niphal actually
developed in this manner. Second, the essential meaning of the Niphal is the most abstract
category that can fit all the other meanings. The authors write, “By abstracting the common
notion behind these uses we may, however, come close to the grammatical form’s significance
apart from the lexical values” (*IBHS*:§23.1g). Thus they catalog all the meanings of the Niphal,
which arise from the various possibilities “in translation” (*IBHS*:§23.1d), and which point to the
abstract category that gives rise to them all.
The motivation behind their choice of the middle as the most basic category, however, reveals strengths and weaknesses. They write, “The middle is not necessarily the most common kind of Niphal; it is rather the most general, affording the common denominator of meaning, more abstract than the other varieties” (IBHS:§23.2a).\(^{32}\) This trajectory makes the most sense; proceeding from the middle can best explain the development of other meanings. A more detailed description of the middle is necessary, however. As we saw above in sections 2.2.2.1 and 2.2.2.4, scholars generally agree on the definition of the passive, but differ significantly on the meaning of the middle. The middle appears to be broader or more abstract than the passive, but perhaps this appearance arises from the fact that we have not found a concrete definition of the middle.\(^{33}\) Thus IBHS makes use of the most ill-defined category in order to define the Niphal. Further study of the middle voice will help solidify this approach to the unity of the Niphal.

2.2.3.1.3. Niphal not unified

Siebesma (1991) challenges the passive/reflexive distinction in BH as he studies the interaction of the Niphal with other passive stems. According to him, the various passive stems were gradually losing their individual semantic nuances by the time the HB was composed. He ultimately concludes that the differences among the passive stems—especially when they relate to the Qal—do not relate principally to how arguments relate to one another. Instead, he examines the stems vis-à-vis all the inflected forms. Many of his conclusions are based on those

\(^{32}\) IBHS claims that the passive is a more common sense for the Niphal than the middle (IBHS:§23.2.2a). This notion agrees with Siebesma (section 2.2.3.1.3).

\(^{33}\) Kemmer notes that the middle often has a passive meaning cross-linguistically (Kemmer 1993:149).
roots that appear in the Pual and/or Hophal and are semantically related to the Qal of the same root, that is, where the Pual and Hophal do not bear a significantly different meaning of the root from the Qal

Siebesma believes that the Niphal “expresses a uniform category of meaning.” He gathers statistics to critique the idea that the Niphal is either passive or reflexive at its base. He writes, “The number of ni. [Niphal]-stems that is to be translated reflexively is much smaller than the number of ni.-stems that requires a passive translation; according to my calculation it concerns more than 70 roots” (Siebesma 1991:34). This number reflects that the Niphal is most often translated as passive, but reflexive translations indicate that the stem is not necessarily basically passive. As Jenni concluded based on his paradigm of the verbal stems that the Niphal did not make a passive/reflexive distinction (section 2.2.3.2.1), Siebesma’s statistics confirm that the varied meanings of the stem do not allow one to categorize it as one voice exclusive to the other. For Siebesma, the tendency of the Niphal towards passive translation does not suffice for defining the category.

The passive is not exclusive to the Niphal in Siebesma’s model. He writes in his conclusions, “The presupposition, then, which maintains that the verbal stems in Biblical Hebrew form a closed system within which each verbal stem has its own well determined distinct semantic function and meaning, is incorrect” (Siebesma 1991:172). Moreover, he

---

34 Siebesma’s idea of strictly one function per stem parallels Jenni’s idea (section 2.2.3.2.1).

35 While not to the same degree of statistical accuracy, Bicknell made a similar point before Siebesma, as she claims that 33 of 153 Niphals examined are reflexive, namely, the Agent is the same as the Patient (Bicknell 1984:99).

36 He allows that the stems may have had distinct functions at an earlier stage of the language (Siebesma 1991:172)
explicitly departs from Jenni by relating the Niphal to stems other than the Qal (Siebesma 1991:37). The Niphal cannot represent a discrete semantic category, since the Pual and Hophal overlap with its passive function. As a result, the Niphal and the Pual can correlate to the passive of the same root.

Statistically, the various stems relate to each other according to inflected forms and not semantics in Siebesma’s model (Siebesma 1991:170-72). His work proceeds by demonstrating how the Niphal—as well as other stems—appears in various inflected forms and how often. Once he establishes the relative use of the stem in the participle, perfect, imperfect, etc., he compares the statistics for the passive stems. When roots appear in more than one passive stem, one stem tends to prefer one inflected form and another stem, another form. For example, in roots where Niphal and Pual usages semantically relate to the Qal, the Niphal prefers the imperfect and the Pual, the perfect (Siebesma 1991:171).

In Siebesma’s diachronic model, stems that began with one voice function apiece blended into each other. From their original representation of a voice function, the stems merged into the inflectional system over time. At the stage of the HB the derivational forms no longer represent distinct semantic categories because their meanings overlap. The tables of verb counts that Siebesma uses to come to these conclusions offer a significant contribution.

---

37 Siebesma grants that this was not necessarily the case in earlier stages of the language.
2.2.3.2.  **Synchronic: Reflexive/passive not relevant**

2.2.3.2.1.  **Jenni (1973)**

Jenni (1973) sees a problem in the plethora of distinct meanings of the Niphal, so he addresses two problematic divisions within the Niphal. First, the Niphal includes passive and reflexive senses. Second, the base stems that appear in the Niphal are split such that 20-25% of them are intransitive, and deriving a passive or reflexive from these in the normal sense is impossible (Jenni 1973:63).\(^{38}\) He first claims that a stem can only relate directly to one other stem. Thus, he must show that the Niphal relates to a Qal in every case, even if the Qal is intransitive.\(^{39}\) He posits a single category for the Niphal to overcome these divisions.

The passive/reflexive distinction falsely divides the Niphal, according to Jenni. He writes, “Dagegen besitzt der Unterschied zwischen reflexiver und passiver Bedeutung nur von aussen her gesehen, nicht aber innerhebräisch beim Nif‘al eine besondere Relevanz” (Jenni 1973:63). In other words, the categories of passive and reflexive do not necessarily apply to the Niphal in BH since the distinction originates outside of BH. Moreover, the language itself does not evidence these two types of subject-object relations.

Once Jenni sets aside passive and reflexive as categories foreign to BH, he posits a description that unifies these apparent functions of the Niphal. He believes that the Niphal represents an event unfolding upon the subject without consideration of the Agent: “Das hebräische Nif‘al bezeichnet das Geschehen eines Vorgangs oder einer Handlung am Subjekt

---

\(^{38}\) I will refer to those Niphals that derive from transitive roots as “transitive Niphals,” and those from intransitive roots as “intransitive Niphals.”

\(^{39}\) Jenni additionally assumes that the Niphal can only *directly* relate to one other stem according to the Aktualis:Resultativ opposition. He describes this opposition in depth in his earlier book (Jenni 1968).
selber ohne Rücksicht auf die Art oder den Grad der Mitwirkung dieses Subjekts an diesem Geschehen” (Jenni 1973:63). “Am Subjekt” stands out as a key phrase here, in that the Niphal does not only indicate an action but also that the action affects the subject. This focus on the action unfolding on the subject contrasts with the use of the transitive Qal, for in those cases the subject generally effects the change on the object. He explicitly denies the assumption that the Niphal establishes the subject’s participation (Mitwirkung) in the action. The subject is acted upon, whether by another entity, the same entity, or no entity initiated the action. In this way, Jenni allows the Niphal to be read as a passive, reflexive, or middle, respectively. Ultimately, Jenni defines the Niphal as “show oneself as something” (“sich als etwas erweisen”) (Jenni 1973:64). This definition subsumes what was understood previously as passive and reflexive.

The next problem Jenni addresses is that of roots appearing in the Niphal, while the corresponding Qal of the same root is intransitive. A verb with only one argument in the Qal poses a problem because once the subject is demoted in the Niphal, there is nothing to take its place. One solution (which Jenni rejects) would relate these Niphals to a Piel or Hiphil instead of a Qal (Jenni 1973:64). The Piel or Hiphil raises the number of participants, which provides the verb an argument to take the place of the demoted argument. The “direct opposition” between these two stems that Jenni asserts excludes any relationship between the Niphal and the other active stems. The Niphal relates directly to the Qal alone, according to him, so he must look to the Niphal-Qal relationship to solve this problem.

The new definition for the function of the Niphal that Jenni posits above (“sich als etwas erweisen”) solves the problem of intransitive Niphals. One common example of this problem

40 Like Siebesma above (section 2.2.3.1.3), Jenni distinguishes between essential and translational meanings.
appears in cases where an intransitive root in the Qal seems to be synonymous to the Niphal of the same root. Jenni claims that a subtle contrast can be discerned between these two forms. For example, the roots הָיָה(hyh “be” or מִקְדָּשׁ qdš “be holy” seem to mean the same thing in the Qal and the Niphal. According to Jenni, however, the Niphal tends to nuance how the action unfolds. He writes, “Dabei betont das Nif‘al nicht so sehr das Ingressive oder das Werden gegenüber dem Sein beim Qal, sondern das geschehnishaftge ‘sich als etwas erweisen’, den Zustand oder Vorgang an sich manifest werden lassen” (Jenni 1973:64). The distinction Jenni makes is subtle. The Niphal does not contrast the “becoming” (Werden) with “being” (Sein), but it indicates letting the condition or occurrence become manifest. In using the example of מִקְדָּשׁ qdš above (which he provides) we would translate the distinction as follows according to Jenni’s definition: while the Qal means “be holy,” the Niphal would mean “show oneself to be holy” or “let oneself be manifest as holy,” but not “become holy.”

Once he has removed the possibility of any “crossing” relationship between the Niphal and the Piel, he is further able to define the Niphal:Pual relationship parallel to the Qal:Piel relationship. He writes, “Auch hier bezeichnet das Nif‘al das aktuelle Geschehen eines Vorganges am Subjekt, das Pu‘al dagegen das resultative Versetztwerden in einen Zustand ohne Berücksichtigung des Herganges, nur im Blick auf das erreichte Resultat.” Then he notes their distribution among intransitive and transitive roots, but is not able to go through all the material to prove this point (Jenni 1973:68).

———

41 Jenni avoids “ingressive” or “becoming” because the Niphal specifically indicates the final resulting state of the action. He refers to this point when he says later, “ . . . das Partizip Nif‘al . . . nicht so sehr wie qatül einen statischen Zustand, sondern ein ‘geworden sein’ . . . ” (Jenni 1973:64). This translation of the Niphal as “have become” seems to be where Jenni was leaning in the earlier point, although in this latter instance, Jenni is contrasting the Niphal participle with the Qal passive participle. An explanation of the distinction between the Niphal and the Pual participles (which Jenni did not provide) would help to fill out this distinction.
In this 1973 article he offers the example of the Pual נָנַשׁ nuttas “be made broken” in Judg 6:28 and explains that the verb could not be Niphal.42

5. wayyaššîmû ʔănšé hāṣîr bábbōqer wəhînneh nuttas mizbâh and.arose.early people.of the.city in.the.morning and.behold broken:Pu:QTL altar.of

habbă′al
the.Baal

And the people of the city arose early in the morning, and behold, the altar of Baal was broken (Pual) (Gen 3:8).

Jenni claims that the וָהִינֶה wəhinneh “and behold” indicates that the people only found out about it in the morning. A Niphal (“show itself to be broken,” in the present context) in this case would have anticipated the people’s knowledge.43 Jenni believes that the resultative Pual does not have any concern for what came before the event, while the actual Niphal reveals some knowledge of the preceding action. In the given verse, no knowledge is available to the people before they see the altar of Baal and Asherah the next morning, so the verb must be a Pual and not a Niphal.

Jenni’s solution to the two problems of the split between the passive and reflexive meaning, and between transitive and intransitive Niphals, stays within the confines of his presuppositions. He assumes that each stem represents a single meaning. Thus he unifies the various senses of the Niphal by his definition, “show oneself to be something.” Moreover, each stem relates directly to one other stem. So rather than suggesting an intermediate relationship with a Piel or Hiphil between an intransitive Qal and the Niphal, he claims that the Niphal carries

42 I am translating this way to bring out Jenni’s “resultative” nuance. Assumedly, “showed itself to be broken” would be the translation of the Niphal.

43 Lev 13:17, 25 may contradict this understanding of the Niphal.
a special sense of the state, that is, “show oneself” to be the state, which contrasts with the Qal and the Pual. He thus unifies the meanings of the Niphal with this category.

2.2.3.2.2. **Bicknell (1984)**

In her 1984 dissertation, Bicknell seeks to define the passive stems in BH. Among these stems she includes the Pual, Hophal, Niphal, and Qal passive.\(^4^4\) She proceeds along the same lines as Jenni, arguing that the Niphal is not defined according to passive and reflexive. These categories have been applied inaccurately in BH because of the influence of target language concerns. By eliminating passive and reflexive as possible categories for the Niphal, she seeks the explicitly marked categories that function in BH without presupposing categories from other languages. She takes a step beyond Jenni and believes that these categories do not apply to any of the passive stems.

She argues firmly against the idea that BH indicates the distinction between the passive and reflexive in any of the passive stems. She writes,

\[
\ldots\text{Hebrew clauses with verbs in passive stems as a rule do not specify agents or reflexive pronouns. The identification of a particular clause as passive, reflexive or nonagentful (stative or intransitive) is therefore a matter of interpretation. There are no syntactic criteria upon which the decision of the reader is based. Instead, the interpretation is based on criteria such as the nature of the action (as agentful or not), context, and sense (knowledge of the world) (Bicknell 1984:124).}
\]

This statement makes clear that Bicknell sees that distinguishing passive, reflexive, and nonagentful within passive stems arises from the context and reader, and that the verbs themselves do not function to indicate such distinctions. The patient subject of these three readings unites them into one category, which she calls “passive.” She previously stated that

\(^4^4\) She does not include the Hitpael, which she calls reflexive.
with a few exceptions “only patients occur as subjects of passive clauses in Hebrew” (Bicknell 1984:123). The reader must interpret such passive/reflexive nuances based on context rather than stem.

By defining all passives as resultative (see 2.2.2.2 above), Bicknell unifies the passive stems in one function. She does not distinguish clearly among the various passives, however. Jenni did not eliminate the passive/reflexive distinction entirely from the stems, as he understood that the Pual:Hitpael relationship is basically passive:reflexive. Bicknell claims, “It may therefore be concluded that the syntactic categories passive, reflexive, and stative are not naturally applied to Hebrew” (Bicknell 1984:120), and this idea is incompatible with Jenni’s. She does not believe that these distinctions apply to any of the passive stems, not just the Niphal. Furthermore, she does not distinguish clearly among any of the passive stems.

2.2.3.2.3. Boyd (1993)

Because the middle voice is the key to classifying the Niphal, according to Boyd, previous scholars have misunderstood the meaning of the “middle.” They have misconstrued the Niphal as a reflexive, in his opinion. Earlier scholars did not consistently consider the possibility of middle for the Niphal, especially Hebraists who spoke French, German, or Dutch as their native language (Boyd 1993:70). The demands of the scholars’ native language and the target language for translation obscured those scholars’ views of the Niphal. Boyd develops——independently from transitivity concerns—a system that tightens the definition of the middle, over and against the reflexive. Furthermore, this definition of the middle unifies the various uses of the Niphal.
As we saw above (section 2.2.2.4), the middle can be distinguished from the reflexive and passive with Boyd’s three-tiered system. The semantic level separates the middle from the reflexive (Boyd 1993:73). The subject of a reflexives (“semantic reflexive” as he calls it) refers to a unique entity that bears two semantic roles, Agent and Patient (Boyd 1993:110). The referents in semantic reflexives relate to the same semantic roles as the non-reflexive counterpart. In other words, for the reflexive, Patient=Agent, but in the non-reflexive, Patient≠Agent. The single expressed argument thus bears two semantic roles. (See section 2.2.2.3.) In middle constructions, however, the single expressed argument bears only one semantic role. Rather than continue to carry the role of Agent and/or Patient, the subject’s role is transformed to that of Actor in the same way that a passive transforms the syntactic role of direct object to subject. (See section 2.2.2.4.)

For this reason, Boyd insists on the importance of the semantic level of role transformation (or “diathesis,” in his terms) for distinguishing middle and reflexive. Boyd demonstrates the significance of semantic roles for understanding the middle diathesis over and against the reflexive and passive. Acceptance of such a model forces a reanalysis of those Niphals that previously have been understood as reflexives in light of the semantic roles of the participants. Boyd unites the meanings of the Niphal by demonstrating that Niphals generally bear an Actor subject, and are thus most often middle.

---

45 Boyd is very dependent on Geniušienė (1987) for this model.

46 The stringency of these requirements allows Boyd to recategorize specific words that have been understood previously as reflexive. For example, in 2 Sam 17:23 we find the root הָנַּג hng “strangle” in the Niphal with Ahithophel as the subject.
2.2.3.2.4. Creason (1995)

Creason’s (1995) dissertation seeks to define the Niphal according to Aktionsart. He defines Aktionsart according to IBHS’s definition when he writes, “Within this category, [the authors of IBHS] include phenomena of the following type: fientivity, causation, voice, double-status action and transitivity. All five of these types of phenomena are relevant to the concerns of this study . . .” (Creason 1995:12). He agrees with Jenni with respect to the relationships among the stems, and demonstrates that the Niphal most probably relates to the Qal and not to the Piel or Hiphil. The Niphal, according to Creason, presents an action from the point of view of a single participant, most typically the object of the Qal, which, in turn, may be interpreted as passive, reflexive, stative, etc., according to the relationships among the arguments.47

Niphals present situations from the point of view of a single participant, namely, the direct object in the equivalent Qal. The stem does not offer information about any other participant(s) or their identity with the explicit participant. Creason writes, “The Niphal refers to

\[
\text{wayyēlek ³el-bētō ³el-}`irō waywasa\text w ³el-bētō wayyēḥānaq}
\]

and.went to-house.his to-city.his and.commanded to-house.his and.hang:Ni:WAYY
And [Ahithophel] went home to his city, and set his affairs in order and hanged himself (Niphal) (2 Sam 17:23).

Boyd assumes that in a strangling situation, the strangler must be animate. He writes, “The nature of the action [of strangulation] suggests that a foreign referent, either the servants of Ahithophel or an inanimate means of strangulation, possibly a rope, is the strangler” (Boyd 1993:139). In the cited verse, the strangler was either the household, in which case coreference could not hold and the situation is passive, or some instrument, such as a rope, which would not be animate and so not an Agent. In both cases, reflexivity is excluded (Boyd 1993:138-39).

This definition of the “nature of the action” of strangulation precludes the possibility of coreference—since the victims of strangulation must be animate and foreign—resulting in a circular definition of the middle. Boyd understands that stranglers must be animate by his definition of “Agent,” “the semantic role of the main performer or initiator of the action” (Boyd 1993:297). He offers an example of a Piel occurrence of the same root (Nah 2:13) and there the Agent is animate, but this evidence does not adequately prove his point. For a reflexive situation, the strangler and the victim must be the same (criterion (3)), and Boyd dismisses this possibility out of hand. Nevertheless, the action of strangulation does not necessarily preclude Ahithophel from being the main performer or initiator of his own strangulation. Therefore, the function of the “nature of the action” is troubling because it predetermines the possible diathesis.

47 This lack of distinction among voices in the Niphal strongly resembles Bicknell’s and Siebesma’s theories (section 2.2.5).
an event or the state resulting from an event. This situation may involve any number of participants, but the Niphal presents this situation with respect to only a single participant and without regard for any other participant which may be involved in this situation” (Creason 1995:367-68). In contrast, the other passive stems imply more participants and their relationships. Thus Creason focuses not on the event or state but on the point of view from which the event is expressed, and in the case of the Niphal, the point of view is that of the single participant in the action.

Creason explicitly references Jenni when he asserts that the Niphal can only relate to the Qal. However, Creason supplies more data than Jenni to explain this assumption, which strengthens Creason’s argument. Nevertheless, he sees some exceptions to his argument, as he writes, “. . . we agree with Jenni in seeing the Niphal as being in direct opposition to the Qal and not to any of the other active stems with a few possible very rare exceptions” (Creason 1995:368). Thus the exclusive Qal-Niphal relationship is a strong tendency and not a fast rule.

While Creason resembles Boyd in that he believes that the Niphal functions principally as a middle voice, Creason does not adopt Boyd’s definition of the middle. The Niphal makes clear that there is one participant that “acts upon itself or in its own interests and therefore has two roles in the situation.” As mentioned above (section 2.2.2.4), he includes reflexives and reciprocals as examples of the middle (Creason 1995:287). This view departs from Boyd’s view of distinct reflexive and middle voices based on semantic role. Moreover, the Niphal most frequently refers to a change of state (inchoative action) (Creason 1995:292).

The unity of the Niphal that Creason proposes is centered on his definition of middle and a nearly unique relationship between the Niphal and the Qal. States arising from an event is one
meaning of the middle, and the Niphal represents this function. The relationship of the Niphal to the Qal also unifies the Niphal, as the latter functions as the middle for the former.

2.2.3.3. Niphal not unified

2.2.3.3.1. Van der Merwe et al. (1999)

Van der Merwe et al. (1999) differ from the above scholars in that they do not systematize the various meanings of the Niphal. They do not believe that the meanings within the Niphal can be explained by a single category, or, in opposition to Jenni and Creason, that the Niphal tends to relate to a single other stem.

A single category does not unify the definition of the Niphal van der Merwe et al. offer, but the “definition” consists of a list of uses. In their overall belief concerning the stems they write, “Each stem formation should rather be regarded as an independent form, the meaning of which must be learned separately” (van der Merwe et al. 1999:73). Borrowing from Siebesma (Siebesma 1991:96), van der Merwe et al. claim that the Niphal can relate to any of the active stems. Much of van der Merwe et al.’s methodology depends on relative verb counts; they argue that the Niphal usually relates to the Qal, and less often to the Pual and Hophal, and occasionally to no other verb. The Niphal can express a passive or reflexive (including reciprocal). In addition, some Niphals are active in meaning because they do not relate to any active verb (van der Merwe et al. 1999:78). Morphology most strongly defines the category, and van der Merwe et al. do not insist on a single semantic category for the function of the category.

This approach differs from GKC and Joüon-Muraoka who categorize the Niphal as principally reflexive, but list all the varying uses.
Ultimately, van der Merwe et al. do not leave us with a system for uniting the Niphal form with a single function. Semantically, the Niphal cannot be defined by a single function. The stem system must rely heavily on the idiosyncratic tendencies of each individual root, which renders an inefficient morphological system. The only other possible conclusion from their model is that the system of stems is beyond our comprehension at this point, so it may as well be idiosyncratic.

2.2.3.3.2. **Grüneberg (2003)**

Grüneberg’s (2003) book, which interprets the meaning of בָּרָךְ brk “bless” in Gen 12:3, represents a case-study for his methods of determining the meaning of the Niphal, and how he sees the unity of these meanings. He combines the three-tiered diathesis approach from Boyd (1993) (Grüneberg 2003:35) with Kemmer’s (1993) lexical approach to the middle voice. He surveys the various meanings of the Niphal to determine what is most common. When he defines a particular instance he uses these statistics to determine what the most likely meaning of the given instance is.

Grüneberg explicitly goes against Jenni’s presupposition of exclusive relationships between verbal stems. He just as explicitly follows Boyd’s three-tiered diathesis model. This model includes the common level of participant and syntactic role, as well as semantic role (see sections 2.2.2.4 and 2.2.3.2.3 on Boyd above). Once Grüneberg establishes definitions for various diatheses according to this model, he shows that certain diatheses are more common in

---

49 Grüneberg’s understanding of the middle was explained in section 2.2.2.4. See section 3.4.2.1 on Kemmer (1993).

50 This model depends on Geniušienė (1987).
the Niphal. When he seeks to define a particular Niphal, therefore, certain meanings can be eliminated by probability.

Following this probability model, Grüneberg believes that the Niphal of בָּרָכָה *brk* should be passive for two reasons, namely, that it should neither be middle nor reflexive. First, a middle interpretation of בָּרָכָה *brk* cannot be a viable interpretation in this context because the meaning of the root does not conform to the categories of middle that Grüneberg offers. He writes, “But could it have middle force? In light of the analysis above this seems very doubtful, even though the niphal very frequently has such force, since the word does not obviously fit into any of the categories described” (Grüneberg 2003:65). If it fit into one of the middle semantic categories, though, it could be considered middle.51

Second, the Niphal cannot be reflexive here because this meaning only occurs rarely. He writes, “[G]iven the great rarity of reflexive use of the niphal this possibility is not enough to make the reader likely to perceive reflexive force [in Gen 12:3] . . .” (Grüneberg 2003:65). This statement is predicated by the assumption that readers will more likely perceive a given function

---

51 Grüneberg, however, has not exhaustively examined all the categories of middle for this root. For example, when he discusses “speech actions” (category nine, section 2.2.2.4 Middle above) (Grüneberg 2003:55), he does not allow this root into that middle category. Evidence shows that the verb is more likely a middle than Grüneberg allows.

Kemmer, in contrast to Grüneberg, in her “Checklist for Middle Semantics,” notes “curse” as a possibility for a “speech action” middle, though she does not give any examples at this point (Kemmer 1993:269). If “curse” can appear with a middle sense in the Niphal as a “speech action,” it would seem that בָּרָכָה *brk* “bless” could, too. Moreover, in BH, one notes that בָּרָכָה *qal* “curse” can appear in the Niphal with either a middle or reflexive sense, e.g., 2 Sam 6:22. Nevertheless, other words for “curse,” הָלָא *hal* and הָרָא *har* do not appear in the Niphal with such a sense.

Carr in his critique of Grüneberg’s book is not convinced that בָּרָכָה *brk* could not be an indirect reflexive category of the middle, though this is not one of the categories Grüneberg lists (Carr 2004:743). This sense is related to Grüneberg’s “benefactive” middle (category one, section 2.2.2.4, above). While בָּרָכָה *brk* may still not “obviously” fit into the category of middle, it is not improbable enough to eliminate the possibility altogether.
as a common one. However, if a writer intends to convey a rare instance of the Niphal, it is not clear from Grüneberg’s model how the reader would glean the correct meaning.\(^{52}\)

Perhaps the non-native speaker must cull the least likely possibilities in order to make a more educated guess at the meaning, and in this way Grüneberg’s methods make sense. Native speakers/readers may not do the same, however, and we seek to understand the text as it conveys the thoughts of a native speaker of BH. Even if we accepted Grüneberg’s reasoning, probability would eliminate the passive, as well, since Grüneberg also showed that the passive use of the Niphal is rare, though not as rare as reflexive use. He does not eliminate the reflexive usage altogether, however.

Grüneberg seems to doubt regular meanings or true unity for the Niphal, as his method shows how to guess with the best accuracy, which allows the non-native speaker of BH to access the nature of the voice of the Niphal of a particular root in a particular context. The rest of the book examines the complex nature of the root of this verb in other contexts on which the reader also depends. He does not leave us with a clear, unified category for the Niphal.

2.2.3.4. Cognitive blend

At this point I will introduce a cognitive approach to Modern Hebrew stems by Mandelblit (2000). While this scholar deals principally with Modern Hebrew, his ideas are suggestive for BH, as well. As a cognitive linguist, his assumptions, as well as the implications that arise from his work, contrast with the Hebraists we have analyzed thus far. He suggests that

---

\(^{52}\) For example, Carr is not convinced of this probabilistic approach as he writes, “[T]he niphal occasionally is used for the reflexive, albeit more rarely than the hitpael” (Carr 2004:743). Thus Grüneberg has not eliminated the reflexive reading convincingly.
the Niphal has a consistent function and that the middle/passive ambiguity in that stem arises from ambiguities that exist in the Qal, not in the Niphal.\footnote{Mandelblit refers to the Qal as “pa’al,” following Modern Hebrew convention.}

Before examining Mandelblit’s theory, I will set forth some of the assumptions of cognitive linguistics to demonstrate its more universal aims and application. Mandelblit begins with the cognitive linguistic notion that all languages include basic conceptual event schemas, which are related to clause-structure constructions, such as intransitive, transitive, and caused-motion syntactic constructions. These schemas function as “integrating frames.” When an event occurs, the speaker subjectively projects his or her original, cognitive conception onto the event in order to express the event. The speaker’s cognitive conception imposes an integrating frame that highlights particular aspects of the event over others. This projection occurs in the context of a particular language, which offers a finite number of possible syntactic constructions. Various syntactic constructions, then, highlight certain aspects of a conceived event. One must also note that in the discussion that follows, Mandelblit allows an integrative frame to represent more than one event schema, thus resulting in ambiguities for some stems.\footnote{I will discuss cognitive linguistics further in section 3.4.2.1, below.}

Mandelblit agrees that the Niphal is the passive of the Qal, but he departs from most Hebraists when he claims that the Niphal is not based on the Qal. He theorizes that the Qal does not possess a simple meaning. Rather, the Qal does not necessarily represent the most “basic” representation of an event but one of two integrating frames.\footnote{See Mandelblit (2000:197).} While the transitive Qal typically presents a simple event, Mandelblit suggests that some transitive Qals can integrate a causative scheme.
For example, one can conceive of the Qal verb “kill” as either a simple action or as a complex causative, “cause to die.” He writes,

We also note that *pa‘al*, when used transitively, often marks an integration of a whole causal sequence of events in the verbal root semantics . . . Take for example the Hebrew verb *harag* (*h.r.g-pa‘al*) ‘kill.’ The root of the *pa‘al* verb *harag* denotes, we suggest, the whole causal sequence of predicates (act-cause-death)” (Mandelblit 2000:219).

According to the latter view, “kill” can be conceived of as an integration of the causal predicate (the killer’s action) and the resulting predicate (death of the victim) into one syntactic scheme (the transitive Qal). He offers the following two possible conceptions of the following sentence

6. הַמּוֹגֶף הָרַג אֶת הָחַיַּל
   The commander killed the soldier.  

![Figure 1. Event Schema (Mandelblit 2000:220).](image)

Figure 1A suggests the action involves two predicates, where the commander *acts* (first predicate) in such a way that the soldier *dies* (second predicate). Figure 1B represents this same

---

56 I am employing Mandelblit’s system for transcribing Modern Hebrew in his examples.
action as a simple one, which involves a single predicate. The Hebraists we have considered so far have assumed that the Qal is the “simple action” like Figure 1B and have not considered the semantically compound nature of some verbs.

The Niphal, then, reassigns the roles in one of these two event schemas, but it is not always clear on which Qal the Niphal is based. The motivation for distinguishing these two representations of the Qal event becomes clearer when Mandelblit explains the ambiguity of the Niphal in translation. The Niphal resembles the Qal in that the causational elaboration of an event can be construed in more than one way. The difference between the Niphal and the Qal lies in how the participants are mapped onto the subject slot of the integrating construction, not in how the predicates are integrated. So the same ambiguity surfaces in the Niphal as in the Qal, in that some events may be conceived of with two predicates (emphasis on causative frame) or one (less emphasis on causative frame).

It is not immediately clear which emphasis the speaker is intending, which reflects the split between the passive and middle uses of the Niphal. Mandelblit claims that a causal sequence of events underlies the passive, while the non-causal underlies the middle. He offers another example to support his claim further, “Rachel opened the door,” in the Qal, with the corresponding Niphal, “The door was opened,” or a middle, “The door opened,” depending on which causal frame one

57 Both of these integration schemes contrast with the integration scheme of the Hiphil of mut. He writes, “The root of hemit however (m.u.t DIE, DEATH), indicates only the resulting (effected) predicate in the causal macro-event of killing (marked accordingly by the hif’il morphological pattern)” (Mandelblit 2000:219).

58 Some transitive verbs do not include this causative aspect, such as רַה “see.” Significantly, the Niphal of such transitive verbs does not exhibit a passive/middle ambiguity.
wants to emphasize. On the one hand, English distinguishes between these frames; when the causal frame is emphasized, one uses a passive construction (like Figure 1A), but a middle one when the causal frame is downplayed (like Figure 1B). On the other hand, Hebrew does not distinguish between them. Thus for Hebrew, the mapping of the underlying object to the subject in the Niphal remains constant. The ambiguity of the Niphal results not from an ambiguity of mapping but from a “pragmatic elaboration on the identity of the causal force,” that is, whether the causal force originated internally or externally to the Niphal subject (Mandelblit 2000:229; italics original). The Niphal grammatically encodes a resulting predicate and an effected entity, but does not encode any degree of emphasis on the causal force. So a Niphal potentially allows either a middle or passive reading.

A problem arises when one claims that a single form can be associated with multiple schemes. In his earlier 1997 dissertation, Mandelblit implies that a grammatical form associates with a single event schema. He writes, “When we use a particular grammatical structure or morpheme, we select a particular structure for the conceived situation, with respect to viewpoint, attention, figure/ground organization, and level of schematicity” (Mandelblit 1997:12). This suggests that when the speaker selects a Niphal (or other stem), the speaker selects not only a morpho-syntactic form for the expression, but also a structure for representing the situation. In Mandelblit (2000), though, he says that the Niphal can represent one of two structures of the conceived event. Since Hebrew does not formally distinguish between the causal and non-causal structure that he proposes, it is not clear why he departs from his earlier understanding of the relationship between grammatical form and cognitive structure.

In either case, the concept of integrating frames offers a level of abstraction that unites the stems. Each stem does not relate to another stem, in this view, but to a way of highlighting
particular parts of an action. A speaker may choose to represent an event in a number of ways, and by integrating the event with a particular stem, the speaker highlights certain parts of the event, its participants, etc. Such an approach explains the systematic nature of the stems, since a stem regularly emphasizes the same part of an event. Moreover, the model allows for the idiosyncrasies of the stems, for a speaker subjectively chooses which stem, with its integrative properties, will represent the event the way he or she wants. Ultimately, the Niphal is united in reassigning the arguments of the Qal, and the ambiguity arises in the Qal, outside of the Niphal.

2.2.4. Summary

Uniting the various meanings of the Niphal poses a problem. Some scholars believe in a hierarchy among the Niphal’s meanings, often depicted as diachronic, where a single, pure, abstract category represented the original form, and then the Niphal developed and added on meanings. GKC, Joüon-Muraoka, and IBHS all theorize such models. Siebesma also believes in this sort of diachronic model, though he sees an entirely different system (where the inflectional and derivational systems have merged) among the stems later, at the period of BH.

Other scholars begin from a synchronic point of view to describe the Niphal within the corpus of the HB. Some of these approaches may redefine the categories understood by earlier scholars in order to fit the variety of meanings displayed by the Niphal more easily. Boyd and Creason follow this path. Other synchronic approaches claim that we need new categorie(s) to order the Niphal’s meanings properly. Jenni coins the category translated as “show oneself to be something,” and Bicknell understands BH passives in general to convey the resultative. Siebesma looks to the inflectional system to define the stems, assuming that the significance of the entire system underwent a significant change. Mandelblit observes an ambiguity in the Qal
and applies cognitive blends to the Modern Hebrew stem system to develop a more abstract
category to include all the Niphal meanings and interpretations.

A third approach sees the various readings to be random. Van der Merwe et al. only see
unity in the formal expression of the Niphal, and assign the meanings of individual roots in the
Niphal to the lexicon. Grüneberg sees tendencies within the randomness of the Niphal, and
follows these trends to understand the probable meaning of a specific instance of a Niphal.

Each approach has its strengths and weaknesses. The diachronic model takes a category
that is more abstract to show how individual meanings develop. However, this model suffers
from a lack of direct Hebrew data to support the earlier meaning of the stem. Proponents of a
synchronic system for the Niphal often see that categories imposed on the Niphal previously
were too strongly defined by Indo-European models; while these categories exist in BH, they had
to be modified for the different linguistic paradigm. Thus, their systems arose from the BH data
without hypothesized historical forms and functions. However, the newer categories still do not
fully explain the broad range of Niphal meanings. No one system, therefore, has risen to
prominence among them, which leaves these various synchronic approaches without resolution.
The random (third) approach is based on statistics for the meanings of the Niphal (though other
approaches rely on statistics, as well). Van der Merwe et al. and Grüneberg base their models on
well-established knowledge of a lack of consistency among the meanings of the stems. Most
scholars would find it difficult to claim that no system orders these meanings, though, and deny a
functional unity to the formal unity among these meanings.

Another drive for understanding the Niphal is its relationship to other stems. On the one
hand, some believe that the Niphal directly relates to a single other stem, the Qal. In this point,
Jenni (1973) has been influential in how one should view the form-function relationship in the
verb stems. For example, *IBHS*, Creason (1995), and my present work depend on the notion that a stem ought to have a single function. On the other hand, some scholars claim that the Niphal can relate to any other stem (GKC, Siebesma, Bicknell, van der Merwe et al., Grüneberg, Mandelblit). Unfortunately, Hebraists define “relate” in different ways, and some take the definition for granted, which makes these positions difficult to evaluate. Ultimately, the Niphal can relate to other stems, whether directly or indirectly. For example, Jenni claims that the Niphal directly relates only to the Qal, but he can still compare the indirect relation of the Niphal to the Pual.

2.2.5. **How to determine Agent**

Hebraists seek the identity of the underlying subject of the Niphal, but they agree that the stem does not supply this information consistently. In the most general terms, if the subject is a Patient, and an Agent is understood from the context, the verb is a passive. The middle is much more difficult to define. If the subject is a Patient, or an Actor, or undergoing a spontaneous change with no clear Agent, or is acting in its own interests, or has double-status, the verb is a middle. If the subject is an Agent and a Patient at the same time, the verb is understood to be a reflexive.

When we then interpret or translate BH, we must take a stand on issues important for the target language. For example, a Niphal may be ambiguous whether it is passive, middle, or reflexive. If we translate a Niphal into English, though, the verb form must fit the English verbal system, which does not offer a similar, ambiguous form; English demands that we distinguish passive, middle, and reflexive. Whether the action expressed by the Niphal indicates a passive, middle, or reflexive derives from context and/or knowledge of the real world. Scholars’ claims
of whether a Niphal should be understood as a passive, middle, reflexive, etc., arise both from their definition of each of those relationships, and from their interpretation of a given example. Since I presented scholars’ definitions of the various voices above (section 2.2.2), I will concentrate here on how scholars view the role of the interpretive process in understanding the Niphal.

While Bicknell claims that the categories of reflexive and passive do not apply to BH directly, she allows for interpreting BH sentences as reflexive, passive, or resultative when translating into English. These nuances are present in BH according to her, but she does not believe that they are indicated by the verbal morphology. She writes, “Only animacy of the subject, our knowledge of the world . . . or context determines the interpretation [of reflexive, passive or active intransitive]” (Bicknell 1984:100). So how the reader interprets the possible underlying Agent determines whether the verb will be understood as reflexive or passive. If the Agent and the Patient are the same, the verb is reflexive; if different, passive. As a result, by relegating the distinction of these categories to reader interpretation, she focuses the discussion by delimiting linguistic questions from exegetical ones.

Siebesma only briefly touches on the issue of interpreting the Agent in an action. According to Siebesma, the Agent need not be explicitly mentioned in the Niphal, which allows for more than one interpretation in some instances. Whatever Agent makes the most sense from the context is allowed, and the verb form itself does not impose any relationship. He writes that when one needs to extract the Agent of an action “exegetical presuppositions may come into play as well” (Siebesma 1991:34). He makes clear that when one makes a claim about the meaning of

59 Unlike GKC and Joüon-Muraoka, she does not explicitly consider the indirect and tolerativum as possible senses of the Niphal.
a particular verb, one must recognize the exegetical and theological presuppositions underlying an interpretation. While a linguist looks at trends of particular grammatical forms, and these forms can be isolated and examined objectively, each of the examples requires a subjective judgment as to its meaning.\(^{60}\) It is important to be sensitive to what other motivations have gone into one reading or the other in a given context.

Real-world knowledge enters into one’s construal of a given Niphal, as Creason notes. He distinguishes the meaning of specific occurrences of the Niphal arising from real-world knowledge as opposed to the Niphal stem \textit{per se}. He writes, “The presence or absence of other participants in the situation as well as the volitionality of the single participant which is specified is determined by the context in which the Niphal occurs and by a reader/writer's knowledge of the real world” (Creason 1995:367-68). A subject with less volitionality is less able to function in a reflexive action, for example, since the subject is less able to act on its own behalf. How much volitionality a subject might have depends on one’s knowledge of the real world, which necessarily includes a subjective element.

This statement strongly resembles Bicknell’s (1984:100), as we saw above. Bicknell’s study helped to narrow the study of the passive stem to separate what information the stem conveyed and what came from context. Creason furthers this progression. In addition, Creason claims that the Niphal only denotes the number of participants—one—and the role of this

\(^{60}\) For example, the Niphal of \textit{גָּשַׁה} \textit{drš} “seek” can be translated as “be sought” or “allow oneself to be sought,” where the latter is the so-called \textit{tolerativum} sense. (See Joüon-Muraoka:§51c.) Significantly, the first sense is found in Gen 42:22, where Joseph is the subject, and the latter in Ezek 14:3, where Yhwh is the subject. Possibly, the theological fact that Yhwh is such a figure that he decides who may or may not seek him influenced these distinct translations. Most importantly, the verb does not indicate the distinction between readings, so interpreters must see this difference based on the context. (See Siebesma 1991:35.)
participant—the direct object in the equivalent Qal. In contrast to Boyd, Creason does not discuss further the semantic role of this one participant.

Significantly, many of the scholars indicated that an understanding of the context of a given example of the Niphal determines what option within the category of Niphal one chooses, that is, reflexive, passive, or middle. While the Niphal likely represents some kind of unified category, one must decide on the voice somehow for the sake of translation. These phenomena primarily affect translating BH, and less understanding the BH language as a whole, according to the Hebraists in this section.

2.2.6. Niphal: Conclusions

The scholarly discussion on the Niphal up to this point has been motivated by the problem of the multiple meanings of the stem represented by a single morphological form. Scholars have demonstrated that the Niphal appears in many contexts, with passive, reflexive, middle, reciprocal, resultative, and denominative functions. Since these categories are formally distinguished in many Indo-European languages, the problem has been to find the category or common ground between meanings by which all these functions can be linked in the BH Niphal.

Scholars agree that the Niphal stem bears a variety of meanings, while they struggle to connect them. Some believe that the Niphal historically began with a particular meaning with a broad scope, and then developed into the other meanings. Others believe in an abstract category that covers all these meanings in a synchronic system. Still others believe that no single category can incorporate all these meanings, and so the Niphal form relates to a bundle of vaguely related meanings.

See also Creason (1995:368, 375).
In spite of the difference of opinion among Hebraists, we can see common threads running through the above scholars’ accounts. Those who believe in a system behind the meanings of the Niphal (both synchronic and diachronic approaches) tend to argue for the primacy of passive voice, reflexive, and/or middle voice, or, like Jenni, for a variation on one of these ("show oneself to be something"). Mandelblit does not define the Niphal according to one of these categories, but shows how the passive vs. middle ambiguity arises from the Qal, not the Niphal; the Niphal consistently functions to demote the subject. To distinguish any one of these diatheses, most scholars agree that one must depend on an interpretation of the context to extract the understood, underlying Agent; the Niphal itself does not identify the underlying Agent. In any case, all show that an action unfolds on an underlying Patient in subject position, whatever the Agent may be; the Agent is demoted and the Patient promoted.

We can also see that several scholars see a stative/resultative function alongside the demotion/promotion function of the Niphal. Bicknell most explicitly backs this view, and *IBHS* and Creason see the stative (adjectival) use of the Niphal as a common—though not most basic—use. Jenni, however, rejects the resultative meaning of the Niphal; he believes the Pual is the passive resultative. This view is possible, but Jenni does not present much data to discern this distinction.

Boyd and Grüneberg (and Mandelblit to a lesser extent), however, raise the question of the semantic role of the subject of the Niphal. At the minimum, several scholars take for granted that the Niphal subject is affected by the action, though how it is “affected” is not spelled out. For Boyd, this definition is crucial for understanding the Niphal as middle, which is defined by the semantic role of the Actor subject, and who is involved in the action. Grüneberg implies that the subject’s semantic role is important, since he adopts Boyd’s model, but he does not discuss
semantic roles at length. In Mandelblit’s theory, semantic role is important, though not discussed much. In order for the passive/middle ambiguity to arise in the Niphal in Mandelblit’s theory, the underlying Qal subject must be able to cause an event. The analyses of the subject’s semantic role are inconclusive.

2.3. DEFINITION OF HITPAEL

2.3.1. Formulating the problem

Many of the problems that we saw with the Niphal we find in the Hitpael, as well. The questions raised by Creason (as summarized in section 2.2.1) for the Niphal apply to the Hitpael. Regarding the first question (“Does the Niphal have a single meaning and if so, what is it?”) the Hitpael manifests several different functions, and so scholars wrangle over how to unite those functions. As for the second question (“Are there examples of the Niphal which are directly related to the Piel or Hiphil, or can all Niphals be directly related to the Qal?”), it is not clear how the Hitpael relates to the other stems. Formally, it bears a resemblance to the Piel, since they both display a doubled second radical. Nevertheless, the meaning of the Hitpael does not always relate to a Piel, either because no Piel is extant for that root or because the Piel bears a different meaning of that root. So, like the Niphal, the relationship of the Hitpael to other stems is ambiguous. In response to the third question (“What is the relationship of the Niphal to the other passive and/or reflexive stems?”), the meaning of the Hitpael resembles the Niphal very closely in some cases, so whether a distinction exists between the two stems and what the distinction might be are relevant questions.
In addition to the problems shared by the Niphal and Hitpael, we can see that the Hitpael bears two unique syntactic problems. The most common function of the Hitpael appears to be detransitivization. If the underlying situation has two participants, the Hitpael subject often corresponds to the active object; if the underlying situation has only one participant, the Hitpael subject corresponds to the active subject. When it shares the same subject as the Qal, for example, the difference between the two verbs is subtle. For example, the root with the most Hitpael occurrences, הָלַכְתָּ, “walk”, appears to have the same kind of subject in the Qal and Hitpael. The Hitpael does not appear to function as a reflexive or passive here, so the question is how the Hitpael is distinct from the Qal. Another problematic category is roots that are stative in the Qal and have the same subject in the Hitpael. Often these translate as “act like x” or “pretend to be x,” where “x” is the state represented by the Qal. A second problem arises because BH demonstrates some roots that not only do not promote the underlying object to the Hitpael subject, but that also take a direct object.

Furthermore, the formal relationship of the Hitpael to other stems, within BH and other Semitic languages, presents problems. The Hitpael, which bears a formal relationship to the Piel, competes with another intransitive stem with a formal relationship to the Piel: the Pual. Most see the Pual as exclusively a passive stem, and they tend to call the Hitpael a basic middle or reflexive stem. In a similar way, Aramaic and other Semitic languages use -t- prefixes to denote intransitive diatheses. As a result, scholars extrapolate the meaning(s) of those -t- forms

62 Among scholars who posit a passive and reflexive that relate to the Qal and Piel, respectively, all understand the Hophal as the passive of the Hiphil, but no one that I have found has posited a reflexive for the Hiphil. For example, no specific verb form exists that could create a reflexive of the Hiphil of הָלַכְתָּ himlik “he made X to be king,” reflexive, “He made himself to be king.” Blau believes that early Hebrew had a causative with a -t- prefix, but that it merged into the Hitpael (Blau 1957); see section 2.3.3.1.1. Creason supports this view (Creason 1995:291).
to BH to understand the Hitpael. Many of those languages, though, do not have a Pual as does BH.

Just as scholars approached the Niphal with diachronic and synchronic explanations, scholars apply the same types of models to the Hitpael to explain the diversity of meaning of the stem. The synchronic approach assumes that the Hitpael represents an abstract category that manifests itself in various ways, but the unity of the various meanings is not necessarily discernable on the surface. In contrast, the diachronic model assumes that the different meanings are not inherently related, but came together because of historical forces.

2.3.2. Species of the Hitpael

2.3.2.1. Reflexive

All scholars understand that the Hitpael can bear a reflexive meaning. In spite of the multiple meanings of the Hitpael that most Hebraists observe, the reflexive is primary for many Hebraists. GKC believes that the reflexive category covers all the rest of the other meanings (GKC:§54e-g). Joüon-Muraoka agrees with GKC, but more specifically sees the Hitpael as the reflexive of the Piel (Joüon-Muraoka:§40a). IBHS and Creason see the reflexive as primary for the Hitpael, but allow additional meanings (Creason 1995:291; IBHS:§26.2a). In contrast to these scholars, however, Siebesma sees that reflexive represents only one of several meanings of the Hitpael, as he writes, “The hitp. [Hitpael] may be translated as active, reflexive or reciprocal,  

---

63 In addressing the problem of the Hitpael in Gen 3:8, Creason relies on the idea that the Hitpael is primarily reflexive when he writes, “[T]he narrator uses a Hithpael, apparently to indicate that Adam and Eve acted as agents when they hid themselves from the LORD” (Creason 1995:355-56).
but rarely as passive” (Siebesma 1991:167-68). The reflexive plays a role in all conceptions of the Hitpael, though it may vary in its primacy, depending on a specific Hebraist’s model.

Often when the reflexive is the primary meaning of the Hitpael, it allows other meanings with only a vaguely reflexive sense (cf. section 2.2.2.3). These other senses commonly arise from stative roots, which one would not expect to be detransitivized. Other, more generalized reflexive forces include reciprocal, “to make oneself X,” “conduct oneself as X,” “show oneself X,” and “imagine oneself as X,” where “X” is the state or notion predicated by the stem. A similar meaning is “to affect” to be of a certain character. In addition, the Hitpael can signify an “indirect” reflexive, that is, “an action less directly affecting the subject, and describes it as performed with regard to or for oneself, in one’s own special interest . . . in such cases readily taking an accusative” (GKC:§54f). In the example of Lev 11:44, van der Merwe et al. claim that the Hitpael of הָיָה qdš “holy,” can be read as reflexive or reciprocal (van der Merwe et al. 1999:84).

Other scholars define the reflexive more narrowly. Bean, for example, restricts “reflexive” to cases where the subject can only be identified with the direct object (Bean 1975:24). Though Jenni talks very little about the Hitpael, he believes that the Hitpael is basically reflexive in a narrow sense. The Hitpael expresses “the undertaking of an activity on the [subject] itself” (“die Vornahme einer Tätigkeit an sich selber”) (Jenni 1973:68). This notion of reflexive seems more like the standard notion of the reflexive, as we have in English. The Niphal and Pual exhibit subjects on which the action takes place. In addition, his Niphal definition that I showed above (section 2.2.3.2.1) bears a reflexive notion: “show oneself to be

---

64 This detransitivization of stative roots may be a contributing reason for scholars’ tendency to relate the meaning of the Hitpael to the Piel, for the Piel can transitivize stative Qals.
something.” However, the subject in the Hitpael more clearly undergoes an activity, while the Niphal is demonstrating a state.

One scholar explicitly disputes the claim that the BH Hitpael is basically reflexive, in light of other Semitic languages. Dombrowski writes, “We should be aware of the fact that the meaning of the Semitic T-stems is not, as was hitherto held, basically reflexive. . . . There cannot be any doubt, of course, that the meaning of the T-stems frequently is reflexive. But not less often is it passive or reciprocal” (Dombrowski 1962:220). He understands that reflexive is a common function of the Semitic t-stem, but does not see it as the most common meaning for t-stems among the Semitic languages.

Thus definitions of the reflexive vary, though all scholars see that the Hitpael encompasses it in some way. Scholars have had to deal with the Hitpaels of stative roots, usually by broadening the definition of reflexive by various means. Reflexive can either be defined as coreference between the subject and an object, or may more broadly refer to an identity between the subject and one of many other syntactic roles.

2.3.2.2. Middle

Three scholars see the middle function relating to the various meanings of the Hitpael. Creason subsumes the reflexive and reciprocal into the middle when he writes, “[T]he term ‘middle voice’ is applicable to a verb which refers to a situation in which a participant acts upon itself or in its own interests and therefore has two roles in the situation. Reflexive and reciprocal actions are two common examples of this kind of situation . . .” (Creason 1995:287). Thus reflexive is a subset of middle. Another situation covered by the middle voice is inchoative
actions, that is, it has one participant and that undergoes a process internally, without an external Agent (Creason 1995:388).

Grüneberg is the biggest advocate of a middle Hitpael. The middle force of the Hitpael resembles that of the Niphal (section 2.2.2.4). For example, the Hitpael of הַמָּלֶךְ nqm “take revenge” carries middle force, e.g. in Jer 5:9, denoting an activity always or typically performed for one's own benefit, just as it does in the Niphal elsewhere (Grüneberg 2003:196). He offers other specific examples: “הָבַה [hb] provides an example of a self-move middle. At least some uses of the hithpael of הָנָה [ns] offer a further example. In Num 23:24 . . . הָיְנָא [yitnas são] parallels the qal הָמָה [yâqûm] and thus means simply ‘arise’ (not e.g. ‘rouse itself’)” (Grüneberg 2003:194).

In his paradigm, Grüneberg believes that the middle is the most common, and so the most important, use of the Hitpael. He writes, “The hithpael predominantly expresses a variety of middle nuances, though occasionally is passive (and very occasionally reciprocal or reflexive)” (Grüneberg 2003:242). The “nuances” he refers to are the semantic classes of Hitpaels that he identifies.

Voigt’s model looks at the Hitpael as a derivative of the Proto-Hamito-Semitic -t- form, which he believes represented a middle voice. All the daughter languages developed that morpheme’s functions in different ways (Voigt 1987:89). He does not look specifically at BH, however. Nevertheless, he recognizes that across Hamito-Semitic languages the -t- morpheme

65 He offers another example: “Middles are also used for verbs of ‘posture and bodily contortion’. הָיְנָא [hityašše b] meaning ‘stand, take up position’ fits into this category” (Grüneberg 2003:195).

66 Voigt begins with Akkadian, where he notes homonymy between the perfect intransitive and the preterite transitive verb forms (iptarVs), and the spread of the infixed -t- throughout the transitive and intransitive paradigms.
covers inflectional (*Präsen*, *Perfekt*) and derivational (*Reflexivstämme, Intensivstämme*)
categories. For the derivational meanings of which the BH Hitpael could be an example, Voigt
understands that the meaning is “middle” or “subjective” (Voigt 1987:105).

With these definitions, Hebraists are able to retain the observed reflexive uses with other
characteristics. Creason is able to join the reflexive with the benefactive. Grüneberg uses the
middle category to unite the disparate meanings across various semantic categories. Voigt,
however, proposes a model that allows the Hitpael to join into the genealogy of analogous forms
across Hamito-Semitic languages. Each of these authors thus uses the middle category to join
meanings that do not immediately appear to be related.

2.3.2.3. Passive

The Hitpael can have a passive meaning, that is, where the underlying subject and object
are both known and do not refer to the same entity. Scholars admit that this meaning is rarer
than reflexive (GKC:§54g; Siebesma 1991:167-68; Creason 1995:291).67

A problem arises because the passive use does not readily fit into the reflexive category
commonly ascribed to the Hitpael. As a result, Hebraists suggest that the passive meaning
developed later, perhaps through the influences of other languages. *IBHS* notes that passive
Hitpael “tends to be found in later biblical literature,” for example Qoh 8:10 (*IBHS*:§26.3a).68
Creason furthers this notion as he writes, “[The Hithpael] is also occasionally used as a passive,
but this use appears most frequently in later texts and so it may be the result of influence from

67 GKC seem to imply here that the passive sense developed later than the reflexive sense (§54g).

68 They do not comment on the passive Niphal in Qoh 9:5, however. See my explanation in section
4.2.2.1.1 below.
Aramaic . . .” (Creason 1995:342). He presents the examples Ps 107:17; Prov 31:30; and Qoh 8:10, which are “clearly passive” (Creason 1995:353). This tendency observed by *IBHS* and Creason helps to explain the “spread” of the Hitpael into the functional realm of the passive.69

This “spread,” however raises the question of motivation for this shift. This semantic territory appears to have been covered well by the Niphal and Pual in earlier BH, and another stem entering the passive realm seems superfluous. Perhaps the Pual was becoming less productive at the point of later BH, leaving a gap for the Hitpael to fill. Nevertheless, the question of why BH needed more than one passive stem remains to be discussed below (section 3.4).

2.3.2.4. “Act like X”

The Hitpael displays the meaning of acting like the state or noun represented by the root. Boyd notes that this connotation occurs in the Hitpael, but never in the Niphal (Boyd 1993:254-55). He does not explain why this dichotomy arose, whether as a result of historical circumstances or the nature of the Hitpael. Nevertheless, this clear separation of function offers some insight into the nature of the Hitpael.

“Act like X” Hitpaels can be derived from either nouns or adjectives, with or without the notion of deceptive action.70 “Act like” can either mean “perform the actions of,” such as with

---

69 One should note the parallels between this explanation and that by which GKC explained the development of the passive meaning of the Niphal (section 2.2.3.1.1).

70 I discuss this category of verbs in more depth in section 4.3.4.
the root נב nb “prophesy,” or נבש נבש נבש נב “act rich” (IBHS: §26.4a). “Act like X” can also mean “pretend to be like,” which we find with the root חל חל חל חל “sick” (2 Sam 13:5, 6) (Boyd 1993:254-55). Siebesma sees this same meaning as “to behave oneself in a certain way,” without the connotation of deception (Siebesma 1991:168). Garr refers to the “semblative sense,” which represents the denominative subset of “act as” Hitpaels. For example, the Hitpael with a semblative sense of חכמה חכמה חכמה חכמה חכמה “wise,” could be either actual or feigned wise behavior (Garr 2003:38-39). The ambiguous motivation of the actor can only be gleaned from context.

Garr makes a further claim about the semantics of semblative verbs. He writes that these denominative Hitpaels “require semantic agents and express dynamic events, albeit to different degrees” (Garr 2003:38-39). We should note, though, that none of these verbs appears to have a semantic Agent, since the subject is not affected by the action. Nevertheless, the “act like X” verbs, universally recognized by Hebraists as a unique function of the Hitpael, must play a part in understanding the essence of this verb stem.

2.3.2.5. Iterative

The Hitpael demonstrates a meaning often called “iterative” or “durative” by Hebraists. The most common root with this meaning—the most common root in the Hitpael, as well—is

71 Geniušienė demonstrates the same phenomenon with the Latin middle: Latin graecus “Greek” - graec-or “act as Greeks do”; aeger “sick” - aegr-or “be sick”; calculo “school-master” - calcul-or “be a school-master” (Geniušienė 1987:298).

72 Boyd further writes, “To my knowledge, this [i.e., חל חל חל חל חל “sick”] is the only verb in the hithpael-niphal overlap corpus that definitely exhibits this behavior” (Boyd 1993:254-55).

73 Garr uses “denominative” to cover חלב חלב חלב חלב חלב “act like (someone in) mourning,’ and חלב חלב חלב חלב חלב ‘act like (someone) rich,’ even though it is not clear whether the roots of these words are basically nominal, adjectival, or verbal.
"hlk “go, walk.” As an intransitive verb of motion, it cannot be construed clearly as reflexive or passive or “act as X” in the ways we have defined them. Thus, scholars unanimously see the iterative or durative sense of the Hitpael here without any reflexive or passive sense. The Hitpael uniquely demonstrates this meaning, which some say may have merged into the Hitpael from another stem via historical development.

Boyd, in the way he claims that the “act like X” meaning exists exclusively in the Hitpael, notes that the iterative is likewise unique to the Hitpael. The reason for the lack of iterative nuance in the Niphal lies beyond the Niphal-Qal, Hitpael-Piel paradigm (Boyd 1993:251). Like the “act like X” sense, the iterative can also potentially provide insight into the meaning of the Hitpael.

Akkadian possesses two separate stems, a Dt (a doubled second radical with an infixed -t-) and a form with a -tan- infix. The Dt resembles the Hitpael, as it includes a t prefix with a doubled second radical, and usually has a passive, and less often a reciprocal or reflexive meaning (Huehnergard 2005:424). The -tan- morpheme is infixed after the first radical, and the nasal consonant often assimilates to the following consonant. The -tan- infix covers iterative actions (Huehnergard 2005:411). In most forms, the Dt and the D combined with the -tan- infix are formally indistinguishable (Huehnergard 2005:424).

Many try to explain why the single form of the Hitpael includes iterative and passive-reflexive functions. They hypothesize that BH had an iterative stem that blended formally into the passive-reflexive Hitpael. In some theories, BH began with some form equivalent to the Akkadian -tan-, which later merged with the Hitpael. For example, Goetze posits that certain D forms do not follow the common D function because they are not D forms. They are -tan- forms
that have assimilated the  and the  (Goetze 1942:7). Goetze extends the idea of the “hidden” -tan- forms when he claims that BH includes old -tan- forms.

Creason remains somewhat skeptical of the BH analogy to Akkadian, however. He explains, “Although the semantic similarity of these Hithpaels to Akkadian tan-forms is unmistakable, the morphological similarity is not so clear . . .” (Creason 1995:357-58). So the overlap in meaning between the Hitpael and the Akkadian -tan- forms seems clear, but the formal similarity, and thus the diachronic relationship, is less so for Creason.

Speiser and Dombrowski admit that blending meanings together in this way is common in BH. They blend into the Hitpael on analogy with other functions that were formally distinct in earlier stages of Hebrew. Speiser begins by noting that BH has “drastically” reduced its inventory of -t- forms (Speiser 1955:118). This indicates for Speiser that some stems had already merged in BH. Dombrowski looks for historical merges with the Hitpael in the same way. He writes, “[W]hy should we hesitate to expect a sometimes durative force of the Hebrew Hithpa’el, particularly as it is rather probable that an original Gt-stem [i.e., a Qal with an infixed -t-] was merged into it or perhaps even replaced by it as similarly in Arabic?” (Dombrowski 1962:222). On analogy with the Gt, which likely merged with the Hitpael, the iterative (his “durative”) merged with the Hitpael. The iterative was originally another form: the -tan-, as seen in Akkadian. According to Speiser and Dombrowski, this meaning was also folded into the Hitpael (Speiser 1955:120; Dombrowski 1962:222).74

The formal resemblance between the Hitpael and -tan- stems, alongside the common durative meaning of the Hitpael and the -tan-, drive some to see an analogy between the

74 Speiser further argues that this merge occurred as a result of the rise of the Niphal and Hophal (Speiser 1955:118).
Akkadian and BH verbs. Moreover, this merge accounts for the “disappearing” t-forms in BH. Nevertheless, Creason is cautious about committing too much to this analogy, since they do not look so similar formally in his opinion. Nevertheless, unless this merge occurred completely because of formal correlations, one has to explain why this function merged into the Hitpael. Perhaps this merge hints at another facet of the essence of the Hitpael. I will examine this possibility further when I present the overlap between the middle and aspect in section 3.6.

2.3.2.6. **Stylistic usage**

Hebraists cannot discern a consistent difference in meaning between the Qal and Hitpael of certain roots. Some believe that the Hitpael can simply have an active meaning in some cases (van der Merwe et al. 1999:84; Siebesma 1991:167-68). Others look to explain the difference in ways besides semantics. Certain Hebraists claim that the difference depends on literary genre, though conclusions are inconsistent.

GKC note meanings that overlap between the Hitpael and the Qal, e.g. in the root לбанк lbn “mourn.” They claim that the distinction in these cases is one of style, namely, the Qal is used only in poetic style and the Hitpael in prose (GKC:§54c).

In Mazars’s (1968) study, he claims literary genre differentiates between the Qal and Hitpael of some roots. He claims, “Plusieurs des conjugaisons d’un même verbe ont des sens identiques, les différences sont à peine sensibles . . .” (Mazars 1968:353). So some stems do not necessarily differ from others in a noticeable way. He notes that particularly in the books of Kings and Psalms, the verb “walk” can appear in the Qal and Hitpael without any difference in meaning, an interpretation that is corroborated by the versions (Mazars 1968:359). Significantly, the variation in stems for הלק hlk appears most prevalently in the book of Psalms and other
poetry, and, as a result, the author concludes that the variation in stems relates to the poetic genre (Mazars 1968:363). The Hitpael variant was used not to indicate a semantic contrast with the Qal but “à l’esprit d’en appeler au rythme et à la mesure de la phrase,” that is, the Hitpael causes lengthening of the word and altering the accent and vowel structure, which makes recitation “plus douce” (Mazar 1968:362)

Bean searches for distributional differences of the Hitpael compared to other stems. He focuses on the verbs “where no clear distinction has been determined between Hithpa’el meaning or function and the meaning and function of the Qal or Pi’el or Niph’al stems” (Bean 1975:25).

This problem directs him to look at genre, age, and place of origin of the texts in which the Hitpael appears. In the end he sees some correlation between genre and preference for the meaning of the Hitpael, as he finds the Hitpael tends to be used more often in novella prose, lament/taunt poetry, and wisdom Psalms (Bean 1975:111-14). He does not see any correlation—positive or negative—with chronology (Bean 1975:76) or geography (Bean 1975:87).

Thus at this point conclusions are contradictory as to how the type of text bears on the use of the Hitpael, when the related Qal appears to be synonymous to it. GKC believe that poetry prefers Qal over Hitpael. Mazars, however, believes that poetry prefers Hitpael over Qal, and Bean concurs that the Hitpael appears more often in some genres of text than in others.

Results from stylistic approaches have not been widely accepted by scholars.

2.3.2.7. Summary of Hitpael species

All the above authors agree on some senses of the Hitpael: reflexive, passive, and “act like.” Different authors define reflexive more or less broadly, as some include reflexive actions alongside the direct reflexive. Most scholars mention reciprocal in this class, for example, as
well as indirect (“for oneself”). All accept the remaining meaning, iterative, though GKC and Mazars nuance this view, for they see it as a stylistic variant of the Qal.

Nevertheless, fitting the reflexive together with other meanings into a single, synchronic category has eluded Hebraists. The passive, “act as,” and iterative do not relate to the reflexive in an obvious way. Most believe that the Hitpael is reflexive at its base, and some of them hypothesize that iterative meanings merged into the Hitpael at an early stage of the language (before the biblical period). Similarly, the Hitpael bled into the passive domain at a late stage of BH, according to some. “Act as” is treated like a standard denominative, and functioning analogously to the denominative processes in the Piel and Niphal. The above scholars do not treat these denominatives in depth.

### 2.3.3. Towards Unity of the Hitpael

#### 2.3.3.1. Diachronic

##### 2.3.3.1.1. Blau (1957)

In his diachronic model, Blau (1957) looks for those Hitpael forms that do not relate to the Qal or Piel, but to the Hiphil. He begins by noting the asymmetry of the verbal paradigm: three active stems (G, D, C), two passive (Dp, Cp), and one reflexive (tD).\(^{75}\) (For his article he has chosen not to deal with the place of the Niphal in the paradigm [Blau 1957:385-86].) Blau mentions the asymmetry of no passive or reflexive of G (Blau 1957:385), but he sees evidence for symmetry at an earlier stage of the language. Based on earlier research, though, we know

---

\(^{75}\) These abbreviations mean the following: G is the “Grund,” or basic stem; D is the “Doppel” stem, where the second consonant is doubled; C is the causative stem. The lower-case “p” means “passive” of the corresponding stem, and the “t” refers to a /t/ affixed to the corresponding stem.
that a passive Qal and tG existed at some point (Blau 1957:386). This leaves the tC as the only asymmetrical point. As a result, he looks at verbs that a) phonologically do not follow normal pointing patterns of tD or tG and b) semantically relate to the Hiphil (Blau 1957:387-88).

Finally, he describes some of the phonological peculiarities of the tC, as the Masoretes construed these forms.

Certain regularities relate the examples Blau presents. First, all are words with a prefixed t. In the first two of these examples, the t is doubled.\textsuperscript{76} Second, these examples differ from the paradigm of the Hitpael, that is, in three of the examples R\textsubscript{2} is not doubled. Additionally one finds that where R\textsubscript{2} is not doubled the preceding vowel is lengthened.\textsuperscript{77} Third, the verbs commonly share the passive/reflexive meaning expressed by the Hiphil of the root.\textsuperscript{78}

Blau concludes that the Hitpael assimilated various expressions of the root that had been expressed by distinct forms at one time. The stem system was symmetrical at one time, with a tC correlating to the Hiphil (C) and Hophal (Cp) on one axis, and the tD on the other axis. Therefore, he offers an explanation that unites the odd meanings of the Hitpael that relate more clearly to the Hiphil than to the Piel or Qal. Historical forces explain the seeming lack of unity among the meanings of the Hitpael.

\textsuperscript{76} This is reminiscent of the Aramaic tC, though Blau does not mention this commonality.

\textsuperscript{77} One would predict that these vowels would lengthen from normal phonological processes.

\textsuperscript{78} In the end, the examples of tC forms that Blau cites do not form a consistent phonological or semantic category. Regarding semantics, he does not express explicitly what the tC would mean, or how the meaning would differ from another stem, e.g., the tC vs. the Hophal of \texttt{בְּשֵׁנֶי} yɔb “station, set” (Hiphil). Similarly, it is not clear that the supposed tC of \texttt{בְּשֵׁנֶי} brr would differ in meaning from a Niphal or a Hitpael. Phonologically, the tC does not demonstrate a consistent form, although it is possible that Masoretes unfamiliar with the form could have altered these forms accidentally in transmission of the text, or that some alteration of the form may have occurred naturally over the course of the history of the language. One should also note that all the examples Blau offers contain weak roots, and such roots can produce phonological oddities even if they come from a Hitpael or other known stem. It would help to see the tC of a strong root, where the phonology of the root itself could not explain the strange phonological form. The fact that all the roots offered as evidence weakens Blau’s case.
2.3.3.1.2. Dombrowski (1962)

Dombrowski does not believe that t-forms are essentially passive or reflexive. After a further study of various Semitic t-stems, Dombrowski concludes that T-stems are not reflexive at their base, for t-stems can either be reflexive (including passive and reflexive) or iterative/durative (Dombrowski 1962:220). As a result of these observations, Dombrowski concludes that Hebrew had a durative Gt at one point, which subsequently merged with the Hitpael (Dombrowski 1962:222).

Furthermore, he generalizes on the t morpheme, stating that it is basically “inversative.” “Inversative” is a multivalent phenomenon. It can relate to the t of the feminine suffixed and prefixed verb forms and even the nominal feminine *-at, “inverting” the masculine form. In derived forms it “inverts the action of the verb back onto the subject (Dombrowski 1962:222-23). In all cases, the t morpheme inverts the meaning of the base word. The general “inversative” affected the G and D stems differently in Semitic languages. In particular verbs derived with the t, such as the Gt and Dt, the forms can have an iterative/durative function. These Gt and Dt forms later merged in BH.

---

79 For example, Arabic, Aramaic, and Ethiopic all have iterative t-stems, and Ugaritic and Akkadian have iterative verbs namely in the Gt (Dombrowski 1962:221-22).

80 He writes, “. . . I suggest that the formation of the T-stems originates in the intention to indicate an inversion of the action of the verb by that element which shows he contrast best—the anti-masculine element T” (1962:223).

81 The t inversative as a morphological process results in overproduction, and thus the category is too broad. Dombrowski allows the t inversative for nouns, but he does not explain why the inversion must be limited to gender and why it could not be used in other inversions such as “dark” and “light.” A natural way to use an inversative with verbs would be a negation, such as English un- in “wind” vs. “unwind.” Yet Semitic does not use the morpheme in this way. The model proposed by Dombrowski must offer more to limit the words produced.
2.3.3.1.3. Creason (1995)

Along the lines of Speiser, Blau, and Dombrowski, Creason sees that various stems merged into the Hitpael. He writes, “[T]here is evidence to suggest that the Hithpael forms in the extant texts represent a group of stems which have been assimilated to a single set of forms in a way similar to the manner in which the Qal Passive was assimilated to the Pual and the Hophal” (Creason 1995:291). The Qal passive was productive during the period in which the HB was written, but disappeared from productive use in a later stage of Hebrew. As a result, the Masoretes read the Qal passives as Puals and Hophals (Creason 1995:290). On analogy, Creason implies that several t-forms exist in the HB, but the Masoretes did not recognize them because the forms had disappeared from the language by their time. The Masoretic text reflects the final stage of the historical merge of several stems into the Hitpael.

He also looks at reflexive and passive Hitpaels, but does not agree with previous attempts to unite them. Regarding the split between reflexive and passive, Creason sees that they are united in that they do not require a Patient subject. “Such Hithpaels [as with a Theme subject in מַלְפֵל הַל “praise” and רָע “see”] suggest that defining the opposition between active and reflexive verbs in terms of agents and patients is just as inappropriate for this opposition as it was from the opposition between active and passive verbs” (Creason 1995:348-49). The Hitpael can take Patients and Experiencers, which means that a change does not necessarily take place on the subject. Passive and reflexive Hitpaels alike do not require such a change. Thus the semantic role of the subject does not necessarily help define the Hitpael.
2.3.3.2. **Synchronic**

Scholars have the most difficulty uniting the Hitpael synchronically. As I showed above, the species of the Hitpael cover a wide, seemingly unrelated field of meanings. While Jenni united the meanings of the Hitpael synchronically, it is not clear that all the meanings will fit into his definition. Others despair at defining the Hitpael as a unified, synchronic category.

The Hitpael in Jenni’s definition expresses how the activity unfolded on the subject. He says that the Hitpael expresses “the undertaking of an activity on oneself, by which the subject is shifted into a new state, or rather, a new adjectival predicate can be stated” (Jenni 1973:68). By choosing the words “activity” and “new adjectival predicate” Jenni implies that the Hitpael expresses an ongoing event that focuses especially on this shift. This approach explains the reflexive and the “act as” meanings, but not the passive or iterative uses. If one stretched the meaning of “on oneself,” one could extend this definition to the iterative verbs, though Jenni does not do so explicitly.

Bean seeks to explain why a Hitpael was chosen over some other construction in a particular context (Bean 1975:40). To help solve this problem, Bean tests various factors, namely, literary and grammatical ones, as possible influences on the occurrences of the Hitpael (Bean 1975:7-8). He tabulates the uses of the Hitpael in the categories of reflexive, passive, reciprocal, desiderative, and non-specific (Bean 1975:136-37). Next, Bean breaks down the

---

82 “Beim Hitpa’el endlich handelt es sich um die Vornahme einer Tätigkeit an sich selber, wodurch das Subjekt in einen neuen Zustand versetzt wird bzw. ein neues adjektivisches Prädiket ausgesagt werden kann” (Jenni 1973:68).

83 This includes the use of הַמָּן “seek grace” in 1 Kgs 8:47b (Bean 1975:137, incorrectly cited as 1 Kgs 4:47b).
various uses of the Hitpael to see if certain literary or grammatical contexts prefer particular use(s) of the Hitpael.\textsuperscript{85}

As a result, Bean’s work produces some conclusions concerning how often the Hitpael is used. Novella forms of the narrative literary genre, lament/taunt poetry, and wisdom psalms show a higher than average rate of use for the Hitpael (Bean 1975:111-14). He further concludes that a shift occurred in how the Hitpael was used from pre-exilic, to exilic, and to post-exilic works, though “[n]o absolute distinction may be observed” (Bean 1975:150-53).\textsuperscript{86}

In the end, Bean’s conclusions are generally negative. First, he notes that the grammar does not determine the use of the Hitpael. In the case of syntax, the Hitpael overlaps with other constructions in the same sorts of clauses, such as the Niphal in passive ones, or the

\textsuperscript{84} He also calls this function the “simple relationship,” where “the Hitpael is used no differently from other active stems with regard to subject-verb orientation” (Bean 1975:137).

\textsuperscript{85} He writes, “[T]he goal will be to determine if a certain kind of Hitpael usage, as opposed to the Hitpael per se, is characteristic of a book(s), a time, or a kind of literary form” (Bean 1975:139).

\textsuperscript{86} The data collection methods of Bean, however, represent the greatest weakness of this work. When he gauges the number of uses of the Hitpael, his standard formula is number of Hitpaels / number of verses (Bean 1975:46). The limits of a verse are arbitrary with respect to the verbs and the syntax; a verse may have any number of verbs. So a randomly chosen group of five verses with 15 verbs would likely have about twice as many Hitpaels than another randomly selected group of five verses with 7 verbs, and such a situation will skew results. Thus number of Hitpaels / number of clauses would have made more sense for Bean’s statistics in order to control against “long” and “short” verses. Another aid would have been to compare statistics for the Hitpael against other forms performing the same function. Again, two sets of five random verses may differ in the number of passive Hitpaels because one set may be describing people (where passives are less likely cross-linguistically and reflexive more possible) and the other, inanimate objects (where passives are more likely and reflexive, less likely). One needs to select for contexts that require a reflexive, and then count the number of Hitpaels. So if the Niphal and the Hitpael could potentially be used for a reflexive, then comparing their relative use in reflexive contexts could have clarified the shift (or lack thereof) in the Hitpael’s use. Lack of adequate controls damaged the reliability of results of his study.

\textsuperscript{87} Richter sees a variety of transitivity relations between the Hitpael and its Piel or Qal counterpart. He writes, “Aus dem Material der ThrFG [Thronfolge] liegen wenige sichere Beispiele für eine transitive Satzart im Dt-stamm vor, häufig aber Satzarten reduzierungen zu einer transitiven Basis im D- (und G-)Stamm; insofern ist die charakteristische Funktion dieses Stammes reflexiv (reziprok). Daneben gibt es intransitive Basen ohne Satzartveränderung” Richter 1978-80:3.110). So the Hitpael can be transitive or intransitive, and the intransitive can be related to a transitive or intransitive underlying form. Thus transitivity can stay the same from Qal/Piel to Hitpael, but note that transitivity cannot increase. Compare to Modern Greek (Chapter 3).
preposition "ל l- plus a pronominal suffix in reflexive ones (Bean 1975:40). Similarly, he writes that “the Hithpa’el-related verbs are neither semantically homogeneous nor dichotomous, and not easily associated except in the most general terms” (Bean 1975:127). So the meanings of the Hitpael are not determined syntactically or semantically. Second, he concludes that chronology (Bean 1975:76) and geography (Bean 1975:87) do not determine the relative number of uses of the Hitpael in any significant way. Third, he determines that the Hitpael is not usually reflexive (Bean 1975:167, 172; contra Jenni 1973:68). As a result, one cannot define a given Hitpael verb pro forma because neither the Hitpael nor any of its specific uses is determined by time, place, literary genre, life-setting, or sentence usage (Bean 1975:173). The use of the Hitpael, therefore, is often idiosyncratic, and not unified by a single use or category.

Grüneberg and van der Merwe et al. do not see a unifying category for the Hitpael. Their model looks at the Hitpael synchronically. The Hitpael represents a variety of meanings, especially middle, but including others, according to Grüneberg (Grüneberg 2003:242). He does not posit a single category that holds the meanings together, however. This understanding of the unity of the Hitpael parallels what he presents on the unity of the meaning of the Niphal (section 2.2.3.3.2). Van der Merwe et al. imply a similar model (van der Merwe et al. 1999:84).

Thus the scholarly search for a synchronic, unifying category for the Hitpael has produced disappointing results. Jenni’s definition does not include all the pertinent species of

---

88 Here he also notes the further problem of separating the overlap between the Niphal and the Hitpael (Bean 1975:26-28). Unfortunately, Bean does not offer a final conclusion on this particular problem.

89 As an example of such a reflexive, Bean offers Gen 21:16: וַתְּכֶּק וַתְּכֶּקּ לָה wattēlek wattēlek lāh “And she went and sat (for herself).” This example does not, however, fit the narrow definition of reflexive that Bean presented earlier.

90 In fact, this list closely resembles the list for the middle voice offered by Kemmer (1993; see section 3.4.2.1), which offers categories to which the verbs might easily be associated.
the Hitpael. Bean undertook the examination of the Hitpael in his dissertation, and could not find the characteristic that unified the various functions with the single form. Güneberg and van der Merwe et al. list the variety of meanings the Hitpael can have. Grüneberg presents the majority meaning of the Hitpael, but this does not unify this meaning with other meanings.

2.3.3.3. Summary

All the models but one above presuppose that the various meanings of the Hitpael do not belong to single, functional category. Jenni alone posits that the Hitpael represents a single functional category. For him the stem essentially functions synchronically as a reflexive, where the subject undertakes an action that ends up shifting its state. Bean, also searching for a synchronic model for the meaning of the Hitpael, cannot find a single category for the Hitpael. For him and van der Merwe et al., no individual Hitpael can be predicted to have a particular meaning pro forma. Grüneberg, though, guesses at a Hitpael’s meaning according to statistics of use.

The other scholars shape a diachronic model in which various t-stems merge into a single one. Because Akkadian and other Semitic languages use multiple t-forms, and the functions of many of those t-forms are reflected in the Hitpael, they believe that an early form of Hebrew had multiple, distinct t-forms. By the period of BH the Hitpael had subsumed those t-forms. Creason’s model differs slightly, by suggesting that the shift from multiple t-forms to a single one occurred between the time of the writing of the HB and the period of the Masoretes, on analogy with the Qal passive.
2.3.4. Hitpael: Conclusions

Scholarship does not offer a simple definition for the nature of the Hitpael. Those who have studied the Hitpael agree on the sorts of meanings that appear in that stem: reflexive, iterative, “act as,” some middle, and a few passives. Nevertheless, no one has presented a single category that subsumes all these distinct meanings. (Jenni’s category does not deal with all the meanings of the Hitpael.) According to general consensus, the stem generally represents a reflexive, with other meanings attached on by historical developments. The various non-reflexive meanings were represented by other stems at one point in history and then merged into the Hitpael. Nevertheless, no one answers the question why these meanings were all attracted to the Hitpael.

The Hitpael covers areas of meaning not covered by any other stem, namely, the iterative and the meaning “act as.” Significantly, most scholars ascribe the reflexive to the Hitpael as its most basic meaning and see the iterative and “act as” meanings as peripheral, based on the function of the other t-stems in Northwest and Eastern Semitic languages. This approach leaves an intriguing question: what if these distinct uses of the Hitpael lie at the heart of the Hitpael’s function? Even if we follow the notion that the various meanings of the Hitpael resulted from a historical merge of other, now extinct stems, the Hitpael represents a synchronic formal category in BH. Such a category could perhaps explain the attraction for certain meanings to the Hitpael during the course of the development of the stems. It remains as a challenge for this work to find a unified category for the varying uses of the Hitpael.
2.4. **Overlap of Niphal and Hitpael**

Most scholars notice a significant overlap between the Niphal and Hitpael in specific examples. The above research points to distinct basic categories and historical development for the two stems. Nevertheless, several functions of the two stems are identical, namely, passive, reflexive, and middle. The formal distinction between the two suggests a functional contrast, but some roots that manifest a Niphal and Hitpael do not demonstrate any practical, functional difference. Scholars approach the problem of an apparent redundancy between the two stems in unique ways.

In looking at the amount of overlap between the Niphal and Hitpael, we find different scholars who argue for the extremes of total and zero overlap between the stems. We do not necessarily need to believe in a difference between the two stems, according to Mitchell (1987). Mitchell, when he looks at the Niphal and Hitpael of בָּרַק (brk) “bless,” does not believe that a difference between the Niphal and Hitpael of that root necessarily exists (Mitchell 1987:33 n.3). Formal differences do not necessarily imply functional differences in a specific instance. Jenni sharply contrasts with Mitchell. He believes that the verb stems each occupy their own area of meaning separate from every other (Jenni 1973:61).

Most scholars fall between these two extremes, recognizing a certain amount, but not total, overlap between the two stems. GKC and Joüon-Muraoka’s models of the stems predict some overlap between the stems. The table that GKC use to relate the stems to one another predicts a redundancy between the Niphal and the Hitpael, namely, that they should have practically the same, reflexive function when the Qal and Piel of the same root do not differ significantly in meaning (GKC:§39f). The model proposed by Joüon-Muraoka strongly
resembles that of GKC, though the overlap between the Niphal and Hitpael is stated more explicitly. Joüon-Muraoka agrees that the Niphal is the reflexive of the Qal (Joüon-Muraoka:§40a). Since the Hitpael likewise represents a reflexive (of the Piel rather than the Qal), “[t]he majority of the meanings of the Nifal are naturally shared by Hitpael . . .” (Joüon-Muraoka:§51c).

Since Hebraists recognize a reflexive notion in the Niphal, some compare the nuance that differentiates the Niphal reflexive from the Hitpael reflexive. Among the various meanings of “reflexive” they ascribe, GKC posit one meaning that can they call “intensive” reflexive (e.g., of כננ qnm “show oneself revengeful”) (GKC:§54e). This meaning contrasts with the Niphal, which they imply is the standard reflexive (though for כננ qnm they translate the Niphal “take revenge). Since Joüon-Muraoka sees the Niphal as the reflexive of the Qal (section 2.2.2.3), the overlap between the two arises naturally. The difference lies in the fact that the Niphal corresponds to the Qal, and Hitpael, to the Piel (Joüon-Muraoka:§51c). More recent scholars have not addressed the different kinds of reflexive that these earlier works posit.

While Mitchell, GKC, and Joüon-Muraoka theorize that the Niphal and Hitpael theoretically need not carry different meanings, Boyd discusses more in depth the empirical overlap between the Niphal and the Hitpael. His study of the two stems begins with the observation, “. . . 100 roots are attested with apparently the same voice signification in both [the

---

91 The formal relationship of the Hitpael to the Piel, the so-called “intensive” stem, probably drives this distinction, though GKC do not explain on what basis they distinguish the standard and intensive reflexive. See also Joüon-Muraoka §40a.

92 The relationship of the Hitpael to the Niphal is not the only problematic overlap that scholars have found. “One of the more difficult problems,” Bean writes, “in describing the functions of the Hithpa’el stem has come from those usages where no clear distinction has been determined between Hithpa’el meaning or function and the meaning and function of the Qal or Pi’el or Niph’al stems” (Bean 1975:25). He observes that the Hitpael can overlap with several stems, not just with the Niphal.
Niphal and Hitpael] stems” (Boyd 1993:2). Later in his study, Boyd observes that this overlap is the rule, not the exception: “Save for a few exceptions, the two stems [Niphal and Hitpael] appear to be used as equivalent alternatives” (Boyd 1993:271). Thus the meaning of the Hitpael is interwoven with the Niphal, challenging the notion of an autonomous meaning for the Hitpael.

Boyd lists five ways in which the two stems differ in connotation, though he does not systematize these differences. First, the Hitpael may have an iterative sense that the Niphal does not have. Second, the Niphal and the Hitpael of the same root may have “different denotations,” that is, the root bears different meanings in the Niphal and Hitpael. Third, the stems may differ in that a root may have a literal meaning in one root and a figurative sense in the other. Fourth, the Hitpael can indicate “feigned behavior,” but the Niphal cannot indicate such. Fifth, one of the stems may allow “additional connotations” of certain roots that the other stem may not (Boyd 1993:251-57). With these observations, we see the areas where the Hitpael never overlaps with the Niphal distinctly from the troubling areas of overlap. Boyd more clearly defines the area of overlap between the two stems, while still recognizing that the Niphal and Hitpael often mean the same thing.

Siebesma recognizes the problem of overlapping meaning between the Niphal and Hitpael of specific roots, and offers a solution from the inflectional system. First, he recognizes the same problem that the above recognized: “For a number of roots it is difficult to make a distinction between the meaning of the ni. [Niphal] and that of the hitp. [Hitpael], e.g. of the

---

93 When Boyd seeks to correlate the differences between the Niphal and the Hitpael according to voice, he finds that this distinction is not significant for the overlap between the stems. He writes, “It is somewhat surprising to discover that voice signification is largely independent of the stem. In fact, of the five stem-voice correlation patterns, total correlation, high correlation, low correlation, zero correlation, and uncertain correlation, the fourth claims the most verbs” (Boyd 1993:257).
roots KRK and KAS [sic, should be BRK and BAŠ] (ni. 2 Sam. 10:6 = hitp., 1 Chron. 19:6)”
(Siebesma 1991:169). Here are the verses he cites above. They include the root רנק bš
“be/become odious.”

7. wayyirû bënê ʿammôn kî niḇ̄aṣû bǝḏāwîd
and.saw sons.of Ammon that odious:Ni:QTL by.David
And the sons of Ammon saw that they had become odious (Niphal) by David (1 Sam 10:6).

8. wayyirû bënê ʿammôn kî hiṭbaṣû ʾim-dāwîd
and.saw sons.of Ammon that odious:Hit:QTL with-David
And the sons of Ammon saw that they had become odious (Hitpael) with David (1 Chr 19:6).

One way that he explains the difference is that the Niphal “expresses the undergoing of an
action,” while the Hitpael, “expresses the active performance of an action or an emphasis which
is placed more on the active action than on the undergoing of the action” (Siebesma 1991:167-68). Hence the Hitpael is “less passive” than the Niphal.94 Ultimately, Siebesma concludes that
historical trends obscured some of the distinction between the Niphal and Hitpael vis-à-vis
subject-object relations, so that they function in BH alongside the inflectional morphology,
where the Niphal takes over the perfective and the Hitpael, the imperfective, as we see in such
roots as אָמַת amj†m “be unclean,” and בֵּית bcy ycB “take a position” (Siebesma 1991:169). Thus
aspect has joined passivity as a primary distinction between the two stems.95

At this point, scholarship has shown that overlap between the Niphal and Hitpael is
significant, but not universal. In the case of some roots, the Niphal and Hitpael are
indistinguishable, for example, יֵרֵך brk “bless” and בֵּשׁ bš “ashamed.” Nevertheless, the

94 This view opposes Boyd’s, who noted that no correlation of diathesis most often characterized the
Niphal/Hitpael relationship (see above, note 93).

95 He seems to be referring to viewpoint, not situation, aspect here.
Hitpael can have meanings that are exclusive to it. Moreover, the Niphal sometimes broadly appears more passive than the Hitpael, and the Hitpael may show a preference for the imperfective, and the Niphal, for the perfective. As a result, the stems tend to differ, but not consistently enough to assume a difference between the two. Thus Hebraists do not claim a basic functional difference between the two stems in spite of their clear formal differences, while they allow for limited distinctions in some meanings of the Hitpael and some aspectual differences. Further investigation into the overlap between the two will reveal essential, defining characteristics of the two stems.

One class of verbs that I will try to incorporate into a theory of BH voice is roots that have no subject and/or Agent in the Qal. Certain Hebraists, e.g., Jenni, believe that the passivization occurs without any mediating stem, such as a Piel or Hiphil. I will look more carefully at this class of roots to see what sort of pattern emerges in their Niphal and Hitpael forms (sections 4.3 and 4.4).

---

96 These are the “impersonal Niphals” I discuss in section 4.4.4.5, below.
CHAPTER 3. VOICE AND ASPECT IN LINGUISTICS

3.1. INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter demonstrated two major issues in defining the relationship between the Niphal and the Hitpael. The first is that each stem covers more than one functional area, namely, passive, middle, and reflexive. I call this the “internal overlap” of the form. The second is that the functions of the two stems overlap with each other, and this overlap makes the distinct forms appear redundant. I call this the “external overlap” of the form.

Chaotic relationships such as internal and external overlap are common in the middle and passive voices cross-linguistically. Several functions may map onto a single form, and more than one form can cover a single function. Language theories must deal with the lack of one-to-one mappings, and this work is not an exception. In this chapter, I address these questions with a synthesis of the current linguistic understanding of the passive and middle voices in order to explain the motivations for these two areas of difficulty.

Regarding internal overlap, the functional overlap in the area of the passive and middle voices can also be found in other, unrelated languages. For example, we find that the middle form commonly overlaps with the passive function in languages with a distinct middle voice (Kemmer 1993:149). By a synthesis of current functional definitions of the passive and middle, I will explain this internal overlap.

Many Hebraists have not assumed the internal overlap in the Niphal and Hitpael forms, and we saw in Chapter 2 that many have tried to tie each stem to a single function (e.g., IBHS [1990], Boyd [1993], Creason [1995]). Nevertheless, the respective functions of these two forms
overlap—we find some reflexive Niphals, and some middle Hitpaelss—obscuring the precise
categories distinguished by these Hebraists. I will explain here why examples of each stem
overlaps with multiple functions.

External overlap also occurs commonly cross-linguistically. Languages may have more
than one passive voice form, for example. This occurs because the forms lie at the confluence of
more than one function. If we assume that the Niphal and Hitpael can both be understood as
passive voice, another function may explain the external overlap of the two stems. Keenan, in
his cross-linguistic study of the passive noted this external overlap among passive forms. He
made the following universal statements (Keenan 1985:267-69).

- “Languages with basic passives commonly have more than one formally distinct
  passive construction.”
- “If a language has any passives it has ones which can be used to cover the perfective
  range of meanings.”
- “If a language has two or more basic passives they are likely to differ semantically
  with respect to the aspect ranges they cover.”

These generalizations suggest that we do not need to treat as exceptional the overlap in the realm
of BH passive. Aspect, Keenan suggests, explains the difference between two passive voices. Furthermore, looking at the aspect could help distinguish passive and middle in the overlapping
area (across languages and in BH) where both appear to exhibit passive function.

This chapter examines the confluence of voice and aspect in the Niphal and Hitpael in
order to understand the external overlap between the stems. “Aspect,” or more specifically,

1 These generalization are labeled “G-3,” “G-4,” and “G-5,” respectively, in Keenan’s original work.

2 Keenan begins an important discussion on the interaction situation and viewpoint aspect, as he mentions
terms from each realm. In his G-2.2, he distinguishes passives of stative and activity verbs (situation aspect), and in
G-4 (cited above) he says that one passive will cover the perfective (viewpoint aspect). In this dissertation, I am
exploring the profound effects that these universals imply, that is, the effect of aspect on voice.
“situation aspect,” represents the most significant realm of aspect for the following discussion.

Situation aspect comprises distinctions between states and actions. I will define the term more precisely in section 3.2. A given passive event contains more than one phase. Usually some kind of activity is followed by a second phase, a new state, and the activity often unfolds on the underlying object of the sentence. I posit that one passive form, often the “true passive,” tends to intersect with the state phase, and another form, often the “middle,” with the activity phase.

I have organized this chapter in the following way. In section 3.2, I will define situation aspect. This section will set up the theoretical framework for analyzing the aspecual difference between the passive and middle voices. Section 3.3 will cover the passive voice, including how passive forms function pragmatically with respect to the status of the underlying subject and object. Section 3.4 discusses the middle voice beginning with its formal and syntactic problems. Then I will turn to the demotion of the underlying subject and its effect on transitivity and semantics. By defining the passive functionally, I will resolve the apparent internal overlap within particular forms. I will explain the external overlap between the passive and middle forms in section 3.5, by showing that the two forms share a common functional element. Finally, in section 3.6, I will draw out implications of using situation aspect to distinguish the passive and middle forms, both theoretically and in two case studies. Situation aspect allows us to distinguish the middle and passive forms, even in light of their common pragmatic function.

3.2. Definition of Situation Aspect

In this section I will explore Keenan’s suggestion that if a language has more than one passive construction, they will differ in aspect (see section 3.1). However, Keenan does not identify what sort of aspect he means. Since the publication of Keenan’s article, linguists have
continually been discovering how intricate aspect is. In this section, I will first examine what aspect is, defining its overall function. Then, I will look at the area of situation aspect most relevant to the external overlap in voice. Discussion in BH often revolves around viewpoint aspect, but I seek to bring out the manifestations of situation aspect in BH. I will define these two areas of aspect below. I will show that aspect represents a cross-linguistic phenomenon that allows speakers to focus on the whole or a single part of an event or state.

A situation does not have an inherent aspect; the speaker, through a complex process, imposes an aspect onto it (Smith 1991:12). The points before, during, and after a state exists or an event takes place are potentially infinite. From his or her point of view the speaker decides what points are most salient (Smith 1991:xvi). Individual grammatical markers do not indicate situation types on their own, however, but “verb constellations of lexical morphemes” and other parts of the sentence (Smith 1991:7, 10). Russian demonstrates this phenomenon. Take the following examples.

1. *pisat’ “to write” (imperfective)*
2. *na-pisat’ “to write” (perfective)*
3. *za-pisat’ “to write down, to note” (perfective, different semantic nuance)*
4. *za-pis-yy-at’ “to write down, to note” (imperfective, with nuance of *zapisat’*)

In order to invoke a certain type of situation, the speaker fits together a verb with verb stems (which demonstrate preferences for certain situation types), perfective and imperfective prefixes and stem extensions, and suffixes. In this way he or she can express completed or partially completed events (Smith 1991:75). Examples 1-4 demonstrate how aspect allows more complex

---

3 We will see in 3.6.2 that some verbs do not fall into a single category, and context determines their situation aspect.
expressions. Furthermore, aspects do not bear a simple meaning, but represent properties that
cluster around a given aspectual category (Smith 1991:24). As a result, a speaker chooses a
constellation of verbal morphemes in order to describe those features salient to what he or she
wants to express.

Linguists categorize the ways that situations can be depicted by aspect; furthermore,
different types of aspect can be distinguished. The category of distinctions that we saw above,
that focuses on perfective and imperfective actions, is called “viewpoint aspect,” as it presents to
the hearer either “a full or partial view of a situation” (Smith 1991:5). Another aspectual
distinction is called “situation aspect,” which presents a situation to the hearer as one of various
categories of dynamic situation or state (Smith 1991:4). Comrie writes, “With a state, unless
something happens to change that state, then the state will continue. . . . With a dynamic
situation, on the other hand, the situation will only continue if it is continually subject to a new
input of energy. . . . To remain in a state requires no effort, whereas to remain in a dynamic
situation does require effort . . .” (Comrie 1976:49). Thus dynamic activity distinguishes these
two aspects.

Within the category of dynamic situations, languages offer an extreme level of detail. As
various situations involve different configurations of dynamic situations and states, many of the
categories within situation aspect involve changes of state. Smith writes, “Changes of state have
a special status for human beings” (Smith 1991:66). It follows that languages can express
variations in changes of state in a complex, detailed way. So speakers can express the beginning

4 Smith’s definition of “activity” appears influenced by Comrie’s definition of “dynamic situation” (Smith
and end points, and duration of the input of energy when presenting a situation. The internal structure of events is available to the grammar for aspect to encode (Pustejovsky 2005:33).

Linguists categorize situations into different types, but they all represent differences in states, changes, and duration. Smith offers the following situation types with examples:

- **States** are static, durative (*know the answer, love Mary*)
- **Activities** are dynamic, durative, atelic events (*laugh, stroll in the park*)
- **Accomplishments** are dynamic, durative, telic events consisting of a process with successive stages and an outcome (*build a house, walk to school, learn Greek*)
- **Semelfactives** are dynamic, atelic, instantaneous events (*tap, knock*)
- **Achievements** are dynamic, telic, instantaneous events (*win the race, reach the top*)

(adapted from Smith [1991:6]).

We can note binary features that Smith considers to be basic for characterizing these situation types: static:dynamic, durative:instantaneous, telic:atelic.\(^5\)

Pustejovsky offers a simpler system with three situation types: state, process, and transition (Pustejovsky 2005:33). He refers to “state” in the same way as Smith, and his “process” coincides with Smith’s “activity.” Pustejovsky’s “transition” comprises “accomplishments,” “semelfactives,” and “achievements.” The distinction between “semelfactive” and “achievement” depends on a “telic” vs. “atelic” distinction, but how this difference plays out is not always apparent, for example, why “tap” is atelic but “reach” is telic. That leaves the “accomplishment” vs. “achievement” distinction, which Pustejovsky’s model does not assume to be a basic distinction.\(^6\)

Comrie’s category, “dynamic situation,” includes Pustejovsky’s process and transition. Pustejovsky, Smith, and Comrie thus all agree on the state

\(^5\) She calls these oppositions ±State, ±Durative, and ±Telic, respectively.

\(^6\) Pustejovsky claims that agency distinguishes accomplishments (agentive) from achievements (non-agentive) (Pustejovsky 2005:42-44).
vs. activity/process/dynamic situation dichotomy, but deal with the “transition” category differently.

We can view situation aspect with the following diagram. Note that the event depicts two phases of the action ($x_{-3}$-$x_1$ and $x_1$-$x_3$) divided by a transition point ($x_0$).

![Basic situation diagram](image)

Figure 2. Basic situation diagram (based on Pustejovsky 2005).

A speaker may choose any point, points, or group of points to express his or her view of a situation. So $x_1$–$x_3$ or $x_3$–$x_1$ could represent an ongoing state or activity, where no change takes place. “State” is the simplest situation type (Smith 1991:28), which is “a single event, which is evaluated relative to no other event” (Pustejovsky 2005:40). “Activity” means that the stages of the action occur homogenously, with no particular end point (Smith 1991:28; Pustejovsky 2005:40).

In more complex situations, a change of state or transition occurs. An accomplishment includes a process that resulted in a change of state, e.g., “build” entails building an unbuilt object until the object is built. This type of event would occur, for example, from $x_2$–$x_3$.

![Accomplishment Type](image)

Figure 3. Accomplishment Type (based on Pustejovsky 2005).

An achievement, such as “reach the top,” does not assume any process before the transition, that is, no relevant parts reach leftwards from $x_0$. The situation has an end phase that assumes that the entity remains in the state transitioned into, expressed by points $x_1$-$x_3$. 

Semelfactives would include the simple transition point, e.g., “tap.” This kind of situation assumes the transition itself, with no preceding or succeeding phases. The action is instantaneous.

Smith’s terms can easily be incorporated into my diagram. The feature of covering more than one point parallels Smith’s “+Duration” (Smith 1991:29). Smith’s feature “+Telic” would cover any situation on Figure 2 that includes the transition point and some other point (Smith 1991:29). Nevertheless, my diagram stays close to Pustejovsky’s model. While Pustejovsky recognizes Smith’s system, “state” and “process” are primitive in Pustejovsky’s system, but not “transition,” as it combines a process followed by a transition and a state.
Languages can distinguish situation aspect morphologically and lexically. We saw in examples 1 - 4 that Russian distinguishes aspect morphologically. An English speaker can occasionally distinguish situation aspect lexically. For example, if a car stopped working, one can say that the owner “broke” the car or “destroyed” the car. The first variant would be an achievement; it places less focus on the process preceding the transition from unbroken to broken. *Destroy*, however, is an accomplishment, so more stress is placed on the process leading up to the transition point. As a result of the different focus on the process, *destroy* hints at more of a methodical and complete process than *break*. So an owner may *destroy* a car over years of (willful) neglect of repairs, while he or she may *break* a car by forgetting to fill the oil. Thus, *break* demonstrates an achievement, and *destroy*, an accomplishment. We must be aware of the ways that languages encode situation aspect before we explore the passive cross-linguistically and in BH.

Particular events may reflect one situation aspect more often than another. Nevertheless, other, rarer situation aspects of the same event may be possible in more specific contexts. In order to understand this contrast, I will explain the concept of “marked” and “unmarked” forms. The “unmarked” form is the simpler, more general, default form. In contrast, the “marked” form includes more complex forms with more specific reference (Smith 1991:15). For example, *Smurf* refers to any member of the race of small blue people. It is the unmarked form. In order to specify exceptional members, one can use complex forms, e.g., *Smurfette* (the only female). *Smurfette* is the marked form of the more general *Smurf*, and *Smurfette* is marked for “feminine.”

In the realm of aspect, a speaker can express a situation using a marked or unmarked aspect to make particular properties more or less salient (Smith 1991:19). Certain verbs are unmarked in some aspects but marked in others. For example, in English *know* is unmarked as a
state. Since the imperative generally does not allow states, the imperative of *know* is often not acceptable to native speakers. However, in a particular situation it can appear with a different, marked aspect. If a teacher’s student does not know an answer the student should know, the teacher can say, “Know the answer by tomorrow!”—a grammatical use of the imperative. In this instance, the verb refers to a *change* of state from ¬know to know (by doing the homework, studying harder, etc.), rather than the state itself. Some states in English can represent activities when expressed in the progressive, e.g., “Mary was impolite” vs. “Mary was being impolite.” The latter implies action, while the former does not (Smith 1991:43, 84). In Navajo, certain semelfactives can be expressed in the imperfective to convey more of an interval, in effect, making it more like an achievement or accomplishment (Smith 1991:57).

Context determines the aspect of some verbs that allow more than one category. Fagan points out that *touch* can refer to an achievement, activity, accomplishment, or a state, depending on the context (Fagan 1992:68). Whether the complement is a direct object or a directional complement influences the aspectual interpretation of the verb, Steinbach suggests (Steinbach 2002:100). For example, *Max is eating a hamburger*, represents an accomplishment with this direct object complement, that is, the action is completed when the hamburger is consumed. When the object changes to a plural, *Max is eating hamburgers*, the sentence is more akin to an activity, that is, the action does not emphasize an endpoint. *Walk* is normally an activity because

---

7 Bulgarian (Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999:157-58), Greek (Geniušienė 1987:298), and BH (section 4.3.4) all use the activity passive to express this function.
it does not necessarily imply an end point. However, the expression *walk to the store* expresses an end point, which expresses an accomplishment situation (Pustejovsky 2005:34).\(^8\)

Thus speakers express situations in terms of states, process, and transitions between them. Languages offer various strategies, such as lexical, contextual, and morphological contrasts, to allow speakers to focus on the salience of one part or the other, or a combination of them. While Smith’s system distinguishes to a finer degree among situation types by concentrating more or less on the phase preceding the transition, Pustejovsky’s system fixes the situation aspectual contrast as basically states vs. activities with transitions as a corollary.

Situation aspect does not function independently of viewpoint aspect. Since a transition is defined by a point where the action changes into a new state, the transition point can be looked upon as the culmination or endpoint of the activity. As a result, we would predict some overlap between the transition point of situation aspect and the completed, perfective action of viewpoint aspect. In other words, expressions that focus on the transition point may demonstrate some effects in viewpoint aspect. Conversely, expressions that refer to activities may overlap with imperfective.

### 3.3. Passive voice

#### 3.3.1. Multiple forms of passive

Various linguistic models focus on different ways that language organizes information. Formal theories define the passive syntactically. They assume that the passive primarily denotes

---

\(^8\) “Melt” can either express an accomplishment or achievement, depending if one detaches the resulting state from the process or not (Smith 1991:63). “Comb one’s hair” or “mow the lawn” can either be an activity or accomplishment, determined by whether the resulting state is in purview of the expression (Smith 1991:74). Such distinctions are ultimately determined by context.
the subject/Agent syntactically and promotes the object/Patient. These models address the syntactic mechanics of “transforming” the active sentence into a passive one. In contrast, functional models define the passive semantically. They approach the passive as a single function with potentially more than one formal member. They highlight how the passive conveys information differently from the active, namely, by demoting the subject/Agent. This process of demotion is more complex than a change in syntax, and I discuss this at length in section 3.3.2.1.

Passivization is not formally monolithic; a language may perform this function with more than one form. As a result, functional linguists compare and contrast multiple passive forms with one another, as well as with the active. For example, Sansò claims, “[N]o grammatical category can be singled out that can be interpreted exclusively as ‘passive’.” Other constructions that one could include in the broader category “passive” are the middle, causative, valence-reducing morphemes, and plural personal pronouns (Sansò 2003:39-40). As a result, one should not look at a single passive form on its own. Since various formal passive constructions overlap with one another, we will examine how the passive functions vis-à-vis the other members. As Sansò writes, “[A] study of the passive cannot be but a study of voice,” but must

---

9 See Perlmutter and Postal (1983). Jaeggli explains that the verb absorbs the subject and cannot license a direct object (Jaeggli 1986:587). Haegeman’s account follows Jaeggli’s (Haegeman 1991:169-74). More recently, El-Marzouk shows the difficulties in a Principles and Parameters approach with the impersonal passive (El-Marzouk 2003:39), and Seuren demonstrates problems with the ability of Minimalism to explain impersonal passives in English, German, and Dutch (Seuren 2004:223-27). Nevertheless, impersonal passives constitute an ongoing discussion in Minimalist theories.

10 Shibatani lists even more roles of the passive that go beyond the current discussion. He claims that the passive is essentially an agent-defocusing device, which fits the conclusions of my study (Shibatani 1985:830).
be examined among other “coding options” (2003:46); an active:passive dichotomy does not suffice for understanding competing passive forms.¹¹

Cornelis champions the idea of the passive as its own category for research, which is not necessarily dependent on the active. She believes, “[T]he passive can and perhaps should be taken seriously as an independent construction” (Cornelis 1997:28). Though her study appeared before Sansò’s, she also sees the passive as expressed through multiple constructions in a single language.¹² So not only should linguists study the passive as its own category, she posits that they should observe it separately from the active.

Hebraists have followed the assumption that the passive function can be covered by multiple forms. They unanimously see that the Qal passive, Pual, and Hophal forms express the passive.¹³ Similarly, they understand that the Niphal and Hitpael can also express the passive. The area and extent of their external overlap, though, remains to be defined more precisely. Assuming a functional approach and definition of the passive allows us the possibility of more than one passive as its own functional category. This approach allows us to examine more thoroughly complex relationships among binyanim as I introduced in 1.1.

One cannot separate the passive entirely from the active, however. Our model thus includes two levels of distinction. One level distinguishes between active and passive, and the other, the various formal passive constructions. The passive category opposes the active externally and contains oppositions internally. For the present study, I will assume the two

---

¹¹ In her study she chose two competing constructions in Italian and Spanish to compare how and where the constructions are used in the two languages (Sansò 2003:153)

¹² Cornelis claims that the worden passive in Dutch, while single in form, demonstrates multiple functions, depending on the type of text it occurs in and contextual elements (Cornelis 1997:97).

distinctions to be binary. I will view the relationship between the active and passives as follows.

Figure 6 contains two passive forms under the single passive function category.

![Figure 6. Voice hierarchy.](image)

### 3.3.2. Passive and participant roles

We need terms that can accommodate the constantly shifting roles of the participants in active and passive sentences. They must describe the syntactic configuration of the sentences, while we recognize that a given entity occurs in different syntactic positions, depending on the voice. Moreover, a single entity may take on a different semantic role without changing its linear position in the sentence. In this section I will present a system for referring to the participants in corresponding active and passive situations that is sensitive to their semantic and syntactic roles.¹⁴

A typical transitive sentence includes two entities and each fulfills a syntactic and a semantic function. The one that typically determines verb agreement and takes nominative case is the syntactic subject. At the same time, it often functions semantically as an Agent. I will

---

¹⁴ Much of this discussion parallels Boyd’s explanation of “diathesis.” See especially Boyd (1993:97-98).
refer to this syntactic entity as the “A.” The other entity is in the direct object position, usually a Patient; I will call it the “O.” Here is an example.

5. The player hit the ball.

Here “player” is an Agent (A), and “ball” is a Patient (O).

When the sentence undergoes passivization, the A is demoted and the O promoted. The entity that appears in the subject position of a one-place predicate, I will call the “S.”

6. The ball was hit.

Syntactic participants are not assigned a specific semantic role by the syntax, but by the verb. In some cases the A constituent does not play the role of Agent. An Agent is an entity that volitionally performs an action, typically affecting another entity. The most common exception is an Experiencer that undergoes a mental process or sensory input; it does not affect another entity per se, though another entity may be involved in the situation. Similarly, the O constituent does not always function as a Patient, that is, the entity that undergoes the action of the Agent. When the A is an Experiencer, the O fulfills the role of Theme, the object of the mental situation or sensory input. Here are some examples.

7. The scientist saw the microbe.

8. The microbe was seen.

---

15 These terms follow the usage of Hopper and Thompson (1980:252) and Dixon and Aikhenvald (2000).

16 My definition of Theme is loosely based on Haegeman (1991:41-42). She first defines Theme as, “the person or thing moved by the action expressed by the predicate,” but then changes to, “the entity affected by the action or state expressed by the predicate.” She combines the Patient and the Theme in the latter definition. I have chosen to separate roles of Patient, where the entity is affected by the action, e.g., physically, and Theme, where the entity is affected indirectly by the action, as in mental process verbs.
In sentence 7, “scientist” is an Experiencer A, and “microbe” is a Theme O. In sentence 8, the O constituent from sentence 7 becomes the S of the passive verb and functions semantically as the Theme.

In active one-participant sentences (i.e., intransitive sentences) the S can fulfill the role of Mover in addition to the semantic roles typically associated with transitive sentences (e.g., Agent).

9. The fire fighter went into the building.

“Fire fighter” is a Mover S, and “building” fulfills the role of Goal. I claim that the following sentence follows the same configuration of semantic roles as sentence 9, though it syntactically resembles the two-participant verbs above in sentences 5 and 7.

10. The fire fighter entered the building.

“Fire fighter” is a Mover A, and “building,” the Goal.

As a result, we see that the S can manifest the semantic roles typically related to the A (e.g., Mover) or the O (e.g., Theme). In studying sentences where a single constituent is apparent but two are expected, we cannot assume that the S is a promoted O with its associated semantic role. The S can also refer to the semantic entity A of the original sentence with two constituents.

### 3.3.2.1. Demotion of A

The functional approaches vary in the notion of “demotion.” The functionalists I discuss here would agree that the A receives less attention than the O (or other arguments) and then address what it means to receive less attention. Functional linguists define A-demotion as
reducing its topicality and producing a lower elaboration of events and a new point of view in the situation.\textsuperscript{17}

The A functions on several levels simultaneously. Wilmet describes four components of the typical A: 1) the \textit{logical} subject (the entity about which the sentence asserts something), 2) the \textit{psychological} subject (conveys known information), 3) the \textit{semantic} subject (often the Agent), and 4) the \textit{grammatical} subject (decides verb agreement) (Wilmet 2000:268-70).\textsuperscript{18} In effect, the passive changes the \textit{logical} subject to a new \textit{semantic} and/or \textit{grammatical} subject in order to match the \textit{psychological} subject in the surrounding discourse. We have already discussed the \textit{grammatical} subject (that is, the subject of the verb) above. This section will cover the \textit{logical}, \textit{psychological}, and \textit{semantic} subjects. The \textit{logical} and \textit{psychological} subjects are distinct when a sentence asserts information about an entity that is not already known in the discourse.\textsuperscript{19}

On the level of Wilmet’s \textit{semantic} subject, the passive mechanisms of some languages are sensitive to the semantic role of the A, and may limit what sort of A may be demoted according to its semantic class. This mechanism, however, seems to be rare. For example, Bulgarian restricts A-demotion to Agents or Patients. English, by contrast, may passivize any

\textsuperscript{17}Klaiman claimed that looking at voice from the standpoint of participant point of view is more “traditional,” while “contemporary” linguistics examines voice by comparing clause-level verb-noun structure with the logical predicate-argument level (Klaiman 1991:3-4).

\textsuperscript{18}Wilmet combines “subject” and “A” as I delineated them in section 3.3.1 into the single term “subject.”

\textsuperscript{19}I will treat nominal arguments here. A different problem arises when one looks at sentential objects of verbs. When such sentences appear in the passive, English allows for an impersonal passive, e.g., “It is believed that Hebrew is impenetrable.” Thus it seems that even in a language that does not allow impersonal passives, but requires O to be promoted, sentential complements are an exception. See El-Marzouk (El-Marzouk 2003:42).
semantic class, including Agent, Instrument, Patient, Experiencer, or Location. Here are some examples of this phenomenon (from Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999:115).

11. The bed has not been slept in (English).

12. *Legloto ne bešte spano vuv (Bulgarian)
   bed-the not was slept in

Thus individual languages specify which semantic entities may passivize, whether only Agents and Patients, or more broadly, Agent, Instrument, Patient, Experiencer, or Location. One could also explain this distinction using syntax rather than semantics. The passivization rule would state, then, that English allows passivization out of a prepositional phrase, while Bulgarian does not. This would indicate that languages are sensitive to a subject’s syntactic role, rather than its semantic role. Nevertheless, the phenomenon demonstrates that languages differ on what types of elements can be passivized.

The passive commonly demotes the A on Wilmet’s psychological subject level, as the passive S refers to the known information of an entity other than the A. Givón, in his study, measured the topicality of A and O according to the number of times they occur in the preceding and following contexts surrounding the linguistic mechanism in question. He shows that the passive promotes O and demotes A vis-à-vis their topicality. He begins by defining the prototypical transitive event, where the A is the salient cause, the O is the salient effect, and the verbal modality is perceptually and/or cognitively salient (Givón 1994:7). Next, he looks at the

---

20 In the same way, any semantic class may show up in the English by-phrase in passive sentences (Boeckx 1998:217).

21 Givón looks at other mechanisms besides the passive that change the relative topicality of event participants.

22 His refers to the participants with the abbreviations “AGT” and “PAT.”
relative topicality of the A and the O in the active and passive voices alongside the inverse and antipassive. To determine topicality Givón uses an empirical, statistical method which determines anaphoric accessibility, “whether the current referent has prior text antecedence,” and cataphoric persistence, “whether the current referent recurs in the following text” (Givón 1994:9). These statistics determine contextual relevance or topicality of the referent. He concludes that the passive reflects a lower topicality of A (and higher topicality of O) according to the frequency of its occurrence in the surrounding context.

In a similar way, Murphy sees evidence of A-demotion and O-promotion on the level of topicality and the degree of persistence of an entity in the discourse. Murphy’s definition of topicality resembles Wilmet’s psychological subject because it regards known information in the discourse. Like Givón, Murphy defines topicality according to the persistence of the entity in the discourse. Murphy writes, “The purpose of the [passive] construction seems to be to focus attention on the logical object . . . or to deemphasize the logical subject . . .” (Murphy 2004:1). We note the disjunction between A-demotion and O-promotion; the passive may demote the A, promote the O, or both. Murphy recognizes that de-emphasizing the logical subject parallels emphasizing the logical object, as he notes that an A with low topicality, as well as an O with high topicality, can trigger passivization (Murphy 2004:102-4, 199). Higher persistence equals higher topicality, and lower persistence means lower topicality. As a result, high and low topicality are defined by their statistical persistence.

---

23 The active-direct voice makes the A more topical, while the inverse makes the O more topical. Moreover, the antipassive makes the A topical and the O extremely non-topical (i.e., optional), while the passive makes the O topical and the A extremely non-topical (Givón 1994:8-9).

24 Sansò disagrees with Givón because the latter fails to limit the number and nature of functions a single structure may have (Sansò 2003:45).
When characterizing the Spanish periphrastic passive, Sansò refers to “saliency,” that is, the subject of the passive is salient in the discourse.\footnote{Her use of “saliency” resembles the use of “topicality” or “psychological subject” by others.} Sansò claims that the passive either introduces a new salient entity or “recalls a salient entity already introduced in the previous clause/discourse span” (Sansò 2003:109). The passive thus allows an O to be a salient entity, whether the salient entity is newly-introduced (and will persist in the discourse) or has been persisting in the discourse. The position of the A does not appear in her definition of the passive, insofar as the passive relates to the saliency of the subject (S).

Languages offer multiple ways of raising and lowering the level of specificity of an event.\footnote{See the explanation of Kemmer below for the low elaboration of events in the middle (section 3.4.2.1).} Sansò writes that the passive and middle are “strategies for signaling a departure from the canonical transitive event type in the direction of a less distinguished/elaborated event type” (Sansò 2003:74).\footnote{Her view of elaboration of events draws from Kemmer (1993).} In the active sentence, the A and O are distinct and explicit. The passive renders the A less distinct than the S, seen by the fact that the speaker is often not obliged to express it (Sansò 2003:69).

In passive sentences we see that forms of the passive differ by the degree to which the A persists, even in reflexive and reciprocal actions.\footnote{Sansò believes that passive voices differ according to “prominence of the patient, downgrading of the agent and degree of transitivity of the predicate” (Sansò 2003:45).} For example, Dimitrova-Vulchanova asserts that the A in the English passive can be expressed overtly with a by-phrase, or can exist by implication. In the latter case, the Initiator (her term for the A role) is still present conceptually,
but not overtly. She calls the contrast of overt vs. implied existence of the A “degrees of
demotion” (Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999:133).

A-demotion also affects the point of view from which the hearer views the situation.
Cornelis assumes that the speaker takes on the point of view of one of the arguments of any
sentence, passive or active, and the hearer is “invited to also adopt [that argument’s] way of
conceptualizing the event” (Cornelis 1997:81). When she speaks of demoting the A, she means
that the author signals the reader not to view the event from the A’s point of view (related to
Wilmet’s (2), above). She looks at the Dutch passive, which denotes, “[T]he agent’s perspective
is not central” (Cornelis 1997:30). Demotion of an argument indicates whose point of view is
most important. She defines the passive thus: “process towards a final state, the causer of which
should not be identified with” (Cornelis 1997:81).

This approach allows one to describe the passive voice’s pragmatic function
independently of its syntactic form. (See section 3.3.1.) By establishing the pragmatics of the
passive, Givón’s model deals more easily with passives without syntactic promotion of the O.
Take the following Russian examples:

13. a. Molniy -a razbil -a sten-u
  lightning-NOM.FEM smashed-FEM wall-ACC.FEM
  “Lightning smashed the wall.”

29 Furthermore, she includes all of the mechanisms that demote the A into the single category of “passive,”
which includes the passive, impersonal, and middle (Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999:217).

30 This definition is significant for understanding situation aspect because it specifies “towards a final
state.” See section 3.2 below.
b. Sten-u *razbil -o molniy -ey*  
wall-ACC.FEM smashed-NEUT lighting-INST.FEM  
“The wall was smashed by lightning” (Khrakovskiy 1974:15-16).

We note that the verb in sentence 13b bears neuter agreement, even though there is no neuter noun in the sentence. We should interpret this verb, therefore, as impersonal, that is, it has no subject. On the one hand, we can see the syntactic demotion of the A, from nominative (sentence 13a) to instrumental case (sentence 13b). On the other hand, the O has been promoted in word-order, but not in case or grammatical function; it remains in accusative case in both sentences. This example defies simple explanation in models that depend on syntactic O-promotion to define the passive. According to Givón’s model, though, we do not need to depend on the syntactic promotion of the O but can look at the pragmatic importance of the nouns involved, in the present example, signified by word-order promotion (Givón 1994, 28:14).

The functional approach combines intuitive approaches with empirical tests. On the one hand, Sansò’s “elaboration of events” and Cornelis’s “identify (with an argument),” represent more intuitive models. The inability to disprove a sentence’s “elaboration of events” or the specific entity one “identifies with” weakens the model. We can only verify this model by testing its predictions. On the other hand, Givón’s model is founded on more empirical data and supports the predictions of Sansò and Cornelis. Givón also analyses more types of topicality-changing devices in languages, and this scope allows his theory broader application. However, Cornelis believes that “topic” is too vague to define passive universally. She chooses to talk about “perspective” rather than “topic” (Cornelis 1997:29).

Passive demotion of the A, therefore, consistently de-emphasizes topicality of A (psychological subject demotion) with effects on the syntactic, semantic, and logical levels, to make the argument less distinguishable, influencing the hearer to identify less with that entity. A
speaker uses the passive to lower the topicality of A (psychological subject), resulting in syntactic or semantic demotion. As the passive obscures the A, a lower elaboration of events emerges. (See section 3.4.2.1.) In this way, the speaker skews an event to fit a particular point of view to assert new information about a particular entity (logical subject). The O becomes a good candidate for S once the A is demoted.

As I examine the Niphal and Hitpael in BH, I will assume this definition of the passive: demotion of A’s topicality. Applying Givón’s experimental model directly, though, poses particular problems in the HB. In Givón’s paradigm, one can easily define a text’s beginning point, end point, and author, within which the entities function more or less consistently. This allows him to count the consistency to which a given entity persists in a text. Biblical texts, however, are less consistent, and we thus have more difficulty defining the beginning point, end point, and author of a text. Persistence of an entity in a text, therefore, may result from reasons other than topicality, such as redaction. As a result, I will discern the psychological subject in the biblical texts as well as possible from the surrounding context.

3.3.2.2. Promotion of O

Various languages allow passive without object promotion. For example, passives of one-participant sentences present a problem for the canonical passive definition of demoting the A and promoting the O. One would not predict that Arabic allows the passive of intransitive verbs, such as “walk,” “sleep,” and “dance” (El-Marzouk 2003:39), or that German also allows this phenomenon.
14. Es wurde getanzt, bis das Bier leer war
   “(People) danced until the beer was empty.”

The underlying active sentence has no O to promote, as German “tanzen” (“dance”) only allows one argument, e.g., the dancer. So the problem of no noun in subject position is solved in German by inserting a “dummy” subject (“it”).

Furthermore, some examples demonstrate passivization of underlying two-participant sentences without object-promotion. Here is a Russian example repeated from sentence 13 above. Morphologically the verb is not marked as passive, but the sentence conveys a passive meaning.

15. a. Molniy -a razbil -a sten-u
    lightning-NOM.FEM smashed-FEM wall-ACC.FEM
    “Lightning smashed the wall.”

    b. Sten-u razbil -o molniy -ey
    wall-ACC.FEM smashed-NEUT lightning-INST.FEM
    “The wall was smashed by lightning” (Khrakovskiy 1974:15-16).

The accusative-marked O remains in the accusative case, though it is promoted in word-order, that is, the O appears in the position normally occupied by the A or S. The verb bears a neuter ending, so it does not agree with any argument. We would conclude that the S is grammatically empty. Such sentences result without an S to agree with the verb (grammatical O-promotion), but with a noun in S position. Thus grammatical O-promotion does not seem to be essential to the passive.

31 This example was retrieved from http://dencklerblog.de/, July 13, 2007. We can suppose the corresponding active to be, “Man hat getanzt . . .” (“One/people [past] danced . . .”).

32 Norwegian, Dutch, Polish, and Ukrainian allow passivization of transitive verbs without promoting the O (Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999:134). A similar phenomenon occurs with the Creek passive (Eastern Muskogean, Southeast United States) (Broadwell and Duncan 2002:34).
Admittedly, these examples of passive without grammatical object-promotion are exceptions. Not all languages allow passives without object promotion, and within the languages that allow this process, passives without O promotion are rarer than passives with promotion. Nevertheless, a strong theory of the passive must generalize on the nature of the passive without ignoring clear cross-linguistic tendencies.\textsuperscript{33}

Sansò, a functional linguist, does not refer to O in her definition because of abundant evidence against the idea of promoting O in the passive. She has concentrated on the demotion of the A as essential to the passive. Sansò writes, “The basicness of agent defocusing explains the fact that many languages allow passives of intransitive clauses, as well as passives without object promotion” (Sansò 2003:61). Demotion of A occurs universally in passives. By adopting a model where A’s demotion is central, one can explain more easily passive sentences that cannot or do not promote the O.

3.3.3. Exceptionality

Passive forms, however, do not always relate directly to a corresponding active. The quality of such divergent relations between active and passive verbs of the same verb stem is called “exceptionality.” Smirniotopoulos describes how “exceptionality” manifests itself in two ways. In the first type, a transitive active verb does not correspond to any passive form (Smirniotopoulos 1992:98-103), or a passive to any corresponding active (Smirniotopoulos 1992:108-11). In the other type, “the meaning of the passive form is not as predicted”

\textsuperscript{33} A demotion is necessary for the definition of passive, but not necessarily sufficient. “Inverse” also demotes A, and a fuller theory would need to distinguish between these two. This task does not fall in the purview of this dissertation. For further explanation on the effects of these sorts of grammatical processes, see (Givón 1994, 28).
These data further support her claim that the passive is a lexical process because it is idiosyncratic (Smirniotopoulos 1992:281-82). The common idiosyncratic relationship between active and passive verbs indicates a more lexical, idiosyncratic role in passive generation.

A passive derived in the lexicon explains the above paradoxes. For example, some verbs cannot form passives, such as “resemble” in the following sentences.

17. *Brian was resembled by Sarah.

This cannot be predicted by the syntax, but only by the lexical make-up of the verb. These idiosyncratic deviations in verbs and the active/passive argument relation motivate us to search beyond assuming a simple active-passive relationship for a given verb.

For the purposes of BH, these conclusions indicate that the passive in BH may include a lexical component. Exceptionality applies often to the case of BH. Many BH passives do not derive from an extant active. Other passives correspond to intransitive actives. Often these passives of intransitive actives deviate from the active with either a slightly different or unique meaning. A lexical location for passivization would explain why the derivational system of the binyanim is incomplete and idiosyncratic for many roots. While these gaps could result from historical accident and the incomplete extant data set, we now see cross-linguistic evidence to explain such gaps as lexical idiosyncrasies. A lexical model of the generation of the passive allows us to explain synchronically a lack of correspondence between active and passive verbs.
3.4. **MIDDLE VOICE**

3.4.1. **Formal expression of the middle**

The middle presents problems to scholars because of wide formal and functional varieties. Formally, the middle may resemble the reflexive. For some languages, such as German and French, the middle does not function identically to the reflexive, because some syntactic differences arise (see below, section 3.4.2.3). In other cases, the middle may not resemble the reflexive morphologically, as is the case in English.

Certain common meanings of the middle voice occur in many languages with a middle voice, but at the same time we find great variety of “fringe” meanings that exist in a small number of languages. The middle allows a reflexive meaning in most languages. In some languages the middle encodes habitual actions, while in others the middle allows eventive readings. Additionally, every language possesses a group of idiosyncratic uses of the middle. The question remains: what—if anything—unites the reflexive, habitual, and idiosyncratic meanings in this internal overlap?

This section will address these problems with a cognitive model, which defines formal expressions primarily by the abstract schema the form represents. I will show that the middle presents a situation from a non-agentive point of view, and this change in point of view reduces the transitivity of a sentence regardless of whether the S identifies with the A or the O. Once I have established these points, I will demonstrate how the middle and passive share some essential characteristics, and this common ground can help explain their relationship to the reflexive.
Hebraists, and more generally, Semiticists, often invoke the term “middle” to help distinguish between the Niphal and Hitpael. Voigt wrote concerning the middle voice in Semito-hamitic languages, “Für das Semito-hamitische möchten wir die Nicht-Transitivität als primäres Merkmal des Mediums begreifen” (Voigt 1987:92). While the transitivity-reducing properties of the middle are easily noticeable, the middle presents variety and contradictions that must be explained.

Languages often have a middle form distinct from a passive. In spite of contrasting forms, the middle often functions like a passive. Most research on the middle voice takes place among Indo-European languages, hence this discussion will largely draw from those languages. English, German, French, and Russian all form the passive voice with similar, periphrastic expressions, but they vary greatly in how they express the middle.

18. (English)
   This book reads easily.

19. (German)
   Dieses Buch liest sich leicht.
   this book reads RFLX easily
   “This book reads easily.”

20. (French)
   Ce livre se lit facilement.
   this book RFLX reads easily
   “This book reads easily.”

Austronesian languages vary with a range similar to the Indo-European family in how they form the middle, such as middle morphology, originally reciprocal morphemes, or reduplication. Functionally, the subfamilies and languages within them diverge (Bril 2005).

Outside of this single language family, one finds further formal expressions of the middle, with a wide variation of functions. Such broad variation results in confusion, for a linguist working in one language may not always mean the same thing by “middle voice,” as one working in another language. This problem of terminology of “middle” prompted Dixon and Aikhenvald to write, “This plethora of different uses for ‘middle’ scarcely makes for typological clarity. We would recommend that the term be restricted to its original Greek-based sense (or else avoided entirely). Some of the derivations presently characterized as ‘middle’ could simply be termed ‘(general) intransitivizer’” (Dixon and Aikhenvald 2000:12).
21. (Russian)
   Eta kniga legko chitaet=sya.
   this book easily read=MID
   “This book reads easily.”

All these examples are nearly synonymous. English, example 18, expresses the middle with an unmarked active verb. Examples 19 and 20 show that German and French use the reflexive marker to mark the middle voice. Russian, in example 21, uses a middle clitic, -sya, that is etymologically related to the full Russian reflexive pronoun, sebya.

The complete range of the middle’s functions, though, varies from language to language. For example, German and English almost exclusively use the middle to express habitual actions or characteristics, while Russian can often express one-time events with the middle.

Nevertheless, the middle in these specific examples functions among all these languages as a passive; more specifically, the form can depict the unfolding of an action on the underlying O without mentioning the A. As a result, the middle and passive may not be immediately distinguishable in their function, which produces internal overlap. In the next section, we will see that the middle functions similarly to the passive as far as syntax and semantics, which lies at the center of their internal overlap. Differences occur, nonetheless, that separate the two.

---

36 This example resembles unaccusative movement, except that the English middle tends to require an adverb. Reinhart notes that Germanic languages show an overlap between unaccusatives and reflexives. Significantly, she also notes that Modern Hebrew marks unaccusatives with the Hitpael (Reinhart 1996:1-7). Levin and Rappaport Hovav note the distinct properties of the English middle construction. Not every English verb allows a middle. This form is restricted to activity and accomplishment verbs; aspect plays a role in determining whether a verb may appear in the middle (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2005:96-101).

37 Spanish and Italian closely resemble French in this construction.
3.4.2. Middle and participant roles

3.4.2.1. Cognitive model for middle

Many linguists who study the middle have adopted a cognitive model, which consists of various abstract schemas of events. Section 3.4.1 argued for the necessity of including semantics with syntax to explain the middle. Cognitive approaches allow linguists to talk about relationships among participants on an abstract level, without needing to talk about particular expressions of these relationships. The need to explain the broad range of functions for the middle form within and among languages, and especially the common overlap between the middle and the reflexive, suggest that this model may be appropriate for this study. The model also defines differences between similar grammatical constructions, and provides insight into the connection between a speaker’s point of view and a grammatical expression. I will summarize the cognitive model and show how a speaker can express a particular point of view of a situation by using the middle voice.

The concept of a cognitive schema is important to understand in cognitive linguistics. Cognitive linguistics begins by assuming that the human mind contains schema that are encoded by linguistic expressions. While the world may present an infinite number of situations, the mind generalizes situations into categories, and the core of each group is composed of a “typical” representative. Manney writes, “A schema is a general, abstract representation of the commonalities observed across a number of specific instantiating expressions . . .” (Manney 2000:54).

A schema is tied to a particular linguistic form. Another term for these schemas is “situation types,” which are defined as “sets of situational or semantic/pragmatic contexts that
are systematically associated with a particular form of expression” (Kemmer 1993:7). So if we note supposedly distinct functions expressed by a single form, we should, according to Kemmer’s definition, look for the commonality to define the function properly.

An instance of a category relates to another instance of the same category according to the assumptions of cognitive linguistics. To explain these connections, cognitive linguists use the concept of prototypes. Manney writes,

A prototype is generally defined as a typical instance or best exemplar rather than an absolute representation of a particular category, and may also be quiet complex internally. . . . Membership in a given category is thus specified by degree rather than by definition. . . . [C]ategory members are specified as central or peripheral with respect to the category prototype (Manney 2000:58).38

I claimed above that a “typical” situation lies at the core of these schemas. The categories of these cognitive schemas are not defined by necessary and sufficient conditions, but by relative distance from a typical situation called a prototype. A given structure belongs to a particular category based on degrees of resemblance to this prototype.

The cognitive approach breaks down schemas according to prominence, perspective, and specificity. One can compare constructions that are functionally related according to these criteria, even though the expressions may not bear close formal relations. Kemmer writes,

This decompositional view of verbal semantics allows us to compare the semantic structures of events in terms of parameters such as number of participants in the event, interactional relations among participants, and the participants’ relation to the event itself with regard to such properties as conceived origination of the event and its effect on participants (Kemmer 1993:8).

38 This definition resembles that of Smith (1991:21).
In this way, Kemmer sets out the parameters she is examining in middle schemas. They are the 1) number of participants, 2) relationships among the participants, and 3) origins and effects of the event.

This model further predicts that if a situation closely resembles a prototype, that situation will act more like another situation that resembles that prototype than one that does not resemble the prototype. For example, if a language distinguishes grammatically between human and nonhuman entities, it contains prototypes for those categories. The model would predict that an ape would likely be treated grammatically more like a human than a rock, since an ape’s salient traits resembles a human’s more than the inanimate (nonhuman) rock’s. Nevertheless, as Manney stresses, a cognitive linguistic model predicts “strong tendencies rather than absolutely defined generalizations” (Manney 2000:8). The same non/human categorization might vary with liminal entities, e.g., babies.

By choosing a linguistic expression, the speaker is imposing the corresponding schema onto the event (Manney 2000:57). An event is not tied to any particular schema; the speaker must choose what schema best fits the event according to his or her point of view, and then use the corresponding linguistic expression. The choice of schema involves, according to Manney, “1) the relative prominence given to its various subparts, 2) the perspective from which it is viewed, and/or 3) the level of specificity at which the event is characterized” (Manney 2000:6). By analogy, one can describe a single car accident from various perspectives (e.g., from the crosswalk, from a car passing by the accident, from a tall building overlooking the accident). Each viewpoint emphasizes a different part of the event. Thus, understanding the schema that is tied to a linguistic expression allows us to grasp the point of view of the speaker or writer.
Now we will look at how linguistic expressions indicate a particular schema. A corollary arises from the cognitive approach regarding how to categorize meanings. Since a grammatical expression is tied to a schema or event type, we assume that multiple meanings expressed by the same construction can be unified in a single category (Kemmer 1993:4). Linguists who have studied the middle voice encounter the problem of disparate meanings expressed by a single form. Hebraists, for example, have run into this problem describing the Niphal and the Hitpael. They may look to diachronic means for a solution to this problem (see sections 2.2.3.1 and 2.3.3.1, above). With a cognitive linguistic approach we will assume the synchronic unity of the functions expressed by the Niphal and the Hitpael in order to see what separates the problematic overlap between the Niphal and Hitpael stems.39

The middle form relates to a particular schema. Suzanne Kemmer’s 1993 watershed book on the middle voice, in which she approached the middle from a cognitive and semantic point of view, sought a broad, cross-linguistic definition of “middle.” She first categorized examples of the middle voice cross-linguistically into common semantic categories, which resembled reflexive actions (grooming/body care, nontranslational motion, change in body posture, indirect middle, etc., [Kemmer 1993:16-17]). The middle forms of many languages exhibit at least a diachronic—if not a synchronic—resemblance to the reflexive. As a result, she compared these typical semantic categories to reflexive situation types using semantic prototype models. She ultimately claimed that all middles are related by a single “situation type” that resembles a reflexive situation type, but whose two, coreferential participants are less distinct.

39 This contradicts the assumption of Mitchell in his work on the Niphal/Hitpael distinction of בָּרֹק brk “bless” in the Patriarchal Narratives. He claims that it is “unwarranted” to assume that differing forms requires differing meanings, though he does not preclude the assumption altogether (Mitchell 1987:33 n. 3).
These middle semantic categories all relate to the reflexive situation type, where the actor and affected entity are typically coreferential.

“Transitivity” often describes the number of participants. The transitivity of some expressions, however, is not easy to determine. For example, is a reflexive transitive or not? In BH, reflexive sentences often are in a detransitivizing stem (e.g., Niphal or Hitpael), but the single participant acts as two (i.e., Agent and Patient). Such examples demonstrate how complex “transitivity” can be.

One of the facets of the middle voice relates to transitivity and the distinguishability of participants. Kemmer includes the middle on a cline between transitive and intransitive, or, as she states it more precisely, between one- and two-participant events. In her cross-linguistic study of the middle voice, she has determined that a principal feature of the middle is the relative distinguishability of the participants. For her, the reflexive represents two clear participants, who happen to be coreferenced. The participants are less distinguishable than in other two-participant events. In contrast, the middle distinguishes the two participants less than a reflexive. I will reproduce her diagram here.

---

She further subsumes the property “subject affectedness,” which some claim to be the defining feature of the middle, under “relative elaboration of events.”
Hopper and Thompson see both volitionality and agency on the cline of transitivity, and a reduction in either of them qualifies as a reduction in transitivity (Hopper and Thompson 1980:252). For example, one can reduce volitionality by making the A less responsible for the action, or one can reduce agency by changing semantic class, e.g., from an Agent to an Experiencer. Both attributes are essential to the prototypical A. By reducing the transitivity through A, one moves A away from a typical Agent role.

Murphy invokes Hopper and Thompson’s work on transitivity when he says that Kemmer adds middles to Hopper and Thompson’s transitivity scale (Murphy 2004:119). Understanding that the reflexive falls between transitives and intransitives, Murphy notes that Hopper and Thompson recognize that reflexives fall between transitive and intransitive sentences (Hopper and Thompson 1980:277-78). We can thus draw a parallel between transitivity and distinguishability of participants when describing the middle voice. The middle voice falls between the reflexive and one-participant events in distinguishability of participants and transitivity.

Manney has defined the middle schema according to the energy source and path of the action. In the standard agent-patient schema of a prototypically transitive event, the “energy” of the action moves along a path from the Agent (our “A”) to the Patient (our “O”). For example, the sentence, “The boxer hit his opponent,” expresses energy moving from the A (the boxer) to the O (his opponent) (Manney 2000:57). The same schema can be extended to Experiencer events. So, “The boxer eyed his opponent,” describes an event where energy traveled from the Experiencer-A (the boxer) to the Theme-O (his opponent). In this way an Agent/Patient relationship parallels an Experiencer/Theme relationship.
In the middle schema, the path looks different from the path in the active, according to Manney. The latter expresses energy moving from the A to the O; the former “involves a path that leads to rather than originates from the subject [S], so the experiencer subject of the middle schema is understood as an energy sink, rather than an energy source” (Manney 2000:65). Kemmer additionally posits that the indistinguishability of participants in the middle voice leads to a circular energy path that leads from the entity onto the same entity, or stays within the entity (Kemmer 1993:71). Thus, the path that the event’s energy moves along is viewed from the point of view of the endpoint rather than the beginning point.

The Modern Greek middle demonstrates one way that an A is demoted on a pragmatic level. According to Manney, the middle and passive are related in that “the notion of a responsible agent is absent, irrelevant, or incongruous” (Manney 2000:1). If a speaker wants to express an event and downplay the role of the Agent (vis-à-vis the active expression of the event), he or she would be more likely to use a middle voice, as this is the prototypical role of the Modern Greek middle voice (Manney 2000:25, 53). The middle voice appears in pragmatic contexts where the Agent’s role in bringing about a change is de-emphasized, especially when the Agent is obvious and/or the events are more controversial in the larger cultural context (Manney 2000:165).

The cognitive approach offers a helpful model for understanding the middle voice because it allows one to conceive of the energy of an event distinctly from its syntactic

---

41 Kemmer’s schema does not help us understand the “passive middle,” where the two participants cannot be the same entity.

42 However, Manney does not define precisely what “downplay” means, and leaves it to the judgments of her native speakers.

43 According to this pragmatic definition, the middle and passive strongly resemble one another.
formulation. This model explains the effects on transitivity examined in section 3.4.2.3, below. A tendency towards intransitivity in syntax in the middle arises from a change in point of view from the action’s “energy emitter” to the “energy sink.” Since we assume that the middle schema is universal, we can assume that some middle form exists in all languages. A given language expresses the middle in a particular way, but this does not imply that another language will express it in the same way. Hence we see the importance of Kemmer’s study, as it showed various cross-linguistic means for expressing the single functional category of middle with significantly overlapping meanings.

I will base further discussion of the middle voice on the notion of a schema that presents the situation with the S as the goal of the energy of the action. I will test the predictions of the cognitive approach on BH. Manney’s model predicts that the middle and passive will function similarly, while Kemmer predicts that the middles without coreference are more peripheral to the middle model. In both models, the middle focuses on the S—usually the underlying O—as opposed to the A. On the scale of transitivity, the middle represents an intermediate point between reflexive and one-participant events.

3.4.2.2. Demotion of A

As discussed above (section 3.4.1), Voigt said that the middle is first recognizable by its intransitivity. The middle, like the passive, demotes A and usually promotes O to S. Moreover, the middle may apply to sentences that only have one participant. This essential A-demotion follows much of what we have said about the passive. However, we also see that the A can become the S in the middle, as well. Although the number of participants may not be reduced, and the A may stay in the same syntactic positions, we can view the A-demotion as a reduction
in agentivity in both cases. If A≠S, A is demoted by backgrounding its agency; if A=S, A is demoted by reducing its agency and volition.

The middle voice allows a range of relationships among the S, A, and O. German unites the functions “reflexive” (S=A=O), generic (the A argument is generic, and S=A or S≠A), “anticausative” (S≠A), and “inherent reflexive” (S=A) under the same phonological form as the middle for the same reason, because they all present the event from the point of view of the non-agentive subject (Steinbach 2002:299). While verbs with “affected” arguments often appear in the subject position of middles, some verbs without affected objects can be grammatical in the middle (Steinbach 2002:33).

Even in languages that allow the middle to preserve the same number of participants as the active, a middle may not have more participants than its active counterpart. Active-middle variants of the same verb “most typically encode a transitivity alternation” in Modern Greek. Most often, the middle of a verb is less transitive than the active of the same verb. Nevertheless, if the active has two participants, the middle may have one or two participants, and if the active has one participant, the middle has no more than one. Manney does not find any examples where the middle has more participants than the active counterpart (Manney 2000:39). The middle thus never increases and tends to reduce the number of participants.

Linguists find that the subjects of middles (and passives, for that matter) are not limited to Patients, but are quite commonly Experiencers (what I am calling Themes). Steinbach notes

44 Dutch also allows verbs without actor-arguments and that cannot project an external argument (i.e., grammatical and semantic subject) to appear in the middle (Steinbach 2002:101).

45 Arce-Arenales et al. claim that the middle diathesis in nominative-accusative languages “mark[s] a particular kind of active clause in which the subject is affected by the action” (Arce-Arenales et al. 1994, 27:17-18). This definition is a bit too broad for the current discussion.
that German allows *verlieren* (‘lose’), *vergessen* (‘forget’), *finden* (‘find’), and *welken* (‘wilt’) to form grammatical middle constructions, even though the middle subjects are not inherently affected by the action, and are thus not Patients, but more like Themes (Steinbach 2002:40). The same phenomenon occurs in Modern Greek, and so Manney claims that psycho-emotive verbs in the active and middle voices follow the same schema as transitive verbs with Agent and Patient arguments. When the psycho-emotive verb occurs in the middle and not the active, that is, it is deponent, the “experiencer subject [is depicted] as the goal of a force dynamic interaction” (Manney 2000:107). This parallel of Patient and Theme subjects demonstrates that the determining characteristics for S are low volitionality and agency, not necessarily one specific semantic role.

The middle subject of the Modern Greek middle voice always appears to be a non-Agent entity that undergoes a process. This does not imply that either the A or O must become the S. Manney claims that “passive, emotional response, and spontaneous change” are united in that they depict events “from the perspective of a nonagent which undergoes experience” (Manney 2000:187). The subject may benefit from the process, respond emotionally to the event, have an object move into its domain, or act without full responsibility for the action (Manney 2000:11). In certain texts, the middle voice emphasizes what a Patient subject underwent by focusing on the action itself (Manney 2000:195).

In instances where languages do not reduce the number of participants in the middle, the sentence is still less transitive. The middle can demote A semantically, by reducing its volition or agency. While syntactic and cognitive approaches agree that the middle demotes the A of the active counterpart, they define “demotion” differently. According to Hopper and Thompson both alterations qualify as a reduction in transitivity (Hopper and Thompson 1980:252).
Reduction in volition is marked by a case change, and in agency by change of semantic class.

Next, I will turn to agentivity in the middle voice. The middle S can carry various roles, which creates a problem for generalizing on the middle subject’s nature. Some middle subjects serve a Patient or Experiencer role, like a passive. The middle can derive an S from an O, usually a Patient or Theme, or an A with reduced agency and volitionality.

3.4.2.2.1. $A \neq S$

The middle can detransitivize by reducing the volitionality and agency of the A. Dimitrova-Vulchanova believes that the subject undergoes a semantic demotion (1999:168). In other words, the Agent referent bears less of an Initiator role and has less responsibility in the action in the middle than in the passive. Semantic demotion, then, “is likely to be reflected in the syntax,” that is, the A is often demoted syntactically, as well (Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999:150).

The middle can thus be defined as a reduction in the semantic role or degree of agency of the subject: transitivity reduction, in Hopper and Thompson’s terms.

Once the A is reduced in the middle, some underlying agency—even from an unexpressed entity—is often still understood even if the language does not allow the A to be expressed syntactically. This underlying agency distinguishes the middle function from other agentless constructions.\(^{46}\) Both German and Modern Greek, as well as French, interpret agency in middle sentences similarly. In German the Agent remains implicit in the middle sentence and may not appear overtly (Steinbach 2002:17; Fagan 1992:20). Reflexive anticausatives, which

---

\(^{46}\) Steinbach (2002), Manney (2000), and Fagan (1992) use the terms “anticausative,” “spontaneous change of state,” and “ergative,” respectively, with essentially the same meaning, that is, the subject is affected by the action, without an implied Agent. We should note that the above use of “ergative” by Fagan refers to a semantic, not a syntactic, trait.
are formally identical to middles, do not imply a semantic argument, however (Steinbach 2002:43). Similarly, the English middle does not allow the initiator of the action to be expressed, unlike a “by”-phrase in the passive (Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999:123). Modern Greek middles allow the implication of an Agent, though not in the case of “spontaneous and natural change,” that is, cases where one would not expect any agency (Manney 2000:11-12).

An implicit Agent is assumed in French middles, but not in (semantically) ergative sentences where one would not assume an Agent (Fagan 1992:146). Thus the Agent is understood by the listener or reader (when the context allows it), even though the Agent is not explicit.

One should not assume that the middle universally does not allow the expression of the Agent. Dimitrova-Vulchanova notes that Bulgarian allows the initiating argument to appear in a by-phrase, in contrast to German (Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999:142-43). The underlying A is conceptually present in both languages, even if their syntactic expression differs.

Similarly, Fagan looks to the role of the subject as a way to solve the above problems with the middle in German. The German middle presents the problem of a syntactic entity, that is, a reflexive pronoun, often with no lexical role. Fagan addresses the problem by separating the mechanisms that assign semantic and syntactic roles. The middle voice moves the semantic role assigned by the verb to the subject position (Fagan 1992:198). In turn, the associated argument appears in subject position in the syntax. This mechanism allows the verb to license a syntactic

\[47\] Compare Dimitrova-Vulchanova’s approach to the passive, section 3.3.2.1.

\[48\] This stance contradicts Boyd’s definition of the middle, when he writes, “Middle has the same mapping as the passive but without an implied or explicit agent, even if the action requires an agent in the real world—even if the context mentions who the agent is” (Boyd 1993:245). It is difficult to understand how an Agent cannot be implied if the action requires an Agent in the real world. His definition of “middle” more closely resembles what the other authors have defined as “anticausatives” (see note 46).
object with no lexical role, while the O becomes the S.\textsuperscript{49} In impersonal middle constructions, no lexical role is sent to the subject position (Fagan 1992:166).

3.4.2.2.2. \textbf{A=S}

If the underlying A acts in the process depicted by the middle, that is S=A, the actions impinge on the subject, or the emotional effect on the subject may be heightened, while the subject’s initiative is downplayed (Manney 2000:121). Thus the middle S, whatever argument it is derived from, is comprised of the components, “high effect,” “low volition,” and “low individuation” (Manney 2000:11).\textsuperscript{50} “Low volition” explains the following examples of lowered transitivity in the middle.

The following active-middle pair in Russian contains the same referent as subject, while the degree of involvement or volition differs. The subject in active sentence 22 is an Experiencer, and in the middle sentence 23, the subject is less volitional.

22. Ya xoču kušat’
I-NOM want.1s to-eat
“I want to eat.”

23. Mne xočet=sya kušat’
me-DAT want.3s=MID to-eat
“I want to eat.” “I feel like eating.”

The first sentence, 22, implies more volition on the part of the subject, he or she has come to a decision, as opposed to sentence 23, where the desire came to the subject. Neither one manifests

\textsuperscript{49} For ergative sentences, that is, similar to a middle with no underlying Agent, the lexical role of the A is not moved but deleted (Fagan 1992:198).

\textsuperscript{50} Experiencer subjects of mental process verbs exemplify “high effect” (Manney 2000:11) “Low volition” implies lowered agentivity. “Low individuation” seems to resemble Kemmer’s “low individuation of participants.” Bakker refers to “affectedness,” which is measured by transitivity, and breaks down into the features “volition,” “agency,” and “causation” (Bakker 1994, 27:44).
a Patient as the subject, however. Since the subject is undergoing a mental process, we should assign the subject to the category, “Experiencer.” Nevertheless, the subjects of both sentences are Experiencers. They do not “experience” in the same way, though, as the subject of the second sentence is more passive to the experience than the subject of the first.

Middle constructions allow various semantic roles for the S when the S is derived from the A. For example, a middle subject can also be the Experiencer of an emotion verb, as in the following example (which includes a direct object in the genitive case). The following verb only appears in the middle, and never in the active.

24. Ya boyu=s’ lyudey
   I fear=MID people.GEN
   “I’m afraid of people.”

Similarly, the following verb only appears in the middle. The A argument resembles an Experiencer also, since the situation resembles an emotional experience.

25. Kogda ty smeyosh=sya smeyot=sya ves’ mir
    when you laugh=MID laugh=MID all world
    “When you laugh, the whole world laughs.”

The middle subject may be reflexive, bearing the role of Agent and Patient. Here is another Russian example.

26. Ya odevayus’
    I dress=MID
    “I’m getting dressed.”

51 I am calling the dative pronoun in example 23 the subject. Even though it is not in the Nominative and does not determine the verb agreement, the pronoun is coreferenced to the PRO in the infinitival clause, just like the Nominative subject of example 22.

52 Note that “smile” (ulybat’=syu) also appears in the middle.

53 Cf. Boyd in section 2.2.3.2.3, above.
A native speaker of Russian would typically use this expression when he or she was getting him- or herself dressed, but it can occasionally be used if someone is dressing the speaker. So the middle subject can function as an Agent, Patient, or Experiencer, in transitive, intransitive, and reflexive sentences.

Manney admits to less common meanings of the middle that do not fit the definition she has proposed. She finds some examples of Agent subjects in the middle, for example. Nevertheless, these occurrences appear much less frequently than middles with the core function of expressing an event from a non-Agent point of view (Manney 2000:80). The above examples demonstrate that when $S=A$, the $A$ most often shows less volitionality and agency than in the active counterpart.

### 3.4.2.2.3. Semantics of middle $S$

The most consistent solution to unify the two cases of $A$ demotion (3.4.2.2.1 and 3.4.2.2.2) assumes a distinction between syntactic and semantic detransitivization. Middle verbs are less transitive than active ones, so some linguists seek an explanation in the syntax. This works well for cases where $A \neq S$. However, the complex syntax of the middle stymies explanations of the middle with syntax alone, such as when $A=S$. So linguists have turned to a combination of syntax and semantics for a solution. The middle detransitivizes syntactically by reducing the number of arguments, and/or semantically, by reducing the volitionality and agency of the $A$.

In terms of event schema, the middle focuses on the event energy as it moves *towards* $S$, (as opposed to energy *from* $A$ in the active). We see how $S$ is affected by the action. While Kemmer claims that the middle essentially indicates that the energy goes out of and into the
same point, in the case of “passive middles,” this coreference is not the case. The shift in focus in the schema allows the reader to perceive the event energy in terms of its goal rather than its source. This solution for the middle resonates with the solution found for the passive, above. Wilmet delineated the various aspects of a subject (section 3.3.2.1). He, like Fagan, separated the semantic subject from the syntactic subject. Once the syntactic and semantic roles are separated one can manipulate one role without necessarily touching the other.\textsuperscript{54} Detransitivization can occur with both.

Reduction of the A in the middle voice in these languages leads to tangible conclusions. The subject is always viewed as less “agentive” in the middle than in active counterparts. In German this phenomenon usually manifests itself in the loss of an argument. In Russian and Modern Greek the subject entity might remain the same, but the level of the subject’s agentivity is reduced. Some languages forbid expressing the A in middle constructions. However, all the languages discussed above do not force agency to disappear completely from the situation’s purview; agency is often implied. Moreover, this implied agency distinguishes the middle from anticausatives / ergative / spontaneous actions that use the same form of expression as the middle.

### 3.4.2.3. Promotion of O

The middle deals with the O differently than the passive does. Some languages allow the middle in active, one-participant actions, while others do not. In English, the middle verb

\textsuperscript{54}Boyd makes a valuable contribution when he separates semantics from syntax, which appears to be the best solution. In section 2.2.3.2.3, we saw how Boyd is basing his model on the one outlined in Geniušienė (1987:52-57). Boyd separates arguments onto three levels (syntactic, semantic, and referential), and defines the middle subject semantically as “Actor,” that is “the controller of the action and the entity most affected by the action” (Boyd 1993:113-14).
appears just like the active morphologically. The middle in some languages allows direct objects. Hence, O-promotion is not essential to the functional definition of the middle, as in the passive, further explaining internal overlap.

The formal expression of the middle varies according to language. The German middle is expressed with what appears to be a reflexive marker, but the marker functions differently on the syntactic and semantic level. The German middle requires a direct object to be present phonologically, though it is semantically empty; that is, the reflexive does not corefer to the subject. Fagan describes how the middle in German has to be able to license a direct object in order for the reflexive pronoun to be grammatical, even though the reflexive pronoun does not necessarily co-refer to another entity in the middle (Fagan 1992:128; see also Steinbach 2002:86). Since the German middle verb does not lose its ability to assign a direct object in the syntax, nothing in the syntax motivates the direct object to move up. In other German examples, semantic coreference between the middle subject and the reflexive pronoun is allowed, but we see here that the middle does not require semantic coreference (Steinbach 2002:3-4).

---

55 We likewise find Niphals and Hitpaels—both having been described as middles by various authors (see section 2.2.2.4 and 2.3.2.2, respectively)—with direct objects on occasion. Take the following example in the Niphal.

\[\text{wōyāśā³ lōʔānēnū wōnilḥam ʔēt- milḥāmōṭēnū} \]

\[\text{and.go.out to.face.our and.fight:Niphal:QTL ACC-wars.our} \]

And he will go out before us and fight our wars (for us) (1 Sam 8:20).

56 Steinbach similarly states, “So far, we do not find any relevant syntactic restrictions on middle formation. . . . German middle constructions can not be conclusively derived from the principles of generative syntactic theories” (Steinbach 2002:96).

57 Steinbach further claims that reflexivity and valence reduction are closely related in Indo-European languages (Steinbach 2002:51-52).
While the French middle is expressed with a reflexive pronoun as the German middle is, the French construction acts syntactically intransitive as opposed to German. When French cliticizes direct object pronouns to the front of the verb, the sentence acts predictably transitive. Fagan contrasts these verbs with objective clitic pronouns to those with reflexive clitics. Only the latter can pass tests for intransitive verbs, but verbs with a direct object clitic cannot (Fagan 1992:144). The coreference affects how the syntax functions in the language. As a result, the movement appears to take place extra-syntactically, before the language parses the sentence as transitive or intransitive. So the French middle is expressed by a reflexive clitic and is syntactically intransitive; the German middle takes a full reflexive pronoun and is syntactically transitive.

For the German middle voice, “reduction” of agency often means elimination of the first argument of the verb. The subject does not manifest the first, or “external,” argument of the middle verb (Steinbach 2002:18). German middle verbs use syntactic demotion more consistently than semantic demotion, that is, they do not reduce agency in the same way as Russian or Modern Greek.

English middle sentences cannot express any direct object. The English middle can never have a syntactic or phonological object. This phenomenon contrasts remarkably with the other Indo-European languages that require some semantically empty entity in the O slot.

The middle in some languages can occur in basic one-participant sentences, much like the passive. The languages that allow such constructions in the middle are the same as those that allow the passive of one-participant sentences. The middle of one-participant sentences may
demonstrate no O-promotion in German, French, and Russian, but English does not allow one-participant verbs to appear in the middle.  

27. (German)
   Hier schläft es sich gut.
   here sleeps it RFLX well  
   “One sleeps well here.”

28. (French)
   il se dort sous forme de chat sous sa couette pour avoir moins froid
   he RFLX sleep under form of cat under his duvet for have less cold
   “He sleeps in the form of a cat under his duvet in order to be less cold.”

29. (Russian)
   zdes’ xorosh spīt=sya
   here well sleep=MID
   “One sleeps well here.”

30. (English)
   *Under a cozy duvet it sleeps well.

If one assumed that a syntactic movement process produced the middle, one would not predict the existence of middles arising from intransitive verbs, as syntactic demotion of the A would leave the verb without an S. English demonstrates that some languages do not allow this sort of movement. One should note that these examples all bear a common middle function, that is, they describe habitual actions or processes.

Steinbach advocates A-reduction as more primary than O-promotion and claims that any argument promotion comes as a result of this demotion (Steinbach 2002:216). As a result, German verbs with no arguments, e.g., regnen (“rain”), tauen (“thaw”), do not exhibit middle

58 Steinbach describes the phenomenon of intransitive middles in German (Steinbach 2002:23-24). Fagan claims that French does not allow such intransitive middles (Fagan 1992:97). We find examples of intransitive middles in French, albeit less commonly than in German or Russian, e.g., sentence 28.

59 This example was retrieved from http://nekoneko.xooit.com/t8-Fye-Flowright.htm, June 12, 2007.
forms (Steinbach 2002:25). In this way the German middle resembles the argument structure of a passive: the A is reduced and the O is promoted.

The Modern Greek middle can occasionally take a direct object, allowing two participants. This phenomenon contrasts with Hamito-Semitic languages in Voigt’s study (section 3.4.1). A syntactic account of the passive would say that the passive verb cannot license a second argument after one has been eliminated. When the direct object is generated in object position, it must move when passivized to an available, acceptable position: the subject position. Modern Greek middle verbs appear in transitive and intransitive sentences (Manney 2000:38-39).

While the middle displays O-promotion that is very similar to passive movement, English data show that the middle differs from the passive in what syntactic entities are available for promotion. The English middle looks like a passive in some ways (it demotes A and promotes O), but the language restricts O movement more than in the passive. The type of movement that the English passive and middle allow further demonstrates that the middle does not simply move

---

60 Reduction of the Agent does not universally require that the active verb possess semantic participants. Some languages seem to be able to add a Patient to such verbs as “rain,” which often does not possess a semantic participant, though it may possess a “dummy” syntactic subject. The passive subject of these verbs still bears characteristics of reduced agency. The first example comes from Japanese, and the second from BH. (I would like to thank Kasumi Kato [p.c.] for the Japanese examples.)

Ame-ga fut-ta. Watashi-wa ame-ni fut-rare-ta.
rain-NOM fall-past I-TOP rain-by fall-PSV-PAST.
‘It rained.’ ‘I was adversely affected by rain.’

helqah ʔahat timmätër
field one be.rained:Niphal
One field will be rained on (Niphal) (Amos 4:7).

61 Manney defines transitive as sentences with a subject in the Nominative case and an object that is in the accusative case or a sentential object. “Intransitive” means that the object is the object of a prepositional phrase, in the Genitive case, or there is no object. Middle verbs can appear in any of these situations.
arguments in the syntax (Fagan 1992:141). The English passive allows “preposition stranding”; the middle does not.

31. a. The kids laughed \[_{PPat \, NP}the \, new \, boy\]. (active)
   b. The new boy was laughed \[_{PPat \, t}\]. (passive)
   c. *The new boy laughs \[_{PPat \, t}\] easily. (middle)

The English passive allows movement out of a prepositional phrase, leaving the preposition in place. The middle, though, does not allow the same sort of movement. Syntactic movement in the passive and middle involve different mechanisms.

These examples demonstrate the syntactic variation that occurs in the middle voice across languages. Languages vary in the treatment of the overt object on the syntactic and phonological levels. Similarly, the middle varies as to whether or not the middle requires an O, just as the passive does not consistently require an O constituent in the underlying active. Similarly, languages that restrict or allow the middle in one-participant sentences do the same in the passive. However, the middle differs from the passive in that the middle always promotes the O syntactically, if one exists.

3.4.3. Middle and reflexive

Semiticists like to focus on the S/O relationship in the middle. Sometimes the S can assume coreference between the underlying A and O—or occasionally another argument besides the O—resulting in a reflexive meaning. Creason defines the middle thus as he writes, “In essence, then, the term ‘middle voice’ is applicable to a verb which refers to a situation in which a participant acts upon itself or in its own interests and therefore has two roles in the situation. Reflexive and reciprocal actions are two common examples of this kind of situation” (Creason
1995:287). By this definition reflexives are a subset of middle actions, which essentially include some sort of coreference. Moreover, this definition excludes a formal reflexive-passive relationship. Other Semiticists do not define the voices so narrowly, however; Joosten writes that the Niphal and t-forms are “equally” reflexive (Joosten 2000:212).62 These forms may express the reflexive and reciprocal, but not exclusively. Cross-linguistically we note that the formal middle often may not encode coreference.

The middle overlaps considerably with the reflexive in many languages, as we saw in Kemmer’s (1993) study on the middle voice. She noted that the middle voice marker often is homophonous with or derived from the reflexive. We see internal overlap as a result. Moreover, languages often encode with the middle voice semantic classes of verbs that depict reflexive-like actions. Thus we should not ignore the considerable overlap between the middle and the reflexive functions, but we should similarly not assume that the reflexive is entirely included in the middle.

Nevertheless, a definition of the middle where S acts on itself and has two roles is too narrow and resembles the reflexive too closely in light of the data I have presented. By the “reflexive” definition, examples 18-21 and 24 would not be considered middle because the participant does not act in any way. Moreover, example 25 does not depict a subject who acts on him- or herself. By his definition, we could only classify 26 as middle. Boyd’s definition differs only slightly from Creason’s, in that he says the morphological middle “predominantly” signals the middle diathesis, which means, “the subject is both in control of and affected by the action of the verb” (Boyd 1993:298). This implies that the morphological middle may indicate structures

62 Modern Arabic dialects have evolved away from the internal passive and predominantly use the “morphologically marked reflexive” to indicate the passive (El-Marzouk 2003:64 n. 22).
other than the middle diathesis, but such non-reflexive structures represent the exceptions. The above approaches allow a more accurate definition of the middle cross linguistically.

Other Semiticists define the middle with the S as the recipient or affected entity of the event. Joosten claims that the so-called “stative” Hebrew verbs—those that follow the morphological pattern “kābed-yikbad”—resemble the Indo-European middle. Furthermore, each of the examples depicts a process “whose subject is the center [“siège”]” (Joosten 2000:204). Voigt also recognizes a more general “subjectivity” to the middle in Semitic languages, that is, the middle combines the subject with the event (Voigt 1987:93). These authors thus see that the new, non-canonical subject’s point of view is brought to the fore in the middle constructions.

This work in Semitic languages corresponds to questions addressed in the linguistic literature on the middle voice. While Creason’s and Boyd’s definitions resemble Kemmer’s (1993) model in that co-reference lies at the base of the middle, the approach of the former two needs to be broadened. Kemmer sees close affinity between the middle and reflexive, but she attempts to distinguish the two, unlike Creason and Boyd. Voigt and Joosten see point of view as more relevant, similarly to Kemmer. However, Voigt and Joostén fall short of clearly defining the nature of the middle subject vis-à-vis the active subject.

The middle relates to the reflexive, but cannot be defined by it. The S may or may not have an agentive role in the middle event, but very often is affected by the action, whether physically (as a Patient) or emotionally (as an Experiencer). The middle reflects a schema that allows both Patient and Experiencer subject middles to follow the same cognitive schema, which gives rise to the various meanings of the middle voice. Additionally, the middle subject becomes foregrounded in larger texts. The middle lowers the elaboration of events by obscuring the
Agent role of the S with reduced volition (examples 22 and 23), a Patient role (examples 18-21, 26), an Experiencer role (examples 24-25), or no overt argument (example 27-29).

The Modern Greek middle form can be ambiguous as to whether it encodes coreference or not, that is, passive or reflexive meaning.

32. i ifiýénya θisiástike
    the-Iphigénia:NOM sacrifice:3SG:MID
    “Iphigénia was sacrificed/sacrificed herself” (adapted from Manney [2000:203]).

The sentence gives us information about the S, whom someone (the A) sacrificed. However, the formal middle does identify the A specifically with Iphigenia or someone else. One would have to interpret this ambiguity from the context, just as we must in BH.

Languages are specific in whether they allow the arguments of the formal passive to corefer. English does not allow such a use of the passive, as English stipulates that the A and O usually do not corefer.

33. I hit myself.

34. I was hit (??by myself).

Only in active sentences marked with a reflexive pronoun may they corefer. However, one can find examples of passive participles that imply a reflexive action.

35. Tommy, are you washed for dinner?

This example may be an example of a copula plus adjective, rather than a passive voice proper. Nevertheless, the passive participle assumes two participants, which most likely corefer to one another. So in English, which does not allow explicit coreference in the passive, the passive participle can imply coreference.

---

63 I include example 26 among those with a Patient S, because that would explain both the passive and reflexive uses of the phrase. Knowledge of the world, not grammatical indicators, suggests that an adult subject would be acting on him- or herself under normal circumstances.
We should not downplay the passive or the reflexive function of the middle form in BH and Modern Greek. The A is demoted, and the O promoted, as in any passive. In reflexive cases, though, the two roles refer to the same entity. The following examples illustrate this phenomenon.

36. wəšillaḥtânî wənistartî ḫaššāḏeh ᴄaḏ hāʾēreb ḥaššōlīšît and.send.me and.hide:Niphal:QTL:1cs in.the.field until the.evening the.third So send me so that *I may hide (myself)* (Niphal) in the field until the third day at evening (1 Sam 20:5).

37. wayyithabbe³ ḡaʾāḏām ᴨəʾišṭô mippōnê yhwh ṭĕlōhîm and.hid:Hitpael:YQTL the.person and.wife.his from.face yhwh god . . . and the man and his wife *hid (themselves)* (Hitpael) before Yhwh God (Gen 3:8).

Discussion on the nature of the difference between these two reflexive constructions will continue in the next section.

Note that the reflexive pronoun is often optional in English, especially in grooming actions, such as, “The teenager shaved (himself).” Inclusion of a reflexive pronoun in English would indicate contrastive focus, for example, “The teenager shaved *himself* [and not the cat].” The same applies to “hide” in English. In BH the Niphal and Hitpael do not occur with any reflexive pronoun, e.g., ṯaḥm, in cases of coreference. Therefore, my translations of BH henceforth will only include reflexive pronouns when indicated by English. The reader should note that the English translation of the Niphal always allows the potential for a reflexive pronoun when the context indicates coreference.

---

64 Both languages also allow a form of the reflexive with an explicit reflexive marker.

65 We find a “true reflexive” with a sort of reflexive pronoun in the following verse. Note that the verb is a Piel, not a Niphal or Hitpael.

³al-ṭəšaqqaḏû ᵇəṯ-naḥšōṭeḵᵉḵ bəḵol-haššēreḵ haššōrēš not.make.abominable:Piel ACC-RFLX.2mp with.any-swarming.thing the.swarms Do not *make yourselves abominable* (Piel) with any swarming thing that swarms (Lev 11:43).
In a language such as BH that does not use an explicit reflexive marker extensively, the reflexive can potentially be expressed by the passive. Modern Greek allows the demoted A to corefer with the O in the formal middle in the above case. English, which normally frowns upon coreference in the passive, allows it on occasion. Thus it should not surprise us to see that BH permits reflexive coreference in the Niphal and Hitpael (see sections 2.2.2.3 and 2.3.2.1). In BH, therefore, I will assume coreference in either the Niphal or Hitpael to be secondary to voice. One must thus glean such relations from context.

3.5. **Summary of Passive and Middle Voice**

The middle functions similarly to the passive, as I defined the passive in section 3.3.2.1, by the demotion of A. Furthermore, the active event schema directs the situation’s energy *from* A; passive and middle forms focus on the trajectory *towards* S. The point of view changes in the passive and middle forms when compared to the active. More specifically, the point of view moves off the A, leaving an S with reduced agentivity and volition. As a reaction, both voices may promote the O to S, if the event includes an O. This considerable functional and syntactic overlap explains the external overlap between passive and middle forms.

The passive and middle vary somewhat in how they express this change of point of view. The A is always demoted syntactically in the passive, and the topicality of A is lowered. The middle A is usually demoted syntactically, but can also be demoted semantically. Many of the above examples of the middle indicate some sort of action unfolding on an S (S=A or S≠A), while the A is backgrounded or pragmatically eliminated. The following table summarizes the similarities and differences between the passive and middle so far.
Table 4. Passive and middle characteristics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Middle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event trajectory towards the S</td>
<td>Event trajectory towards the S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-demotion definitive</td>
<td>A-demotion definitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-promotion common</td>
<td>O-promotion common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S has reduced agency &amp; volition</td>
<td>S has reduced agency &amp; volition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possible with 1-participant verb, $A \neq S$</td>
<td>Possible with 1-participant verb, $A \neq S$ or $A=S$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap with reflexive rare</td>
<td>Overlap with reflexive common</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now we can clarify the internal overlap with the Niphal and Hitpael. We can see from this table that the passive and middle functions are defined by the same argument relationships, namely, demotion of the A, including reduced agency and volition. The two functions share other, secondary characteristics, such as the common promotion of the O and how they express reduced agency in some cases of 1-participant verbs. As a result, it should not surprise us that the Niphal and Hitpael both cover passive and middle territories because the territories themselves resemble each other so closely.

Before I discuss the overlap between the formal middle and passive further, I would like to discuss the names of these forms. Terminology has become snarled at this point, as middle form and function, as well as passive form and function, refer to different things. Natural language sees internal and external overlap often, but it behooves us to tidy up our terms as much as possible. When one refers to the “passive middle,” one is referring to a formal middle with a
passive function. However, as we saw in section 3.2, the passive function is not monolithic and not always distinct from the middle function. Similarly, Fagan distinguished between the middle function of the middle form, as opposed to the ergative function of the middle form (Fagan 1992:198). So the passive and middle forms can both perform the passive function, and the formal middle may or may not function as a middle. Based on the discussion above, I define the passive function as *demoting the A and usually promoting the O*. The following diagram further specifies Figure 6 to summarize the place of the passive form and the middle form in the event distinction hierarchy.

![Figure 8. Voice hierarchy.](image)

### 3.6. Voice and Situation Aspect

#### 3.6.1. Formal Passive and Aspect

The passive voice affects the presentation of the A and O constituents compared to the active voice; more specifically, the passive demotes A. However, the particular ambiguities that arise in the formal passive, as well as its overlap with the resultative, anterior, and stative, indicate that the formal passive also functions significantly in the realm of situation aspect.

Hebraists have not always agreed with this assessment of the passive in BH. Creason writes, “The active:passive opposition can be defined solely in terms of the way in which the
participants in a situation are represented in a clause and so it does not indicate a distinction in Aktionsart” (Creason 1995:389). He thus excludes aspect as a defining feature of the passive voice in BH.

Nevertheless, cross-linguistic evidence supports the significance of aspect in the passive voice. Change in voice indicates a change in how the situation is viewed more broadly. First, formal passives can demonstrate an ambiguity that does not occur in the active analogue, as we see in the following Russian and English examples.

38. a. I broke the bottle.
   b. The bottle was broken.

39. a. Ya slomal butylku
    I.NOM broke.PERF bottle.ACC
    “I broke the bottle.”

   b. Butylka byla slomena
    bottle.NOM was broken.PERF.PTPL
    “The bottle was broken.”

The a. sentences can only refer to an action of breaking. In contrast, the b. sentences can refer to an action or a state. The b. sentences would refer to an action if they appeared in the following context (and its Russian translation), “The bottle was broken when I dropped it,” but to a state in this context, “When I went to take a drink, I noticed the bottle was broken.” The English and Russian passives thus straddle an action and a state in a way that the active does not (Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999:111). The passive appears to bring a stative ambiguity to the expression.

66 Creason defines Aktionsart broadly: “the kind of situation to which a verb refers” (Creason 1995:viii). In practice, he equates this word with “situation aspect,” “inherent aspect,” and “event ontology,” in opposition to (viewpoint) aspect (Creason 1995:5-6). I use the term “situation aspect” in a similar way to Creason’s Aktionsart.

67 I would like to thank Alex Leites (p.c.) for helping with these Russian examples.
Additionally, the passive refers to how the subject had reached the state expressed.

Boeckx offers the following pair of English examples of a middle followed by a passive.

40. a. Not a neck craned when I entered the room.

b. Not a neck was craned when I entered the room. (Boeckx 1998:344) [my emphasis]

The first example expresses “the process of craning,” while the second “refers to the state or position reached by the neck” (Boeckx 1998:344). The passive expresses the stative. We find the same distinction in Dutch between the “process” passive (marked by the auxiliary worden “become”) and the “state” passive (with the auxiliary zijn “be”) (Cornelis 1997:56). The passive refers to the state that the subject has entered before the reference point of the utterance. The above examples of the passive, sentences 38b, 39b, and 40b, refer to a state in a way that the active does not.

A second area of overlap for the passive occurs with anterior or resultative aspect. Murphy calls the passive an indicator of “anterior aspect, in which clauses refer to actions or states which took place or existed earlier than the current reference time” (Murphy 2004:105). He thus ties the passive voice to aspect and tense, more specifically, that the situation was completed earlier. We can thus understand the anterior to be related to the perfective.

Bybee et al. relates the resultative form to the passive. Resultative is close in meaning to anterior. As far as topicality, both passive and resultative make “the patient the subject of the clause.” Moreover, telicity of the given event is necessary to resultatives and passives. The

---

68 Example 40a is a middle voice. Below I examine the process aspect of the middle, section 3.6.2.

69 Bybee et al. note that Danish, Kui (Dravidian, India), and Tucano (Tucanoan, Brazil) developed their resultative constructions from a form of “to be” and a participle of the verb. This construction relates it strongly to the stative (Bybee et al. 1994:54). The development seems to parallel that of the passive construction in the Germanic and Modern Greek languages.
difference, however, between the passive and the resultative lies in the fact that the resultative can apply to an intransitive verb in English, e.g., *He is gone*, but the passive cannot (Bybee et al. 1994:54). The earlier example of a passive of an intransitive in German (sentence 14), though, suggests that this distinction between resultative vs. passive may be arbitrary, or at least fuzzy, since detransitivizing processes in some languages can be described equally as well as resultative as passive. These linguists’ observations suggest an important link between resultative and passive actions.

We find independent cross-linguistic support for Murphy’s and Bybee et al.’s close connection between the resultative or anterior aspect and some specific passive forms. For example, one specific passive form in Hausa often entails that the action is perfective or completed (Abdoulaye 2000:263). In addition, the Bulgarian periphrastic passive is often associated with the resultative (as opposed to the *se*-passive of the same language [Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999:24-25]). Along the same lines as Bulgarian, Russian only allows the periphrastic passive to be formed from perfective verbs (Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999:206). The perfective, resultative, and anterior, all relate in that they indicate an end point to the event. We should expect them to overlap in some grammatical expressions. In response to Sansò, then, we see that particular passive forms in some languages relate the perfective to the passive, focusing on the end point; the active does not require any aspectual restrictions.

---

70 We will see in section 4.4.3.2 that this rare construction in BH is marked by the Niphal.

71 Bybee et al. claim that the among the resultative, passive, and anterior, the resultative alone consistently points to the persistence of the state (Bybee et al. 1994:63). However, the distinction between the passive and the resultative goes beyond the scope of the present work.

72 In traditional Hausa grammar, this form is referred to as “form 7.”
Sansò challenges Bybee et al.’s and Murphy’s dependence on the resultative to define the passive. She asserts that the link between the resultative and the passive proves too vague to supply a definition. For example, the active and passive sentences, “They shut the door” and “The door was shut by them,” do not differ “as far as the presence of both an action and a resulting state is concerned” (Sansò 2003:41-42). In other words, the active conveys “resultative” as much as the passive. If “resultative” cannot distinguish the active and passive, one cannot maintain it as a criterion for defining the passive.

The following examples could be explained by allowing resultative to at least be a condition for forming a passive. The passive seems to assume a preceding action. When a verb can be understood purely statively, it either cannot passivize or must be understood to include some sort of action.

41. a. John weighed the letter.
   b. The letter weighed 2 oz.

42. a. The letter was weighed by John.
   b. *Two oz. was weighed by the letter.  

El-Marzouk posits that the situation expressed by the sentence must be viewed as a one-time action in order to be expressed as a passive (El-Marzouk 2003:25-26). For this reason, 42a. is acceptable, but not 42b. Dimitrova-Vulchanova’s findings agree with El-Marzouk’s, as she says that verbs that establish a relationship of comparison do not passivize, which would explain the ungrammaticality of 42b. (Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999:120). Neither of the b. examples

73 The examples in 41 come from (El-Marzouk 2003:25-26). Example 41b resembles unaccusative movement, and this is reinforced by the evidence of 42b, which suggests that “two oz.” is not a true O. Thus unaccusative and passive movement seem to be mutually exclusive.
includes an action in its purview—only a state. These data would suggest, then, that the passive is not simply an indicator of a state, but must assume an action to be grammatical.

Moreover, further complex tense and aspect features complicate defining the aspect of the passive as “resultative.” To begin, let us note that both of examples in 40 are in the past tense, which lends itself to a resultative interpretation. In the progressive tense the English passive does not seem to express a resultative.

43. The tiles are being laid in the new house.

This example is not past tense, anterior, or perfective, but expresses an ongoing, passive action.

We can solve these dilemmas by synthesizing the anterior/resultative aspect with the stative overlap. In her analysis of these two analogous sentences, Sansò does not mention the resultative/stative ambiguity that the passive typically allows separately from the active, as seen above in sentences 38 and 39. I showed that the passive is more closely related to the stative than the active, and this may influence the resultative interpretation of the passive. Thus one must observe the anterior and stative functions of the formal passive to distinguish it from the active. When a transition occurs, the subject enters into a new state, which converges with the end of the action. This explains the overlap between the stative and resultative, which are distinct but closely related in many contexts.

Furthermore, if we consider the stative nature of the formal passive, we see that sentence 43 has the final state in its purview, even though it indicates a process. This somewhat contradictory status lies in the margin of the passive function. In contrast to the English passive, the Russian formal passive is incompatible with processes because the passive requires a perfective verb. Thus, Russian cannot express example 43 in the passive, and so would be forced to use a middle in the imperfective, and similarly, English could not express this in the
middle (Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999:175). The Russian passive is forbidden from expressing a progressive notion, likely because the passive is so closely related to the resultative. As a result, the English progressive passive may lie farther from the passive voice’s core meaning since, at its core, the passive is normally aligned with the resultative. If we agree with Boeckx’s explanations for example 40, we should say that the passive assumes an action that ended in a state, while a middle can focus on the process. The English progressive passive could be a means to emphasize the action more than the state, rather than the passive’s normal emphasis on the state. Nevertheless, the English progressive passive expresses a passive with less of a resultative sense than the simple passive.

Recognizing the stative as well as the resultative/anterior nature of the passive resolves Sansò’s critique. I have shown in section 3.3.2.1 that topicality conditions already differentiate between the active and the passive functions. Thus one can define the passive form by the confluence of A-demotion (defining for the passive function), and the stative and resultative aspects.

### 3.6.2. Formal middle and aspect

We have seen thus far that the formal middle reduces transitivity. This reduction may manifest itself in an S with less agentivity and volitionality than A, though the S may coincide with either the A or the O referent. It also tends to reduce the number of participants. In this section I will look at how middle voice overlaps with situation aspect. The formal middle demonstrates that it focuses on processes by 1) its focus on ongoing or habitual events and 2) its close association with those situation aspects that necessarily include a process.
Some languages exhibit an overlap between middle voice functions and verbal aspect, for example, various Afro-Asiatic languages. Voigt noted that in Tuareg (Berber, North Africa) the t-stem (t-Stamm) can have the function of durativity and intensive, and that the equivalent form in Semitic languages displays these meanings as well as reflexive/passive and perfective meanings (Voigt 1987:95, 97).\(^{74}\) In his study of BH, Creason claims that “middle” can refer to inchoative situations, as well as reflexive/reciprocal meanings (Creason 1995:390).\(^{75}\)

We find that the middle commonly expresses a situation that refers to a property of the S constituent in English and German. Often the English and German formal middles bear a nuance of “habitual,” which is less common in the passive. The middle sentence, *The book reads easily* (and its German translation, “Das Buch liest sich leicht”), contrasts with the standard passive, *The book was read easily* (and the equivalent German, “Das Buch wird leicht gelesen”). The middle implies that anyone who picks up the book will find it easy to read, and the passive, that at some point in time a reader found that he or she read the book without difficulty. Fagan claims that the generic readings convey a “stative” meaning in that they describe a generic property of the book (Fagan 1992:6-7, 21).\(^{76}\) Significantly, this property is expressed as an activity. Thus the middle describes a property that unfolds on the S.

---

\(^{74}\) The Akkadian perfect with infixed /-t-/ poses a potential problem to my paradigm and lies beyond the scope of this work. Voigt helps solve this problem, as he does not believe that the internal imperfective of Tuareg is directly related to Akkadian perfective, both with the /-t/ morpheme (Voigt 1987:94-95). Significantly, he posits that the perfective evolved from the passive and not from the durative direction of development (Voigt 1987:96).

\(^{75}\) Creason follows *IBHS* in calling the reflexive/reciprocal meanings “double-status situations” (Creason 1995:334).

\(^{76}\) Steinbach explains that the German middle triggers generic quantification of the underlying agent, which, in turn, leads to other characteristics of the German middle, such as the necessity of adverbials and the “arbitrary nature of the implied argument” (Steinbach 2002:39).
The German formal middle occasionally expresses particular events, however. Although Fagan and Steinbach claim that German and English formal middles are generic and stative, Steinbach writes, “Middle constructions [in German] are grammatical in present, past (Präteritum) and future tense and with perfect aspect (Perfekt and Plusquamperfekt)” (Steinbach 2002:23). These tenses and aspects affect the eventive/stative interpretation of the middle. In German book reviews, one can find the middle in the Perfekt with an eventive reading.

44. . . die Geschichte an sich hat mir gut gefallen und das Buch las sich leicht . . . the story by RFLX AUX me well pleased and the book read RFLX easily “I liked the story itself, and the book was easy to read.”

This example conveys an eventive sense of the formal middle: the book read easily, beginning to end. Nevertheless, the book reviewer is implying that the book will be easy for others to read, as well. So the formal middle still retains an implication about the nature of the book.

Similarly, English can convey an eventive with a formal middle. An electrician could respond to the question, “How did the work go?” with:

45. The wires connected easily.

The speaker is not conveying anything about the state of the wires, but about an event. In contrast, the sentence could represent a habitual action in the past if the sentence were restated with a formal middle: “The wires connected easily, before they became corroded.” Thus context and tense determine the eventive sense of the formal middle.

77 German sentence cited from http://www.amazon.de/review/RPW636REYADMB/ref=cm_cr_rdp_perm, retrieved May 15, 2007. The example is in the Perfekt, which is much less common than the Präsens.

78 This point is discussed in more depth by Ottosson and Maling’s review of Steinbach’s book. They write that such examples as 44 suggest “that the defining properties for the MC [Middle Construction] are at least not exhaustively characterized by genericity” (Ottosson and Maling 2006:433).
Significantly, the properties in these examples concern a process unfolding on that book or those wires. The formal middle does not describe a state that the object exists in, but the manner in which the process takes place. “Corroded” is a state that resulted in the connection process becoming difficult. In the same way, “The book reads easily” contrasts with “The book is easy to read” in that the second describes more specifically a property of the book, as opposed to how an action unfolded—and will continue to unfold. This explains how Fagan understood the middle as stative, though I would add to her statement so that it reflected a state by means of a habitual action.

The formal middle voice describes non-habitual events in French and Italian, as well (Fagan 1992:59; Steinbach 2002:86). These languages tend to refer to specific events with the middle more often than German and English. For this reason Steinbach claims that Italian middles are more “passive-like” than those in German (Steinbach 2002:86). In French, the tense and aspect of the middle verb influences how the middle is read; progressives are more often read as eventive than as non-progressive verbs (Fagan 1992:195). Context influences a stative vs. eventive reading of a French or Italian middle voice, and this effect is similar to English and German.

Like French and Italian, Russian demonstrates that the middle is not bound by generic vs. stative distinctions. The middle just as commonly refers to events and states. For example, the middle often encodes emotional experiences. I will repeat here the Russian examples, sentences 24, 25, and 26.

46. Я боюсь людей
I fear=MID people.GEN
“I’m afraid of people.”
47. Kogda ty smeyosh=sya smeot=sya ves’ mir
    when you laugh=MID laugh=MID all world
    “When you laugh, the whole world laughs.”

48. Ya odevayus’
    I dress=MID
    “I’m getting dressed.”

Example 46 indicates a state or mental process that English, German, or French would not allow in the middle, according to the linguists above. At the same time, the middle can equally express generic or specific events, as in examples 47 and 48, respectively. Further research would be necessary to understand if any aspectual restrictions exist for the Russian middle.

This evidence suggests, contrary to Fagan and Steinbach, that many languages allow eventive middles, though some languages prefer statives over eventives. However, what were described above as “statives” are not necessarily states, but processes that imply a property of the object. We should thus classify them as “habituals,” since they secondarily refer to a habitual process of continuing or repeating the same process.

Steinbach suggested that the eventive middle acts more like a passive. Since the stative criterion for middles does not always hold, the line between middle and passive blurs. This

---

79 Analyzing it as a mental process rather than a state would make more sense here. First, the verb is in the imperfective. Second, it contrasts with the more stative expression, *mnye strašno*, me.DAT it-is-scary. The middle verb expresses a more habitual state than the more stative expression.

80 We can see a tendency for the middle to identify with the imperfective in Russian and in the development of Latin. The periphrastic passive in Russian is restricted by aspect in that it may only occur with perfective verbs. The middle is not restricted this way, so it becomes the de facto passive of the imperfective (Fagan 1992:240). Latin may have developed in a parallel way. As the perfective passive developed a perfective meaning in Vulgar Latin, the middle may have developed in order to fill the gap of the imperfective passive left by the periphrastic passive (Fagan 1992:208-09). The imperfective middle voice of both languages stands in opposition to a periphrastic passive restricted to the perfective aspect. This tendency to appear in the imperfective shows an affinity to habitual and durative situations, which are often related to the imperfective.
explanation for eventive middles raises an important question, that is, what is the difference between the middle and passive voice, especially eventive middles.  

Having described how the middle expresses aspect, I will now turn to the situation aspect of the verbs that appear in the middle. Fagan states that situation aspect directly affects which verbs may appear as middles in German and English (1992:8). Aspect plays an even more important role, in her view, than agentivity in the formation of the middle, as Keenan generalized (section 3.1). For example, verbs whose agency would seem to make them candidates for middle formation according to agency of the A, do not appear in the middle in English, for example, \textit{reach}, \textit{hit}, and \textit{kick}. The middle requires that the verb come from a particular aspectual class, and these verbs do not satisfy this aspectual constraint (Fagan 1992:75-76). Activities and accomplishments may appear in the middle, but achievements and states do not form middles (Fagan 1992:71). Significantly, \textit{reach} is an achievement, and \textit{hit} and \textit{kick} are semelfactive, and these two aspectual classes do not include a process preceding the transition point. Language filters out verbs from particular aspectual categories to create well-formed middle verbs.

Furthermore, context can affect the aspectual category of a verb (section 3.2); certain verbs can only appear in the middle under marked contextual conditions. Sometimes the middle may represent an aspectual category that is more seldom associated with a verb. For example,

---

81 Arce-Arenales et al. posit a view that contrasts with Fagan and Steinbach, namely, that the middle is not associated with stativization. Their approach is more broadly cross-linguistic, namely, the Spanish \textit{se}-construction, the English \textit{get}-passive, and Koyukon Athabaskan. Their results agree with Creason above (section 2.3.3.1.3), that the middle is associated with inchoative and punctual aspects. Moreover, if a language has two passives, one will function as a middle (covering reflexive, reciprocal, detransitivization, passive, impersonal, accidental) and the other will be associated with “stativity” (Arce-Arenales et al. 1994, 27:17). These findings raise the question how we can synthesize these various functions.
Fagan claims that achievements cannot appear in the middle in some languages. But German sterben, “die,” is normally an achievement, yet it may appear in the middle.

49. So schnell stirbt es sich nicht  
so quickly dies it RFLX not  
“One doesn’t die that quickly” (Fagan 1992:86).

The context, Fagan suggests, tells the reader that the verb refers to a process rather than a punctual event, thus forcing an accomplishment reading. She writes, “[I]t is sometimes possible to focus on the process even though one uses the verb that denotes the endpoint of that process” (Fagan 1992:86). Since the German middle is associated with accomplishments, the reader interprets the present sterben as an accomplishment, rather than its more common sense as an achievement, because an achievement would be incompatible with the formal middle. Whether an accomplishment or an activity, the sentence comments on the process of dying rather than the final point of death.83

Further interactions between the middle voice and situation aspect appear in French. While German and English do not allow achievements or states in the middle, French allows achievements but not states. Example 50 represents an achievement, and 51, a state.

50. Pierre se reconnaît à son nez rouge  
Pierre RFLX recognize by his nose red  
“Pierre can be recognized by his red nose.”

51. *Les dates historiques se savent difficilement  
the dates historical RFLX know with.difficulty  
“Historical dates know difficultly” (Fagan 1992:94).

---

82 For example, “recognize” is an achievement and so, “A red-winged blackbird recognizes easily,” is ungrammatical (Fagan 1992:68)

83 In German, the impersonal passive of sterben “die” is also possible: Es wird gestorben. It does not necessarily refer to a process of dying.
While Fagan presents sentence 50 as an achievement, the present tense implies a habitual event. The habitual sense makes the verb resemble an activity. While an individual recognizing event must be an achievement, its repetition without any endpoint pushes the verb towards the category of an activity. Since the data demonstrate that the aspect of a verb determines whether the formal middle will be grammatical or not, we must conclude that the formal middle is sensitive to the semantic structure of verbs. Moreover, languages must include a language-specific feature that sorts out acceptable middle voice sentences because of the differences in what aspects they allow.

The input verb to a middle must include a process, whether it leads to an end point (i.e., an accomplishment) or not (i.e., an activity). The middle verb then expresses an ongoing event, whether durative, habitual, or imperfective. These types of events also relate to activities. In cases where the verb’s aspectual category is ambiguous (e.g., between a state and an accomplishment) the middle must express the accomplishment or be ungrammatical.

These restrictions vary in different languages. In German and English, the middle tends to prefer generic middles over eventive middles, though eventive middles are acceptable in some contexts. Even in the generic instances, where they appear to describe a state, the verb indicates a process that implies a particular state. French and Italian allow more eventive passives, and French allows achievements.

Formal middles function as a subset of process verbs. The achievement example above (sentence 50) resembles an activity when it bears a habitual meaning. In Russian the middle represents the only way to express the passive in the imperfective, typically when the event does not include endpoints, whether the event implies endpoints or not.
Focusing on processes can be understood in Kemmer’s terms of low elaboration of events. Kemmer claimed that generic activities relate to the middle via the trait of low elaboration of events (1993:148). I claim that the middle’s relationship to processes defines the middle voice, with or without an endpoint, because the middle shifts the focus away from a precise endpoint.

When we assume Comrie’s basic distinction between stative and dynamic events (1976:49), we can categorize the formal passive and middle. I have already established the close functional relationship between the two voices, namely, they share similar event schemas as both demote A. The voices distinguish themselves from each other, as well. The passive corresponds to anterior states, offering a potential stative reading that the active counterpart does not. Similarly, the middle corresponds to activities, usually before they reach a final state. Here is an update of Figure 8, but now I have categorized the two passive voices according to their aspectual function. The two types of passive, “activity form” and “stative form” replace “middle form” and “passive form,” and are subsets of the functional category “passive.”

![Figure 9. Event hierarchy (revised).](image)

### 3.6.3. Voice and aspect: Case studies

I will illustrate that the aspectual tendencies shown by the passive above can be abstracted in a concise way. An event underlies passive expressions, which most often includes
or implies a transition. The passive expression marks a demotion of the A, usually promoting the O. This focuses on the active:passive distinction. In addition, the two passive expressions connote either the state that resulted from the transition or the activity that led to the transition point. The stative:activity passive distinction focuses on this point of view.

With a clearer understanding of situation aspect, we are able to confirm and elaborate on Keenan’s points in section 3.1. Languages with more than one passive voice use them to distinguish situation aspect. When the focus on the A is reduced, the speaker chooses how to depict the passive event, whether as stative or as activity. In this section I will present two languages, Spanish and Tagalog (Philippines, Austronesian), with some references to German, and how their passive voices can focus on activities and states in the passive voice.  

3.6.3.1. Spanish

Now I will turn to two distinct passive voice constructions in Spanish: the “periphrastic passive” with the auxiliary verb *ser* and the “reflexive passive” with the reflexive pronoun *se*.

Each passive form may only express particular situation aspects. The discussion here follows de Miguel (2000). An action described by a *ser* passive depicts an event that ends in a state. While this passive can refer to iterative or habitual actions, the event expressed by a *ser* passive always

---

*84 The intersection of passive and aspect is vast, as languages signal subtle distinctions with multiple (typically 2–3) passive constructions. English uses not only the so-called middle and periphrastic passive with “be,” but also has a periphrastic passive with “get.” German and Dutch have periphrastic *werden/worden* passive, as well as *sein/zijn*. Swedish has a middle, marked with –s (a reduced form of the reflexive), and two passives, *bli* + past participle and *vara* + passive participle (Holmes and Hinchliffe 1994:310-12). Russian commonly uses a verb in the third person plural to function where other languages would use a passive. Reintges demonstrates the complexities of intersecting three distinct passive voices with aspect in Older Egyptian (Reintges 1997:353-424). Smirniotopoulos recognizes multiple passive voices in Modern Greek, one formed with the AUX *íme* “be” + passive participle, and one with *éxo* “have” + perfect participle (as opposed to *éxo* + passive participle, with active meaning), in addition to the morphological passive. They all interact with the tense/aspect system (Smirniotopoulos 1992:120-23). Malay has three prefixes that appear to have passive and aspectual functions: *ber-* , *di-* , and *ter-* (Mintz 1994:134-78).*
includes “a culminating final phase, whether or not it is preceded by another phase” (de Miguel 2000:207).

52. el huerto de mi abuelo fue heredado por mi madre
the orchard of my grandfather be:Preterite inherit:PsvParticiple by my mother
“The orchard of my grandfather was inherited by my mother”
(de Miguel 2000:205; my emphasis).

The auxiliary ser can appear with perfective or imperfective morphology (i.e., viewpoint aspect) in Spanish (de Miguel 2000:206). Nevertheless, a stative situation (i.e., situation aspect) always plays a part in the event being expressed (de Miguel 2000:206).

The reflexive passive se is always used in passive constructions where the event includes a transition point. However, this point need not be in the purview of the expression. As a result, the construction may be used in delimited or non-delimited verbs (de Miguel 2000:210).

Thus Spanish uses the reflexive passive regularly for habitual (example 53) or collective actions (example 54).

53. aquí se habla español
“Spanish is spoken here.”

54. Los crímenes Nazis se juzgaron por un tribunal especial
“The Nazi crimes were judged by a special tribunal”
(de Miguel 2000:210; my emphasis).

The reflexive passive refers to habitual and collective (or iterative) actions. In this way, Spanish demonstrates two passives, one that is linked to states resulting from a transition, and another that does not necessarily focus on the beginning or ending points, and is thus used in habitual or iterative passive expressions.

85 De Miguel uses “Achievement” differently from Smith and Pustejovsky. He divides Achievements into “simple” and “compound” Achievements (de Miguel 2000:203). The former is equivalent to Smith’s Semelfactive, and the latter is an ingressive State or Process, which would both fall under Smith’s Achievement.
These two types of passive voice manifest the stative:activity passive opposition. All three examples demote the A and promote the O, so they represent passive sentences. Example 52 highlights the transition and the state resulting from the transition; in terms of Figure 2, the relevant points would be $x_0$ (the transition point) and $x_1 - x_3$. The sentence does not focus on the activity before the transition. In contrast, examples 53 and 54 look mainly at the activity, and do not suppose that the transition point has been reached. The first one cannot include a transition point—no new state is reached—and the second only optionally implies a transition.

Examples 52 and 54 demonstrate the subtle difference between the stative passive and activity passive. Both verbs are in the preterit form with a perfective sense; they demonstrate a completed action. The difference, though, was described by de Miguel: the ser (stative) passive must include a state, but the se (activity) passive does not necessarily imply that the end point of the achievement is included in the expression. In general “judging” implies a verdict, and an end of the activity, so one would read this as an accomplishment. Moreover, the preterit indicates the situation has finished, that is, reached an end point. Nevertheless, the speaker may choose to focus on the activity and not the transition. Since the situation is iterative, one can view it as an activity made up of serial accomplishments. The se passive allows the speaker this option, but not the ser passive. Thus the speaker makes a crucial decision to focus on the transition point or not, that is, the culminating state, which determines which passive voice he or she uses.

The German passive parallels the Spanish. As we saw in 3.6.2, achievements are not allowed to occur in the German middle, while accomplishments are (Fagan 1992:100). This

---

86 De Miguel appears to set up a privative opposition between the two passives, although he does not state it explicitly. For the feature “stative,” ser reflects the presence of this feature, while se reflects either the presence or absence of this feature.
implies that the situation must include some process preceding the transition point in order to appear in the middle. Spanish se passives must have a transition in the purview of the situation, but it need not be expressed by the verb. The German and the Spanish activity passives are used in habitual expressions. In contrast, German and Spanish form their stative passives periphrastically, and both require a state to follow the transition.

3.6.3.2. Tagalog

Based on the analysis of the Tagalog passive voice from Latrouite and Naumann (1999), two of the passive suffixes are distinguished by their reference to the state resulting from, and the process of, the action. The two verbal suffixes that mark the passive voice in Tagalog are /-in/ and /-an/. In singly transitive verbs, one finds an aspectual correlation between the two suffixes. The prefix /-in/ is associated with the culminating point of the transition, and /-an/ with an intermediate point before the culmination. The following examples use the verbs “eat” (examples 55 and 56) and “walk” (examples 57 and 58).

55. Kain-in mo ang isda.
   Eat-GV Gen:you Nom fish
   “Eat the fish up.”

56. K(a)in-an mo ang isda.
   Eat-LV Gen:you Nom fish
   “Eat some/a part of the fish.”

57. Lakar-in mo ang Luneta/ ang lahat ng daan.
   Walk-GV Gen:you Nom Luneta/ Nom all LK way
   “Walk up to Luneta/all the way.”

---

87 The following examples are from Latrouite and Naumann (1999:222). Emphasis is original. One should note that the verbs are in the imperative, but the noun in the nominative case is the subject.

In both sets of examples, the passive suffix /-in/ is used when the action is viewed as completed, specifically, when the whole fish is eaten and the whole path is walked. In contrast, /-an/ is found when an intermediate point of the action is in focus, namely, how much of the fish is to be eaten or what kind of path is to be walked. In the words of Latrouite and Naumann, /-in/ refers to the “maximal result,” that is, the result only at the end-point of the sequence; /-an/ is used for minimal results, which means that the result holds at intermediate points of the action (Latrouite and Naumann 1999:226). So /-in/ refers to the completed passive event, and /-an/ to the moments during the event’s process.

Tagalog thus forces the same choice on its speaker as Spanish does, namely, whether he or she wants to include the transition point and focus on the resulting state in the passive situation. Including the end point, the speaker would use /-in/, but without the end point, /-an/.

3.7. **Summary: Voice and Aspect**

We can now see a cross-linguistic pattern emerge among the distinct passive voices in these two languages, as well as other languages we have considered. Spanish looks at the interior phasal make-up of the action, and offers a choice of passive voice to focus on a particular phase. Tagalog can refer to the end result with /-in/, parallel to the Spanish ser passive, or points along the action before the end result with /-an/, similar to the se passive in Spanish. The first appears to be “stative” passives, and the latter, “activity” passives.

---

89 Furthermore, /-an/ cannot be used with semelfactive verbs, e.g., “knock” (Latrouite and Naumann 2001:2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Stative</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td><em>be</em> + participle</td>
<td>(unmarked middle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td><em>sein</em> + participle</td>
<td><em>sich</em> (reflexive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td><em>ser</em> + participle</td>
<td><em>se</em> (reflexive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td><em>-in</em></td>
<td><em>-an</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Stative and activity passives.

Based on these categories, I suggest that we view Biblical Hebrew in the following way.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biblical Hebrew</th>
<th>Niphal</th>
<th>Hitpael</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


This table demonstrates that some languages distinguish between stative and activity passive voice. It does not exhaust the passive voice options in all these languages, however. For example, the unmarked German passive form, *werden* + participle, is not on the table. I included the *sein* form because it is more marked for stative aspect. Similarly, Spanish uses and additional passive, *estar* + participle, which is a different form of the stative aspect, but it is more problematic than the *ser* form (de Miguel 2000:212). BH, as well, is well known to possess passive forms in addition to the Niphal and Hitpael on the above chart (Qal passive, Pual, and Hophal). In this way, I have sought to isolate the feature of situation aspect in the passive voice, even though other passive forms exist. The existence of these other forms suggests that further forces may be at work to distinguish among those additional passives. A discussion of passive forms, therefore, must be aware of these other factors.

We can now clearly see the two levels of decision in using the passive and middle forms. The first decision is a functional one, whether to use the active or passive. A speaker bases his or her decision on how much to highlight the A. The unmarked presentation of the arguments is the active voice, which usually highlights the A. To reduce the focus on the A argument, one can use a passive voice. The passive voice may manifest itself syntactically by demoting the A and usually raising the O to the status of S. Change in voice may similarly affect the semantic
role of A, making A less agentive, recategorizing the A as an Experiencer, Theme, or Patient. On this level, the middle and passive forms are not distinct, hence the apparent internal overlap of these forms. Once the speaker determines to demote the A, he or she must decide on what situation aspect in which to depict the event. If the speaker wants to focus on the transition point and/or the resulting state, he or she chooses the passive form. If, however, the speaker wants to focus on the process of the event, he or she chooses the middle form.  

BH reflects this tiered decision. The speaker first determines how much to highlight the A, and then decides on the situation aspect of the event. If the situation aspect is more stative, a Niphal would be used, and if the aspect is more of a process, the Hitpael.

The perceived internal overlap of each stem, that is, the multi-functionality of each stem, results from an incomplete understanding of the passive and middle voice. Both voices are determined on the functional level by the level by which the A is highlighted. So either the passive or the middle could theoretically represent any such function. The external overlap, that is, between the Niphal and the Hitpael forms, comes from their shared function. The Niphal stative passive shares a defining function with the Hitpael activity passive. So we would predict that either form could be found in an instance where the A is less highlighted. Within that area of functional overlap, we predict an aspectual distinction. Thus, we would predict to find Niphals in contexts that render a passive function as more stative, and Hitpaels where the passive is more activity-oriented. In Chapter 2 we saw that Hebraists have demonstrated abundantly the extent of the two stems’ functional overlap. In Chapter 4 I will test whether the Niphal and Hitpael can be distinguished by aspect in the areas where they overlap.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{90}}\text{ Cf. Levin and Rappaport Hovav (2005:96-101).}\]
CHAPTER 4. HEBREW EVIDENCE

4.1. INTRODUCTION

In Chapter 2 I demonstrated the main streams of thought regarding the Niphal and Hitpael stems. The categories passive, middle, and reflexive are used most often to classify the uses of the stems. However, these categories are defined and applied inconsistently from one author to another. As a result, the relationship between the two stems remains obscure.

Following this survey of these BH stems, Chapter 3 presented modern linguistic views of the passive and middle voices to establish a theoretical framework for distinguishing between the Niphal and Hitpael. Cross-linguistically, the “passive” covers a range of syntactic phenomena, some of which are often not classified as passive. The passive presents a subject with reduced agency, and this reduction can be expressed syntactically or semantically. The middle voice likewise describes similar processes. According to our definition of passive, though, the middle is considered a variety of the passive. The formal passive and middle can be distinguished by situation aspect.

The present chapter presents data taken from the HB to apply the theoretical framework developed in Chapter 3 in order to approach the problems presented in Chapter 2 in a new way. In my research, I began by examining all the Niphals (4,119 instances), Hitpaels (835 instances), Hitpolels (114 instances), Hitpalpels (21 instances), Hotpaals (8 instances), and Nitpaels (3 instances), according to the framework of Chapter 3. I present here representative examples of this research that will establish the meaning of the Niphal and Hitpael, as well as the rarer t-forms. Furthermore, I have found true the claim by IBHS, which states, “Thus the Hippael,
Hithpoel, and Hithpaal are unremarkable variants of the Hithpael, as are the Hithpolel and Hithpalpel of geminate roots” (IBHS:§26.1.1c). I have also included in my study the Niphals and Hitpaels from the inscriptions and Sira. The inscriptions include eight Niphals and one Hitpalpel.¹ Sira includes 362 examples of the Niphal and 142 Hitpaels (consisting also of Hitpolel and Hitpalpel).

In this chapter, I have divided the data into sections on two principles. The first principle is distance from the prototypical active situation. Thus active verbs that typically assume two participants, an Agent A and Patient O, come first; then active two-participant sentences with an Experiencer A and Theme O. Following the two-participant verbs come one-participant verbs, which I divided into two sections: typically dynamic and typically stative. The second principle is semantic class. Kemmer demonstrated that middle verbs cluster around particular semantic categories based on the middle situation (Kemmer 1993). However, she did not examine the category of those verbs that fall into what she called the “passive middle” category—in my terms, activity passives that do not require coreference between the underlying A and O. Because of this gap, I extended her theory into the passive middle category. As we will see the activity passive is not restricted to (or from) any particular categories, but it demonstrates preferences for certain categories. Moreover, the stative passive shows preferences for semantic categories, as well. Another reason for organizing the data by semantic class is the paucity of data available for BH. At times, when a verb only appears once or twice in the passive, a near synonym can tease out more information about a rare verb.

¹ Some Niphals are difficult to determine with certainty, since in the yiqtol form they look identical to other binyanim, such as the Qal or Pual.
In order to reduce the number of examples covered, I have selected verbs that display more information about the Niphal, Hitpael, and how they contrast. The second point determined the three main divisions of this chapter, which are based on transitivity. Languages most typically passivize transitive verbs, and less typically stative and intransitive verbs. So this section tests whether passivization in BH acts differently among these different types. The second point overlaps with the third, namely, I am testing the semantic roles involved in passivization. Some languages, such as Bulgarian, only allow passivization of certain semantic roles (section 3.3.2.1). In addition, Boyd’s theory depends on the notion that the middle, and hence the Niphal, is defined by the semantic roles of the participants (section 2.2.3.2.3). Significantly, I defined passivization as the demotion of A, which can include a demotion in agency. For this reason I have also separated two types of transitive verbs, depending on their semantic roles. Thus, this chapter seeks to test representative examples of the Niphal/Hitpael contrast according to syntax and semantics to apply the theoretical framework from Chapter 3 on the BH data. In other words, I will determine whether the distinction between the Niphal and Hitpael lies in the area of passive and situation aspect.

Examples from BH offer varying amounts of information. My test is founded on a process of contrasts. Most of the examples are pairs of sentences, one with a Niphal and one with a Hitpael. The most helpful examples are those with 1) the same lexical root 2) in the same context, describing the same action. Such examples may come in the same scene, sometimes in the same pericope or with similar wording, e.g., דִּון pִּm, “troubled,” in sentence 59. The most common examples demonstrate 1) the same root 2) in different contexts. Nevertheless, I have tried to minimalize extraneous variables by finding verbs with the same TAM form to compare,
for example, סתר str; “hide.” in examples 2 and 3 (both are participles). In rare cases I have compared 1) different (though semantically related) roots 2) in different contexts. Such examples offer less secure information. While they suggest interesting information about the Niphal/Hitpael contrast, one must beware of roots from a single semantic class that bear slightly different nuances, e.g., הלכ hlk, “go; walk,” (section 4.4.3.2) vs. מלח mlt, “flee” (section 4.4.3.3).

4.2. BASIC TRANSITIVE

4.2.1. Agentive transitive

This section focuses on agentive transitive verbs. I refer to them as transitive because they prototypically include an A constituent and an O constituent in their active form. This category is opposed to intransitive verbs, which include a single constituent in the active form of the verb. I refer to them as agentive because they include an Agent—as well as a Patient—in their basic semantics. This category is opposed to experiencer transitives, which include an Experiencer and Theme in their semantics.

This group in BH causes more problems for voice theories than we might assume. As explained in section 3.3.2, formal theories assume a single passivization process. When one introduces more than one form that can function as a passive voice, a simple formal system becomes less adequate. The binary correspondence between active and passive no longer functions, even among these clear examples that one would expect to demonstrate standard passive predictions. Similarly, middle voice theories do not adequately explain the common passive function of the middle. As a result, I am seeking what differentiates the two forms that
share the passive function, the Niphal and Hitpael, in concrete BH examples. These minimal pairs inform us about the basic function of the Niphal and Hitpael. I am beginning with agentive transitive verbs because they most clearly fit the passive prototype.

I have laid out this section in the following way. First, I will look at verbs in similar contexts to demonstrate the correspondence of the stems with situation aspect. Second, I will turn to verbs where the ratio of Niphals to Hitpaels is very high, to see how BH shows markedness in this area. Third, the BH data demonstrate a correlation between iterative and inceptive aspects and the Hitpael. Fourth, I will look at words from semantic categories that are often expressed by the middle voice to examine how they are manifested in BH. Fifth, I will present cases where the root gains more idiosyncratic meanings in either or both the Niphal and Hitpael, and will test whether situation aspect can help explain these lexical developments. Based on these data, I will extend my conclusions to two areas. First, I will show how other t-forms should be classified with respect to situation aspect, namely the Nitpael, Hitpolel, and Hitpalpel. Second, I will show how situation aspect is used in particular passages to literary effect.

---

2 This correspondence between semantic categories and the middle voice comes from (Kemmer 1993).
4.2.1.1. **Basic distinction: State vs. activity**

4.2.1.1.1. “Pour”

I will begin with an example that demonstrates a minimal pair in a single context, the verb יָפַק špk, “pour.”

1. **nišpak** läºªreºš kœbœdœi ʕal-šœber bat-œammœ . . .
   is.pour.out:Niphal:QTL to.the.ground liver.my over-destruction daughter-my people . . .

   loºimmœtœm yœºmorœ ʔayyœh dœgœn wœyœyœn bœhœtœtœpœm kœdhœlœl
   to.mothers.their they.say where grain and-wine in.faint:Hitpael.their like.wounded

   birœbœœtœ ʕir bohœstappœk
   in.squares city in.pour.out:Hitpael:INFC soul.their to-breast mothers.their

   . . . my liver is poured out (Niphal) on the ground over the destruction of the daughter of
   my people . . . To their mothers they were saying, “Where is grain and wine?” as they
   were fainting like the wounded in the squares of the city, as their souls were being poured
   out (Hitpael) on the breast of their mothers (Lam 2:11-12).

Most often this type of “transfer” verb in BH prefers the Niphal because the language typically
does not view the action as an activity but as a state, but this does not mean that the language
cannot view these events as activities. This pair demonstrates that this Niphal/Hitpael contrast
exists in this semantic class. 4 There is no underlying Agent of the pouring, so no A has been

---

3 The same verses offer a minimal pair between the Niphal and Hitpael of the root נעמ נספ, “be faint.” See example 74.

4 I have ascribed the following roots to this category: כָּמֵר msr, “delivered over,” שַל slh, “sent,” נֶט ntn,
   “give,” חָל hœl, “removed,” and חָל כבפ hœl mlœ, “thrust away.” Two other groups deal with specific types of Pat: projectiles
   and liquids. The “projectile” verbs are יָרָה yrh, “shoot,” and גָּפַל sgœl, “stone.” The “liquid” verbs are מָשׂ וָח pœnml, “dipped”,
   Among them we notice that Hitpaels are rare. Only two roots verbs include Hitpaels, and they are all among the
   “liquid” verbs. The verb יָפַק špk, “pour,” has three Hitpaels (vs. eight Niphals), and the verb חָל כבפ mlœ mœl, “fill,” has
   one Hitpael (vs. 36 Niphals). Such a preponderance of Niphals in this semantic class presents us with the question
   of the influence of semantic category on aspect.
demoted syntactically. The first example of “pour” takes place in the speaker’s present, while the second is a flashback to the time of the actual events. As a result, the root appears in the Niphal in the first verse. The speaker is describing his state when he is no longer able to cry; his liver is in a state of having been poured out. In contrast, as the city was languishing, the children were dying. They begged for food as they slowly perished, as their souls were “being poured out,” an activity in this context, expressed by a Hitpael.

So in a very specific context, the BH author may choose to depict a transfer verb as an activity rather than a state. The very rare “transfer” Hitpael is used in a context that is distinguishing between two time frames, the author’s point of view and the flashback. Another possible factor is that this example of “pour out” is metaphorical or idiomatic; the “soul being poured out” is a metaphor or an idiom for dying. In these specific circumstances, therefore, we see that even with a strong tendency to view the action of “being poured out” as a state, the Hitpael expresses an activity in certain, rare contexts.

4.2.1.1.2. “Hide” שאר הרא

The following pair of examples of “hide” verbs with the participle of the root הרא str also contrasts on the axis of situation aspect. Here, the Niphal describes a state of being hidden, and the Hitpael, the activity of hiding among other activities.

5 This verse will be discussed further in example 74.

6 We often see the Hitpael representing idiomatic senses in contrast to the Niphal. See section 4.2.1.6.

7 The subcategory of “hide” includes many, popular verbs, and covering them fully here would be impossible. In this category we find the roots חן hb, הרא str, לם tm, חזר tmn, חזר khd, חזר knp, and פז spn. The first three roots appear in both stems: חן hb, 16 Niphal and 10 Hitpael; הרא str, 30 Niphals and 5 Hitpaels; and לם tm, 11 Niphals and 6 Hitpaels. The latter four roots only appear in the Niphal: חזר tmn, once;
Example 2 describes an object or being that is in a concealed state that could avoid being scorched by the sun. The second example, example 3, describes Yhwh as one who “hides.” This sentence is passive insofar as the subject (A) has been demoted. I am assuming a coreference between the A and the O in the underlying sentence. This does not seem to be a state, as Yhwh is described as one who also saves, המֹשְׁמָע. So “saving” contrasts with “hiding,” which are both actions that Yhwh takes on occasion; sometimes he is hiding and sometimes he is saving. Thus the Niphal aligns itself with the state of being concealed, while the Hitpael indicates an action that is engaged on occasion.

While these examples represent the state/activity distinction clearly, other cases of this root, however, do not separate as neatly between the two situations. In some cases, the Niphal appears like an activity.

In this case, the prudent person immediately seeks cover when he or she sees evil. Here “hide” seems to function more as an activity than a state. Conversely, the following example demonstrates that the Hitpael can indicate what appears to be more of a state than an activity.

---

*khd*, 11 times; *kap*, once; and *spn*, 3 times. Thus the roots that appear only in the Niphal are rarer than those that appear in both. This distribution suggests that Hitpaels of the latter could have been possible in certain contexts.
5. \(\text{wəʼābdāh} \ \text{ḥokmaṭ} \ \text{ḥākāmāyw} \ \text{ūḥinaṭ} \ \text{noḥōnāyw} \)
   and-perish wisdom.of wise-his and-understanding.of understanding-his

   \text{tistattār}
   hide:Hitpael:YQTL

   \ldots and the wisdom of his wise ones will perish, and the understanding of his understanding ones \textit{will hide} (Hitpael) (Isa 29:14).

This verse aligns “perish” and “hide” as the verbs in the parallel stichs of this verse. The situation describes a point where wise and understanding people will no longer be able to function as such, where wisdom will be gone and understanding will be nowhere to be seen. Both verbs have this endpoint in mind.

The problem in both examples 4 and 5 arises because “hiding” involves an activity (“going to hide/be hidden”), followed by a transition point and a state (“being hidden”). If we imagine “hiding” as a path, the activity of going to hide follows a path up to the endpoint of being hidden. In the case of being hidden, one can refer to any part of that situation: the final point of being hidden or the path up to that point. The Hebrew author has an option in some cases where the context does not force him to choose to focus on one particular part of the situation. In this way, we can say that in example 4 the author chose to emphasize the final state of hiddenness. As I argued in section 3.6.1, the passive stative and anterior are not the same, but they overlap often. This state implies the preceding activity, which may explain why the Niphal
is used in cases where the Hitpael would have been possible. In example 5, the author focused on the path towards that destination of being hidden.

The other explanation would be that the stems do not represent situation aspect in any way. The situation in example 4 is either reflexive or middle, which works well with an animate subject. This interpretation would follow well on Boyd’s (2.2.3.2.3) and Creason’s models (2.2.3.2.4). The Hitpael in example 5 does not appear to be a reflexive or any kind of “double status” verb. Inanimate subjects are generally regarded as incapable of acting on themselves, and interpreting them otherwise is excluded to stylistic contexts of anthropomorphism. Here we may have a case of anthropomorphism, however, where understanding goes away and hides itself. Sometimes the Hitpael relates to metaphorical uses of verbs in peculiar ways. In the present case the Hitpael would be reflexive or middle. If “understanding” is not anthropomorphized, then it is difficult to understand the significance of the stem in this context. Whether the subject is anthropomorphized or not, we end up with a problem. If the subject is not anthropomorphized, the verb must be understood as passive. A reflexive/middle Niphal vs. a passive Hitpael distinction goes against the models posited in the last chapters. If the verb is reflexive/middle, it does not differ from the Niphal, negating the distinction between the stems.

Since the contexts do not offer enough information to force a particular reading of the stems, I will explain the nuance that these stems bring to the context. In the example of the prudent man, example 4, the author could have used a Hitpael, which would have offered an

---

8 This fact helps explain the Niphal in 1 Sam 20:5, 24; 1 Kgs 17:3; Jer 23:24; 36:19; Prov 28:28.

9 The root בָּלַל b/l, “swallow,” in the Hitpael also bears a metaphorical sense, “be rendered useless,” in Ps 107:27. This metaphorical sense mirrors that of הָיָרָה s/r, “hide,” in example 5. Significantly, both appear in the Hitpael. These verbs refer to actions—acting foolish—which explains the use of the Hitpael. See section 4.2.1.6.1.

10 See section 4.2.1.6.2, and especially 4.2.1.6.2.1.
inceptive nuance; upon seeing evil, he will begin to go hide. Here, however, the author chose a Niphal, which emphasizes that the prudent one will be hidden when he sees evil, leaving ambiguous whether he started to hide before or after he saw the evil. In the example of “understanding,” example 5, the Hitpael could convey an inceptive sense, where as soon as wisdom perished, understanding went to hide; understanding was not hidden yet. Related to this nuance, the verb could convey “becoming” hidden, that is, understanding was undergoing a process of becoming hidden. The process is thus emphasized over the final state. The Hitpael can additionally indicate “act as X” as we saw above (section 2.3.2.4). “Act as X” can mean that the subject acts with or without a pretense. Under this interpretation of the verb, understanding was “acting” hidden; in other words, understanding was no longer functioning openly. Without more contextual information, I cannot discern the precise meaning conveyed by these two stems, but my theory allows one to narrow down the possibilities.\footnote{A Pual of this root appears in Prov 27:5. In that example, the Pual is a attributive adjective participle, which is common for the Pual. In this way, the Pual seems to be a stative, like the Niphal. Furthermore, the Pual emphasizes the transition even less than the Niphal.}

4.2.1.1.3. “Hide” \(hb^3\)

In a pair of examples of the root \(hb^3\) we see a difference in focus between the action and state of hiding. We can find this contrast in verses Josh 10:16 (Niphal) and 1 Sam 13:6 (Hitpael).
6. wayyânúsû ḥâmēšet hammolakîm hâléleh \[\text{and.fled five the.kings the.these and.hid:Niphal:WAYY in.cave}\]
\[\text{bammaqqêdâh in.Maqqeda}\]
And these five kings fled, and they hid in the cave in Maqqeda (Josh 10:16).

7. wořîš yiśrâël râ'û kî šar-lô kî niggaś hâ'âm \[\text{and.man Israel saw that trouble-to.him for pressed the.people and.hide:Hitpael:WAYY}\]
\[\text{hâ'âm bammaqarôt ûbashawâhîm ûbashassorîhim ûbabborôt the.people in.the.caves and.in.the.holes and.in.the.rocks and.in.the.holes and.in.the.pits}\]
And the Israelites saw that they were in trouble, for the people were hard-pressed. So the people hid (Hitpael) in caves and in holes and in rocks and in holes and in pits (1 Sam 13:6).

The first example refers to the kings’ hidden state. They fled, and ended up hidden. In contrast, the second example refers to the activity of hiding. The people saw their dire straits and went to hide in various places, in contrast to Saul, who did not go (1 Sam 13:7). So the context contrasts the people, who go away to hide, and Saul, who remains. Let us note further that these verses do not seem to contrast on the basis of agency. Both describe humans who want to hide after a battle. The people are not made to hide by an external Agent, but hide themselves, so middle or reflexive readings would be equally possible in both cases.\[12\]

An analysis of these two verses is offered by Boyd (1993:249-50).\[13\] When he examines them according to his voice-based theory, he claims to find “total overlap” between the use of hûb in the Niphal and its use in the Hitpael. Since this root does not occur in any Piel forms,

\[\text{12 In Job 24:4 we find a Pual of this root. } HALOT \text{ suggests it be read as a Hitpael and translates, “need to hide oneself” (284), while BDB keeps the Pual and translates, “are made to hide themselves” (285). Thus the Pual translation assumes an external Cause, while the Hitpael expresses internal motivation. Keeping with the Pual I would claim that the Pual in this example stresses the external Cause.}\]

\[\text{13 He includes Gen 3:8, 10 in the same analysis. See below, section 4.2.1.1.4.}\]
Boyd claims that relating the Hitpael to the Piel would be “unsound.”\textsuperscript{14} Moreover, he claims that the Niphal cannot be reflexive, and the Hitpael may be in these instances; however, both may be middle or passive (1993:247). In the end, Boyd asserts that the usage of the Niphal and Hitpael are indistinguishable in this pair (and others) he analyses.

Creason (1995:356) cites these examples from Boyd, but disputes his analysis. He believes that the Niphal relates to the Qal stem, but with a “passive/stative” or “inchoative/middle” meaning, though later he agrees with Siebesma who claims that the Niphal may be understood as a reflexive (1995:357, citing Siebesma [1991:167-68]). The Hitpael contrasts with the Niphal because the former can relate to the attested Qal, unattested Piel, or to attested Hiphil, and must carry a reflexive meaning and not an “inchoative/middle” meaning.\textsuperscript{15} Such a view offers no necessary distinction between these verbs in the two stems, but only that the Niphal may be reflexive and the Hitpael must be.\textsuperscript{16} If we say that both verbs are reflexive in meaning, which makes good sense from the context, then Creason’s theory does not explain why one stem was chosen over the other in a particular context.

Boyd and Creason have not explained why a particular stem is used in a given context; situation aspect, though, can answer this question. We find a Niphal in Jos 10:16, where the verse describes how the kings hid after being routed. While we have a reference to the kings fleeing and then hiding, the majority of the context describes what Joshua did to the hidden kings. In the following verse, 10:17, the kings are recalled as “hidden” (נְחָבָּם neḥbám, a

\textsuperscript{14} As a result, he undermines those theories that differentiate between the two stems according to the Niphal’s and Hitpael’s basic stem relations to other stems.

\textsuperscript{15} The Hiphil of this root appears six times. The likelihood of a Piel existing in the spoken language is difficult to determine.

\textsuperscript{16} This view contrasts with Boyd’s above.
Niphal participle) in the cave, where the Niphal participle refers to the kings’ state. The action of the next verse, 10:18 (sealing the cave) is predicated on the fact that the kings were in a hidden state, rather than taking action to hide. Thus we should understand this Niphal as referring to a state rather than an activity.

“Hiding” is more of an activity in 1 Sam 13:6, as it is viewed there as an action instead of as a state. First, the narrator describes what the men of Israel did when they saw trouble arise. The men hid in various places, which are all described. So the “hiding” is seen as a series of actions. Second, Saul’s action is contrasted with the other Israelites’ actions; while they left to go hide, he stayed and waited. The end of the scene describes how Saul ended up alone, resulting from the people leaving him to go hide.

4.2.1.1.4. “Hide” הָבַּב, second example

One cannot discuss the contrast between the Niphal and the Hitpael of “hide” without addressing the excellent, contrastive examples in Gen 3:8-10. Here we also see that the Hitpael effectively means “go hide,” when we interpret the “activity” of hiding.

17 This seems to be the reason for the Hitpael of מָלַך, “hide,” in 1 Sam 23:19; 26:1; Ps 54:2; which all happen to describe the same action of David.

18 The same use of הָבַּב appears in 1 Chr 21:20, in the contrast between Ornan and his sons. When the angel of Yhwh came, the sons went and hid, leaving the father alone to thresh. It is interesting that the sons are never discussed further, only the father; the verb is used to move the sons out of the scene. Moreover, the father and David’s interaction with him are the main topic for the rest of the pericope. The author must not have wanted to depict that the sons were already hiding when the angel appeared (which would have been implicit in a Niphal), but wanted to reinforce the image of the father as alone when David approached and as he offered his (and possibly his sons’) entire livelihood to David.
8. wayyišmo’ú ṭet-qôl yhwh .'.$êlôhîm mìthallëk  baggàn  lôrû’h hayyôm
and.heard ACC-voice yhwh God walk:Hitpael:PTPL in.the.garden to.cool the.day

wayyiḥabbë³
hâ’âdâm wâ’ištô mipponê yhwh .'.$êlôhîm bêtôk  ’êṣ
and.hide:Hitpael:WAYY the.person and.wife.his from.face yhwh god in.midst tree

haggàn  wayyiqrâ’ yhwh  .$êlôhîm  ’el-hâ’âdâm wayyô’mer lô  ’a yyékkâh
the.garden and.called yhwh god to.the.person and.said to.him where.you

wayyô’mer ṭeṭ-qôlkâ  šâmá’ti baggàn wâ’îrä’  kî  ’êrôm  ’ânôkî
and.said ACC-voice.your heard.1cs in.the.garden and.afraid.1cs for.naked I

wâ’êḥâbë³
and.hide:Niphal:WAYY:1cs

And they heard the sound of Yhwh God walking around in the garden in the cool of the
day, and the man and his wife went to hide (Hitpael) before Yhwh God in the midst of the
trees of the garden. And Yhwh God called to the man and said to him, “Where are you?”
And he said, “I heard your voice in the garden, and I was afraid because I was naked, so I
hid (Niphal)” (Gen 3:8-10).

This example offers a good case study for the difference between these stems because 1) the
Niphal and Hitpael of אבב appear once each, 2) the two verbs describe the same event, and 3) both verbs are in the same form (wayyiqtol).

This verse contrasts “hide” as a state and as an activity. In first scene, Yhwh is walking
around, and when Adam and Eve are ashamed, they go and hide (Hitpael). When Yhwh asks
where they are, Adam answers that he was afraid and so he is hidden (Niphal). The Hitpael
indicates an activity; as soon as Adam heard the voice, he went to hide, as we saw in example

---

19 Yhwh’s walking is מיתהלך mìthallëk, a Hitpael, showing an iterative action. See below, section 4.2.1.4.1.

20 Cassuto (1978:154) and IBHS (§7.2.1d) understand "tree" as a collective, meaning a group of trees. Such an interpretation would not contradict my explanation of Adam going to hide among the trees. On the contrary, such a conception of Adam’s action may reveal an iterative hiding action, which would require a Hitpael.
In contrast, Adam is answering at the end of the example, that he was hidden (Niphal). This comes from the point of view of after the transition took place, that is, the resulting state of his action, as in example 6. This use also resembles the question about David in example 18, that is, where David is currently hidden. Moreover, the Niphal indicates the final state that Adam is in; he is no longer performing a hiding action. The contrast between the Hitpael and Niphal in Gen 3:8-10 thus reflects a dynamic vs. a stative nuance of הִ疮 "hide."

Scholars do not agree on the meaning of each of the occurrences, however, or what distinction the author is intending to highlight by using different verb forms. Westermann (1984:182), von Rad (1961:84), and Cassuto (1978:154) all represent both actions as reflexive (‘... the man and his wife hid themselves ...’), while Sarna (1989:26, following NJPS) reads them both as middle (‘... the man and his wife hid ...’). Thus we cannot tell if these authors sensed a distinction in the Hebrew, since they do not reveal any distinction in English. Boyd does not see any difference between how the stems are used here (1993:249-50; see analysis above). Creason in his dissertation spends some time to explain the distinction between the Niphal and Hitpael of הִ疮 in Gen 3:8-10. He writes,

[T]he narrator uses a Hithpael, apparently to indicate that Adam and Eve acted as agents when they hid themselves from the LORD. [Gen 3:10] is taken from the response that Adam makes to the LORD when the LORD asks Adam where he is. Adam replies using a Niphal form, which does not specifically entail that there was an agent of the action (Creason 1995:355-56).

---

21 If the verb had been in the Niphal, it could have suggested that Adam was already hidden when he heard Yhwh’s voice. As it stands, the first verb, a Hitpael, is inceptive because they went to hide upon hearing Yhwh. If the verb had been in the Niphal it would not be inceptive, and hence it would not indicate that the hiding action followed upon hearing Yhwh, that is, a cause and effect.

22 This use also resembles the question about where David is currently hidden, in example 18, below.
This explanation reveals that Creason senses the primary difference between the Niphal and the Hitpael as one of agency. More specifically, Creason believes that the Hitpael indicates that the Agent is the same entity as the Patient, that is, reflexive, and the Niphal does not point to any particular Agent, that is, passive or middle.

An opposing view is offered in Grüneberg’s work, that is, that the Niphal of hiding verbs is essentially middle. He writes,

Verbs denoting hiding... frequently occur in the niphal, and are often analysed as reflexives. However they are better seen as self-move middles... Hiding oneself by placing a blanket over one’s head, as one might over another’s head, would be semantically reflexive; hiding by moving behind foliage—as presumably Adam and Eve did in Gen 3:10—is not more reflexive than any other verb of motion” (Grüneberg 2003:50).

Thus for Grüneberg the Niphal is essentially middle, and the semantics of the verb are the same as a motion verb. In this explanation, Grüneberg mentions the relationship between the Agent and the P, namely that v. 10 is not reflexive, which furthers his argument that the Niphal is a middle voice.23

Only Creason offers an explanation for why the author would have chosen a Niphal or a Hitpael in a given instance, but Grüneberg notes a problem with Creason’s view. Grüneberg notes that if one contrasts the Niphal and Hitpael of רָפָה in Isa 28:15 and 29:14, respectively, one finds that the Niphal most likely is reflexive and the Hitpael is more passive. This fact leaves Creason’s explanation somewhat doubtful (Grüneberg 2003:45 n. 59).24 Nevertheless,

23 With this definition of the Niphal, it is difficult to understand how Grüneberg would handle an inanimate S of a “hide” verb.

24 Nevertheless, Grüneberg still does not see a strong distinction between the Niphal and the Hitpael (Grüneberg 2003:45).
one counter-example does not mean that Creason’s explanation is impossible, but introduces the notion that the underlying distinction between the Niphal and Hitpael is more complex.

The model I outlined in the preceding sections can explain the reason why the Hitpael and Niphal were used as they were in Gen 3:8-10. From the beginning we claimed that the two verbs indicate the same event, Adam and Eve hiding from Yhwh. These uses of this verb fit with the nuances of the Niphal and Hitpael that we saw above, that is the Niphal refers to the state of being hidden, and the Hitpael, the activity of going to hide.

4.2.1.5. “Sell”

With the root, המר mkr, “sell,” we find evidence for the use of the Hitpael as a marker of situation aspect in a direct relationship to the Niphal (the root bears the same meaning in both stems), as well as with an idiomatic sense, where the meaning of the root in the Niphal and Hitpael diverge.25 We can see the purely aspectual distinction in the two following examples.

(The idiomatic use is explained in section 4.2.6.2.3.)

9. kî-yimmāḵēr ǀ lōkā ʔāḥīḵā hāḵibri ʔō hāḵibriyyāb
for-sell:Niphal:YQTL to.you brother.your the.Hebrew:MASC or the.Hebrew:FEM

waʿāḥāḏḵā ʔēṣ šānîm
and.servant.your six years

If your Hebrew brother or sister is sold (Niphal) to you, he will serve you six years (Deut 15:12).

10. wəhitmakkartem šām lāq̄ybeʾḵā laʾāḇāḏim wəlišpāhōt  
and.sell:Hitpael:QTL there to.enemies.your for.servants and.for.handmaids  
wəʾēn qōneh  
and.there.is.no buyers:PTPL  

And you will be sold (Hitpael) to your enemies there as male and female slaves, but none will buy (you) (Deut 28:68).

Both instances depict similar scenes: Hebrews being sold as slaves. The A is demoted syntactically in both sentences. The main distinction, however, is the completion of the transaction. The first sentence describes what happens after the slave is sold, not the process of selling. The focus thus lies after the endpoint of the transition. The second sentence depicts the Israelites as they are “on the market.” They have not been sold at the point that is focused on. This sentence expresses the activity leading to the (unlikely) point at which they are sold.

These situations corroborate my theory of the Niphal and Hitpael. I claim that the Niphal is the resultative stative passive. In the present case the Niphal occurs where the focus is on the outcome of being sold, where the subject is in a sold state. In contrast, the Hitpael in my theory expresses the activity preceding the transition point, and in the present case, the transition point has not been reached. (The speaker expresses the unlikelihood that the transition will be reached at all.)

Some see a passive vs. reflexive distinction between the Niphal of the first example and the Hitpael of the second, and so would translate the Hitpael in the second example as, “offer

26 This correlation between situation aspect and completion does not necessarily coincide with viewpoint aspect, however. One could say that the event expressed in the Hitpael has an imperfective sense, since the selling was never completed. The context implies, though, that the event of trying to sell ended; attempting to sell the Hebrews did not occur indefinitely. The event likely stopped without the final state being reached. Such a distinction reveals that an activity can be viewed in its entirety—a perfective view—without the state implied by the activity being reached. See the interaction between situation and viewpoint aspects, section 4.2.3.
yourself for sale.” While it could be the case that the seller in the first example is a third party, the seller is not clear. In the second instance the seller seems likely to be the same as the potential slave, that is, a reflexive.

The second solution does not necessarily conflict with my solution. The Niphal in the first example marks a stative aspect after a transition, where the identity of the slave, but not the seller, is clear. Similarly, the Hitpael marks an activity aspect, focusing on the process of being sold, and the context suggests that the buyer and seller are the same entity. Nevertheless, based on what we observe with other minimal pairs, the Agent/Patient identity functions less consistently as the essential Niphal/Hitpael distinction than situation aspect does. Based on other examples, it seems that a passive/reflexive distinction is less likely the deciding factor for using the Niphal and Hitpael in the present examples.

4.2.1.1.6. “Appear” and a corrected reading

In the second group, מָלַל לְלִי gll, מָלַל לְלִי ה ב k, and פָּלַס plš, we find mostly t-forms, as only two Niphals (of מָלַל לְלִי gll) exist (Isa 34:4 and Amos 5:24). The Niphal in Isa 34:4 follows my theory, but Amos 5:24 seems more problematic.

11. וֹיִגַּגַּאל kammayim mishpāṭ ūṣədqāh kōnahal ʾētān
and.roll:Niphal:YQTL like.the.water justice and.righteousness like.stream everlasting
And may justice roll down (Niphal) like water, and righteousness like an ever-flowing stream (Amos 5:24).

27 NRSV, NJPS, Driver (1986:319), Christensen (2002:607) translate this verb as a reflexive. Interestingly, the LXX translates as πρεθαρμόθεν, a future passive that also translates the Niphal of this Hebrew verb in Lev 25:23

28 The other roots of this category are less helpful. The first root, מָלַל לְלִי k, is a hapax. The second root, פָּלַס plš, appears four times, and only as a Hitpael (Jer 6:26; 25:34; Ezek 27:30; Mic 1:10). It always occurs in contexts related to mourning, and three times with “dust” or “ash.” The action itself remains obscure.
In this context the rolling action is ongoing, without a culminating state in mind. The focus is on justice appearing and rolling down, just like a steadily-flowing river would. This does not fit my theory because it would look at the “rolling” action from the resultative stative point of view. That interpretation would assume that the “rolling” was done.

However, the Niphal of this root is problematic in the jussive, because it is identical to the Niphal of הָלַח "appear," as we see in Isa 47:3. Understanding the latter root, we could translate it, “Let justice appear (Niphal) like water.” This expression depicts a typical use of the Niphal, thus fitting my theory better. The question, though, is whether this is an appropriate verb for the present context. In other words, would the appearance of water make sense in conjunction with an everlasting stream.

As a result, my theory offers an alternate reading of this verse, but we can find biblical data that indirectly and independently support my reading. A further piece of evidence is that neither מִשְׁפָּח "justice" nor רָאָה "righteousness" appears with the root הָלַח "glh, “roll.” The former, “justice,” never appears with the root הָלַח "glh, “appear,” but the latter, "righteousness,” is said to be “revealed” in Isa 56:1 (Niphal of הָלַח "glh, “appear”) and in Ps 98:2 (Piel [active] of same root). This evidence demonstrates a precedence for righteousness “appearing.” Furthermore, the noun for “springs” in Jos 15:19 (parallel to Judg 1:15) is גּולְט, which comes from the root הָלַח "glh. So “spring” is associated with water “appearing.”

---

29 In Josh 15:19 and Judg 1:15, springs of water are referred to as גּולְטָאָיִם, where the root of the first word may be either הָלַח "glh or הָלַח "glh. The former root is more likely the root according to normal noun-forming procedures. (Cf. Bauer and Leander [1991:§74f].)
In the present context in Amos 5:24, one could raise the question of why justice would appear before righteousness, but this image is possible in BH. It is common for “justice” and “righteousness” to appear as a pair.\(^{30}\) This implies that they come together, not one preceding the other. This is how a spring and a stream work together; there is no clear division between the two. Moreover, in Ps 72:1 God’s “justice” is requested for the king, and his “righteousness” for the king’s son. Similar to the passage under discussion, the two come in a chronological sequence, but do not appear separated. Thus BH allows the two to be separated conceptually, even though they usually function as a unit. In this way, we can conceive of justice appearing as it flows into righteousness, never entirely separated.

As a result, I believe that הָנָלָה נָלָה נָלָה, “appear,” would allow for a more accurate translation. First, the Niphal of נָלָה נָלָה נָלָה, “roll,” does not refer to water elsewhere. The only other occurrence of the Niphal is in Isa 34:4, where it refers to a scroll being “rolled up” (a completed state) which sounds like the opposite of the sense in the current example. So we cannot take for granted that “roll” makes sense with water as the subject in BH as it does in English. Second, the root נָלָה נָלָה נָלָה, “appear,” makes good sense in this context. An “everlasting stream” is different from a wadi. A wadi only appears in rainstorms or in melt from the snow of the mountains. An everlasting stream comes from a spring, where the water wells up or “appears” out of the ground. The image would be one where the waters appear and then flow down as a stream in a natural progression.\(^{31}\) Thus I would translate this verb from the root נָלָה נָלָה נָלָה, “appear,” not from נָלָה נָלָה נָלָה, “roll,” as is often done. The resulting image depicts a progressive action of water appearing.

\(^{30}\) For example, we find this pair in Gen 18:19; 2 Sam 8:15; 1 Kgs 10:9; Ps 33:5.

\(^{31}\) NJPS follows this reading where it reads, “But let justice well up like water” (my emphasis).
as from a spring, and then flowing.\footnote{An ever-flowing spring, in fact, would require a spring.} If this reading is correct, then the Niphal would make more sense because the activity of the everlasting stream happens after the result of the appearance of the water.

### 4.2.1.2. Niphal processes

One example of the root הָקַם bnh, “build,” presents a problem for this theory so far.

12. wəhabbāyīt bahibbānōtō ʿeḇen-šālēmāh massāʾ nīpāh
   and.the.house in.build:Niphal:INFC.its stone.whole quarry build:Niphal:QTL
   And the house, when \textit{it was being built} (Niphal), \textit{was built} (Niphal) (with) whole stone
   (from the) quarry (1 Kgs 6:7).

In this verse we find two Niphals of the same verb. The second verb refers to the end state of the house; the description is from the final state, after the transition from “unbuilt” to “built.” The first verb, however, depicts the activity that occurred before the transition point, the process of the house approaching the final state of being “built.” I would have thus expected a Hitpael in the first occurrence of this root in this verse.

One can understand this verb as a final state. As the reader can tell from the amount of words I needed to supply in the translation, the syntax of the verse is convoluted. The instrument of construction is not indicated as such, and the specific relationship of the whole stone and the quarry is not indicated. The passage describes the temple from the point of view of the end of construction. From this view, perhaps a more literal translation of the infinitive would be “in its having been built,” that is, after the final transition point of being built. Such an interpretation, however, is rather forced. The example remains a problem for my theory.
Another example, one of the root הָדָּפ ndp, “drive,” is also problematic for my theory, in that the Niphal must be interpreted as an activity.

13. וֹרָאָדָ֑בָּׁפּ עֹצַמּ קֶול הָאָלֶה niddāph
   and-pursue ACC-them sound.of leaf drive:Niphal:PTPL
   And the sound of a driven (Niphal) leaf shall put them to flight (Lev 26:36).

The sound of the leaf is the focus of the above event. Only a leaf in the process of being driven makes a sound. A leaf in the state of having been driven is only in a new place than it was in before, and does not make noise.

Neither הָדָּפ ndp, “drive,” nor the preceding verb, בְּנָה bnh, “build,” occur in the Hitpael, which deepens the dilemma. It is possible that only historical accident has given us a corpus without any Hitpaels of these roots, which could have existed theoretically. Another reason is that somehow these roots prevent the possibility of Hitpaels. The fact that these two examples offer good opportunities for Hitpaels, yet Hitpaels fail to appear where I would predict them, suggests the latter possibility.

It seems that some verbs allow the Niphal to cover the situation aspect covered by the Hitpael in other roots. This does not seem to be motivated by semantic factors, as “build” and “drive” do not appear related semantically. Something more idiosyncratic may well be at work in these two roots that disallow the Hitpael. The Niphal and Hitpael of a single root tend to distinguish situation aspect. If a root does not allow both, however, the Niphal may cover both situation aspects. At this point, unfortunately, I cannot determine with certainty which roots
theoretically could allow both the Niphal and Hitpael, but do not demonstrate a Hitpael, and which cannot allow a Hitpael.\textsuperscript{33}

\textbf{4.2.1.3. Affectness and situation aspect}

Verbs that assume a high degree of affectedness of the object tend to show a high proportion of Niphals to Hitpaels. A “high degree of affectedness” is what Bakker calls, “[A] high-transitivity causative event,” such as “kill” (Bakker 1994:26). The Patient is affected to a high degree; these verbs include “kill,” and also “destroy” and “burn.” In Ancient Greek, the middle voice occurs least often among these verbs. When these sorts of verbs are passivized in BH, they overwhelmingly prefer the Niphal, and Hitpaels are rare. Nevertheless, the Hitpael is not universally excluded. Occasionally the author will depict an event of high affectedness on the subject (Patient) as a process rather than a culminating state. On these occasions, the event is depicted by a Hitpael.

We will see in the following examples that the Niphal depicts a higher level of affectedness on the subject than the Hitpael. The Niphal occurs with Patients that are affected completely (or nearly so) as the Patient enters into the culminating state of the event. Similarly, we know that the Hitpael shows the process of an event, before the culminating state is reached. In other words, the subject is not yet completely affected. As a result, we can understand that Hitpaels demonstrate a lower level of affectedness on the subject than the Niphal.

\textsuperscript{33} This problem is typical in analyzing dead languages. Miller writes in her article about the language of epigraphic texts, “But perhaps our greatest lack in examining epigraphic texts is knowing to what degree our limited corpus is representative of the languages” (2004:292). More specifically, she addresses our problem when she writes that the productivity of roots in other \textit{binyanim} other than what appears in our corpus “can only be approximated” (2004:295).
Among these verbs with a high degree of affectedness typically, the rare Hitpaels can be understood, therefore, to be marked for lower Patient affectedness. If an author wants to indicate that the subject is highly affected by these verbs, he uses the unmarked Niphal. If he wants to express a lower level of affectedness than the verb typically shows, he uses a Hitpael. The following data will show this distinction.

4.2.1.3.1. “(Over)turn”

Let us first look at how the data from verbs assuming a high level of affectedness on the Patient demonstrate the standard situation aspect distinction that we have seen elsewhere. We can see in the following examples that the verb יָרָג hpk, “(over)turn,” follows the Niphal and Hitpael split in situation aspect. Both seem to be passive, as well. Nevertheless, the subject in example 14 is more completely affected than the subject in example 15, since the latter has not entirely entered into a “turned” state.34

14. וֹדֶֽעָרְבָּאֵיִמִּים yôm wənîwēh nehpäket
   again forty day and.Nineveh (over)turn:Niphal:PTPL
   Forty more days and Nineveh will be overthrown (Niphal) (Jon 3:4).

15. wayyaškën miqqēḏem lōqân-כֶּדֶן ָּשֶׁ֣ת-הָּקָּרְעָּהֵֽים wōtēth làhêt haḥēreḇ
   and.placed from.before to.garden-Eden ACC-the.cherubim and.ACC flame the.sword
   hammīthappēket lišmōr ֹט-דֶּֽרֶּק ָּשֶׁ֣ת הָּחַֽשֶּׁ֥יִם
   the.turn:Hitpael:PTPL to.guard ACC-way.of tree.of the.life

   And he placed at the East of the garden of Eden the cherubim, and the flame of the
   turning (Hitpael) sword to guard the way of the tree of life (Gen 3:24).

34 Similarly, the subject in example 35 is more completely affected than the subject in example 36, since the latter has not entirely entered into a “swallowed” state.
In example 14 Jonah is referring to the final state of Nineveh, and not the process. One should note that the time reference is “again (֖נֶדֶנְוֹ ֑ד 40 days),” which further points to the culmination of a transition. The following example, example 15, contrasts with this conception of “turning” by indicating constant action. The sword is *constantly* in the process of turning, without the notion of finally being turned. The process thus never culminates in a final state.35

4.2.1.3.2. “Crush”

The root **אכד akd**, “crush,” bears high transitivity since the Patient is affected fully by the action.36 Nevertheless, we can find the root in both the Niphal and Hitpael (one Niphal and two Hitpael occurrences), and situation aspect determines their use. The following pair of examples is not ideal because the verbs we are focusing on are not in the same tense. This comes from a paucity of data, as the Hitpael only appears in the *yiqtol*, while the Niphal never does.

Significantly, though, both verbs present passive situations, that is, the assumed Agent is not the same as the Patient.

16. ֶלֶחָ֑הֵית רֻֽפּ ֖שֹֽפָלִים ֶלֶחָ֑הֵית לֶחָ֑הֵית נִגְכַּ֔פִּים
to.live:Hiphil spirit lowly and.to.live:Hiphil heart crush:Niphil:PTPL
. . . to revive the spirit of the lowly and to revive the heart of the *crushed* (Niphal) (Isa 57:15).

17. **וּוֹיִדָּדָקָּוּ** ֖בַּשָּׂסָָּר ֖וֹֽהֶנׁ ֖מַשְׁשִּׁל
crush:Hitpael:YQTL in.the.gate and.there.is.not save:PTPL
. . . and they are being *crushed* (Hitpael) in the gate, and there is none to save (Job 5:4).

---

35 An interesting translation problem arises when distinguishing between these two verbs, since English does not offer the same options as BH. I deliberately picked two participles to contrast in these two examples, to control against the extra effects of a variation of verb tenses. In English we would translate the Niphal and Hitpael participles literally as “turned (over)” and “turning (over),” respectively. The latter, though, is not a passive in English, and since the noun (sword) functions more like a Patient than an Agent, a middle reading seems most appropriate.

36 The root **וֹכִּי kci** is likely a bi-form of this root.
The Niphal points to the state of those whom Yhwh revives. The fact that he revives them assumes that they are already in a crushed state. The focus is on the activity after they are already crushed, not the process of being crushed.

In contrast, the context of the Hitpael shows that the verb represents an activity in which the children have not (yet) been fully crushed. If the person being affected were already crushed, then a savior would not help. Thus it is more likely that the subject is being presented as still undergoing being crushed. The activity of being crushed is the focus of the expression. Thus the Hitpael example demonstrates a lower level of affectedness on the Patient than the Niphal one.

4.2.1.4. Secondary distinctions

4.2.1.4.1. Iterative

In BH we see another contrast between the use of the Hitpael and Niphal, in which the former’s meaning extends to multiple or iterative actions, and the latter covers one-time actions culminating in a state. These meanings derive from the situation aspect of each stem. The following examples of a Hitpael and a Niphal of הָנָה appear in similar contexts, where David is hiding and his enemies—Absalom in example 18, and Saul in example 19—are looking for him. The leaders are forming their strategy for finding David.

18. hinneh ʿattāh hū-nehbā boʾaḥaṭ ḥappōḥāṭīm ʿō boʾaḥaṭ ḥammāqōmōṯ
behold you he-hide:Niphal:PTPL in.one the.pits or in.one the.places
Behold, now he is hidden (Niphal) in one of the pits or in another place (2 Sam 17:9).

19. ūrāʾū ʿudšū mikkōl hammāḥāḇōṯīm ʿāsher yithabbēšām
and.see and.know from.every the.hiding.places that hide:Hitpael:YQTL there
And go and find out about all the hiding places where he has been hiding (Hitpael) (1 Sam 23:23).
The enemies’ plans differ in one significant aspect that dictates the choice of verb stem: whether they want to find the particular place where he is currently hidden (example 18) or search out all the places David has been hiding (example 19). Significantly, the author uses the Niphal in the case where the enemies discuss David’s current state of hiding, and the Hitpael for his hiding actions. The former depicts David’s hidden state, in which the action is less significant. In contrast, the latter looks at David’s actions, moving from hiding place to hiding place, as David was hiding, presumably coming out of hiding, and then hiding again (1 Sam 23:21-22). Where David’s state has constantly been in flux because of his hiding activities, hiding is presented as a dynamic activity.

This correlation suggests that iterative actions are seen more as an activity than a one-time action. The Niphal would lend itself better to one-time actions because the stem refers to the final state that resulted from an action. In contrast, Hitpaels do not imply a culminating state, so they would be used in a context where an action keeps repeating but does not reach a culminating state.³⁷

4.2.1.4.2. Inceptive

The Hitpael and Niphal for the root נלע in Lev 5:2-4 and Deut 22:1-4 contrast with respect to situation aspect. This contrast parallels a distinction of inceptivity, where the Hitpael

---

³⁷ Nevertheless, the verb נלע “eat,” occurs in the Niphal, representing a habitual action where various Patients repeatedly reaches a culminating state. In Leviticus 6-7, for example, this root appears eleven times. Each time it indicates what shall and shall not be eaten under particular circumstances, which is presented as the actions of and ideal model. Should another individual follow this model, each time the item will enter into the culminating state of being eaten, and be fully affected. Each occurrence is understood as separate, and thus it the Niphal is not iterative.
is inceptive and the Niphal is not. The Niphal correlates with a state that has existed for an unknown period, while the Hitpael assumes that one would just be entering the state.\footnote{Each of these passages has three occurrences of the Niphal and Hitpael, respectively. I am noting only one for the sake of brevity.}

\begin{equation}
\text{20. } \text{ô kî yigga} c \text{ baṭum} aṭ \text{ ²ādām ³oḥōl ³um³aṭō ³āšer ⁷iṭmā³ bāh}
\text{ or if touch in.uncleanness person to.any uncleanness.his that is.unclean in.it}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{w̠ne׳lam } \text{ mimmēnnū w̠hû³ yāda} c \text{ w̠e̠a̠śēm}
\text{ and.hide:Niphal:QTL from.him and.he know and.is.unclean}
\end{equation}

Or whenever someone touches the uncleanness of a person, whatever the uncleanness by which he becomes unclean, and it is hidden (Niphal) from him, when he knows, he will be unclean (Lev 5:3).

\begin{equation}
\text{21. } \text{l̠ō³-tırōh ²e̠t-šōr ³āḥîkā ²ō ²e̠t-šēwōh ⁷idāḥîm}
\text{ not-see:2ms ACC-ox brother.your or ACC-sheep.his wander}
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{w̠hi̠f̠ālāmtā } \text{ mēhem hāšēb tāšēbēm lā̠a̠ḥîkā}
\text{ and.hide:Hitpael:QTL:2ms from.them return:INFA return:YQTL to.brother.your}
\end{equation}

You will not see your brother’s ox or his sheep wandering and hide yourself (Hitpael) from them. You will surely return them to your brother (Deut 22:1).

The texts occur in similar contexts (legal material), but differ in their content (how to handle unknown uncleanness vs. how not to react to a wandering animal). Hiddenness is described differently in the two texts. The point of the first case is those cases where the situation (the P) was not known to the offender when he became unclean, so the situation was always hidden. Example 21, though, expresses a context where the P of the hiding action performs an activity. Thus the Niphal represents a state of hiddenness, and the Hitpael, an activity of hiding.

A nuance of inceptivity arises from this contrast. In the Hitpael example, the subject was first not hidden but then hid. Once the addressee sees the ox or sheep that have wandered off, he
is exhorted not to go and hide himself.\textsuperscript{39} This activity led to the subject beginning to be hidden. With the focus on starting to hide, this event can be read as inceptive. In contrast, the Niphal subject did not undergo the activity of being hidden in this context, but its state of already being hidden is focused on. Thus the Niphal did not begin to be hidden in this passage, so the verb is not inceptive.

Again we see a correlation between the Niphal and the passive, and the Hitpael and the reflexive, though this association does not contradict my conclusions. In fact, the context demands that the Niphal be a passive, because the abstract subject is inanimate and cannot act on itself, and the Hitpael’s animate subject bears guilt if he or she hides. Nevertheless, we find minimal pairs whose contexts do not demand these associations, that is, Niphals with reflexive meaning and Hitpaels with passive meaning and/or inanimate subjects. Situation aspect applies, nonetheless, in these two examples, alongside Agent-Patient relationships. Thus the situation aspect feature for these stems is more consistent than the Agent-Patient relationship for these stems.

\textbf{4.2.1.5. Semantic middles}

In her book on the middle, Kemmer offers a limited number of semantic categories where the middle voice clusters cross linguistically.\textsuperscript{40} Kemmer has shown that cross-linguistically, middle forms (“middle markers” in Kemmer’s words) often appear in these categories. One can look to these semantic categories to find a preponderance of middle verbs. To test Kemmer’s

\textsuperscript{39} Significantly, the word “wandered off” is in the Niphal. This usage demonstrates that the animals are not in process of wandering off, but have fully wandered off. So we would not expect a Hitpael in this context.

\textsuperscript{40} For example, she lists “grooming or body care,” “nontranslational motion,” “change in body posture,” “emotive speech actions,” and “other speech actions” (Kemmer 1993:16-20; see section 3.4.2.1, above).
model, I have drawn from the roots from these semantic categories to look for how BH expresses the middle voice. For example, I have placed here roots in the Niphal and Hitpael that come from the categories of “cover/dress,” “uncover,” and “shave,” and that bear nearly the same meaning. Significantly, neither the Niphal nor the Hitpael represents a noticeable majority among these roots, however.

At the same time, I will examine the following examples according to situation aspect. My hypothesis predicts that among these semantic categories, the Niphal and Hitpael will demonstrate a dichotomy in situation aspect.

4.2.1.5.1. Niphal passive, Hitpael reflexive or middle (“cover”)

The passive of the root שָׁלֵל ksh, “cover,” predominately occurs in the Hitpael (2 Niphals vs. 9 Hitpaels). Kemmer includes self-action verbs, such as grooming, as well-represented in the middle voice cross-linguistically (Kemmer 1993:16). From this model I would predict that this root would be represented more often in the Hitpael. Thus we see that all the subjects of the Niphals are inanimate, and only one subject of a Hitpael is inanimate (Prov 26:26). Nevertheless, situation aspect may also be a factor for using each stem.

22. bahāmōn gallāyw niksāṭāh
   in.noise waves.its cover:Niphal:QTL
   . . . by the noise of its waves, she has been covered (Niphal) (Jer 51:42).

23. wattiqqah ḥaṣṣāṭāp wattiṭkās
   and.took the.veil and.cover:Hitpael:WAYY
   So she took her veil and covered herself (Hitpael) (Gen 24:65).

---

41 Among “cover” verbs I found two types of verbs. One covers with something solid, like clothing. These roots are שָׁלֵל ksh, חָפֵשׁ hph, “cover,” יָדוֹ hds, “gird,” לִבְגָדָה ldh, “arm,” and שַׁמֵּשׁ šmš, “disguise.” The other type is characterized by covering with a substance. We find here כָּפֶר fwér, “plaster,” טִמֵּה tm, “stained,” and שָׁלֵמָה mšm, “anoint.” The first type includes few Niphals and many Hitpaels. The latter type includes only Niphals and no Hitpaels.
The first example first states that the sea has gone over Babel, so the covering action seems to have already reached its final state. In contrast, Rebecca in Gen 24:65 does not seem to be covered already when she asks the question about the man, for which reason she had to “take” her veil to cover up. Thus the focus is on the pious action that Rebecca took upon learning about this man.

Another possible interpretation based on agency would say that the Niphal indicates a passive, and the Hitpael, a reflexive or a middle. The first example has an inanimate subject as the subject of the Niphal. In addition, Yhwh seems to be the Agent in this context. In the other example of the Niphal, Ezek 24:8, the Niphal also functions as a passive. The second example has an animate subject who is clearly acting on herself. On the one hand, we could call this construction reflexive since the Agent and the Patient are the same entities; on the other hand, we could call it a middle since this root falls into one of Kemmer’s middle categories. The context makes it very difficult to distinguish a reflexive from a middle in a way that is similar to the French and Spanish reflexive/middle constructions with se. We could say that in the present case the Hitpael straddles the line between reflexive and middle.

The Pual, much like the Niphal, mostly expresses passive expressions. While this root appears twice in the Niphal, it appears seven times in the Pual. Here is an example.

24. wəhammáyim gābrú məʾḥōd məʾḥōd ʿal-hāʾāreṣ wayokussû
and-the-waters high very very on-the-land and-cover:Pual:WAYY

kol-hēḥārim haggōbōhîm
all -the-mountains the-high

When the waters had grown exceedingly high on the land, all the high mountains were covered (Pual) (Gen 7:19).
This context resembles the Niphal in example 22, above. Both sentences assume water covering over land. They are both passive and express the resulting state of being covered over. In these two examples, I am not able to explain the difference between the two stems. Both stems cover similar, if not the same, semantic territory, and appear to contrast with the Hitpael in the same way.

One Pual example appears to be middle stative.

25. wayyippōl dāwîd wəhazzqēnîm _moₕussîm_ bašṣaqîm ʿal-pənēhem
and-fell David and-the-elders cover:Pual:PTPL in-the-sackcloth on-faces-their
And David and the elders—_covered_ (Pual) in sackcloth—fell on their faces (1 Chr 21:16).

On the one hand, the men are in a covered state. It is common for participles to express states, but not necessary. Puals often express states, so a Pual participle most often expresses a state. On the other hand, the context of this Pual assumes that the men covered themselves with sackcloth. The result is a stative participle with a middle or reflexive interpretation. Pual stative participles are very common,\(^\text{42}\) while reflexive interpretations are rare.\(^\text{43}\) In European languages, even those with a middle voice distinct from the passive voice, the passive participle can express underlying reflexive or passive situations, if the pragmatics of the situation allows both options. For example, “My husband is finally dressed,” can express situations where the husband dressed himself or was dressed by another. Perhaps a similar phenomenon is occurring here.

\(^\text{42}\) Of 417 Pual exemplars in the HB, 188 (45%) of them are participles. This contrasts with Niphals, where 20% are participles, and Hitpaels, with 15% participles. *IBHS* affirms the adjectival nature of the Pual: “This participial quality of the _Pual_ reflects its structure as an essentially adjectival causation predicate (like the _Piel_ and as passive)” (*IBHS*:§25.1b).

\(^\text{43}\) The root לְבַשׁ _lbš_, “wear,” appears four times in the Pual, always as a participle. It never appears in the Niphal or Hitpael. Thus the middle stative participle dominates this root. This is exceptional for the Pual, but the fact that the root appears to offer no Niphal or Hitpael option makes it easier to explain the necessity for the middle to be expressed by the Pual of this root. It is difficult to determine, however, why a Niphal or Hitpael of this root would not occur.
Regarding situation aspect, the Hitpael seems to focus more on the activity of covering in these examples, and the Niphal and Pual, on the final state. The Hitpael refers to an inceptive action, which relates to the activity aspect. Moreover, the situation requires that she not already be in a covered state at this point; her action of veiling herself demonstrates her modest before Isaac.

Some Hitpaels, however, appear to be clearly stative, which raises a problem for my theory. Here is an example:

26. wayyišlaḥ ʾet-ʾelyāqîm ʾāšer-ʾal -habbáyiṯ wəšēbnâ ̄ h assōpēr wəʾēṯ ziqnê and-sent ACC-Elyaqim who-over-the-house and-Shebna the-scribe and-ACC elders.of hakkōḥānim mitkassîm baśṣaqqîm the-priests cover:Hitpael:PTPL in-the-sackcloth

And he sent Eliakim, who was over the house, and Shebna, the scribe, and the elders of the priests, covered (Hitpael) in sackcloth (2 Kgs 19:2 [=Isa 37:2]).

Unless the priests were putting on sackcloth as they were walking, this example indicates that the priests were in a covered state. They were most likely dressing themselves, so the verb bears a standard middle sense. Thus this Hitpael clearly overlaps with the Pual of example 25. This case of a Hitpael is very difficult for my theory, but I will tentatively propose the following solution.

The Hitpael of the same root in the previous verse could explain this case of the Hitpael. In the previous verse, 2 Kgs 19:1, the king “dressed” in sackcloth, an activity expressed with a Hitpael. The present verse, 19:2, then, could be drawing a parallel between the king and the

44 We find similar problems with 1 Kgs 11:29 and Prov 26:26. The latter verse poses a particular problem in that the form has no tav but a dagesh in the first kaf. This likely indicates a Hitpael, but looks very similar to a Niphal, except for the dagesh in the second radical. Moreover, the verb in the parallel stich is a Niphal of גלע, “uncover.” One could read the Hitpael as “act like X.”
officials, that is, as the king put on sackcloth, so did the officials. The distinct processes of putting on sackcloth occurred simultaneously with the king and the officials. If the officials’ action were expressed with a Niphal would most likely imply that the officials were already in a covered state when the king began the process of putting on sackcloth. An inceptive sense, as we have seen elsewhere, could lie at the base of this sense to indicate that they put on sackcloth when the king did and were not already in a covered state.

4.2.1.5.2. Niphal middle, Hitpael middle (“gird”)

The pair of examples analyzed from the root רז דר, “gird,” does not make the ideal minimal pair. Only one Niphal example exists. The Niphal is a participle, but there are no Hitpael participles, so the following pair is less than ideal.

27. mēḵîn hārîm bōḵōhô neḏəzâr bigbûrâh
establish:PTPL the.mountains in.strength.his gird:Niphal:PTPL in.might
Establishing mountains with his strength, girded (Niphal) with might (Ps 65:7).

28. yhwh mālāḵ gēšûţ lāḇēš lāḇēš yhwh ʾōz ḥiṭəazzâr
yhwh is.king grandeur put.on put.on yhwh strength gird:Hitpael:QTL
Yhwh reigns, Yhwh has put on grandeur, he has girded himself (Hitpael) with strength (Ps 93:1).

The similarity in context of these two verses is striking. Both describe Yhwh’s superlative strength in metaphorical terms, as if strength were his garment. Moreover, both meanings would naturally fall in the category of “middle” according to Kemmer, since “girding” is a clothing action typically performed on oneself (cf. Kemmer 1993:16). Both examples depict Yhwh girded. It is difficult, if not impossible, to imagine someone besides Yhwh girding him, so we would have to say that Yhwh has girded himself in both cases. Thus we cannot claim that the verbs depict a distinction in agency. As a result, neither context disambiguates the reflexive and
the middle voice. Since this is such a clear member of Kemmer’s middle semantic classes, we would be justified calling both the Niphal and Hitpael verbs “middle,” though we cannot exclude the reflexive as a possibility.

This similarity raises the next question, namely, what does the difference between the sentences signify. We can note two differences. One is the difference in tense. As I mentioned, the first is a participle, and the second, a qatal. We would expect the former to be more likely to describe a state, since participles are often used adjectivally. In contrast, the second verb more likely refers to an action, since it is a finite form. The second difference is reflected in the stems used, for the Niphal is used in the first example, and the Hitpael, the second. According to my theory, the stem distinction should reflect a state vs. activity contrast, so example 27 describes Yhwh in a girded state, while example 28 depicts Yhwh undergoing the activity of becoming girded.45 In the present contexts, then, the stems and the verb inflections coincide: the Niphal participle presents a state and the Hitpael qatal, an activity.

The contexts of the two Psalms further suggest distinct situations; that is, the first context describes who Yhwh is, and the second, what he does. Yhwh is often described by participles in Psalm 65,46 while the people are never depicted by participles. Overall the Psalm describes who Yhwh is and how the people react to him. The main actions are thus attributed to the people, as the passage describes Yhwh’s attributes. Psalm 93, in contrast, never depicts Yhwh with participles. Yhwh is the center of the description in the Psalm, which describes Yhwh’s

45 This may raise a theological concern: Does the author of Psalm 93 imagine a time when Yhwh was not girded with strength? This could be the case, as a soldier is “girded” with his weapon when he goes out to war. We can assume that Yhwh is not always preparing to go out and fight, so such a transition would be appropriate for Yhwh.

46 Yhwh is described by participles in verses 3, 7 (twice), and 8, and by “participial” infinitives absolute in verse 11 (twice).
greatness through his *actions.* Overall, then, Psalm 65 tends to describe Yhwh by states, and Psalm 93 by actions, which would explain why the author chose a Niphal in the former, and a Hitpael in the latter.

4.2.1.5.3. Niphal reflexive or passive, Hitpael middle (“uncover”)

This semantic class includes the roots גָּלָה, מָלְאָה, נֵסָר, “revealed, uncover”; שָׁפֵה, מָשַׁא, מַשָּׁר, “stripped”; and פַּרְשַׁה, מַשָּׁר, “take off.” We find a minimal pair of this semantic class in the root גָּלָה with the meaning of “becoming naked,” that may be reasonably understood as a reflexive sense.

29. kōh, 2āmar ḫādōnāy yhwh yāʾan hiššāpēk noẖuṣṭēk wattiggāleh
   thus-said lord yhwh because poured.out brazenness and.reveal:Niphal:WAYY
   ērerwātēk boṭaznūṭāyīk al-mos̱ahābhāyīk nakedness.your in.harlotries.your

   Thus said the Lord Yhwh, “Because of your brazenness gushed out, your nakedness was revealed (Niphal) in your harlotries over your lovers. . .” (Ezek 16:36).

30. wayyēšt min-hayyaʾin wayyiškār wayyitgal boṭōk ʿohōlōh
   and.drank from-the.wine and.is.drunk and.reveal:Hitpael:WAYY in.midst.of tent.his
   And he drank some of the wine and was drunk, and became naked (Hitpael) inside his tent (Gen 9:21).

The scenes seem similar on the surface, as both depict shameful situations of being seen naked and exposed. Moreover, both actions deal with “dressing” verbs, which are considered “middle” (Grüneberg 2003:48). Nevertheless, the variation in stems suggests some difference between the two situations. Example 29, with the Niphal, depicts a scene where a woman is naked in front of
her lovers. The context does not clearly indicate who did the undressing, whether the woman did it herself or if she was stripped by her lovers. Moreover, it appears that the state of affairs occurred more than once.

Example 30, with the Hitpael, depicts Noah clearly having undressed himself. The event only occurred this one time. It appears that he was already undressed by the time that his son, Ham entered, although not necessarily. Thus the Niphal depicts a situation where the Agent is ambiguous, but where the Patient is found in an undressed state, either once or many times. The context of the Hitpael indicates that Noah was the Agent of the action, and the action may or may not have been complete by the time of the next event (Ham’s entry).

The context of this situation raises an additional issue, that of Ham’s guilt in the next verse. There the text states that Ham saw the nakedness of his father; hence, Noah was naked. Thus the action of undressing was completed, at least by the time Ham left the tent. This situation implies that Noah was in a naked state, and sounds similar to the situation of the harlot Israel in example 29.

This similarity raises an important distinction from the point of view of situation aspect. As I explained in section 3.2, a transition occurs when an activity approaches a point after which the situation is seen as a state. The completion of an activity, then, is this point. The same point marks the beginning of a state, albeit a hair’s breadth away. Thus one can speak of this point as an activity (at its very end) or a state (at its very beginning).

Situation aspect appears to be the best explanation for the two stems in these contexts. It is possible to look at the distinction between the stems as indicating a passive (Niphal) vs. middle (Hitpael) contrast. However, as we have seen elsewhere, these stems do not indicate this distinction consistently. Moreover, both examples 29 and 30 could be interpreted as middle
verbs. From the point of view of situation aspect, we see that the Niphal in example 29 depicts the woman’s nakedness as exposed; by her harlotries she is now in a naked state. In contrast, the Hitpael in example 30 does not focus on a state but an activity.

The text raises a problem, in that Ham is blamed for seeing his father’s nakedness after walking in on him accidentally. If the Hitpael focuses on the activity of becoming naked, the stem could provide a clue as to why Ham is blamed. Noah is in the process of becoming naked when Ham walks in. Perhaps Ham is there during the process and does not leave until Noah is naked. He does not walk into the tent, stumbling upon his father’s state of nakedness (which likely would have been depicted with a Niphal), but sees him in the process undressing and does not leave until after he had seen his father’s nakedness. As a result, Ham bears more guilt. The ongoing activity of undressing gives Ham the opportunity to leave immediately, but Ham does not leave.

Among the “uncover” verbs, שָׁלֵלָה, “stripped,” stands out as an exception. The root only appears four times, in the Qal (Isa 32:11), Poel (Isa 23:13), Palpel, and Hitpalpel (both in Jer 51:58), although it is understood as a by-form of שָׁלַל (BDB 792; HALOT 889). In the Poel, Pilpel, and Hitpalpel, the root means carries the nuance, “destroy.” The Hitpalpel is exceptional because it appears to function as a stative and clearly has an external Agent—just as we would expect the Niphal to function. Moreover, we have seen that among verbs classes where the Patient is highly affected, such as “destroy,” the verbs individually tend to prefer the Niphal over the Hitpael.
And the walls of Babel will be laid bare (Hitpalpel), and its gates will be kindled with fire, and nations will labor for no reason, and peoples will become weary for the sake of fire (Jer 51:58).

The context of this verse is common. Yhwh threatens to destroy Babylon in spite of her great strength and famous victories (vv. 41-58). The context on its own does not lend itself to an exceptional verb use. However, the text does not explain why the nations and peoples are so tired. If they are the ones who “streamed” to Babylon in v. 44, they seem to be laboring for the sake of the city, maybe saving it from destruction.

Two morphological oddities occur in this verse. First, the verb under consideration, a Hitpalpel, is preceded by an infinitive absolute of the Pilpel, a variation on the Piel. This is an extremely rare occurrence (see IBHS:§35.2.1e). Second, the present verb “kindle” is in the Qal according to BDB (428) and HALOT (429), though the meaning is clearly passive. “Gates” functions as a Patient, and “fire” as the Cause. As a result, we can see that this passage expresses typical ideas in an atypical way.

This use of the Hitpael presents a problem to my theory, but my theory may be able to explain its exceptionality. Such situations—highly affected subject, focus on final state—would be presented as a Niphal in my theory. It is possible here, though, that the author is deliberately presenting the situation in an atypical way. If we follow my theory, then the Hitpael in the current context would indicate that the situation does not focus on the end or final state of the
action of “destroying,” but on the ongoing activity. This hypothesis might also explain why a Qal is used for the verb, “kindle.” The Qal there could be understood as an ongoing situation wherein the gates are continuing to burn. A Niphal would have indicated that the situation had come to its end in a final “burnt” state. The labor and work of the nations also point to the fact that this is a process that is going on. My theory would explain this scene by assuming that the Hitpael represents a process of destruction, paralleled by the Qal of “burning.” The scene focuses on the process, because the nations are wearing themselves out trying to counteract the process before the ultimate state of destruction has been reached.

This root also appears in the Hitpalpel in a similar context in the *Uza* 2 Ostracon, line 9. This inscription comes from the second half of the seventh century (Dobbs-Allsopp et al 2005:521), which is earlier than the Jeremiah text. This is the only place in the epigraphic evidence where the root appears at all. That text is damaged, however, so it does not offer significant help in understanding the Hitpalpel in the current text (Dobbs-Allsopp et al 2005:521-27). This is the only example of the Hitpael in the epigraphic corpus. The fact that only a single Hitpael appears in the inscriptiveal corpus raises the question of why there would be so few. Statistically, this fact may not be significant because of the small data set among the inscriptions (nine pieces). If it is significant, one could explain this phenomenon in two ways. First, the nature of the texts may exclude contexts where process-oriented passives are necessary. If texts focus on events that are or will be accomplished, rather than on the process towards their completion, one would not expect to find Hitpaels. For example, the only text where we find two Niphals is the Siloam Tunnel inscription, which commemorates the completed state of the

48 I would like to thank Doug Hemken, statistical computing specialist, for his statistical advice (p.c.).
tunnel, and we find two Niphals there (נָב qn and שָם šm “tunnel” and “hear”). Second, the inscriptions may be resorting to other strategies to express notions that are expressed by the Hitpael in the HB. In my examination of the inscriptional evidence, though, I did not find such a strategy. Therefore, it seems that the nature of texts in the inscriptions might exclude use of the Hitpael.

4.2.1.5.4. Niphal (anticausative) middle (“made bald”)

This category includes three roots, מְרַע mfr, “make smooth; make bald,” and נוּר qrh, “have oneself shaved,” and רְשׁ gdh, “shave.” “Grooming” is one of the principal semantic areas where the middle voice occurs, according to Kemmer (1993:16). We find that shaving verbs in BH generally follow this rule by expressing “shave” verbs in the Hitpael. However, BH shows a nuance that Kemmer also points out, “spontaneous events” (Kemmer 1993:19). When the shaving Agent is assumed to be someone other than the shaved (Patient), we do not have any Hitpaels. So the verb מְרַע mfr, “make bald,” appears in the Niphal, and not the Hitpael.49

32. וַיַּֽעַשׁ בִּי יִמְמָרֵֽט — רְשׁוֹ אֵלֵךְ וְקִרְמָלִים יָמְלָּאִים בְּעָרָֽיִם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
and.man if bald:Niphal:YQTL head.his bald he clean he and.if from.edge face.his

יִמְמָרֵֽט בְּעָרָֽיִם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִמְמָרֵֽט בְּעָרָֽיִם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל יִמְמָרֵֽט בְּעָרָֽיִם בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל
bald:Niphal:YQTL head.his bald he clean he

If a man’s head becomes bald (Niphal), (and) he is bald, he is clean. And if on the edge of his face his head becomes bald (Niphal), and he is bald (on the forehead)50, he is clean (Lev 13:40-41).

49 This root in an active sense often means “polish (metal),” e.g., 1 Kgs 7:45; Ezek 21:9. The meanings are probably related etymologically.

50 This root is a hapax, but from the equivalent word in the preceding verse we can gather that it has a meaning similar to “bald.”
This chapter generally deals with skin conditions. Skin conditions can be viewed in two ways: contracting them, or being found with them. The priest has to make a decision regarding the person in question, and he judges based on the individual’s state. Thus the state of the skin condition is in the purview of these verses. My model would predict that both of the above cases, because they point to a state, would appear in the Niphal. Nevertheless, the sentence does not present us with a potential Agent; the balding seems to happen spontaneously. Such spontaneous occurrences are often encoded in the middle. Thus we see the Niphal functioning as a middle voice.

This root also appears in the Pual, where it may bear a passive or a middle sense. In three cases it refers to metal, and is translated as “burnished” or “polished” (1 Kgs 7:45; Ezek 21:15-16). These are all passive senses. The other two occurrences have to do with people who are “smooth” or “shaven” (Isa 18:2, 7). Because these last two are actions Kemmer includes in her semantic category of actions normally performed on oneself, I identify them as middle. The Pual is used in this root for actions that have deliberately taken place, whether on oneself or on an object. It contrasts with the Niphal, which expresses spontaneous action.

4.2.1.5.5. Hitpael middle (“shave”)

The root for “shave,” נָלַג, does not appear in the Niphal. In the contexts where the Hitpael is used, the Agent and Patient are likely coreferential. The stative aspect of the root is probably encoded in the Pual. Interestingly, the Pual is used where the underlying Agent is demoted, and the underlying Agent and Patient are obviously not coreferred.

51 These sentences include the only Niphals of this root.
33. **wō̂htgallāh** wō̂et-hannéteq lō۰ yō̂gallḗḥ
And he will shave (Hitpael), but the scab he will not shave (Lev 13:33).

34. wayyā́hel šō̂ar-rō۰šṓ  laṣammḗḥ kaqā́šer gullā́ḥ
and.began hair-head.his to.grow as.which shave:Pual:QTL
And the hair of his head began to grow back after it was shaved off (Pual) (Judg 16:22).

The Hitpael example, sentence 33, presents shaving as an action that the person undertakes because it declares what may or may not be shaved during the process of shaving. This contrasts with the above example 32, where the Niphal of “bald” focuses on the state in which the subject appears before the priest. In example 34, Samson is already in a shaved state, but the verb is in the Pual. It is clear that the shaving was not done by him, and the other examples of the Pual follow the same pattern. So while these roots show some tendencies, they are impossible to prove here since no precise Niphal/Hitpael minimal pairs exist.

From these examples, we can also detect a reflexive/passive distinction between the Hitpael and the Pual. It is reasonable to think that the Agent and Patient should not be coreferential in example 33. Moreover, this type of action fits Kemmer’s middle semantic category, “grooming” or “body care,” well (Kemmer 1993:16). So this Hitpael bears a clear middle sense. But while the Hitpael expresses cases where the Agent and Patient are the same entity, that is reflexive, and the Pual, when they are not the same, that is, passive. The first case implies that the individual was shaved by his or her own hand. The context of the second case comes in the context of Samson being shaved by Delilah. Thus these stems express cases that distinguish agency: reflexive (Hitpael) or passive (Pual).  

---

We can see the same dichotomies among “wash” verbs, where the Hitpael is more reflexive and the Pual is more passive. These roots are “פְּרִיוֹן” (*frh*), “purified”; “רֶפֶס” (*šfp*), “rinsed” (does not appear in the Hitpael); “רָפָע” (*ṛḥs*), “washed” (does not appear in the Hitpael).
4.2.1.5.6. Semantic middle: Conclusions

In summary, among these clear middle semantic categories, we see that the situation aspect holds as the consistent distinction between the Niphal and the Hitpael. In each case, the Niphal referred to the resulting state of the event on the Patient, and the Hitpael, to the ongoing process.

“Passive,” “middle,” and “reflexive” were not expressed consistently by one stem or the other. The verb “cover” demonstrated a passive Niphal and a middle Hitpael. “Gird” functioned as a middle in the Niphal and the Hitpael. With the verb “uncover, undress,” the Niphal seemed more reflexive and the Hitpael more middle. Though the verb, “become bald,” does not demonstrate a Hitpael, the Niphal expresses a spontaneous action middle. Finally, “shave” does not appear in the Niphal, but does in the Hitpael, where it functions as a “grooming” middle verb. So among common middle verbs, the Niphal functions as a passive, a middle, and a reflexive, and the Hitpael as a middle, and maybe a reflexive. Thus the middle voice, according to Kemmer’s definition, is expressed by both stems.

4.2.1.6. Idiomatic and metaphorical uses

4.2.1.6.1. “Swallow”

Lexicalization factors into the distribution of the verb בָּלָב בַּלָּב, “swallow.” The basic verb has a high level of affectedness of the Agent on the Patient. However, the verb bears a different meaning in the Niphal and Hitpael, “devastated” or “engulfed,” and the Patient is not
food (BDB 118). So we have a metaphorical extension of the root’s meaning that is lexicalized in the Niphal and Hitpael.\(^{53}\)

35. nibla\(\textsuperscript{c}\) yiśræ\(\textsuperscript{e}\)l
swallow:Niphal:QTL Israel
Israel is devastated (Niphal) (Hos 8:8).

36. yāhōggû wəyānū̂ ˚u kaššikkôr wəkōl-hôḵmātām tịbllā\(\textsuperscript{c}\)
reel and.stagger like.the.drunk and.all-wisdom.their swallow:Hitpael:YQTL
They were reeling and staggering like a drunk man, and all their wisdom was being swallowed up (Hitpael) (Ps 107:27).

The first example depends on Israel’s devastation to describe where the people exists now. Their living among the nations demonstrates that they are in a devastated state. Psalm 107:26-27, however, describes various actions of the “redeemed” (Ps 107:2) before their redemption. Each section of the Psalm describes what they did, and each section ends with a cry to Yhwh and a description of Yhwh’s saving actions. In this context, the people’s wisdom does not need to be completely lost. The activity of it becoming lost made the people want to cry out to Yhwh.

The Pual conveys the same lexicalized sense of this root, meaning “devastated” or “confused.”

37. wə̄gəm ˚aḥôr taf̄aḥôr pen yəbulla\(\textsuperscript{c}\) lammeḵ ˚alək-haḵām ˚ašer
and.also cross cross to.the-king and.to.all.the-people who
\(\text{\textsuperscript{3}}}\)ittô
with-him

And so cross immediately, lest the king and all the people with him be devastated (Pual) (2 Sam 17:16).

\(^{53}\) In comparing the Niphal and Hitpael, one should note that the Niphal (two examples) occurs only in the qatal, and the Hitpael (one example) in the yiqtol. This distributional fact follows the overall trend of distribution of the stems among the perfective and imperfective verb forms.
The function of this root, then, is difficult to distinguish from the Niphal and Hitpael. One difference to note, however, is that the Pual only appears as a PTPL or YQTL, while the Niphal only appears as a QTL, and the Hitpael, YQTL. So the overlap may be more pronounced with the Hitpael, since the meaning and form are the same, and only the meaning is shared with the Niphal. The Pual seems to focus on the final state, like the Niphal and unlike the Hitpael.

Additionally, the passive in example 37 is impersonal, that is, the affected Patients/O have not been promoted but are found in prepositional phrases. This does not seem to affect the use of the passive in this passage, however.

4.2.1.6.2. Idiomatic Hitpael

The present verbs include ones where the Agent moves the Patient towards the Agent. I have included the following roots in the present subcategory: מַקָּה (lkd, לְקָה) 54 “take”; מִקָּר (mkr, “sell”; מְזָה, מִזָּה sph. מִזָּה, מִזָּה tps, “catch, take possession”; מְנָה nst, “lift”; מָנָה gnb, “steal”; מִזְבַּח, מִזְבַּח bzh, מִזְבַּח bzh sph. מִזְבַּח, מִזְבַּח ššs, שֶלְל sph. מִזְבַּח, מִזְבַּח ššl, “despoil.” 55

Nevertheless, the rare Hitpaels in this group tend to be metaphorical, and their semantics do not relate directly to their Niphal counterparts, although the state/activity distinction remains intact.

54 This root also occurs in the Niphal in the Arad Letter 111, line 4 (Dobbs-Allsopp et al 2005:106-107).

55 Kemmer also includes such verbs in the middle category “indirect middle,” which includes words such as “acquire (for oneself),” “take for oneself,” and “lay claim to.”
4.2.1.6.2.1. “Take” לָכוּとなる lkd

The root לָכֹן lkd, “take,” demonstrates Niphal and Hitpael examples. The Niphal means “taken” or “chosen” (36 occurrences). In refers to those things or entities in the literal state of being taken. The Hitpael of the same root occurs twice with different meanings, both in the book of Job. In the first instance, 38:30, the verb refers to water freezing, and in the second, 41:9, the Leviathan’s interlocking scales. The Hitpael verb thus means “interlock” or “solidify.” While one can see how this meaning relates to the Niphal, its more specific, metaphorical nature is also evident.

It is not clear, though, that an activity, rather than a state, is indicated in both of the Hitpael examples. The first refers to the state rather than the process of freezing. The second example is less clear. While it appears to refer to a state, “interlocked,” it is possible that the author is depicting the scales being grabbed, one by another, as opposed to separated (also expressed by a Hitpael here). Such an activity, even in a metaphorical sense, is difficult to picture. The Hitpael of this root could mean, “harden.”56 Thus it seems that the Hitpael has a specific, idiomatic sense that may cover some stative territory normally covered by the Niphal. Apart from situation aspect, the meaning of the Hitpael is distinct from the meaning of the Niphal, so the Niphal/Hitpael distinction may bear more of a literal/idiomatic distinction rather than situation aspect.

56 In English, the word “take” can have a similar, though not identical, idiomatic sense. For example, one should not move something that has been glued before the glue “takes.” Note that the English idiom requires a middle voice.
4.2.1.6.2.2. “Take” יָקַל lqH

In a similar way, the second root יָקַל lqH, “take,” means “be taken” in the Niphal, very similar to יָקַד lkd. Furthermore, the Niphal refers to the state of being taken in both roots. The root יָקַל lqH, in the Hitpael, though, means “flashing/kindled.” Moreover, in both cases where these Hitpaels occur, Exod 9:24 and Ezek 1:4, the verb refers to fire, which is compared to the weather in both contexts. Here is Exod 9:24.

39. wayahi ḥārāḏ waṭēš miṭlaqqáḥat bōṭok habbārāḏ
     and.was hail and.there.was take:Hitpael:PTPL in.midst the.hail
     And there was hail and fire taking (Hitpael) in the midst of the hail (Exod 9:24).

The context is not entirely clear as to whether the verbs indicate the state of “burning” or the activity of “flashing” or “catching on fire.” Many Hebraists understand the event as an activity, in any case.\(^{57}\) As we can say in English that a fire is “taking” when it is catching on, but not yet caught on, so it seems יָקַל lqH can mean the same in BH. This meaning focuses on the activity of being kindled rather than the state, nevertheless. So these examples also bear metaphorical meanings distinct from their corresponding Niphals, yet the predicted Niphal/Hitpael distinction of situation aspect still holds.\(^{58}\)

So while the Hitpael can take on metaphorical or idiosyncratic meanings, the Hitpael’s aspectual property still holds. Even in these cases where the Hitpael deviates from the root’s

---

\(^{57}\) Note the following translations: NRSV, NJPS “flashing,” BDB “taking hold of itself” (544), HALOT (535) LXX ψλογίζων “set on fire, kindle” (present active participle).

\(^{58}\) The root גָּנֶב gnb, “steal,” follows the same pattern. While the Niphal means simply, “stolen” (occurring once in Exod 22:11), the Hitpael means, “steal (into), sneak” (occurring twice in 2 Sam 19:4). The verb may be derived from the verbal root like the Niphal, with a lexicalization that occurs; otherwise, perhaps the verb means “act like a robber,” more closely related to the noun. In either case, the verb refers to the action that the people are performing, not to their state. It is interesting to note that the Pual can bear the same meaning as the Niphal, “stolen” (Gen 40:15; Exod 22:6) or as the Hitpael, “move stealthily” (Job 4:12).
meaning as expressed by the Niphal, the Hitpael refers to an action and not a state. At the same time, the corresponding Niphal, usually holding more closely to the predicted meaning for the passive, refers to a resulting state.

In addition to the Niphal and Hitpael of this root, we find another form. HALOT calls it the Pual (535), while IBHS understands it the passive Qal (Qp), a separate binyan (§22.6). The root in this binyan carries the same meaning as the Niphal, as opposed to the idiomatic use of the Hitpael. Furthermore, the meaning in the Qp is close to the meaning of the Niphal. Here is an example with both the Niphal and Qp in the same context. One should note that the Qp is pointed here by the Masoretes as a Pual. This is the only context where the two contrast in a single context.

40. . . wəʾēliyyāhû ʔāmar ʿel-ʾēlīšāʾ ʾšāʾal māʾeh ʾēʾeqēšeh-llāḵ baṭērem ʾellāqah
   . . . and-Elijah said to-Elisha ask what do-for:you before take:Niphal:YQTL mēʾimmāḵ . . . ʾim-tirʾēh ʾōṯi luqqāh mēʾittāḵ yōḥi-šākā kēn
   from-you . . . if-see ACC-me take:Qp:PTPL from-with-you be-for-you thus wəʾim-ʾāyin ʾō yīhēh
   but-if-there.is.not not be
   . . . and Elijah said to Elisha, “Ask what I should to for you before I am taken (Niphal) . . . If you see me taken (Qp) from you, it will be so for you, but if I am not, it will not be (so)” (2 Kgs 2:9-10).

In these sentences, the meaning is quite similar, as both refer to the moment when Elijah is taken up into heaven. The Niphal seems to express the moment of transition, while the Qp refers to the process of being taken up, as the NRSV and NKJV translate it. The form of the Qp is not clear, however. With a doubled second consonant, it is pointed like a Pual qatal, but it is functioning like a participle. For this reason it is called a Pual participle without the standard prefixed /m-/ (HALOT 534, citing GKC:§52s) and a Qp participle “pointed as if shortened from Pual məquṭṭal
[the standard form of the Pual participle]” (*IBHS:*§22:6c; also Joüon-Muraoka:*§58b). Both explanations explain the verb as a participle, while recognizing the exceptional nature of this form.

If we analyze the verbs from the point of view of situation aspect, a contrast becomes clear. The Niphal expresses the resultative stative aspect, as the verb points to the transition moment. The other verb points to an activity that Elisha may (or may not) see happening. The Hitpael assumes an idiomatic sense, so the activity aspect of the passive of this verb is left open for other means of expression. It appears from this example, then, that the Qp has taken over that niche left open by the Hitpael.

Elsewhere, though, the Qp of this root functions as a resultative stative.

41. lazōq̄t yiqqārē̄ Peninsula:YQTL woman for from-man take:Qp:QTL-this

This woman will be called “woman,” for from man she was taken (Qp) (*Gen 2:23*).

This verse expresses the fact that the woman was taken out of the man, looking at the event from the point of view after the transition. One could argue that the activity of being taken out of the man is highlighted. However, that interpretation would not be able to take for granted the fact that she was fully taken out of the man, and so could be confusing. A resultative stative interpretation is better.

One must be cautious in comparing the Qp in these two examples, 40 and 41. The first example is a participle and the second, a *qatal*. In this way, it may make more sense that the latter would refer to a resultative state, since the viewpoint aspect is perfective. Furthermore, the second example looks more like a Pual. Thus the fact that it is more transitive and stative may suggest that the verb is a Pual and not a Qp. As a result, one must be cautious in analyzing the Qp as a whole, since it overlaps with the Pual formally sometimes. In other cases the Qp forms
are anomalous and difficult to parse as a Qp or a Pual. The fact that the Qp looks like a Pual in many cases suggests that their distinct function may be difficult to discern precisely.

4.2.1.6.2.3. “Sell”

The above examples 9 and 10 exhibit the same sense for the root, נָמכַר mkr, “sell,” in the Niphal and the Hitpael. However, we find an additional, idiomatic sense for the same root in the Hitpael used three times (1 Kgs 21:20, 25 and 2 Kgs 17:17), and this sense does not appear in the Niphal. This sense of the verb means to dispose oneself to do something negative, the same as the English idiom, “sell out.” The phrase, “to do evil in the eyes of Yhwh,” is always the complement of this verb. The fixed nature of this phrase, and the similarity of the contexts in which it appears, do not make the situation aspect very clear. Nevertheless, all the instances describe ongoing wicked activity, which suggests why the Hitpael is used. This same evidence, though, does not explain why the verb could not be in the Niphal, since the activity of “doing” could assume being in a “sold” state. So the Hitpael makes sense in this context, but there is not enough evidence to explain why the Niphal would not be used, other than to say that such idiomatic uses more often develop in the Hitpael than the Niphal.

4.2.1.6.2.4. “Join”

Within the subcategory, “join,” we can distinguish two groups, depending on how many Patient roles exist, and the purpose. The first group typically involves one Patient joined with

59 Here is an example of the English idiom: “Environmentalists sold out to help Exxon.” Interestingly, the English has a middle or anticausative sense. The idiom cannot be passivized, and it very rarely appears as a reflexive, though the idiom has a reflexive sense.

60 The BH phrase is לָכָּשָׁ֨ךְ הָֽאָרֶץ בָּשָׁ֖נֶן יְהוָ֣ה. la’kash čha’sť bošanén yhwh.

61 We find this phrase rendered as a passive in Greek in the above passages, plus 1 Macc 1:15.
itself or onto something else: קפיט qps, מכנס kns, “drawn together”; קזח qhd, “united”; and קסאר qsr, ממון lwh, סכמה sph, “joined.” The following is an example of the root מכנס kns, “drawn together,” in the Hitpael.

42. wəḥammassēḵāh šārāh kōḥiṭkannēs and.covering narrow as.cover:Hitpael:INFC . . . and the covering is too narrow for covering up (with) (Hitpael) (Isa 28:20).

The second group has more forms, and it typically assumes multiple Patient roles where they join to each other: קבש qbs, קסא sp, קזד y’d, קיד qhl, קזר qwh, לוס lqt, and קקשת qšš, “gather”; סר sr, סמל hsn, “store”; and ורט rm, “heap.” Here is an example with the first root, קבש qbs.

43. wəyiyṭqabbāṣū yaḥdāw ləḥillāḥēm ʾim-yəḥōšūʾ ac wə’im-yiśrāʾēl peh ḫeḥād and.gather:Hitpael:WAYY together.to.fight with-Joshua and.with-Israel mouth one And they gathered together (Hitpael) to make war with Joshua and with Israel of one accord (Josh 9:2).

Niphal/Hitpael overlap is rare among these roots, as only four have both a Niphal and a Hitpael: קסאר qsr (2 Niphals and 3 Hitpaels), and ממון sph, (one Niphal and one Hitpael), “joined”; and קבש qbs (31 Niphals and eight Hitpaels), and זסma sp (81 Niphals and one Hitpael), “gather.”

We find that the roots that display the Niphal/Hitpael contrast follow the paradigm set forth above, even though some of the Hitpaels demonstrate distinct, idiomatic meanings. When the Niphal and Hitpael demonstrate no lexical drift, e.g., קבש qbs and זסma sp, “gather,” the aspectual distinction is maintained. The “join” verb, קסאר qsr, in the Hitpael means “conspire,” which is evidence of some lexical drift. Nevertheless, the Niphal/Hitpael distinction follows the

---

62 This root likely relates to the rarer root זסma ysP, which occurs six times, only in suffixing or participial forms.
situational aspect distinction, in spite of the lexical drift. In both circumstances, the Niphal still indicates a state, and the Hitpael can be read as an activity.\textsuperscript{63}

\section*{4.2.1.6.2.5. \textquotedblleft Lifted up\textquotedblright}

We find one minimal pair of the root לָשַׁנְתּ nš\textsuperscript{2} “lifted up” in the passage Dan 11:12-14.

\begin{verbatim}
44. וֹנְיָשֹׁשָׁפְּל hehâmôn wərâm lôbâbô wôhippîl ribbôvût
and.lift:Niphal:QTL the.multitude and.be.high heart.his and.fall:Hiphil multitudes

וֹלֹּא yâ¢ôz . . . übâʾittîm hâhêm rabbîm yq’amduk ʿal-mêlek hannégeh
and.not be.strong ... and.in.the.times the.those many stand over.king the.South

üḇônê pârîsê ʿamməkā yînnaššoʿû lôhaʿâmîd hâzôn wənikšālû
and.sons violence people.your lift:Hitpael:YQTL to.stand:Hiphil vision and.fall

When the multitude will be carried off (Niphal), his heart will become haughty, and he will bring down myriads, but will not prevail. . . . After some time—years—he will surely come with a great army and with much property. And in those times, many will stand against the king of the South, and the sons of violence of your people will act exalted (Hitpael) to establish the vision and they will fall (Dan 11:12-14).

Here again we find a Hitpael with a metaphorical meaning, “act exalted,” while the Niphal tends to keep the literal meaning, “be carried (off).”

Nevertheless, the Hitpael in this context seems to function as we would predict.\textsuperscript{64} The Niphal in verse 12 is stative, because the following state of haughtiness is predicated on the people being carried off. In contrast, verse 14 makes it clear that the actions occur over a long period. The sons of violence become haughty, but the context is focusing on the action itself and

\textsuperscript{63} The root לָשַׁנְתּ nš\textsuperscript{2} “join,” and הָשַׁנְתּ ʿšp, “gather,” also allow us to read the Niphals and Hitpaels according to our theory, though only one example exists per stem in the former root, and only one Hitpael exists in the latter. They thus do not allow us enough examples to generalize.

\textsuperscript{64} The Hitpael of לָשַׁנְתּ nš\textsuperscript{2} demonstrates inconsistencies of form, as the tav of the prefix assimilates to the following nun two times out of ten occurrences.
not the final state. First, the people are acting haughty, and such a sense commonly appears in the Hitpael. Second, acting haughty occurs during a temporal period without a clear endpoint.

In all the cases of metaphorical and idiomatic uses of these roots, the Niphal represents stative aspect and the Hitpael, activity. I was not able to find ideal minimal pairs for some roots, however, which weakens the effectiveness of these examples. The examples reflected the expected situation aspect for the two stems, nevertheless. So while the contrast may not be discernable in some cases, one could predict that should a proper minimal pair be found, the stem would express the proper situation aspect.

4.2.1.7. Rare stems

4.2.1.7.1. Nitpael (“atone”)

With another root, נָבַּד הַקְּרוֹן, “atoned,” we find a contrast between the Hitpael and the Nitpael.

45. וָלָךְּכָן נִשְׁבָּאֲתִי לֹּבָּט כָּלַי נִמ-יִתְקַפְּּרָא לְבֹּקַט וְיִתְקַפְּּרָא וְיִתְקַפְּּרָא וְיִתְקַפְּּרָא וְיִתְקַפְּּרָא יָוֹן 

and therefore swear:Niphal:QTL:1cs to house Eli if-absolve:Hitpael:YQTL iniquity

בְּט- כָּלַי בֹּצֶבְּחַּה עֻבָּמִנְיָה כָּד-כָּלָם house-Eli by.sacrifice and by offering until forever

And thus I have sworn regarding the house of Eli, that the iniquity of the house of Eli may never be atoned for (Hitpael) by sacrifice or by offering (1 Sam 3:14).
It is difficult to draw conclusions on the Nitpael with information provided by a single occurrence of this root in this stem. Nevertheless, the contrast between examples 45 and 46 offers some information. Atonement can be seen with two senses, like other kinds of rituals. One must include the ritual action and the attained state. The Hitpael in the first example follows our theory since it focuses on the ritual actions, sacrifice and offering, rather than the attained state. The Nitpael's context in example 46, however, shows the people's words as the action that will bring about the atonement as a final state. In this case, then, the Nitpael seems to display attributes of stative aspect, although any conclusions must be provisional because a lack of clear evidence.

We find seven instances of the Pual of this verb, which function similarly to the Hitpael and Nitpael. Here is an example.

47. ̀im-yōkuppar ̣ hẹ̄cāwōn ̣ hazzẹh ̣ lākem ̀cād-tōmuṭūn
   if-absolve:Pual:YQTL the-iniquity the-this for-you until-die
   This iniquity will not be absolved (Pual) until you die (Isa 22:14).

The paucity of examples of this root makes discerning the nuances of the various stems difficult. Similar situations are expressed in all three of the above examples. The difference one sees is that in the Hitpael in example 45, the focus is on the method or activity (how expiation is made),
while the Pual expresses the final result, much like the Niphal elsewhere. The Pual, though, may include reference to the method.

48. **boḥēṣed** weʾēmeṯ †<em>yəquppər</em> †<em>ʿāwōn</em>  
in-kindness and-faithfulness absolve:Pual:YQTL iniquity  
By kindness and faithfulness, iniquity is <em>absolved</em> (Pual) (Prov 16:6).

This sentence from the wisdom genre is referencing how a person ought to act in order for iniquity to be absolved, in a way similar to the action with the Hitpael in example 45. Thus the Pual of this stem overlaps with the state and the activity. Without more examples of the Hitpael and Nitpael, however, it is difficult to determine the nuance of the Pual in this case.

4.2.1.7.2. Hitpolel, Hitpalpel (“roll”)

A single root, יַלֹל gll, offers us a rare opportunity to contrast the Hitpolel and Hitpalpel forms. Unfortunately, the examples are not ideal, as the root appears in the former stem once as an infinitive and once as a participle, and in the latter stem once as a <em>qatal</em>.

49. waʾāmāsāʾ †<em>mitgōlēl</em> baddām bāṭok ḥāmāsillāh wayyāʾ hāʾiš kī-  
and Amasa roll:Hitpolel:PTPL in.the.blood in.midst the.highway and.saw the.man that-

<em>ʿāmād</em> kol-hāʾām wayyassēb ṣt-ʾāmāsāʾ min-ḥāmāsillāh haššādeh wayyašlēk  
stood all.the.people and.turned ACC-Amasa from.the.highway to the.field and.cast

<em>ʿālāyw</em> bēḡēd kaʾāšer rāʾāh kol-habbāʾ ʿālāyw wəʾāmād  
on.him garment as.which saw all-come on.him and.stand

And Amasa <em>was rolling around</em> (Hitpolel) in blood in the midst of the highway, and the man saw that all the people were stopping. So he turned Amasa from the highway to the field, and he covered over him with a garment, just as he saw everyone coming over him and stopping (2 Sam 20:12).

50. kaʾpēreṣ rāḥāb yeʾēṭāyū tāḥaṣ šōʾāh †<em>hitgalgālū</em>  
as.breach wide come under tumult roll:Hitpalpel:QTL  
Like a wide breach they come; <em>they roll in</em> (Hitpalpel) amid the tumult (Job 30:14).
From the information we can gather here, the function of the Hitpolel and Hitpalpel is inconclusive. In the first verse, example 49, one could potentially understand the Hitpolel as representing stative or activity aspect. If it were the former, one could say that Amasa was “rolled” in blood, that is, the final state. This functions the same way as how one “rolls” a stone. More likely, one could say that the form represents an activity, where Amasa was “rolling around” in blood. The Hitpalpel in example 50 is just as inconclusive. The context seems to indicate that the Hitpalpel is describing the activity as the rabble come. However, the verb is in the perfect, which also points at an end point. Nevertheless, I have translated both as if they were Hitpaels.

4.2.1.8.  **Stylistic effect**

4.2.1.8.1.  Ordering events (“hide”)

A possible exception to the Hitpael indicating activity aspect exists in 2 Chr 22:9, where the Hitpael seems to have a stative meaning.

51. wayə♭aqeqš ʔet-ʔaḥazyāhû wayyiλkdûhû wəhû ʔmiṭhabbê ʔbəšōmrôn
   and.sought ACC-Ahaziah and.captured.him and.he hide:Hitpael:PTPL in.Samaria

   wayə♭bû ʔel-ʔēhû ʔwayəmîtuhû wayyiqqbrûhû
   and.brought.him to-Jehu and.killed.him and.buried.him

   And he sought Ahaziah and they captured him—and *he was hiding* (Hitpael) in Samaria. And they brought him to Jehu and they killed him and buried him (2 Chr 22:9).

---

65 This meaning exists in the Qal, e.g., in Prov 26:27.

66 The one other occurrence of a Hitpolel of this root appears in Gen. 43:18. There, however, the meaning is not clear as it seems to mean something like “be rolled (over)” or “attack.” Thus the Gen. example does not clarify the meaning of the Hitpolel of this root.
At first, this Hitpael of הָבַשֹּׁם appears to fulfill the same function as Josh 10:16 (sentence 6), that is, to explain the subsequent reactions to Ahaziah’s state of being hidden. Instead of rolling rocks over the hiding place, as in the Joshua passage, Jehu’s men seek, capture, and kill the hidden Ahaziah.

When the phrase is understood as explaining a textual ambiguity in the broader context, however, this example of the Hitpael follows the same aspectual use of the Hitpael as in 1 Sam 13:6 (sentence 7). In the immediate context this clause, והיה מִיתֹּבֶּלֶר בֻּשּׁוֹרְנָו, seems out of place in 2 Chr 22:9 (sentence 51) as it breaks the wayyiqtol sequence of Jehu’s men’s actions. Moreover, the broader context is ambiguous: how did Jehu’s men capture Ahaziah and those serving him when they had carried out judgment over the house of Ahab?

Ahaziah had followed Joram down to Jezreel after the latter was injured. Assuming that Ahab’s house was in Samaria, somehow Ahaziah had to get back to Samaria in order for Jehu’s men to find him.67

So the Chronicler is not simply referring to the fact that Ahaziah was hidden in Samaria, but is explaining how and why Ahaziah’s capture and death coincided with the destruction of Ahab’s house. The Hitpael emphasizes the action of hiding, which brought the King of Judah to the residence of the house of Ahab. The progressive sense of the stem shows that he was still in the process of going to hide as Jehu’s men found and took him. As a result, this example of the

---

67 The Chronicler had to resolve conflicting accounts of Ahaziah’s death. 2 Kgs 9:27 explains that Ahaziah was fleeing to Bet-Haggan, was shot, and went to die in Megiddo, but 2 Chr 22:9 says that Jehu’s men killed Ahaziah after they brought him to Jehu. As a result, the Chronicler seems to be harmonizing Ahaziah’s flight to Bet-Haggan with the slaughter of Ahab’s sons and Ahaziah’s nephews at Samaria. 2 Kgs 10:1 expresses that Ahab had 70 sons in Samaria, which implies that Samaria would have been where Jehu decided to destroy Ahab’s house. Thus 2 Chr 22 depicts Ahaziah going to hide in Samaria, when Jehu’s men—possibly on their way to Samaria also—capture him, and Jehu’s men continue to Samaria to destroy the house of Ahab. However, the Chronicler does not deal with Ahaziah going to Megiddo.
Hitpael does not parallel the use of the Niphal in Josh 10:16 (sentence 6) but follows the use of the Hitpael in 1 Sam 13:6.

“Hide” can thus be viewed as a state or an action, depending on how the author sees its role in the context. When the narrative action required that the kings be hidden in order for another action to occur, such as in Josh 10:16 (sentence 6), the author chose the Niphal. In contrast, when the action required that someone go and hide, as in 1 Sam 13:6 (sentence 7) and 2 Chr 22:9 (sentence 51), the author emphasized this dynamic action with the Hitpael and a description of the place(s) they hid.

Furthermore, I see a similarity between the contexts of examples 2 and 6, and between examples 3 and 7. In the former pair, the context makes use of the “hiddenness” of the narrative subject. Whether the narrator describes what may be hidden from the sun, or the author wants to describe how Joshua reacts to the kings as they are hidden, both emphasize the state of being hidden. In contrast, the second pair emphasizes what Yhwh and the men of Israel did and how they acted, but not the specific hidden state of the narrative subjects. The Niphal emphasizes the stative aspect of the hiding action; the Hitpael emphasizes the activity aspect.

4.2.1.8.2. Ordering events (“gather”)

In other contexts, the root bears the same meaning in the Niphal and Hitpael, and the contrast is used for literary effect. We can see this distinction in the following context, where the author exploits the contrast between the Niphal and the Hitpael to focus on the distinct points of view of the Israelites and the Philistines. The Niphal places the reader at the end of the action of gathering, while the Hitpael returns the reader back to the midst of the action.
And they gathered (Niphal) at Mitspah, and they drew water and poured (it) out before Yhwh, and they fasted that day. And they said there, “We have sinned before Yhwh!” And Samuel judged the sons of Israel at Mitspah. And the Philistines heard when the sons of Israel were gathering (Hitpael) at Mitspah. So the lords of the Philistines went up to Israel. And the sons of Israel heard and were afraid because of the Philistines (1 Sam 7:6-7).

I am translating these verses as middles, hence I am not including a reflexive pronoun in the translation. In verse 6 we find a Niphal that focuses on the end of the gathering action at Mitspah. According to my hypothesis, the Niphal focuses on final or resulting states. In order to perform the following actions (drawing water, pouring a libation, fasting, and confessing sins), the Israelites must be fully gathered together. Furthermore, the actions following the gathering imply a goal for coming together; the Israelites came together in order to perform the ritual actions and receive forgiveness. Thus the reader sees them in a state of being gathered.

Following these actions, though, the author uses a Hitpael in verse 7 as he switches to the Philistines’ point of view. My hypothesis, that the Hitpael focuses on a dynamic action, works in the present context. Here the reader adopts the Philistines’ point of view as they hear about the process of the Israelites gathering, while the verb necessarily refers to the resulting state of being
gathered. This action makes the Philistines nervous, so their princes go up to examine the matter.

We see, therefore, an overlap between situation and viewpoint aspect. The situation aspect of state vs. activity corresponds in this instance to perfective and imperfective aspect, even though the verbs are in the wayyiqtol and qatal, respectively. The Niphal, because it focuses on the final state, allows a perfective reading. Similarly, the Hitpael, focusing on the activity before it has reached its culminating state, can be construed as an imperfective. For this reason, I have translated the verbs “gathered” and “were gathering,” respectively.

The situation aspect of another “gather” root, קָם נָּסַע (81 Niphals and one Hitpael), can appear ambiguous at times. For example, the Niphal can appear to refer to an activity situation.

53. wayyēśpû kol-ba‘ālē šəḵem wəḵol-bēṯ millōw wayyēšpû and-gather:Niphal:WAYY all-lords.of Shechem and-all-Bet Millo and-went and-

wayyyamlîškû ʿet-ʿābîmek ʾlōmĕlek made.king ACC-Abimelek for-king

And all the lords of Shechem and all of Bet Millo gathered (Niphal) and went and made Abimelek the king (Jdg 9:6).

The context of this verse describes the consequences of Abimelek’s actions. In the preceding two verses, Abimelek hired thugs to accompany him to Ophrah, where they executed nearly all the members of Abimelek’s family. The verse in example 53 describes the reaction from the citizens of Shechem and Bet Millo to Abimelek’s show of force.

The situation aspect of the first verb in this verse is ambiguous according to the context. On the one hand, it could refer to a completed state. After the gathering took place, the

68 The Niphal of this root is used 15 times with “to one’s people,” which is a euphemism for “die.” This meaning does not occur among the other stems.
participants found themselves in a gathered state, upon which they could go and make Abimelek king. On the other hand, it could refer to an activity. The people undertook the activity of gathering, which took place before the later activities of “going” and “making king.” Thus the verb could refer to either type of situation.

Nevertheless, the sequence of events helps point to this as a completed state, rather than an activity. A transition includes an activity before a state is achieved. An activity can refer to any point before the transition point, so an ambiguity would arise, namely, how close to the end transition point the participants found themselves. A state, however, implies that the transition has taken place, removing the ambiguity. Thus with a stative aspect, the reader understands that the following action of “go” must come after the transition point of “gathering.” Sequence of events can influence the appropriate situation aspect.

This same root appears a single time in the Hitpael. The fact that this is the only Hitpael for a root that appears 81 times in the Niphal highlights this occurrence of this verb. Thus we might expect an unexpected situation to be depicted in this case.

54. wayəhî bîšurûn mélek béhit’assêp réʔše ṭām yáhaḏ šibṭê
and-was in-Yeshrun king in-gather:Hitpael:INFC heads.of people together tribes.of
yiśrâ’êl
Israel

And there was a king in Israel when the heads of the people gathered (Hitpael), together the tribes of Israel (Deut 33:5).

It is important to note that this verse appears in Archaic Biblical Hebrew, the earliest stratum of BH. Potentially, the Hitpael could bear a different meaning in this historical stratum of the
An ambiguity arises over who exactly the “king” is in this verse. It could either be identified with David or Yhwh. The poem comes from a post-Exodus standpoint and looks back to a time of the twelve tribes and their leaders, which probably indicates the patriarchs and originators of the tribes. Otherwise, the text could refer to the united kingdom that David began. However, David united the kingdom over several years, and the current text presents the unification as understood. Such a reference would be incongruous with the fact that the text is found in Deuteronomy. Furthermore, verses 2-3 present Yhwh as a regal figure, followed by marching hosts. The text refers more cogently to Yhwh as the king than to David.

In the NRSV and NJPS translations the first verb is translated, “arose” and “became” king, respectively, but I translated “was.” All these translations of wayyihî are valid. When the heads of the people gathered it is important to note that Yhwh was already king at that time. Yhwh was not bestowed kingship after the tribes assembled; we see this already in vv. 2-3. This text seeks to establish Yhwh’s kingship among the tribes.

This interaction between these two events could have influenced the stem of the verb “gather.” The Hitpael often refers to the activity of a transition without reaching the transition point. In this way, the author conveys that Yhwh was king before the people had finished gathering. If the verb “gather” had been in the Niphal, it could have been the case that Yhwh was king only after the heads had finished gathering, leaving the possibility that they had declared him king. The author could have left the verb in the more common Niphal, since Yhwh

---

69 See Chapter 5, below.
was king before and after the heads gathered. This way, however, the author makes clear that Yhwh was king before the people reached an assembled state.

The root נָסָף נָסָף נָסָף נָסָף נָסָף, “gather,” appears five times in the Pual. Since this amount is more than the single Hitpael occurrence of this root, the Pual of this root is likely significant. Overall, it shares the meaning of the Niphal and is in many ways indistinguishable. We see that both appear in similar contexts.

55. וַנֵּאֶסְפֻּ יָלָהֵיָהָּ קֹל גְּדֹּיֶהָּ הָאֵּרִּ֔ס
and-gather:Niphal:QTL against-her all nations.of the-earth
And all the nations of the earth will gather (Niphal) against her (Zech 12:3).

56. וַנֵּאֶסְסְפֻּ יָלֶהֶם יָמָּמִם
and-gather:Pual:QTL against-them peoples
And peoples will gather (Pual) against them (Hos 10:10).

If we look at their differences from a broader point of view, we can note two characteristics of the Pual. First, three of the five Puals are unambiguously passive (Isa 24:22; 33:4; Zech 14:14) and the other two may be passive or middle (Ezek 38:12; Hos 10:10). Among the Niphal, middle meanings are much more common, and the Niphal can have some unambiguous middle senses (e.g., Num 11:30). Thus the Puals tend more towards passive meanings, and play at most a small role among middle situations. We should note that the Hitpael covers an unambiguous middle sense. Second, four of the Pual situations are negative, adversative situations, while the Niphal is not necessarily so. The situations presented with a Pual include two examples of spoil being taken (Isa 33:4; Zech 14:14), one of armies gathering as punishment (Hos 10:10), and one of prisoners gathered into prison (Isa 24:22). The fifth example is less negative (Ezek 38:12).

70 These examples come from distinct chronological strata of the language, as Hosea is pre-exilic, and Zechariah is post-exilic. I chose these examples for their syntactic and semantic similarities. We can see that the Niphal bears a similar meaning to the Pual in other historical periods, as well (e.g., 1 Sam 13:11; Isa 13:4).
Perhaps, then, the Pual of this root could emphasize a passive, adversative nuance. While the Niphal can also express this nuance, the Pual may emphasize this sense more strongly than the Niphal, since the latter expresses neutral judgment and middle voice more often than the Pual. The Hitpael is not adversative, however. More research, however, would be necessary to determine the precise distinction between the Niphal and Pual of this root. We can see, though, that the senses of the Hitpael and Pual are distinct.

4.2.1.8.3. Foreground and background

The roots I have assigned to this group, “heat,” are: $\text{hmm}$, “warm”; $\text{kmr}$, “warm”; $\text{mqq}$, “melt”; $\text{hrr}$, “scorched”; $\text{d`k}$, “dried up”; $\text{nšt}$, “wasted”; and $\text{ḥp}$, “bake.” Hitpaels are rare among these roots, only occurring in the first root, $\text{hmm}$, with one Niphal and one Hitpael, and the root $\text{mwg}$, “melt,” which has eight Niphals and three Hitpolels.

57. $\text{ḥannë|Hämîm hannë|Hämîm hannë|Hämîm}$ $\text{baºHälîm TaºHat Kol-`ëc}$ $\text{ra`ánän šöHá†ê}$ $\text{hayülädîm}$ $\text{BannüHälîm}$

The hot ones among the oaks, under every green tree, sacrificing children in the wadis (Isa 57:5).

58. $\text{`im-löº bërákûºnî Háläcäyw ûmiGGëz}$ $\text{KübäSay}$ $\text{yitHammäm yitHammäm yitHammäm yitHammäm}$

. . . whose loins did not bless me, as he warmed himself (Hitpael) with the shearings of my sheep (Job 31:20).

---

This root also appears in the Niphal in Kuntillet Ajrud 15 Plaster, line 2 (Dobbs-Allsopp et al 2005:286-89). It is difficult to determine in the context of this brief text whether this form represents a $\text{wa+yiqtol}$ or a true $\text{wayyiqtol}$.

This root could be related to $\text{ḥhr}$, “be angry.”
This comparison is not ideal because of a difference in verb forms, a Niphal participle vs. a Hitpael \textit{yiqtol}. Nevertheless, we can see a difference between the usage of the two verb forms with respect to the accompanying actions in the context. In example 57 the author is depicting people hot with lust.\footnote{We would say, “burning with lust,” with an active participle, in English, and not use a stative to depict this state.} They already exist in this state as they slaughter the children in the second half of the verse. This depiction of the people follows the indictment against the people in the preceding verse, which describes their guilt.

We find a different relationship between the Hitpael and the surrounding context in example 58. That verse describes the context by which the poor person blessed Job. The clause with “blessed me” is followed by the \textit{yiqtol} Hitpael to describe how the poor man was warming himself. In this way, the Hitpael focuses on the action of warming; it was not once the poor man was completely warmed up that he blessed Job, but during the action of being warmed. This analysis is weakened by the fact that the verb is in the \textit{yiqtol}, however. A \textit{yiqtol} can also be used to present backgrounded actions, since the verb represents an ongoing imperfective action. Thus the reason for the Hitpael’s use that I am presenting could arise from viewpoint and not situation aspect. The use of the Hitpael in this particular context, though, makes us ask why the Hitpael and not the Niphal was used. One could claim that it was chosen for its reflexive nature, rather than the Niphal’s more passive nature. However, the present context emphasizes not that the man warmed \textit{himself}, but was warmed \textit{by the shearings}. So agency was not likely a factor. Instead, we should understand that an interaction between the viewpoint and situation aspects gave rise to this decision of the author’s.
4.2.1.8.4. Varying points of view

The situation aspect of the Niphal and Hitpael represents more than a linguistic abstraction, for we can see here how the author exploits the Niphal/Hitpael distinction for narrative effect. The Niphal/Hitpael distinction comes out in a clear minimal pair for the verb פָּרָה p̀m, “troubled”. We saw in section 4.2.1.8.2 that the Niphal and Hitpael can order events by switching the point of view. In the present case, the narrative switches from the narrator’s point of view as the king experienced his troubles to the king’s first-person description of his troubles to his advisors.

And in the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams, and his spirit was troubled (Hitpael) and his sleep left him. And the king said to call the magicians, astrologers, sorcerers, and Chaldeans to explain to the king his dreams. So they came and stood before the king. And the king said to them, “A dream I have dreamed and my spirit is troubled (Niphal) to know the dream” (Dan 2:1-3).
The scene describes King Nebuchadnezzar, whose soul is troubled by dreams so that he cannot sleep. This occurs over multiple nights (assuming that multiple dreams took place over multiple nights), until he calls in various advisors to help him with his troubled soul.

The first scene in sentence 59 describes with a Hitpael the king’s ongoing problem from the point of view of the night-by-night occurrences. The king dreamed multiple dreams, and this fact implies a habitual or persistent problem. As he dreamed these dreams, his soul became troubled, expressed by a Hitpael. Through this process, his sleep left him. Thus the processes of dreaming multiple dreams and his soul becoming troubled resulted in his sleep leaving him. We are privy to the development of the king’s becoming troubled. Here the focus is on the “minimal results” (cf. Tagalog, section 3.6.3.2) of the troubling event.

In the second scene of example 59, we hear how the king chose to present the disturbances to his advisors. At that point the king’s soul is fully disturbed. Thus the author uses a Niphal to emphasize that the final state had been reached. Moreover, the king mentions the dream in the singular, in contrast to the plural in verse 1. Interestingly, the king does not refer to his sleep deprivation as the problem, but to the state of his soul. So the king presents to his advisors the troubled state of his soul, rather than the process that brought him to that state. The Niphal in verse 3 emphasizes the state the king’s soul is in, which contrasts with the Hitpael that described the process the king’s soul underwent.

Thus an author may use the situation aspect distinction of the Niphal and Hitpael to bring parts of his narrative into focus. In this case, the Hitpael was used to present the process by which the king’s soul was becoming troubled. The reader can be present as this developed when the author presents it as an ongoing process. Similarly, the author’s use of a Niphal brings the
reader to the end point of the king’s soul becoming troubled as the king presents his soul’s state to his advisors.

4.2.1.9. Conclusions: Agentive transitive

From the data I have presented, we can see that situation aspect stands as the primary distinction between the Niphal and Hitpael among agentive passive verbs which are the most typical and often the least problematic verbs for passive theories. In the clearest minimal pairs, we see that situation aspect functions consistently. Among verbs that appear only rarely in the Hitpael, we see that situation aspect coincides with a desire to show a lower degree of affectedness on the subject. Similarly, situation aspect interacts with iterativity and inceptivity. Among verbs that appear often in the middle voice cross-linguistically, we see that the Niphal and Hitpael still demonstrate a stative/activity distinction. Hitpael (and one Niphal) verbs that diverge in meaning from other forms of the root, that is, demonstrate lexical, idiomatic usage, also demonstrate a situation aspect distinction.

These conclusions also give more insight into other areas. We can see from these data that the Nitpael tends towards the stative aspect, and the Hitpolel and Hitpalpel, the activity aspect. But this section did not raise enough data to decide conclusively. In a further area, the aspect distinction between the Niphal and Hitpael verbs give us insight into literary style. The author can express the order of events that are expressed non-consecutively (“hide”; “gather”), present background and foreground actions (“heat”), or offer to presentations of the same event (“trouble”).

I have also demonstrated that while one might expect these verbs to demonstrate a straightforward correspondence to passive and middle voices, one cannot attribute the passive,
middle, and reflexive to one or the other stem. The usage of the stem and the relationship between Agent and Patient appears arbitrary. This concurs with the conclusions of Bicknell as she writes, “It may therefore be concluded that the syntactic categories passive, reflexive, and stative are not naturally applied to Hebrew” (Bicknell 1984:120). While those results do not contradict mine, situation aspect as the basic distinction between these two stems explains the data more consistently. As we move to more varied syntactic and semantic structures, I will show that situation aspect as the distinction between the Niphal and the Hitpael holds in spite of these variations.

The above examples of the Pual further highlight the function of the Niphal and Hitpael. In the examples where the Pual is most distinct from the other two stems in three ways. First, the Pual is often more stative than the Hitpael, overlapping with the Niphal (sections 4.2.1.5.1 and 4.2.1.6.1). Occasionally, it can overlap with the Hitpael (section 4.2.1.7.1). Second, the ability of the Pual to express the middle is rarer than the Hitpael and Niphal and more ambiguous (section 4.2.1.8.2). Third, the Pual expressed an unambiguous agentive passive in contrast to the spontaneous Niphal and middle/reflexive Hitpael in grooming acts (section 4.2.1.5). From these three factors the Pual appears to gravitate towards expressing the stative phase of events with two distinct participants. As a result, the Pual appears to occupy an area of the transitivity spectrum closer towards the 2-participant end than the Niphal and Hitpael.

4.2.2. Experiencer transitive

The following verbs are transitive, but differ from the transitive verbs we have already examined in the section 4.2.1 above. The verbs of this section assume different semantic roles for their participants than the Agentive transitive verbs. The previous set of transitive verbs that
we looked at contained the roles Agent and Patient. Transitive verbs often contain these semantic roles because the events depict one entity (the Agent) performing an action that affects another entity (the Patient), either in whole or in part. Other transitive verbs assume two entities, but one entity does not affect the other, e.g., “measure” or “see.” In actions indicated by these verbs, an Experiencer performs an action on a Theme, but the Theme is not affected. I will call those transitive verbs that include an Agent subject, “agentive,” and those with an Experiencer subject, “experiencer” verbs.

Even though Themes do not undergo a transition in the same way as a Patient, they can still passivize. For example, in English the experiencer verbs “know” and “measure” can be passivized: “This territory was already known by the scouts,” “I started pounding the wood together after it was measured.” The subject does not undergo a change in state, yet the verbs easily passivize. Moreover, these passive participles can be used in an adjectival sense, e.g., “the known quantity,” “the measured progress,” which further refers to the state the Theme is in.

In this section, I will concentrate on the Niphal and Hitpael of experiencer verbs. The following examples will show that these verbs passivize in a similar way to agentive verbs. As a result, we would expect the Niphal and Hitpael to follow the situation aspect distinction we saw in the preceding section. At the same time, we will look at how experiencer verbs differ from agentive verbs when they passivize. When passivized, the experiencer verbs include more examples of verbs that occur in the Niphal and not in the Hitpael than agentive verbs do. As we will see, BH focuses more often on the final state of passive Themes rather than on the process of approaching this state.
4.2.2.1. Plain distinction

4.2.2.1.1. “Forget”

This verb falls in a group that includes mental processes. The verbs are overwhelmingly Niphal; there are 70 examples of the Niphal among all these verbs, as opposed to four t-forms. All these verbs except perhaps נושא סח, “think,” include two arguments in their lexical structure. We cannot call them Agent and Patient, as the underlying object is not affected by the action. “Experiencer” and “Theme” defines their roles more precisely. In the passive the Theme—the subject of the Niphal or Hitpael—undergoes a transition. These verbs do not represent “typical” middles, since the mental action is not unfolding on the one undergoing the mental process, but on the object of the mental process. Instead the verbs appear more typically passive.

Data from the root רכש סח, “forget,” do not immediately present distinct uses of the Niphal and Hitpael. The following pair of examples does not offer an ideal contrast, for one of the verbs appears in the yiqtol and the other in the qatal. These particular examples cannot contrast passive/middle/reflexive, as both discuss the memory of those who are dead. However, they depict being forgotten with a Niphal and a Hitpael.


75 The meaning of the root סח סח, “think,” is difficult to determine, as it only appears with this meaning in Jon 1:6.

And the dead, they no longer know anything, and there is not more wage for them, for their memory is forgotten (Niphal) (Qoh 9:5).

And they will be forgotten (Hitpael) in the city, those who have done justly. This too is vanity (Qoh 8:10).

Both verses from Qohelet, representing the wisdom genre, describe how the dead are remembered after their death. If there is a difference between the situations, it would have to be subtle, as both examples appear similar in their meaning.

A passive vs. reflexive distinction cannot explain the use of contrasting verbs, as the subject—the dead—performs the same level of agency in both contexts. Neither case allows the subject to have any control over the action, though the verbs could refer to anticausative, spontaneous events, which would indicate a middle. In that case, “spontaneous” and “middle” could apply equally to both verbs. Both of them could be passive, as well. The Theme could be a passive subject since another entity is performing the “forgetting.” As a result, either case could equally be middle or passive and thus could not be the basis of the contrasting stems.

Situation aspect may be expressing distinct depictions of notion of the root שָׁכֵחַ, “forget.” The first example shows a contrast in activities of the living towards the dead. That

---

77 Grüneberg says that the passive is the best sense for the Hitpael in Qoh 8:10 (Grüneberg 2003:201). IBHS agrees that this Hitpael should be translated as a passive, and further use this occurrence as evidence that the passive sense of the Hitpael is a later development (IBHS:§26.3a). They do not discuss the contrasting Niphal of the same root in Qoh 9:5. As we can see, earlier literature demonstrates passive uses of the Hitpael (DH, in 1 Sam 3:14, example 45; P, in Gen 3:24, example 15). Furthermore, the contrast between the Niphal and Hitpael demonstrates that the use of the two stems did not alter their expression of situation aspect in spite of the passage of time.
they have forgotten those who acted justly indicates not just forgetting, but negligence on the part of the living towards the corpses of the dead (Seow 1997:286; Fox 1999:284). The emphasis is on the activities of the living, with the Patient of these activities highlighted as the subject of the verb, “be forgotten.” The second example indicates the state of being forgotten. No more memory of the living exists when it is forgotten.

The emphasis is no longer on the activities of the living, but on the state of the memory of the dead. As a result, it appears that the first example focuses on forgetting as negligent actions, which would lend itself to a Hitpael. Similarly, the second presents the memory of the dead as forgotten, which sounds more like a resultative stative, and hence the Niphal.

4.2.2.1.2. “Know” and reflexive

We find an example of a marked meaning of the root הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ, “know,” where the Hitpael refers to the process of becoming known, in contrast to the less marked, Niphal form of being in a known state.

62. וַיֹּשֵׁב הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ, וַיָּשֶׁב הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ and.after know:Niphal:INFC.1cs slap on-thigh . . . and after I was made known (Niphal), I slapped my thigh (Jer 31:19).

63. וַיֹּקְרַח הוֹשֵׁב הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הוֹשֵׁב הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ וַיֹּקְרַח הוֹשֵׁב הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵعַ הָיוֹדֵעַ וַיֹּקְרַח הוֹשֵׁב הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ וַיֹּקְרַח הוֹשֵׁב הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ וַיֹּקְרַח הוֹשֵׁב הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ וַיֹּкְרַח הוֹשֵׁב הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ וַיֹּקְרַח הוֹשֵׁב הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ וַיֹּкְרַח הוֹשֵׁב הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ וַيֹּкְרַח הוֹשֵׁב הָיוֹדֵעַ הָיוֹדֵעַ hōšîl yūshîl mēšāli wəlōš-ə-mād ʾiš ʾittô and.called go.out every.man from.upon.me and.not-stood man with.him

bəḥiṭwaddaḥ yō̌seḥ ʾel-ə-ḥāy w in.know:Hitpael:INFC Joseph to.brothers.his

. . . so he called out, “Go out from before me, everyone!” And no one stood with him when Joseph made himself known (Hitpael) to his brothers (Gen 45:1).

78 Murphy translates “forgotten” as “disappeared,” which conveys the non-existence of memory I am describing (Murphy 1992:88).
In the first example, the subject asserts upon what grounds his sins were found out, as he expresses, “was made known.” His inner secrets became external knowledge. Joseph, in the second example, similarly made his inner secret public, though he had to wait until all the officials were gone before revealing his true identity.

Situation aspect explains the dichotomy. The Niphal expresses a state that preceded the speaker slapping his thigh. This is the more usual use of קָםָתֵן ydכ, where certain knowledge is acquired, with less emphasis on the preceding process. The Hitpael in the next example requires that the officials exit before Joseph undergoes the process of making himself known. The activity-focused stem fits better in the following context, which explains what he did as he became known to them (wept [v. 2], told them to come closer [v. 4], identified himself [v. 4]). The situation aspect of this verb describes the actions that made Joseph known.

One could claim that the two stems express a passive (Niphal) and reflexive (Hitpael) dichotomy. The speaker in the first example was known by a second entity, and the subject did not participate in being made known. In contrast, Joseph causes himself to be known in the second example. His actions cause him to be known, so Joseph participates in his identity being revealed to his brothers. I agree with this analysis, and have translated accordingly.

However, we are not bound to translate these verses according to a passive/reflexive dichotomy because of the verb stem. The passive and reflexive nuances arise from the context. In addition, the context of the example 62 also allows a reflexive reading, since the speaker made himself known by turning and repenting. So the Niphal bears the potential to be read as a reflexive, like the Hitpael example. Situation aspect distinguishes these two stems, but the stems do not determine the relationship between the participants.
The Niphal, however, may cover some of the activity aspect. We can see this in the following example.

64. \(\text{wayyara\text{\d}t} \quad \text{hagg\text{\d}ren} \quad \text{\'al-tiwwad\text{\d}qi} \quad \text{l\text{\d}\text{\i}\text{\d}sh} \quad \text{\'ad kall\text{\d}t\text{\d}o} \quad \text{and-go.down the-threshing.floor not-know:Niphal:IMPV to-the-man until finish-he} \quad \text{le\text{\d}\text{\i}k\text{\d}ol w\text{\i}li\text{\d}t\text{\d}t} \quad \text{to-eat and-to-drink} \quad \)

So go down to the threshing floor, (but) do not make yourself known (Niphal) to the man until he has finished eating and drinking (Ruth 3:3).

This example seems to cover an inceptive meaning similar to the Hitpael in the previous example, example 63. Ruth’s mother-in-law is commanding Ruth to wait until after Boaz is finished eating and drinking before she begin the process of becoming known to him. In this way, the verb is focused on the beginning stage of becoming known. Thus the Niphal of this example covers the same meaning as the Hitpael of the previous example.

It may be the case, however, that the authors of the two passages are focusing on a particular part of the action with different stems. The Hitpael, focusing on the inception, assumes the duration of “making known” takes place in a process, with a particular duration. In contrast, since the Niphal focuses on the end point, the second example may focus on “making known” as an instantaneous event with no process to undergo. So the Hitpael means that Joseph did not begin the “making known” process until his servants left, and the Niphal, that Ruth should not be “made known” until a later point. In this way, applying the distinction that I laid out in Chapter 3 may provide us with a way of disambiguating the use of the two stems in these two very similar examples.

It is also helpful to see how the Pual of this stem contrasts with these two stems. Theoretically, it could overlap with the Niphal, because this stem often appears with a stative
sense. Since its form is close to the Hitpael, it could overlap with that stem. Of the eight occurrences of this root in the Pual, all of them are participles.\textsuperscript{79} Seven of these are substantive adjective participles, meaning “friend, acquaintance.” The eighth occurrence is a predicate adjective participle, “Let this be known,” in the \textit{kethib} (Isa 12:5), but the \textit{qere} is a Hophal participle. The Pual appears to occupy almost exclusively stative meanings among the uses of this verb, and the one exception is ambiguous. Moreover, among the seven substantive instances they do not involve a transition. As the Pual carves out this semantic area for itself, this sets apart the space occupied by the Niphal and Hitpael, which express transitions.

4.2.2.1.3. “Measure” and reflexive

Occasionally, the passive vs. reflexive distinction between the Niphal and the Hitpael holds, alongside situation aspect. One could make a case for a passive vs. reflexive distinction between the Niphal and Hitpael of the verbs for “measure” and “count.” For these roots, the semantic roles Agent and Patient are less appropriate than Experiencer and Theme, as the underlying object is not essentially affected in the event. Several verbs for “measure” and “count” occur in the Niphal, but t-stems are rare. One of them, נדה וה, \textit{mdd}, “measure,” appears once in the Hitpolel, as well as in the Niphal, and none of them in the Hitpael. This distribution could come about because a subject counting or measuring him- or herself seldom occurs. The minimal pair of the Niphal and Hitpolel could be understood as a passive/reflexive distinction.

\textsuperscript{79} These verses are Ruth 2:1; 2 Kgs 10:11; Job 19:14; Pss 31:12; 55:14; 88:9, 19; and Isa 12:5.
65. ṭāšer lṑ-yissāpēr šōḇāʔ haššāmàyim walṑ yimmad hōl
which not-count:Niphal host.of the.heavens and.not measure:Niphal:YQTL sand.of
hayyām
the.sea

the host of heaven which cannot be counted, and sand of the sea which (can) not be measured
(Niphal) (Jer 33:22).

66. wayyitmṑded ʿal-hayyeš šālōš Pūʔāmīm
and.measure:Hitpael:WAYY on.the.child three times
And he [Elijah] measured himself (Hitpael) over the boy three times (1 Kgs 17:21).

In the first example the Theme does not seem to be acting on itself, as another entity would be counting them. In contrast, since Elijah is the subject of the highlighted verb in the second example, then the verb should be considered reflexive, as no one else is able to measure him. Thus an agency distinction follows from this pair of examples.

The Niphal and Hitpolel distinguish situation aspect here in the same way as the Niphal and Hitpael generally do. The first example, the Niphal, describes to what extent Yhwh will multiply David’s line and the Levites. They will be so many that it will never be the case that they will be able to be counted or measured, that is, to enter into the passive state derived from this verb. The adverbial phrase “three times” in the second example, however, suggests an activity rather than a state. In addition, the prophet’s activity of measuring himself out over the child is described with the Hitpolel.

I only propose these conclusions tentatively, though, because of two problems with the examples. The only occurrence of the Hitpolel is in the wayyiqtol, while the Niphal only appears in the yiqtol, so the different verb forms disrupt the comparison somewhat. The meaning of the Hitpolel verb presents the second problem. How can one “measure oneself”—or “be counted”—on a boy? BDB renders the meaning of this word, “extended, stretched” (551). The LXX
unexpected translation, ἐνεφώσην, “breathed into,” seems to draw from 2 Kgs 4:34, while the influence from that same verse on *HALOT* is explicit in their translation, “stretch oneself out” (547). As a result, what activity the Hitpolel is describing remains obscure. All agree, though, that the verb describes an activity.

Nevertheless, I can safely say that the Niphal and Hitpolel coincide with a passive vs. reflexive distinction in these examples, and this does not necessarily disrupt the situation aspect distinction. Voice and situation aspect are able to work in concert, though situation aspect is the primary, most consistent distinction between them.

4.2.2.1.4. “See,” “hear,” and reciprocal

The two most common verbs in this category are הָרִאשׁוּ `rḥ, “see,” and שָמָע `šm, “hear,” bear similarities and differences that teach us about the range of the Niphal and Hitpael’s meaning. Both appear many times in the Niphal, and only the former occurs in the Hitpael. Even though their meanings are similar, they act differently with respect to their potential subjects and the meaning of the Niphal and Hitpael. I will examine הָרִאשׁוּ `rḥ, “see,” in the present section, and שָמָע `šm, “hear,” in section 4.2.2.2.1 below.

The first root, הָרִאשׁוּ `rḥ, “see,” occurs 101 times in the Niphal and 5 times in the Hitpael. But the Hitpael is even rarer than it seems. While the verb actually appears five times in the Hitpael, two of these occurrences are in 2 Chr 25:17 and 25:21, which are synoptic parallels to 2 Kgs 14:8 and 14:11. So we should count more accurately three independent examples of the

80 This statistic establishes this root as the fourth most common verb to appear in the Niphal, and the root with the highest number of Niphal occurrences that also occurs in the Hitpael.
Hitpael. This high Niphal-to-Hitpael contrast makes every occurrence of the Hitpael stand out more as the marked passive of this verb.\footnote{In Job 33:21 we find an example of the verb הָנָה הָרָה, and it is either in the Qp (HALOT) or the Pual (GKC §64e). It is not clear how this form differs from the Niphal of this root.}

The verb “see” in the Niphal and Hitpael is distinguished by a state vs. activity distinction.

67. וָלֹּ֣-יֵרָ֑ו פָּנָֽיַּר ‬网络科技 
and.not-see:Niphal:YQTL face.my empty.handed
No (person) shall appear (Niphal) before me empty-handed (Exod 23:15).

68. לָקָֽהּ נִֽיְרָ֑ה פָּנִימ
go see:Hitpael:YQTL face
Come, let us appear (Hitpael) before one another (2 Kgs 14:8).

Both of these verbs exhibit the same role for the subject, a Theme. The subject is the one who is being seen. We should understand “appear” as “let oneself be seen,” that is, as a reflexive or middle. Also, the verbs in both sentences are followed by a form of פָּנִים, “face,” which refers to the presence of the individual, that is, Yhwh in the first example, and the two parties in the second. These verbs may not reflect an aspectual distinction; both “appear” verbs can be understood as a state or an activity.

But some evidence tips in favor of 68 as an activity. We see that these verbs follow the same pattern of usage in the Niphal and Hitpael as we have seen, especially in the “hide” verbs (section 4.2.1.1 above). The first example describes the state that those who celebrate the festival should (not) be in: they should not be seen empty-handed. The second example contrasts with the first in that they are not yet being seen by one another. The two kings are to “go” (לָקַֽהּ) where they will be seen in each others’ presence. As with “hide,” the Niphal refers to the
state, and the Hitpael to the action, “go and be seen.” This activity aspect is very rare for this verb, so the state seems more natural. The Niphal and Hitpael in sentences 67 and 68 correlate to stative and activity aspects, respectively. The individual who goes before Yhwh will not be looking at himself (reflexive), nor will he be looked at by his fellows (reciprocal). He will be looked at by Yhwh. So this verb is more passive. In contrast, the two kings will come into each others’ presence and will look upon each other.

Hebraists cite the following verse as an additional example of the reciprocal, a middle category identified by Kemmer (Kemmer 1993:95-127).

69. wayyárra yâqóbb kî yeš-šécher bəmišráyyim wayyó’mer yâqóbb ləḇānâyw lāmāh
and.saw Jacob that there.is-grain in.Egypt and.said Jacob to.sons.his why

And Jacob saw that there was grain in Egypt, and Jacob said to his sons, “Why are you looking at one another (Hitpael)?” (Gen 42:1).

We can attribute the reciprocity to the context as in example 68, as there are no other participants who could potentially fill the Experiencer roles. However, we can also say that Jacob is referring to being seen as an action, not as a state that the brothers are in. Rather than the present action—just looking at each other—Jacob would like them to take another action: go to Egypt to get grain.

Each example of a Hitpael demonstrated an activity, and the Niphals we looked at demonstrated a final state of having been seen. Nevertheless, in the present root a competing explanation exists, that is, a passive vs. reciprocal distinction. In the Hitpael cases above, the subjects were the Experiencer and Theme, that is, they were all seeing and being seen. This was
not the case for the Niphal. The Hitpael functions as a reciprocal verb, and this usage works alongside situation aspect. The evidence, however, slightly favors the Hitpael as an activity.

### 4.2.2.2. Lexical restrictions on passive subject

#### 4.2.2.2.1. “Hear”

On the surface, the verbs נָסָמַךְ, “hear,” and רָאָת, “see,” share essential attributes, but they differ with respect to their passive subjects. They are both experiencer transitives. The actions are similar perception events. Nevertheless, the verb נָסָמַךְ, “hear,” functions differently from רָאָת, “see,” with respect to its passive subject. “Hear” appears in the Niphal (43 times), plus one additional time in the Niphal, reconstructed in the Siloam Tunnel inscription, line 2 (Dobbs-Allsopp et al 2005:500-506), and never in the Hitpael. In contrast to רָאָת, “see,” the Niphal of נָסָמַךְ, “hear,” does not allow animate subjects, but subjects that are sounds, such as קֵול qôl, “voice, sound,” or דּוֹבָרִים, “words,” or the content of a message (e.g., Neh 6:1), predominate.

Thus a reciprocal construction of נָסָמַךְ, “hear,” like the ones we saw above with רָאָת, “see,” likely does not occur since such a structure would require an animate Experimenter as the subject of נָסָמַךְ. The subjects of the latter verb appear restricted to inanimate nouns. One could explain this phenomenon in a different way by saying that no Hitpael of the latter exists because no reciprocal construction exists. Either argument requires one to argue from a lack of Hitpaels, unfortunately. We can see that the Niphal functions as a stative passive, but
without a contrasting Hitpael, we cannot arrive at a more precise explanation of this verb’s lack of Hitpaels and reciprocals.

4.2.2.2.2. “Know”

Among verbs for gaining knowledge, we find one that differs from the others by the semantic class of its passive subject. The root, יִתֵּן byn, “consider, perceive,” has an Experiencer as the subject of the active (Qal and Hiphil) and of the passive (Niphal and Hitpolel). Thus the “knower” is the subject of both voices, and the “knowledge” is never the subject.

By assigning semantic roles in this way, the root יִתֵּן byn, “consider, perceive,” differs from the root ידָיְךָ ydָיְךָ, “know,” on the lexical level in the passive. In the active the verbs act the same. Above in examples 62 and 63, we saw a transformation of the root ידָיְךָ ydָיְךָ, “know,” where the simple form of the verb (Qal) has an Experiencer subject (the “knower”), and a Theme object (the “knowledge”). The passive of the root ידָיְךָ ydָיְךָ, “know,” however, follows the normal

---

82 The lexical semantics of the verbs in this category correlate with preference of one stem or another. This category of verbs includes those that refer to acquiring and possessing knowledge. Some of them are more stative. These roots are ידָיְךָ ydָיְךָ, “know,” יִתֵּן byn, “consider, perceive,” and חָכִימָה hkm, “wise.” Others roots in this group include an activity in their lexical form. These roots are לָבֵין lbb, “get understanding,” בָּשָׂר bsr, “inform,” יָדְךָ ydָךָ, “advise,” יָסָדָה ysd, “take counsel,” and יָסָר ysr, “teach.” All the “stative” knowledge verbs possess Hitpaels, and two out of the three have at least 50% of their occurrences as Hitpael or Hitpolel. The “activity” verbs prefer the Niphal four out of five roots, and only two Hitpaels and one Nitpael exist in the whole group.

83 Because this verb is second-yod root, the Qal and Hiphil are difficult to distinguish in the prefixing forms.

84 With the verb יִתֵּן byn, “consider, perceive,” we see an even split between the Niphal and the Hitpolel, but the verb forms reveal some about the nature of these two stems. Each stem possesses 22 occurrences. Among the Niphal, 21 are participles and one is qatal; among the Hitpolels, 13 are yiqtols, four are qatals, two are wayyiqtols, and three are imperatives. Thus the Niphal forms tend to be more adjectival and the Hitpolel ones, more verbal. (See Isa 10:13 [Niphal] vs. Job 38:18 [Hitpolel].) Furthermore, the participles indicate an attribute, or state, of the subject. The verbs, however, show activities. We should note that in spite of the common Hiphil of this verb, there is no Hophal.
pattern for transitive verbs, because in both the Niphal and the Hitpael the subject is the information, that is, the Theme.

In order to solve this problematic transformation, I shall compare this verb with the intransitive verb, הָלַךְ $hlk$, “go” (section 4.4.3.2). That intransitive verb demonstrates similar Aktionsart in the Qal and in the Hitpael, as the semantic role of the subject—a Theme in this case—is not altered. With “go” the Qal expresses the simple action of going, while the Hitpael refers to walking around literally or to walking around as a metaphor for moral conduct, and there is no specific goal in mind in either case. The Hitpael is completely focused on the activity with no endpoint in its purview. By analogy, יָבָן $byn$ in the Qal reflects the simple action of “perceive,” which assumes an endpoint to the action, and the Hitpolel, an activity with no endpoint in its purview: “examine.”

The verbs יָבָן $byn$ and הָלַךְ $hlk$ function similarly in the Niphal, as well. Nevertheless, the root יָבָן $byn$ demonstrates as many Niphals as Hitpolels, unlike הָלַךְ $hlk$, “go,” which demonstrates a single occurrence of the Niphal. The Niphal of the latter root bears the Theme as its subject, just like the Hitpael. The Niphal differs from the Hitpael because it refers to the end of the “walk” activity; the speaker has reached the end of the path. Similarly, יָבָן $byn$ in the Niphal refers to the state of the subject after having examined, that is, “be intelligent, discreet, discerning, have understanding” (BDB 106-107).

---

85 One can also view the Hitpolel with a more “intensive” meaning. We find a similar phenomenon in German. Steinbach writes, “In this case we observe a semantic difference between the variants [of perception verbs] with and without a reflexive pronoun [i.e., middle marker]. Only the overt reflexive pronoun induces the additional meaning that the experiencer subject perceived the object completely, purposefully and with concentration” (Steinbach 2002:247). This reading is possible in BH, as well, but both the German and BH act according to the theory I am proposing.
As a result, it seems plausible to consider the “perceiver” to be a Theme in the Niphal and Hitpolel of יָנָּב byn, even though the “perceiver” is an Experiencer in the Qal and Hiphil. The “thinker” in the Qal and Hiphil can be understood to be considering an object the mental process of “thinking,” which would make him more of an Experiencer. This would better be expressed in the Qal or Hiphil. Otherwise, the subject can be considered the undergoer, that is, the Theme, of the mental event, which would be more middle in meaning, and so expressed by the Niphal or Hitpolel. In other words, the subject of the Qal/Hiphil is less affected than the subject of the Niphal/Hitpael. The latter two can still take objects (e.g., Niphal: 1 Sam 16:18; Hitpolel: Job 37:14), but the subject of the verb is considered more as a Theme than an Experiencer. In this way, one stem can highlight a specific level of affectedness by the semantic role for the subject, even as the subject’s identity remains the same.

This distribution demonstrates one purpose of the stem system, which is to offer a broader range of Aktionsarten for a given root. The Niphal and Hitpael both offer a way to alter voice, that is, to focus on the Patient/Theme of an event rather than the Agent/Experiencer in the unmarked stem. Here, though, we see a variation on this function. In any case, the Niphal and Hitpolel offer a way to mark aspect in particular contexts.

4.2.3. Interaction between viewpoint and situation aspect

After having looked at Agentive and Experiencer transitive verbs, I would now like to delve farther into the realm of aspect. With a link between the verb stem and situation aspect established among the transitive verbs, let us now survey how the stem interacts with another

86 Perhaps this is parallel to the pair of archaic English collocations “I think” and “me thinks,” where the “I” reflects an Experiencer more, and the “me,” more of a Theme (Tagliamonte and Smith 2005:305).
form of aspect, viewpoint aspect. In BH situation aspect is present in the stems, and viewpoint aspect, in the inflected forms (yiqtol, qatal, etc.). Neither category of situation aspect prescribes co-occurrence with a particular category of viewpoint aspect, and vice versa, producing complex effects.

The root, בָּקַכ bq, “split,” exhibits the basic contrast that we have noticed thus far, where the Niphal points to a state and the Hitpael, to an activity. Significantly for our theory, both verbs appear as perfective qatal.

70. bayyôm hazzè nibqü`û kāl-ma`yônôt təhôm rabbâh wa`ärubbôt in.the.day the.this split:Niphal:QTL all-springs.of deep great and.sluices.of haššâmáyim niptáhû the.heavens open:Niphal:QTL

. . . on that day, all the springs of the great deep split (Niphal), and the sluices of the heavens opened (Gen 7:11).

71. wə`élleh nō`dôt hayyäßig`û ṭəsšer millē`nû ḥəḏāšîm wūhinnèh and.these skins the.wine which filled:Piel:QTL:1cs new and.behold hitbaqqâ`û wə`élleh šalmôtênu ūnə`ālênû bālû mērōb haddēreḵ split:Hitpael:QTL and.these clothes.our and.sandals.our worn.out from.greatness the.road mə`ōd very

. . . and these wineskins that we filled [were] new, and behold, they were splitting (Hitpael). And these clothes and sandals of ours are worn out from the very long journey (Josh 9:13).

The first example describes the beginning of the flood, when the waters came rushing onto the earth. No Agent is specified, so we can assume that this verb is either a middle, if we imagine

---

87 I am following the conclusions of Cook (2002, 2006) regarding the interaction between viewpoint aspect and the inflectional verbal system, namely, that the finite verbal system primarily indicates aspect (2006:32-35).
the splitting happened spontaneously (i.e., autocausative), or a passive, if Yhwh was the Agent.\textsuperscript{88} In either case, the author is depicting the springs in a split state and the heavens in an opened state (also a Niphal). The activity in the scene is the water coming out continuously, and this activity depends on the springs and sluices being in an open state.

In contrast, the second example presents “split” in the Hitpael. Assuming this stem refers to an activity, then we can imagine the skins had not yet reached the state of being split when the Hivites come to the Israelites. One could argue, however, that the skins were already split. First, the verb is in the \textit{qatal}, and a perfective aspect would indicate that the event was completed. Second, the point of the Hivites’ ruse was to convince the Israelites that they had no provisions because of their treacherous journey to the Israelites.

If we assume that the situation and viewpoint aspects interact, then we would conclude that the activity had simply stopped in the past without reaching a final, split state from the point of view of the narrative. We can see this meaning in the context, as well. The Hivites (if they had been wandering in the way they convinced the Israelites they were) would probably not have carried split—and hence empty—wineskins during a long journey, presenting to the Israelites tattered skins and nothing to drink.\textsuperscript{89} Previously in the same pericope (Josh 9:4) the skins were already split and then sewn up again.\textsuperscript{90} If they sewed the skins up again, it was to make them hold their drink. So the point was to have wineskins that looked like they were in the process of

\textsuperscript{88} \textit{IBHS} cites this verse as an example of the Niphal middle (§23.2.1). Boyd claims that these examples demonstrate “the complete overlap of \textit{niphal} and \textit{hithpael}.” The difference in his view is “diachronic, dialectical or related to some literary consideration” (Boyd 1993:244).

\textsuperscript{89} Carrying useless tatters on a long journey would not have made sense, and could have made the Israelites suspicious.

\textsuperscript{90} In that verse, the “split” is expressed by a Pual. This stem seems to point to a state in this context, similar to the Niphal. In the other two cases of the Pual, Ezek 26:10 and Hos 14:1, we find a participle in the former and a YQTL in the latter. Both are passives with an external Agent.
splitting, not that they would be in a split state. As the Israelites saw the stitching, they would have known that the Hivites managed to stop the splitting before the skins were in tatters.

Now that we have observed the intersection between activity and perfective aspects in example 71, let us turn to a stative, imperfective combination in the following verse.

72. hinnē-h-ḇîtnî kāyāyîn lōv-yippāṯēh kāḇōḇōt ḥāḏāšîm
   behold-belly.my like.wine not-open:Niphal:YQTL like.wineskins new

   yibbāqeʾc
   split:Niphal:YQTL

Behold my belly is like wine that is not opened, like wineskins of new wine that will split (Niphal) (Job 32:19).

The author here used a Niphal to describe wineskins that are on the verge of splitting, in contrast to example 71. The Niphal verb in example 72 as often been translated as, “ready to burst,” which sounds like the translation of the Hitpael I offered above. If a perfective Hitpael means the same as an imperfective Niphal, the overlap could contradict the distinction between the Niphal and Hitpael that I have established.

Above we assumed that the qatal Hitpael referred to a completed activity without reaching the end point. Now we can see that the yiqtol Niphal connotes a state that has not yet been reached. This reading of the Niphal is corroborated by what we see in example 122, that the Niphal is not incompatible with the yiqtol. It may refer to an uncompleted event, namely, the realization of the final state, in which case (like example 122), we may translate as a future tense. Second, we see an example of the Hitpael in the qatal in example 85. In the present example

---

91 The NIV, NRSV, NJPS, Clines (2006:681), Pope (1965:211) have translated this verb thusly. Targum of Job translates the verb as a Hitpael (Stec 1994:223*). Tur-Sinai departs somewhat from this reading, as he translates the Hitpael, “break forth” (Tur-Sinai 1967:462). In contrast, LXX translates the verb as the perfect active participle, ἐρρηγοῦς, “burst,” though the LXX translators do not seem to be following the Massoretic text exactly.
(example 72) the speaker laments of the inevitable state that his belly will inevitably reach in the future, but has not yet reached.

We can see another potential problem in the following example that includes a *yiqtol* of the Niphal of the root, הָשַׁט, “destroy.” The *yiqtol* is not in itself a problem. The problem arises from the fact that a process, not a state, seems to be the focus of the passage.

73. wayyāʿaš yhwh kēn wayyāḇō;yārōḇ kāḇēḏ bēṯāh parōh ūḇēṯ
and did yhwh thus and came swarm heavy house.ward pharaoh and.house.of

◌āḇāḏāyw ūḇḵoḵ-ʿerēs mišrāyim tiṣṣāḥēṯ hāḏāʾreš mipponē
servants.his and in.all-land Egypt destroy:Niphal:YQTL the.land from.face.of

heʿārōḇ
the.swarm

And Yhwh did so, and a thick swarm came into the house of Pharaoh, and the house of his servants, so in all the land of Egypt the land *would be destroyed* (Niphal) before the swarm (Exod 8:20).

In this context we may have expected a Hitpael, since the verb seems to be referring to a gradual process of destruction in the land, without making reference to the culminating state.

Furthermore, the *yiqtol* points to the idea that this is an ongoing process, i.e., imperfective, since a future interpretation would not make sense. The expected correlation between the perfective and the Niphal does not hold.

In an imperfective expression, though, the author can still have the culminating state in mind. We saw above (section 3.6.3.1) that Spanish allows for the imperfective with the stative passive. The result is a verb that indicates a process, but with the end state in mind. So while the swarm must painstakingly enter all the houses, the land must be totally destroyed before Pharaoh will relent (Exod 8:21). I have translated with a modal sense: “the land *would be* destroyed.”
This verse thus underscores how we must keep viewpoint and situation aspects separate in our minds.

These examples, therefore, offer further insight into the interaction between viewpoint and situation aspect. The Niphal in the *yiqtol* points to the future realization of a culminating state, even if the activity has not reached that point with respect to the narrative reference point. In a similar way, the Hitpael in the *qatal* points to an activity that has been realized and is completed with respect to the narrative reference point. We can translate such a verb as a past or pluperfect progressive. The viewpoint aspect communicates whether or not a process has been completed; situation aspect refers to whether a final state is reached or not.

### 4.2.4. Conclusions: Transitive verbs

The data in this section demonstrate that transitive sentences, whether comprised of an Agent and Patient or an Experiencer and Theme, passivize in the same way. This fact allows for some possible conclusions. The number of participants is more significant for passive expressions than the semantic roles of the participants. The semantic role of the underlying A does not play a role. Nevertheless, S shows reduced volition and/or agency, whatever the underlying semantic role of the S entity. Thus, the A is demoted in both types of sentences, as predicted by my hypothesis.

Furthermore, my hypothesis about the nature of the Niphal and Hitpael stems has been supported. In cases of minimal pairs, the Niphal represents the stative aspect, and the Hitpael, the activity aspect. Where we do not find minimal pairs, the Niphal and Hitpael still tend towards these situation aspects. Two more roots in this section appear unambiguously in the Pual (sections 4.2.2.1.2 and 4.2.3). In the root ידֲכָה *ydāh*; “know,” the Pual functions as a deverbal
noun. It is clearly stative and implies two participants (the person known and the knower). The latter section presents the root בָּשָׁמָּה bqv, “split,” which is a stative participle in this example. In its other cases the Pual presents stative and agentive actions. We find that the Pual appears less often among the Experiencer transitives we looked at than among the Agentive ones. This reinforces what we tentatively concluded above, in section 4.2.1.9. The Niphal and Hitpael divide up the the passive/middle/reflexive territory according to stative and activity aspect, while the Pual tends more towards Agentive passives.

The last section demonstrated some interesting interaction between the Niphal and Hitpael and the TAM forms. Neither the Niphal nor the Hitpael is confined to one or the other TAM form, which allows for an interaction between situation and viewpoint aspects, as well as tense. The permutations that arise from this interaction create precise and complex expressions of situations. Moreover, these two stems also interact with the narrative viewpoint to order events and more the reader’s focus from one point to another.

4.3. Basic stative

4.3.1. Introduction: Problem of passive of stative

This group includes roots that have one semantic role in their lexical form, a Theme.92 We see that these roots appear often in both the Niphal and the Hitpael. Passivizing such verbs has troubled scholars because models for passivization in BH most often assume an A and an O. So the number of semantic roles among the basic stative verbs proves problematic for these

---

92 Situation aspect of stative verbs has been discussed by Dobbs-Allsopp (2000), who also refers to Creason’s treatment of situation aspect of stative verbs (Creason 1995:31-82). Both of these authors, though, do not delve into the situation aspect distinction in the passive.
models. One’s passivization model, as a result, must allow for a Patient/Theme as a subject of the passive, even when one does not exist in the basic form of the verb.

In spite of their regular appearance, these stative passives are often seen as exceptions to the Qal to Niphal derivation. As a result, some Hebraists suppose that these irregular passives relate to another stem. According to this reasoning, the Niphal, which assumes a change in state, would require two participants, an Agent and a Patient. Since the stative Qal only bears one argument, the Niphal must derive from an active stem with two participants, such as the Piel. However, such relationships are ad hoc, and hence must be related on the lexical level. Otherwise, one can suppose that the passive chooses the semantic role of its subject—a Patient or Theme—without the intermediate step of relating to another stem.93

Whichever way one chooses to view the relationship between the active and passive subjects, the following data show that the Niphal and Hitpael contrast with one another according to situation aspect. Thus these stems do not function differently from basic transitive or intransitive verbs, and so these data offer no reason to believe that these stems are derived from the Qal via an intermediate stem. I will begin by presenting the basic state vs. activity contrast in the Niphal and Hitpael to show this contrast. Then I will look at verbs that appear in the Hitpael or the Niphal, exclusively, and will show that the data demonstrate the same situation aspect functions. In instances where a root appears in the Hitpael but not the Niphal, the verbs demonstrate idiosyncratic expressions of the stative counterpart. Next I will demonstrate that some roots prefer the Niphal or Hitpael, implying that one situation aspect is marked. The stems are still used within the restrictions of situation aspect. I will show how the language uses this

---

93 Cf. Boyd (1993:78, 239). Boyd bases his analysis on Geniušienė’s three-level diathesis model (Geniušienė 1987:52-57). See the analyses in chapter 2 of Jenni (section 2.2.3.2.1), Creason (2.2.3.2.4), and Mandelblit (2.2.3.4).
contrast to indicate inceptivity and “act as X,” where a subject “acts as” a state without reaching that state. Finally, I will look at the Hotpaal of stative roots to determine what stative aspect suits it most appropriately.

4.3.2. Basic Hitpael/Niphal contrast

4.3.2.1. Basic contrast: State vs. activity

I begin this section with minimal verb pairs that demonstrate the basic situation aspect distinction of the Niphal and Hitpael. Each of the examples demonstrates that the Niphal and Hitpael are used for specific emphases. Biblical Hebrew authors make use of this contrast to point to moments where a transition has or has not been completed. This stylistic element allows the author to contrast various points in a transition, juxtapose both the process and the state to emphasize a transition, or contrast being in a state and simply acting like the state.

The root נמלָה נמלָה, “weak,” demonstrates a state/activity contrast in the Niphal and Hitpael. The root is basically stative, with one Theme semantic role. In the passive the subject is understood to undergo a transition. The Niphal and Hitpael allow the author to disambiguate whether the transition has reached the final state—with a Niphal—or the process is still taking place—with a Hitpael. A Niphal and Hitpael of the root occur within one verse of each other in Lam 2:11-12.94 For this root the Niphal is statistically exceptional (one Niphal to six Hitpaels). So not only has the author chosen to contrast the Niphal with the Hitpael in the present context, he has chosen to make this contrast with a rare verb form.

94 BDB (742) refers to this root as נמלָה III. All the Hitpaels and Niphal of this root occur with the present meaning. Roots I (“turn aside”) and II (“envelop oneself”) only occur in the Qal. KB collapses the first two homonyms into one, and the Niphal and Hitpael are derived from their נמלָה II (814-15).
74.  

\[
\text{nišpāḵ} \quad \text{lāʿāres} \quad \text{kəḇēḏi} \quad \text{ʕal-šeber} \quad \text{bat-ʕammi}
\]

is.pour.out:Niphal:QTL to.the.ground liver.my over-destruction daughter-my people

\[
\text{hāʾaḡēp} \quad \text{ʕolēl wāyōnēq} \quad \text{birḥōḇôt} \quad \text{qiryaḥ} \quad \text{laʾimmōtām} \quad \text{yōʾmarū}
\]
in.faint:Niphal:INFC child and.suckling in.squares town to.mothers.their they.say

\[
\text{ʕayyēh ḏāḡān wāyāyin} \quad \text{bəhiṭāṭəḇām} \quad \text{kəḥālāl} \quad \text{birḥōḇôt}
\]
where grain and-wine in.faint:Hitpael.their like.wounded in.squares

\[
\text{cīr bəhiṣṭappēk} \quad \text{naḥšām} \quad \text{ʕel-ḥēq} \quad \text{ʕimmōtām}
\]
city in.pour.out:Hitpael:INFC soul.their to-breast mothers.their

. . . my liver is poured out on the ground over the destruction of the daughter of my people, when child and suckling became faint (Niphal) in the squares of the town. To their mothers they were saying, “Where is grain and wine?” as they were fainting (Hitpael) like the wounded in the squares of the city, as their souls were being poured out on the breast of their mothers (Lam 2:11-12).

The verb in the more common Hitpael refers to an activity—usually of the speaker—of becoming weak or faint, but without a clear culminating state. We see this connotation in the second occurrence of this root.

When the author of Lamentations 2 refers to the weakness or faintness of the children in the wake of the destruction of the city (“the daughter of my people”), he uses the Niphal. It seems significant that he is describing the city’s destruction after he can no longer cry; he had been mourning for a while. Perhaps, then, the use of the Niphal refers to the final state of the children; they reached the ultimate state of “faintness,” death.\(^{95}\) So then the second verse represents a flashback to the process of the city being destroyed, when the children were still in

\(^{95}\) If it is the case that in BH the ultimate state of לַמָּלֶת ־י is death, then the Niphal could not likely appear in the first person exemplars of the Hitpael of this root (Pss 77:4; 107:5; 142:4; 143:4; Jon 2:8).
the process of dying. Such a use of the Niphal/Hitpael contrast, therefore, allows the author to point forwards and backwards to different times.96

The root מְסַמָּה tm, “defile,” appears 18 times in the Niphal and 15 times in the Hitpael—a near-equal distribution.97 Passivizing this root, therefore, is not exceptional, especially in cultic contexts. Moreover, the even representation between these two passive stems indicates that the actions represented by these verbs are often perceived as states and as activities. One minimal pair can be found in Lev 11:43, where the Niphal and Hitpael of this root appear in the same verse.

75. ṣal-təšaqqoṣū ʿet-naḥṣōṭēḳem bəqol-haššēreṣ haššōreṣ
not-pollute:Piel ACC-souls.your by.all-the.creeping.thing the.creep:Qal:PTPL

wələʼ țittammɔʔu bāhem waniṭmēṭem bəm
and.not pollute:Hitpael:YQTL by.them and.pollute:Niphal:QTL by.them

Do not pollute yourselves with any creeping thing that creeps, and do not become defiled (Hitpael) by them and so be defiled (Niphal) by them (Lev 11:43).

At first blush this verse seems redundant, as we find a Hitpael followed by a Niphal of the same root in adjacent clauses. Nevertheless, the fact that the author used different verb forms suggests that he is signaling a subtle distinction.

The order of the verbs is significant if we understand the two verbs to follow one another logically. The context of Leviticus 11 describes what food and water makes one unclean. Breaking these commandments are the actions that make one unclean. The first verb is a Hitpael, which focuses on the process of becoming unclean. The final state of uncleanness is

96 The same contrast with the root ṣakṣ ṣpk, “pour,” in these verses further underscores my conclusion (see example 1).

97 This root appears in the Pual a single time, as a participle (Ezek 4:14).
expressed by the same root in the following Niphal verb. By ingesting unclean things, the people end up in an unclean state. The Hitpael describes the process that ends in the state described by the Niphal.

The same method of exposition occurs in the following verse with the stative verb קדש, “holy” (the opposite of ידועו, “defile”). Here, however, we see an adjective where the Niphal sat in the preceding example. This example shows the close correlation between the adjective and the stative passive stem.

76. כי אני יהוה nationally נוחיתם קדוש קדוש קדוש קדוש קדוש כי קדוש קדוש קדוש קדוש
for I god.your and.holy:Hitpael:QTL and.be:QTL:2cp holy:ADJ for holy:ADJ

אני והלא תסStateException רכפת בוקל-האשレス
I and.not pollute:Piel:YQTL ACC-souls.your by.all-the.creeping.thing

卡拉מכנס אל-האףレス
the.crawl:Qal:PTPL on-the.earth

For I am Yhwh, your God, and you will become holy (Hitpael) and be holy (adjective) because I am holy (adjective), and you will make yourselves unclean with any creeping thing crawling on the earth (Lev 11:44).

The verse begins with an admonition in the Hitpael to become holy, immediately followed by a form of ישות, “be,” plus an adjective. The resulting expression seems almost as redundant as the expression in the verse before. Here, however, the adjective takes the place of the Niphal, which makes the stative part of the event more pronounced; so we see, “become X and so be X” is a meaningful expression in Hebrew, which successively emphasizes the process and the state of X. In verse 43, the resulting state is rendered by a Niphal, and in 44 by an
adjective; both verses use the Hitpael to refer to the preceding process.\textsuperscript{98} So we see a similar overlap between the stative passive and the adjective, as in English. As a result the author exploits this stylistic near-redundancy to emphasize the entire transition: process and final state.\textsuperscript{99}

We can find the same Niphal/Hitpael contrast even with different roots, but with the same semantic connotation. Such a contrast occurs in Isa 33:10. This pair appears different from the above, as here it is a “semantic” minimal pair, that is, the contrasting verbs are of two roots with nearly the same meaning.\textsuperscript{100}

77. ʕattâh ʕaqûm  yō̂mar yhwh ʕattâh ʕrômâm ʕattâh
    now arise:Qal:YQTL:1cs says yhwh now arise:Hitpolel:YQTL now

’ennâśē
lift:Niphal:YQTL

“Now I will arise,” says the Lord. “Now I will be exalted (Hitpolel), now I will be lifted up (Niphal)” (Isa 33:10).

Here we find the same syntactic structure as in example 76, where a Niphal follows a Hitpolel of the same or nearly the same meaning. Logically, the Niphal must come after the Hitpolel, because the Hitpolel refers to the action that leads to the eventual state. The structure adds emphasis of the action and the culminating state. This example also shows the parallel between the Hitpael and Hitpolel. We see that the structure in example 76 is paralleled here, but with a

\textsuperscript{98} The same phenomenon occurs in Num 9:12; similarly, Ps 73:21-22; נָעַם in Ezr 6:20. In Jer 17:14 we see the same construction with the Qal and Hiphil preceding the Niphal of the same root, e.g., “Heal me, and I shall be healed.”

\textsuperscript{99} Pustejovsky defined a transition precisely as a process followed by a state. See section 3.2.

\textsuperscript{100} One should note, however, that the first root is a basic stative root, and the latter, a basic transitive. They function similarly in the passive, however. The former root, נָעַם rwm, “high,” assumes two participants in the Polal (Neh 9:5; Pss 66:17; 75:11).
Hitpolel in the place of a Hitpael. Thus this case underscores IBHS’s statement that the Hitpolel is an “unremarkable variant” of the Hitpael (IBHS:§26.1.1c).

“Cleanness” is depicted as a state and as an activity in the HB.101 This category is represented by the roots בּּר, מְלֶר tbr, “purified”; נֶלַח qnh, הַחַּת hth, “cleansed”; אָפָּר štp, “rinsed”; בּּר, מְלֶר rḥs, כָּבֵס kbs, “washed”; מְלֶה kpr, “atoned”; and תַּמּוֹ מ tmm, “blameless.” When expressing a literal washing action, these roots function more as Agentive transitives, but like statives in their metaphorical sense. Unfortunately for our study, only בּּר brr, “purified,” exists in both the Niphal and Hitpael. Fortunately, though, we have an example of both in the same sentence, which offers a revealing minimal pair.

78. הִמְ-נָבָּר tittāḇā wוֹיַ-יִקְּטֶש tittappāl
With the pure (Niphal) you act pure (Hitpael), and with the crooked you act perverse (2 Sam 22:27).

Here and in the previous verse we see how Yhwh acts with different types of people, and how his behavior mirrors their state. While the people he reacts to are described using adjectives (here, a Niphal participle), Yhwh is always described with a Hitpael in this context. In this way the author puts the focus on Yhwh’s action and the people’s state.102

In preceding examples, we saw that the Hitpael represented a process of transition that one assumed ended in the final, culminating state. In other cases, though, the reader assumes or cannot be sure that the process did not reach its culminating state. The resulting translation often

101 Biblical Hebrew blurs the categories of physical and moral cleanness, perhaps through metaphorical extension.

102 The Hitpael of this root does not necessarily require it be interpreted as an “act like” verb. The same root appears in the Hitpael with the meaning of a simple action in example 86.
has “act (like)” in English. The root הילָה hylh, “ill, grieved,” offers an interesting contrast with respect to the absence of this state.\footnote{This particular root straddles the physical and mental state categories. I have chosen to place the root in the present category because there are more unambiguous examples of it referring to a physical sickness than a mental one. For example, הִלָּה nahlāh, “sick,” in Jer 10:19 most likely refers to physical injury. Jer 12:3 is likely mental (the mental anguish of vain labor), but could be physical (the physical anguish of working hard).}

79. walo̪ nehlu̪ ʿal-šēber yōsēp
and not grieve:Niphal:QTL on destruction Joseph
. . . but they are not in anguish (Niphal) over the destruction of Joseph (Amos 6:6).

80. wayyiškâb ʿamnôn wayyithâl wayyäḇō̄ hammēlek lirı̄ṭō
and laid down Ammon and sick:Hitpael:WAYY and came the king to see him
And Amnon lay down and acted sick (Hitpael), and the king came to see him (2 Sam 13:6).

In the first example, the people are not in anguish, though they should be. The Niphal refers to the state of being in anguish, and this state is negated. In this way the verb refers to a state, even though they are not in it.

The Hitpael in example 80 also describes a condition that Ammon is not in, but with a different emphasis. In the preceding verse, Jonadab suggests to Amnon that Amnon act sick in order to get Tamar into his bedroom. Similarly to the preceding example, Amnon does not actually become sick. Nevertheless, he acts sick. The focus of the example is not on the state Amnon is in, but on how he acts.\footnote{Garr makes a similar comment regarding the denominative. He writes, “For when a hithpael verb is derived from a nominal, the stem often carries a semblative sense—that of acting like its base” (Garr 2003:38-39).} As a result, the author uses a Hitpael instead of a Niphal. Thus, even though the state of sick is not reached in either example, the Niphal and Hitpael still focus the context on the verb’s state or action, and whether the final state is in mind.\footnote{Regarding the other Hitpael-only root, הֲדָשׁ ḫds, “renew,” one could consider this Hitpael as either an “act like” verb, or as a process with a potential for the actual state in Ps 103:5. One could translate that sentence as, “Your youth acts new like an eagle(‘s),” or, “Your youth is being renewed like an eagle(‘s).” Two problems are...}
We can see that the Niphal/Hitpael contrast of situation aspect is used to various ends. The author can use the distinction stylistically, to point at moments during a process or after its culmination. Similarly, an author can emphasize the completeness of an action by mentioning a process and the state of a transition by two verbs in serial. Such emphasis does not necessarily require using the same root twice, and we see evidence of both methods. The author can also contrast those who are in a particular state with another who acts in that way. Once we do not assume that the final state is reached, the Hitpael can represent “acting” in a certain way—even “faking” a condition. By understanding how the stems work in contrast to each other, we can see more easily what certain occurrences of these stems emphasize when not in contrast with the other.

4.3.2.2. Niphal with no Hitpael contrast

If we assume that the Niphal indicates a transition, we can apply this conclusion to Niphals that occur on their own. The problematic case of the subject of הָרֶם rḥb, “wide,” in Isa 30:23—obscure in the context—becomes clear when we see Niphals in this way. BH uses an adjective to refer to a simple “wide” state. The following example, though, does not demonstrate a minimal pair.

revealed in translating this verse, however. First, most translations understand the metaphor as between your youth and an eagle’s, but “eagle” is stated without any possessive. Stating such a comparison between possessed objects would be awkward to state in another way in BH. Second, the verb is נָתַתָּה nîḥḥaddēš, which can either be a 2ms or a 3fs, and neither has an obvious antecedent, since the addressee in this section is feminine, and “youth” is masculine plural.

106 The root appears 19 times as an adjective and once as a Niphal (participle), in example 81.
And he will give rain for your seed, which you sow in the ground, and the grain, the produces of the ground, and it will be rich and fat. And your flocks will graze on that day, lambs [far and] wide (Niphal) (Isa 30:23).

The meaning of כר kar, the subject of בָּרַה bərH, is not entirely clear. BDB offers two definitions, one meaning “pasture,” which it claims is dubious (499), and another, “lamb” (503). So we ask the question of what the subject of the Niphal is—the pasture or the flock.

I understand the root, כר kar, in the more common sense of “lamb,” and so the image is that of a flock of sheep extended broadly. Biblical Hebrew tends to describe wide lands with an adjectival form of בָּר bər, not a verb. We have seen that the Niphal most often refers to a transition. Moreover, three of the four times that of בָּר bər occurs in the Qal, we do not find any transitions. These facts corroborate our initial assumption, that the Niphal of בָּר bər refers to a transition. As a result, the data favor viewing כר kar as “lamb” and not “pasture.” It is more difficult to see that the pasture, as opposed to the lambs, underwent a transition. So the verb depicts the flocks of sheep growing to such an extent that they extend broadly.

---

107 In Isa 60:5, the Qal of this verb could refer to a transition.

108 In this way, we can see a parallel with רָחַב ṭh “stretch” in Num 24:6.
4.3.2.3. Hitpael with no Niphal contrast

A given root may appear in the Hitpael and never in the Niphal. This lack of Niphal examples may occur because of historical accident, that is, what data happen to be preserved. The lack of a Niphal may also exist because of an idiosyncratic feature of the verb. In the latter case, the Hitpael still refers to a transition’s process, but the verb may use means other than the Niphal to point to the culminating state. The “choice” a root makes is idiosyncratic and thus not predictable.\(^\text{109}\) The following root demonstrates this lexical phenomenon.

The root שָׁר “extend” appears once as a finite verb, a Hitpael, never as a Niphal. It occurs twice more as a Qal passive participle, indicating a state.

82. kı-qāṣar hammaṣṣāי meḥīṣṭāre\(^\text{ac}\)

for-short the.bed from.stretch:Hitpael:INFC

For the bed is too short for stretching out (Hitpael) (Isa 28:20).

The Hitpael verb has the specific meaning “to stretch out,” in this context, on a bed. This example is the first half of the verse whose second half is example 42 and which has another Hitpael, כָּר “curl up.”\(^\text{110}\) While we do not see a contrast between state and activity in the present context, we can see that activities/processes are in focus. Had the focus been on being stretched out, the author likely would have used a Qal passive participle, though the latter form may or may not refer to a culminating state from a transition.\(^\text{111}\)

We could translate both Hitpaels as reflexive, but this does not contradict the situation aspect function of the stem. As reflexives, one would translate these Hitpaels as, “stretch oneself

\(^{109}\) Even among three “color” roots, we find three different schemes. See below.

\(^{110}\) This root is a basic transitive verb. The Qal means, “gather up; amass.”

\(^{111}\) The Qal passive participle of שָׁר “extend,” occurs twice, both times referring to a limb that is too long (Lev 21:18; 22:23). A transition is not likely in the purview of this verb.
out” and “cover oneself.” Significantly, the situation describes potential habitual actions, describing the size of the bed and the covers, and whether they are big enough to perform these actions. Such a function is related to situation aspect. So a reflexive sense for these verbs makes sense here, while the overarching situation aspect function of the Hitpael correlates more consistently with data elsewhere.

4.3.2.3.1. Hitpael vs. stative Qal

The closely-related roots for “strong” include יָמָן ms, יֶזָּה hzq, “strong,” and גִּבְרֹת gbr, גּוּל gdl “mighty.” All of them appear in the Hitpael more than once, and never in the Niphal. The most common of the roots is יֶזָּה hzq, which appears 27 times in the Hitpael.112 Since this root does not have a Niphal for the stative, the root appears in the Qal with that sense, though without a transition notion.113

[112] It is the fifth most common Hitpael root.

[113] Good minimal pairs between the Hitpael and the Qal appear in the following verses: 2 Sam 10:11-12; 1 Kgs 20:22-23; 2 Chr 15:7-8; 25:8-11; 27:5-6; 32:5-7; Dan 10:19-21. From Dobbs-Allsopp’s work on the stative Qal, we know that the stative Qal can theoretically represent a state or a transition (Dobbs-Allsopp 2000). Thus we have to depend on the context to distinguish these two significations of the Qal.
83. wayyiggaš hannāhî ʾel-mélek yiśrâʾēl wayyōqmer lô lēk haṭtazzaq
and.approach the.prophet to-king Israel and.said to.him go strong:Hitpael:IMPV

waḏaʿ úrēʾēh ḫēṯ ḫāšer-tacâšēh kî liṯšūbaḥ haššānâh mēlek ṭârām ʿōlēh ḫâleʾkā
and.know and.see ACC which.do for to.turn the.year king Aram go.up over.you

waʿabḏē mēlek-ṭârām ṭâmû ṭēlāyw ṭēlōhê hārîm ṭēlōhēhêm ṭâl-kēn
and.servants king-Aram said to.him god mountains god.their on.therefore

ḥāzqû mimmeʾnnû waʿulām nilḥâm ʾittām bammîḥôr ʾim-lô?
strong:Qal:IMPV from.us and.maybe fight with.them in.the.plain if-not

neḥēzaq mēhem
strong:Qal:YQTL from.them

And the prophet approached the king of Israel and said to him, “Go, become strong (Hitpael), know, and see what you are doing, for at the turning of the year the king of Aram is coming against us.” And the servants of the king of Aram said to him, “A god of mountains is their god. Therefore they were stronger (Qal) than us. So maybe we should go out to war with them in the plain; we will surely be stronger (Qal) than them” (1 Kgs 20:22-23).

The Hitpael verb presents here what the King of Israel ought to be doing, according to the prophet. The king needs to “become strong” before the King of Aram comes back. The King of Israel needs to make preparations for this war, and the preparations are encapsulated in this Hitpael verb. In contrast, the Aramaeans discuss their situation with Qal statives. They use a Qal to describe the past fact of the Israelites’ superiority (that the Israelites were stronger), as well as discussing their future state after the next war (the Aramaeans will be stronger). Thus the Hitpael focuses on an activity, as expected, though here it lies in opposition to Qals and not Niphals. If the Hitpael were a Qal (“be strong!”) it would have referred to the outcome of the upcoming conflict, not to the preparations for the war.

In a similar way, ḥāḏiq Dr “black,” contrasts the Hitpael with a stative Qal rather than a Niphal. The root appears as a Qal participle seven times out of 17 verbal occurrences, as a Qal
qatal four times. The root never occurs as a Niphal. When the process is being referred to, the Hitpael is used.

84. ʿal-zōt teʾebal haʾāreš wəqādrû haššāmāyim mimmāʾal
    on-this mourn the.earth and.black:Qal:QTL the.heavens from.above
    Because of this, the earth mourns, and the skies are black (Qal) above (Jer 4:28).

85. wayəhî ʿad-Kò wə`ad-Kò wəhaššāmāyim hitqaddərû ʿābîm wərûʾh
    and.was until.thus and.until.thus and.the.heavens black:Hitpael:QTL clouds and.wind
    wayəhî gəšem gādōl
    and.was rain great

    And meanwhile the heavens grew black (Hitpael) (with) clouds and wind, and there was a great wind (1 Kgs 18:45).

The first example uses a Qal to describe the dark heavens, which is presented as an inevitable state. In the context the author is focusing on the state of darkening, which is only depicted as a state, not necessarily as a transition. In contrast, the second example describes what had been happening after Elijah’s servant saw the cloud coming over the sea and before Ahab left (1 Kgs 18:44). We find that the verb appears as a qatal in this sense, in contrast to the Hitpael in the yiqtol in sentence 58.114 Thus we see that the dark state existed in the past, whereas the previous example is non-past—habitual, in this case. When the root occurs in the Hitpael, the focus is on the process of darkening, rather than the state. The state for this root is expressed by the Qal.

114 I examined some Hitpaels in the qatal in section 4.2.3.
4.3.2.3.2. Hitpael vs. stative adjective

The root לְבַנָּה \textit{lbn}, “white,” appears with a significantly different distribution than the previous color verb, דָּרוּד \textit{qdr}, “black.” First, we do not find לְבַנָּה \textit{lbn}, “white,” in the Qal.\footnote{The three occurrences of לְבַנָּה \textit{lbn} in the Qal come from a homonymous root meaning “make bricks.”} Second, the stative sense of this root is not expressed with a verb but with an adjective (29 occurrences).\footnote{Dobbs-Allsopp does not address stative senses of roots that include the verb “be” plus an adjective to describe a quality (Dobbs-Allsopp 2000).} We only find one Hitpael of this root.

Many will be purified, \textit{made white} (Hitpael), and refined, but the wicked will act wickedly (Dan 12:10).

The context of this verse is a description of “the end time.” Up to that time, the actions described will be taking place, including the process of purification \textit{(yitbäraru “they will be purified,” also in the Hitpael)}, with a culmination in that time. If the author had wanted to focus on the culminating state of becoming “white,” we would expect to find a Niphal, or at least an adjective.

Moreover, the Hitpael’s syntax in this verse follows the syntax in other verses. In BH we see elsewhere two Hitpaels followed by a Niphal that represents a culminating state (Ezek 38:23), in addition to the cases of a single Hitpael followed by a Niphal (examples 75 and 77). The construction seems to describe a long process that culminates in a state. So here we have
two Hitpaels representing actions, of which יִבְנָל lbn is one, and they are followed by a Niphal of the culminating state. Additionally, the activity of “becoming white” builds on the activity of “being purified” in the present context, and contrasts with another activity, “doing evil.” So it seems natural to contrast an activity with another activity. This use of the Hitpael follows established patterns of syntax we have seen elsewhere.

4.3.2.3.3. Hitpael vs. stative Pual

We find one example of a Hitpael of a third “color” root, כֶּרֶם ćcrm, “red.” This root uses another strategy for expressing the stative sense without a Niphal. Seven of the ten verbal occurrences of this root are Pual participles, and there are nine adjectival uses of the root. In any case, the Hitpael in Prov 23:31 represents the activity aspect. While this verse has caused problems for exegetes, the theory I propose helps in resolving one problem in this verse.

87. ʾal-tēre⁵ yayīn kī ʾiyṭṭaddām kį-yittēn bakkōs ʿēnō yiṭṭallēḵ
not-look wine for red:Hitpael:YQTL for-give in.the.cup eye.its go:Hitpael:YQTL
bomēšārim
in.uprightness

Do not look at wine: when it reddens (Hitpael), when it gives its color to the cup, it walks uprightly (Prov 23:31).

We have seen above that the Hitpael of color verbs indicate the process of becoming that color, and, more generally, a Hitpael indicates an activity. However, it is difficult to imagine wine

117 The Pual occurrences of this root are Exod 25:5; 26:14; 35:7, 23; 36:19; 39:34; Nah 2:4. All the Exodus occurrences refer to skins for the tabernacle, and the Nahum use refers to skin for a shield. They all refer specifically to a state of leather. The adjectival occurrences are Gen 25:30 (twice); Num 19:2; 2 Kgs 3:22; Song 5:10; Isa 63:2; Zech 1:8 (twice); 6:2. They refer to various people, animals, and objects. The Pual occurrences imply a transition, while the adjectival ones do not.
becoming red, since wine is red by nature. The translation “redden” may clarify the idea of the proverb, however, since this English word refers to a transition. With this understanding, we can read this image such that as the wine goes into the cup, it becomes darker and darker red.

Another problem in this verse is the expression, נתן נָּאָן אָיִן nātan ‘ayin, literally, “give (its) eye.” Occasionally, “eye” can mean “color” or “appearance,” especially in reference to metal. In the current example, then, we can say that the wine gives its color to the cup. The resulting image is of wine reddening and giving its color to the cup, that is, the wine is being poured.

The author continues by saying that at this time the wine is acting justly. How one acts is a major focus of the wisdom genre. Moreover, the Hitpael of הָלַךְ hlk, “walk,” often designates conduct. Moreover, the verb is followed by a prepositional phrase, בָּמֶשָׂרִים bomēšārîm, that means “with uprightness.” So the idea is that when the wine is being poured, it conducts itself well. In the following verse, though, we see that wine has a protean character, and can turn on the drinker. Prov 23:32-33 we see the bad effects of drink as the author describes how in the

---

118 Translators often translate the Hitpael as stative (RSV, NRSV, NJPS, KJV, NKJV, NASB, NIV, Murphy [1998:173]). BDB offers “redden, grow, or look red” (10). HALOT translates more specifically, “sparkle reddish” (14), which is similar to Clifford, “shimmers red” (Clifford 1999:202). Waltke states that the verbs should not be translated as a stative, but claims that the Hitpael means “present itself [with the connotation of pretext] as reddish” Waltke 2005:264). The “pretext” meaning of the Hitpael is what I have called “act as X,” but it is not clear how or why wine would falsely present itself as red. Waltke further has to translate מָתַלֵּך yithallēk as “go down,” against its usual meaning, “walk around” or “conduct oneself.”

119 BDB lists several examples where “eye” bears this meaning, including Ezek 1:4, 7; 8:2; and Dan 10:6 (745).

120 While the Hitpael of הָלַךְ hlk does not always indicate moral conduct, it never means to walk a particular path, so the translation “goes down” would not be likely.

121 Outside this verse, this phrase refers to Yhwh’s righteous judgment. See Ps 9:9; 96:10; 98:9. It is possible that in Song 1:4 מֶשָּרִים may refer to a kind of wine (so NJPS) because of the parallel in the next verse, but the interpretation is not clear.
end, the wine spits and bites leaving the drinker crazy. As the wine is poured it is good, but is bad after it is drunk.

Understanding the Hitpael as an activity is preferable in this context to reading the Hitpael as stative. If wine is red by nature, then looking “when it is red,” is tautological, though several translations translate it as such. To avoid this problem NJPS translates the verb as an adjective, “red wine.” Nevertheless, the translations come close to my reading by continuing, “As/when it lends color to/sparkles in the cup.” The expression “lend color” may be seen as a state or an activity, so it is not as clear at pointing to an action as my translation is. With the Hitpael seen as stative, the translation does not bring the two phases of wine’s effects—the seduction and the attack—into focus as sharply.

The author wishes to express two dangerously contradictory phases of wine: when it looks safe as it is poured, and when it has made someone drunk. He uses the Hitpael of לֵךְ תָּדמַן to indicate an action or a process in order to contrast it with another process. This reading of this Hitpael follows what we have seen among the other color verbs in the Hitpael, and the Hitpael in general, that this stem presents the reader with a process. If the color had been expressed as a state by a Pual participle or an adjective, the author could not have depicted as acutely this process, or the contrasting actions of the wine.

\[\text{RSV}, \text{NRSV}, \text{NKJV}, \text{NASB}, \text{NIV}, \text{Waltke (2005:264), and Clifford (1999:202) have, “when it sparkles in the cup (glass, goblet)”; NJPS, “As it lends its color to the cup”; KJV, “when it giveth his colour in the cup”; and Luther Bibel, “im Glase so schön steht.” Murphy translates more literally: “when its eye shines in the cup” (Murphy 1998:173). The LXX translates very liberally, without reference to “red” in this verse. I have only found that the Russian Synodal translation arrived at the same translation of the verb as I did, “как оно краснеет,” “as it turns red.”} \]
4.3.3. Lexical idiosyncrasies

Biblical Hebrew prefers to present certain verbs in either the Niphal or Hitpael, exclusively. This preference is not always predictable, and thus likely lexical. Let us take, for example, the semantic categories for “worried” and “angry.” “Worried” verbs range from “troubled” (בָּשָׂר, בָּשָׂר pšm, בָּשָׂר kr) to “distressed, dismayed” (יָדַע, יָדַע hyl, יָדַע bhl) to “afraid” (ירָא, יָרָא yr, יָרָא rš). Collectively they appear 95 times in the Niphal and five times in the Hitpael—a strong preference for the Niphal. In contrast, “Angry” verbs (רָצָה, רָצָה hrh, רָצָה br, רָצָה np, רָצָה qsp, רָצָה rgz) collectively demonstrate a preference for the Hitpael, with three Niphals and 23 Hitpaels. Even though this distribution seems idiosyncratic, we can draw some conclusions from these statistics and representative data about how the language views the Niphal, Hitpael, and situation aspect.123

From these statistics, we can say that BH views the “worry” as more stative (“being worried”), and the “angry” verbs as activities (“becoming/acting angry”). The language demonstrates these views in the following examples of specific roots in these categories. The root בָּשָׂר bhl, “dismayed,” which only appears in the Niphal, demonstrates stative aspect.124 In the following example, the Benjaminites were in a dismayed state because they saw the imminent disaster.

123 Of all the “worried” and “angry” roots, a single Pual exists, for the root בָּשָׂר bhl, “dismayed; hurry,” in Est 8:14. The Pual appears with a middle meaning there.

124 Interestingly, this root has the latter meaning only in later texts (Qoh 8:3; Prov 28:22 [Niphal]; Qoh 5:1; 7:9; Est 2:9 [Piel]; 2 Chr 26:20; Est 6:14 [Hiphil]).
88. wayyibbāhēl  γίς binyāmîn kî rāʾāh kî-nāgʾāh ʿalāyw hārāʾāh
and.dismay:Niphal:WAYY man Benjaminite for saw that-touch on.them the.evil
. . . and every Benjaminite was dismayed (Niphal), because (each) saw that evil had
reached them (Judg 20:41).

The next example demonstrates the activity aspect of the “angry” verb, נבז רבע.

89. lākēn šāmaʾ yhwh wayyifabbār wǝʾēš nîssōqāh ʾbəyaʾāqōḇ
therefore heard yhwh and.angry:Hitpael:WAYY and.fire kindle:Niphal:QTL in.Jacob
wōgam-ʾap ēlāh ʾbəyiśrāʾēl
and.also-even went.up in.Israel

Therefore, Yhwh heard and became angry (Hitpael), and fire was kindled against Jacob,
and wrath even went up against Israel (Ps 78:21).

The activity of “angry” comes across as the author describes how Yhwh acted angry—flames
and wrath going against Jacob/Israel. “Anger” is not seen as a simple emotion in this context,
but a collective expression of actions, including flames and wrath. 125

Such a phenomenon may demonstrate an aspect of lexicalization of these stems with
particular semantic categories, and this knowledge improves our accuracy in analyzing a given
verb. “Angry” is viewed as more of an activity or process, and “worry,” more of a state.
Nothing about these verbs inherently indicates which is more of an activity or state, but the
language selects one or the other as its preference for a verb. So awareness of idiosyncratic,
lexical information that may accompany a particular root allows us to see why roots in certain
semantic groups appear in one passive stem to the exclusion of another. Moreover, in cases
where exceptions occur we can be aware of what is the marked form of the verb.

125 The alternate theory of passive vs. middle-reflexive voice would not explain why one root prefers one or
the other root exclusively. The internal response to the subject’s surroundings would suggest a middle reading for
the Niphal and Hitpael, respectively.
We saw a further example of lexical idiosyncrasies above when we looked at the color verbs. Color verbs follow the standard use of the Hitpael for activities, and idiosyncratic uses on the root level for expressing a state. The roots that we found in the Hitpael were רד מ dm, “red,” לבן ibn, “white,” and שחור qdr, “black.” Overall, verbs relating to color may appear in the Hitpael but never in the Niphal. Each appears in the Hitpael once. More specifically, they each tend to use other strategies to refer to the state, without using the Niphal. We can thus see that the “normal” or unmarked expression of color is a state, expressed by an adjective, a participle, or finite Qal, and the marked case, a Hitpael verb. So the expression for “being” a color is idiosyncratic according to root, while “becoming” a color uses a Hitpael.

Nevertheless, the integrity of the Niphal/Hitpael opposition holds. If a root or semantic class prefers the Hitpael or Niphal as the unmarked passive stem, the two still represent situation aspect as expected according to my hypothesis. Similarly, when a Niphal of the color verbs does not appear, the Hitpael still expresses activity aspect, but in opposition to a stative aspect expression different from the Niphal.

The root שד़ qds, “holy,” demonstrates a unique pattern of distribution among stems depending on the subject. Out of 11 occurrences of the Niphal, only one of them does not refer to Yhwh (Exod 29:43). Out of 24 occurrences of the Hitpael, only one of them refers to Yhwh (Ezek 48:11), and none of five Puals refers to Yhwh. Thus the Niphal appears reserved for Yhwh. This may have arisen because Yhwh is considered to be in a constant state of holiness. It may be too much to claim that this is a result of a transition, however, because of theological reasons. Perhaps the Niphal functions idiomatically in its reference to Yhwh.
The next question is the difference between the Pual and the Hitpael. Since the Pual only occurs as participles, comparison with a Hitpael participle is preferable.

90. wattābōֳנִיָּה wayyiqṣaḇ ʾimmāh wohi? mitqaddēšet mitṭumʔātāh and-came to-him and-lay with-her and-she holy:Hitpael:PTPL from-uncleanness-her

wattāšoḇ ʾel-bēṯāh and-returned to-house-her

And she [Bathsheba] came to him [David], and he lay with her. (Now she had been sanctifying herself [Hitpael] from her [menstrual] uncleanness.) And she returned to her house (2 Sam 11:4).

91. kî lakkōhānîm bōnē-ʔahārōn hamaqaddāšîm lōhaqtîr because for-the-priests sons.of-Aaron the-holy:Pual:PTPL to-offer.incense For it is for the priests, the sanctified (Pual) sons of Aaron, to offer incense (2 Chr 26:18).

Both of these instances describe humans that underwent some process of sanctification. The Hitpael example is ambiguous whether it is a state or an activity. The verb more likely emphasizes a process because of the context. If the process is highlighted, then it would tie why David saw her bathing and how she got pregnant immediately. A state is less likely to be emphasized in the present context, because Bathsheba’s cleanness is not in question. Thus the Hitpael expresses a process. The Pual, in contrast to the Hitpael, appears to stress the state of the sons of Aaron over and against King Uzziah, who had been offering incense without being in a proper state. Since the Niphal is removed as a possibility to refer to humans, the Hitpael occupies the semantic space I would predict, while the Pual takes over the stative aspect of the Niphal.

126 NRSV understands the sanctification as a process, which they translate, “She was purifying herself,” while NJPS understands it as a perfective, “She had just purified herself.”

127 The other instance of a Hitpael participle, Isa 66:17, is less clear. The context seems to refer to those who believe themselves to be sanctified. Since they are preparing to go into gardens—perhaps the denizens of other deities—to eat unclean animals, it is hard to imagine that they have undergone true sanctification. The Hitpael here, therefore, seems to mean, “act as X.” They never enter a true sanctified state.
4.3.4. “Act as X” and denominative

We have seen examples of “act as” verbs in section 4.3.2.1, and here I will mention two more that do not have a Niphal counterpart, and do not fit neatly into any other category. The root יָנָר syr, “messenger,” only appears one time as a verb—the Hitpael in Josh 9:4—and normally occurs as a noun. In this way, one could argue that this verb is denominative to convey the idea of “acting like” a messenger. The noun alone would not convey this meaning clearly. The other root, דָּד gdd, “troop,” occurs once in the Hitpolel.\(^\text{128}\) This root also appears denominative from the noun דָּדַים gōdûd, “raiders, troops” (BDB 151). Furthermore, the Hitpolel means “act like a troop,” but the context is not clear what aspect of actions of the troops is signified (marching? standing in ranks?).

These verbs exemplify denominative Hitpaels signifying “act like X,” where X represents the noun from which the verb derived. The verbs are not simply denominative, though, as the Hitpael still expresses activity aspect. Both examples assume a transformation that the subjects undergo by their actions without realizing the final state, that is, a subject once was not X, but then approximated X or acted like. We saw this same phenomenon among the other “act like” verbs we saw elsewhere.\(^\text{129}\)

This tendency contrasts with the denominative Niphals, which express that the S entered into the state represented by X. Even in roots without a Hitpael/Niphal opposition, we find that the stems are used for the same situation aspect categories. On occasion we find roots that occur

\(^{128}\) The homonymous root meaning “lacerate” occurs six times in the Hitpolel. The same root occurs twice as a Peal in the Aramaic of Daniel (4:11 and 4:20). The Qal of this root appears to be a bi-form of the hollow, גָּד gwd, “attack.”

\(^{129}\) For example, I presented הָלַח hlh “sick” in section 4.3.2.1, in sentences 79 and 80.
in the Hitpael without a Niphal example, and find that the Hitpael still indicates a process. Conversely, when roots appear in the Niphal and not the Hitpael, we find that the Niphal indicates a state as a result of a transition. This notion solves the problem of denominative Niphal verbs. For example, the noun לֶבֶן lēḇēn, “heart, mind” corresponds to a denominative Niphal meaning, “gain understanding” (Job 11:12). Above, in section 2.2.2.3, GKC tried to explain this Niphal as “reflexive.” However, if a noun appears in the Niphal understood as a stative, passive transition, then the denominative Niphal should express the state of the root entered into by the S. 130 So one without understanding becomes “minded” and now has sense.

4.3.5. Hitpael and inceptive

As we have seen, BH authors use Hitpaels to show that a state has not yet been achieved, and this feature makes it suitable for some ingressive contexts. Occasionally the Niphal can be ambiguous, since this stem expresses that a state has been achieved, but does not indicate when. A Hitpael unambiguously demonstrates that a state has not been achieved, as opposed to the Qal, where the state may or may not have been achieved. We see in the following example such a use of the Hitpael of the root הָצָה hzq, “strong.” 131

130 This derivation is very close to the verbal adjective described by Testen in section 2.2.2.2.

131 A similar problem obtains in 2 Chr 32:5-7.
And you, be strong (Qal), and do not let your hands become weak, for there is payment for your labor.” And as Asa heard these words and the prophecy of the prophet Oded, he became strong (Hitpael), and removed the abominations from the land of Judah and Benjamin (2 Chr 15:7-8).

If the author had used a Niphal or other stative construction in the place of the Hitpael, the context could have been construed such that Asa was already in a strong state when he heard the prophet’s words. With a Hitpael, the reader sees that Asa was undergoing the process of being strengthened when he heard the prophet’s words, and had not yet reached a strong state.

A potential problem arises, as this example presents a Qal command of the prophet to the king to “be strong” very similar to the Hitpael command in 83, and in that example I emphasized the command was to act strong, i.e., a process. In the present example (92), the prophet commands the king to act in a certain way after he commands the king to be strong. This reference to the king’s actions could suggest that a Hitpael would be appropriate here (or that a Qal would have been appropriate in example 83). The seeming inconsistency between the command to be and act strong in the Hitpael and in similar contexts causes a problem for my theory.

These examples demonstrate that an author possesses flexibility in how he or she expresses the situation aspect of an action. In example 83, the Hitpael refers to the actions the
king must take to get ready, while the Qal refers to the judgment after the war as to who was in
stronger state. In example 92, the need to be in a strong state (the Qal imperative) contrasts with
the king going out and beginning to make himself strong—an ingressive.\textsuperscript{132} The author
emphasizes that the king is beginning to become strong; he was not strengthened by the
prophet’s encouragement alone. Both Hitpaels, though, could refer to the act of making oneself
strong, that is, the same kind of middle or reflexive process the prophet is referring to in example
83. Moreover, the actions following the Hitpael verb could refer to the actions that were
strengthening him, not the results of his becoming strong. The command in example 83 refers to
the preparations for becoming strong. In contrast, the command in example 92 refers to the final
state of being strong, immediately followed by the king beginning to become strong,
demonstrated by his actions.\textsuperscript{133}

4.3.6. Hotpaal


This \textit{binyan} strongly resembles the Hitpael, except the vowel between the $h$ and $t$ of the prefix is
an \textit{lo} rather than a \textit{li}, and the last vowel is a \textit{a} rather than a \textit{e}. The second consonant is
doubled, just like the Hitpael. The single occurrence of the former in the Hotpaal appears to
function like a Niphal, expressing a culminating state.

\textsuperscript{132} Some of the Qal/Hitpael distinctions, however, come not from the state/activity opposition of situation
aspect but state/transition. Some of the minimal pairs listed seem to indicate that the Hitpael is used more for
transitions, but the Qal, less so, for example 2 Sam 10:11 (Qal) vs. 2 Sam 10:12 (Hitpael), 2 Chr 25:8 (Qal) vs. 11

\textsuperscript{133} It could be the case that the Qal does not mark situation aspect, and thus could be used in stative and
activity aspects. The situation aspect of the Qal, however, lies beyond the scope of this work.
93. lō²-yûkal ba’lāh hāriʔsôn ʔāšer-šillōḥāh läšûḥ lōqaḥtāh lihyôt lò  lāʾiššāh ʔaḥārē
not-able wife the.first which.sent to.return to.take to.be to.him to.wife after

ʔāšer ḫuṭṭammāº²̄ḥ kî-tōʾēḇâ hîw² liʾnê yhwh
which defile:Hotpaal:QTL for-abomination it to.face yhwh

Her first husband who sent her (away) cannot take her again to be a wife for him after she
has been defiled (Hotpaal), for this would be an abomination before Yhwh, and you will
not defile the land that Yhwh, your god, gives to you as a possession (Deut 24:4).

The context is describing the husband’s actions as they depend on the state of the woman. The
focus does not lie on the activities towards the woman, but her culminating state.

The Hotpaal of ḫšîl dśîn “fat” in Isa 34:6 proves problematic because it does not follow
the formal rules for this binyan, namely, the second radical is not doubled.\(^{134}\) Nevertheless, it
seems to bear stative aspect, since it is describing the sword’s state after the sacrifice. This fact
notwithstanding, an activity aspect could be possible, if one views the sacrifice as still taking
place. Since this verb form is difficult to determine, though, and the Hotpaal binyan itself
demonstrates unique problems, the aspect is not clear. The evidence that is present, though,
points to the Hotpaal as expressing a stative aspect.

Another passive of this root exists, a Pual, so it behooves us to compare the use of both
passive stems. The Pual of this root appears four times (Prov 11:25; 13:4; 28:25; Isa 34:7), and it
is not clear whether the stem bears a middle or a passive meaning. Here is a problematic
example:

94. wāriwwōţâ ʔaršâm middām waʾāpārām mēḥēleb yōḏuššān
and-saturated land-their from-blood and-dust-their from-fat fat:Pual:YQTL
And their land will be saturated with blood, and their dust with fat will be fattened (Pual)
(Isa 34:7).

\(^{134}\) GKC and Joüon-Muraoka correct the form by putting a dagesh in the shin (GKC:§54h; Joüon-
Muraoka:§53h). IBHS does not offer any comment on the missing dagesh, but cite the Masoretic spelling
(IBHS:§26.3b).
The context of this verse describes the war that Yhwh will carry out. The result will be blood and fat poured out all over the land. The ambiguity arises because it is not clear if Yhwh is the Agent behind the fattening actions. It is clear that he has actively slaughtered, but the fattening of the land may either be considered directly or indirectly under Yhwh’s agency. If the dust was fattened directly, then this verb would fit the standard, agentive Pual we have been seeing. If the fattening action resulted indirectly, then this Pual would be a rarer, spontaneous fattening. The same question could be asked in the Proverbs examples (Prov 11:25; 13:4; 28:25). Prov 13:4 is also unclear whether an Agent underlies the event or not. In Prov 11:25 and 28:25, however, Yhwh appears as more of an Agent. So all of these examples could be read as agentive passives, but they are ambiguous. Without a Niphal for comparison, it is difficult to determine the function of the Pual here. In the end, both the Hotpaal and the Pual appear to be agentive, stative passives, although the evidence is ambiguous in places.

4.3.7. Conclusions: Stative roots

In the above examples of stative roots, we can see that the Niphal/Hitpael stative aspect distinction holds throughout. The two roots assume a passive transition that unfolds on the subject. Occasionally a root may strongly prefer the Niphal or Hitpael, or even exclude one of the two entirely. Even in these cases, the stems express situation aspect consistently.

Based on some theories of passive, we would not expect stative roots to passivize because of their single semantic role in their basic structure. Passive theories often assume two arguments for a passive construction, one that is demoted and one, promoted (section 3.3.2). In spite of the single semantic role in the basic semantic structure of these stative roots, we find that BH passivizes them readily. We find many examples of stative roots among the Niphals and
Hitpaels, and even two among the Hotpaals. Some authors have sought to explain this phenomenon by proposing links between the passive forms and correlating transitivizing stems, such as the Piel and Hiphil, but Jenni claims that one does not need the intermediate stem to derive these verbs (section 2.2.3.2.1).

When the Hitpael is established as the activity aspect, its situation aspect can explain other uses of the Hitpael with stative roots. Biblical authors can then exploit this distinction to point at different reference points along the transformation event, so we see the Hitpael used in an inceptive context. Moreover, this aspect explains why the stem is used for “act as X” expressions. As we saw in section 2.3.2, Hebraists tend to list the various “species” of the Hitpael, which relate to each other in various ways. Situation aspect, however, explains the relationship among the activity aspect, inceptive, and “act as X.”

While the situation aspect generalization holds, some verbs we looked at act unpredictably in other ways. Certain semantic categories function in BH as transition states, and others as transition activities, with the non-preferred aspect functioning as a marked category. In other cases, roots “choose” a form to express the stative aspect, in opposition to the Hitpael activity. These preferences appear to be lexical, though further study could potentially reveal patterns that the data I presented did not demonstrate.

The Pual acts in a more idiosyncratic way among these verbs. The stem functions in a more narrow way in the roots רד ה “red,” and קדש “holy” (section 4.3.2.3.3). The first root only applies to leather, usually part of the tabernacle, and one time, a shield. Thus it

\[135\] Bakker (1993:26) explains this phenomenon by noting that the middle marking can encode certain event types as being inherently middle, in which case the middle marker is semantic. Among verbs that are not inherently middle, the middle marking expresses this event type for the given situation in contrast to a non-middle event type of the same verb.
means something like, “be tanned.” The second root is limited to human subjects. For both the Puals are only participles. With the verb \( bhl \), “hurry,” the verb has a middle meaning, as no Agent is clear from the context (section 4.3.3). Finally, the root \( dšn \), “fat,” is likely an agentive passive in the Pual, though it could be interpreted as a middle (section 4.3.6). So we see that the Pual is rare among these verbs, and it bears more specialized notions for some roots, and more ambiguous ones for others.

4.4. **Basic Intransitive**

4.4.1. **Introduction: Problem of passive of intransitive**

In this section I will examine verbs that are basically intransitive. The intransitive verbs here depict an action, as opposed to intransitives that depict a state (section 4.3 above). Since they represent actions, the sole argument is most often a Patient, a Theme, or a Mover. Some notable exceptions exist in verbs that have no semantic roles, and I will also discuss these verbs in this section.

A problem arises when passivizing these intransitive verbs because passivizing typically decreases the valence of the verb, that is, the number of arguments is reduced. We saw the same problem among the stative intransitives (section 4.3 above), which referred to the earlier solution by Jenni (section 2.2.3.2.1). If we assume that the passive demotes the underlying subject and promotes the underlying object, then we have nothing to promote among the arguments of intransitive verbs.

---

136 See the definition of semantic roles in chapter 1.
Nevertheless, the Niphal and Hitpael are common among BH intransitive action verbs, and they demonstrate more than one way to find a potential subject. Among the stative intransitive verbs we saw a strategy that presents the Theme subject of the basic form of the verb as a Patient, one undergoing a transformation.\(^{137}\) Such an alteration often—but not always—assumes an underlying Agent, even though no Agent appears in the basic form of the verb, or no Piel or Hiphil of the lexical verb exists.

Some other intransitive action verbs in the passive use a strategy by which the subject is not transformed, while the situation aspect is transformed. Certain verbs exist in the Qal and Piel, and the Mover semantic role of the Hitpael is still a Mover, for example, הַלְכָּה hlk, “go.” Other verbs appear in the Niphal but not in Qal or Piel, and the single argument is also a Mover, for example, מָלָל mll, “flee.” Some verbs that do not have any semantic roles in the basic structure do not appear with any semantic roles in the passive, for example, שָׁחַה sśh, “storm” (section 4.4.4.5.1 below), or with a Patient (or, less likely, a Location or Goal) in the passive, for example, מַגִּה mtr, “rain” (section 4.4.4.5.2 below).

While assigning semantic roles in the passive appears idiosyncratic, the situation aspect function of the Niphal and Hitpael among these verbs is fairly consistent with what we see elsewhere. The Niphal most often points at a culminating state for an action, and the Hitpael usually implies that the action is a process without a particular end state. Among motion verbs, this distinction may manifest itself by focusing on a particular path that is completed (Niphal) or no distinct path (Hitpael). Other lexical verbs focus on an iterative action (Hitpael) vs. a state (Niphal). Thus I will demonstrate that intransitive verbs, while idiosyncratic in assigning

\(^{137}\) This “diathesis” of semantic role is described by Boyd (1993:78).
semantic roles, still demonstrate the normal contrast in situation aspect in the Niphal and Hitpael, by and large.

4.4.2. **Typical situation aspect distinction**

4.4.2.1. "Take a stand"

The stem יָשֵׁב n/yṣb, “take a stand,” distinguishes situation aspect clearly between the Niphal and the Hitpael. One should note that while the two roots mean the same thing (hence I have listed them together), the Niphal only appears in the form with the nun, and the Hitpael, only in the form with the yod.138 These roots makes use of situation aspectual distinction to distinguish between *standing* and *going* to stand (state vs. activity), as seen in the following example.

95. wehɔyɛ^h nɔkɔn labbɔqer wɔʕalittɔ babbɔqer ɔel-har sīnay and.was set:Niphal:PTPL to.the.morning and.go.up in.the.morning to-mountain Sinai

wɔnissabta lɔ šam ɔralɔš hahar . . . wayyēred yhwh bɛʕānān and.stand:Niphal:QTL to.me there on-head the.mountain . . . and.go.down yhwh in.cloud

wayyityassēb ɔimmɔ šam wayyiqrɔ ɔbɔšem yhwh and.stand:Hitpael:WAYY with.him there and.called by.name yhwh

“And be set for the morning, and go up in the morning to Mt. Sinai, and *stand* (Niphal) for me there, on the top of the mountain.” . . . And Yhwh went down in the cloud and *took a stand* (Hitpael) with him there, and he called the name, “Yhwh” (Exod 34:2, 5).

In this scene, Yhwh tells Moses how he is to go up the mountain and be standing when the deity comes. This command is expressed in the Niphal, as he is already supposed to be in place when

138 The Hitpael form in Exod 2:4 is unexpected, as yod is not written.
Yhwh arrives and passes by (Exod 34:6). Moses’ standing is a state from the point of view of the narrative because the discussion centers on where Moses should be standing, not moving.

The Hitpael in verse 5 expresses how Yhwh moved onto the scene. With Yhwh as the subject of the Hitpael (with KJV, RSV, NRSV, NIV, NAB), Yhwh moves into position once Moses is already stationed, according to the previous command.\(^{139}\) The Hitpael depicts Yhwh’s moving into place as an activity.\(^{140}\) If the second verb were in the Niphal, we could interpret the scene as Yhwh already in the state of standing when Moses came to stand with Yhwh. In this way the author is able to contrast between the state and the activity of standing, that is, whether motion is involved in the event.

4.4.2.2. “Wait”

We find another contrast between the Niphal and t-form of the roots יָהָל (yhl), הָיָל (hyl), “wait.” These two roots are variations on the same root, as can be seen by the semantic identity and phonological similarity between the roots (transposition of a weak consonant between

\(^{139}\) One could also read Moses as the subject of the Hitpael with the Vulgate. Such a reading would assume that Yhwh was present (the object of צָמ “‘im, “with”) when Moses moved into position, and that Moses said the name “Yhwh.” In this case the Hitpael functions the same way, but understands that Moses moved into position after Yhwh descended. The verb still represents an activity situation aspect.

\(^{140}\) We find this contrast also in Num 22:22-23. These follows the same contrast as we saw for “hide” verbs in examples 6 and 7. To defend against the potential objection that the two verbs are in different tenses, one finds in Exod 8:16 a weqatal form of the Hitpael, which contrasts with the Niphal in the weqatal in the present verse, Exod 34:2. In 8:16, Moses is supposed to go into Pharaoh’s presence to stand, as opposed to be standing when Pharaoh comes. This use of the Hitpael in 8:16 matches what we see happening with the Hitpael in 34:5, while in the same tense as the Niphal in 34:2.
second and first position). Nevertheless, Niphals only appear in the first root, and the second root demonstrates one clear Hitpolel example and no Hitpaels with this meaning.\(^{141}\)

96. \textit{wawiyiyâ\'hel}  \textit{öd šib\'at yāmîm ʔāḥērîm wayăšallaḥ ʔeṭ-hayyônâ\(h\)}

and.wait:Niphal:WAYY again seven days another and.sent ACC-the.dove
And [Noah] \textit{waited} (Niphal) another seven more days, and sent the dove . . . (Gen 8:12).

97. dôm lyhw\(h\) \textit{wēthôlēl} lô ʔal-tiṭhar bômašî\(h\)

silent to.yhwh and.wait:Hitpolel:QTL to.him not-angry:Hitpael:YQTL in.prospering

\textit{darkô  bo\(\)iš  ośe\(h\) mōzimmôt}

way.his in.man doing plans

Be silent for Yhwh and \textit{wait} (Hitpolel) for him. Do not get angry over one who prospers in his way, in a man who carries out his schemes (Ps 37:7).

Example 96 offers a distinct end point for the waiting, at which point Noah sent the dove. In contrast, the speaker in example 97 entreats the addressee to wait and then describes what the addressee should be doing as he or she waits (i.e., do not get angry whenever you see someone doing well). So the focus does not fall on when the addressee finishes waiting, but what to do while waiting. Such a distinction—whether the end point was reached or not—falls in the category of situation aspect. The middle vs. reflexive distinction does not explain the use of the two stems. If Agency were the distinguishing factor, we would expect an Agent semantic role, or at least an underlying syntactic object. This verb does not bear an Agent role because there is not one entity affecting a second one.\(^{142}\)

A situation aspect approach would say that sentence 96 depicts the subject to be in a state where he had waited, while in sentence 97, the subject participates in the activity of waiting, and

\(^{141}\) Another Hitpolel appears in Job 15:20. However, that verb could come from the homonymous root meaning “writhe.”

\(^{142}\) See the definition of the semantic roles, section 1.4.
there is no clear endpoint. Moreover, the second example contrasts “waiting” with the verb immediately following “get angry”—a Hitpael. Both verbs represent activities, not a state. So the contrast between the Niphal and Hitpolel forms, as well as the parallel Hitpael in the second example, fortify the analysis of the Niphal as stative and the Hitpolel as an activity.

4.4.2.3. “Lead”

The following pair of examples, sentences 98 and 99, demonstrates how two different roots from the same semantic class can be distinguished by situation aspect. One can account for the following Hitpael example as a reflexive, though it represents the only Hitpael example from the root חַל nhl “lead.”

98. yaʿābor-nāʔ ādōnî lípñē abdō waʔānî qtnāhālāh lōʾîṭṭî lōrēgēl
  pass-please lord to.face servant.his and.I travel:Hitpael:YQTL:1cs to.gentle to.foot
  hammalāʾkāʾ āšer-lōpānay
  the.work which-to.face.my

Let my lord pass before his servant, and I will travel (Hitpael) slowly, at the pace of the cattle that is before me . . . (Gen 33:14).

In this passage the Hitpael of חַל nhl, which means “lead” in the Piel, refers to Jacob’s slow travel. Literally it could be translated “lead myself” or “be led,” and since no external Agent seems to be leading Jacob, the reflexive translation would make sense in the context. I have read it as an autocausative/middle sense here, and translated the verb as an intransitive, “travel.”

143 This root חַל nhl is transitive in its unmarked stem, the Piel. No Qal exists. I have included it in this chapter nevertheless, since its function in the Hitpael parallels that of the next, intransitive motion verb of the same semantic category, חָנַע tḥ, “wander.”
When we look at another verb in the same semantic category as נָהַל nhl “lead.”, we can see that the Niphal can equally be used for a reflexive. Here is an example from the root תֹּה tōh, “wander.”

99. yhwh māṣak bōqirbāh rūḥ ʾiwrīm wāḥīṯū ṣēt-miṣrāyim bāḵōl-yhwh mixed in.proximity spirit confusion and.wander:Hiphil:QTL ACC-Egypt in.every-

maʾāṣēhû k̄ahittāḵōt šīkkār bāqîʾā deed.his as.travel:Niphal:INFC drunk in.vomit

Yhwh has mixed in her midst a spirit of confusion, and they made Egypt wander (Hiphil) in all her deed(s), like a drunk wanders (Niphal) into his vomit (Isa 19:14).

In this context, the first use of the root, תֹּה tōh, is a causative in the Hiphil. Yhwh is clearly the Agent, or at least the Cause, of the Egyptians’ wandering. The drunkard’s wanderings, however, are expressed by a Niphal.144 We may understand this Niphal as a passive, related to the Hiphil sense of “making” someone go astray. His going astray, though, does not seem predicated on another’s actions, so the underlying A is not likely an entity other than the S. The drunkard has made himself go astray, ultimately. Otherwise, we could understand this Niphal as an autocausative/middle.

From the point of view of voice, the Niphal and Hitpael function the same way in these two examples. This lack of contrast motivates us to look elsewhere to explain why the author used two different stems. Situation aspect distinguishes between them. The Hitpael in example 98 refers to the activity of moving. Jacob is describing how he will be traversing the path. The focus is on the activity of traveling along, describing the path. In contrast, the Niphal in example

144 The form of the verb is actually ambiguous. Strictly phonologically, the dagesh in the tav could represent an assimilated /t/ (from a Hitpael) or /n/ (from a Niphal). However, my theory allows me to interpret the ambiguous morphology of this verb as a Niphal.
This Niphal/Hitpael contrast strongly resembles the Tagalog examples above (section 3.6.3.2).

4.4.2.4. “Hurry”

The following examples of the roots דָּהַ and סָקַשׁ, “hurry,” demonstrate a distinction in situation aspect, where the Niphal represents a defined path with a clear endpoint, and the Hitpalpel assumes no distinct path. I am using two different verbs within the same semantic class, which I grant is not an ideal minimal pair. The verbs are close enough, however, to demonstrate the situation aspect distinction between the Niphal and Hitpalpel stems. The Hitpalpel functions just as a Hitpael would. We should note that the Niphal of דָּהַ comes from a late text (Esther), and the Hitpalpel of סָקַשׁ, from a somewhat earlier text (Nahum).

100. wayyāšōb mordōkay ʿel-šāʾar hammēlek wohāmān nipḥāb ʿel-bêṭō and.turned Mordekai to-gate.of the.king and.Haman hurry:Niphal:QTL to-house.his ʿābēl waḥāpûy roṣ mourning and.covered head

And Mordecai returned to the gate of the king, and Haman hurried (Niphal) to his house, mourning and (with) head covered (Est 6:12).

101. ḑāḥūṣōt yithōlālū hārēḵēb yiqṭaṣqaqûn bārḥōbôt in.the.streets crazy:Hitpolel:yiqtol the.chariot hurry:Hitpalpel:yiqtol in.the.squares In the streets the chariots are acting crazy and rushing around (Hitpalpel) in the squares . . . (Nah 2:5).

The animacy of the subjects makes a primary reflexive/middle/passive distinction between the two verbs unlikely. According to Creason’s model, for example, the Niphal is

\[145\] The infinitive is used with a gnomic sense, that is, this is where a drunk tends to end up. My translation reflects a gnomic idea.
middle and is not marked for an external Agent, and the Hitpael (Hitpalpel in this case) is reflexive, so the Agent and Patient corefer (Creason 1995:336). This analysis would imply that the subject of the Hitpalpel must have the potential to be an Agent, and so would likely be animate. The Niphal would not necessarily restrict the subject in this way.

The subjects of the verbs in question differ in animacy—Haman is clearly animate, but the chariot is not—opposite to what Creason’s theory would predict. Many contexts do not allow an inanimate subject as an Agent, which causes a problem for the Hitpael. One could, however, consider the chariots to be animate by metonymy, since they “act crazy,” a verb normally used with animate subjects.146 Moreover, in example 101 the subject of the Hitpalpel does not appear to be the Agent, but is perhaps being made to rush around by another force. The Niphal example would not be marked for agency, according to Creason, but in this example the animate subject is more likely the Agent than the subject in example 101. The Niphal seems more reflexive than the Hitpalpel in these examples, which contradicts Creason’s theory.148

From the perspective of situation aspect, the first example demonstrates a full path, “to his house,” that is, he traversed in a hurried manner. Even though the verb describes the manner of how Haman hurried to his house, the focus is on the points that the two men reach. While it focuses on the endpoint—the transition between the state and the activity—the preceding activity is assumed even when the endpoint is emphasized. In contrast, the second example demonstrates

146 This verb “act crazy” is a Hitpolel, not a Hitpael. In spite of the formal difference, the Hitpolel is functioning just like a Hitpael, focusing on the action of an “act like X” verb.

147 Similar distribution of subjects can be found in the “slow” verbs, צל (Niphal) and מחלא (Hitpael). The former has an animate subject for its single Niphal occurrence, and the latter has eight out of nine animate subjects.

148 This fact also contradicts Boyd’s theory (section 2.2.3.2.3).
a manner of going with no precise path. The context indicates that the chariots were hurrying around without a path. Thus, there is no final state to attain, and only the activity is being focused on in the context. Again, this paradigm matches the Tagalog example above (section 3.6.3.2) very closely, as the action is contrasted between activity of travel vs. traversing a path.

### 4.4.3.  
#### Motion verbs

#### 4.4.3.1. Passive assumes an Agent

We find that the intransitive motion verb, הָלִל, “go up,” appears in the Niphal but not in the Hitpael. The Niphal of this root means “lift up” (intransitive) or “be taken up.” Let us take the following example.

102. והָיִם לֹא יָהֵל הָלִיל הָלִיל הָלִיל הָלִיל והָיִם לֹא יָהֵל הָלִיל הָלִיל הָלִיל

and.if-not rise:Niphal:YQTL the.cloud and.not set.out until-day rise:Niphal:INFC.its But if the cloud did not lift up (Niphal), they would not set out until it lifted (Niphal) (Exod 40:36-37).

I have chosen to translate the Niphals as middle/intransitive verbs. One could assume that the cloud would need an Agent, namely Yhwh, to be lifted off of the tabernacle. However, the surrounding context presents the cloud as an Agent on itself—or at least as a Cause; in 40:34 the cloud “covers” (Piel) the tent. Thus we do not need to imagine a separate Agent, and the autocausative middle makes good sense in English.

The verb הָלִיל, “go up,” while a motion verb in the Qal, functions in the same way as other stative position verbs we have examined so far. While one may not expect an intransitive

---

149 The root appears in the Niphal eighteen times (Exod 40:36; Exod 40:37 [twice]; Num 9:17, 21 [twice]; Num. 9:22; 10:11; 16:24, 27; 2 Sam 2:27; Ezra 1:11; Ps 47:10; 97:9; Jer 37:5, 11; Ezek 9:3; 36:3), and in the Hitpael only once (Jer 51:3).

150 The NRSV translates, “. . . the cloud was taken up.” LXX translates these verbs in the active.
motion verb to appear in the Niphal stem, the use of this verb follows the usage I have outlined for agent transitive verbs (cf. נָשַׁל ns£“lift,” section 4.2.1.6.2.5). Some scholars would say that such a use of the Niphal for an intransitive verb derives not from the Qal, but from the Hiphil.\textsuperscript{151} This may be the case, if one understands that the Niphal derives from a particular form of the verb. Such a derivation need not occur, as the derivation may occur on a more abstract level, such as on the lexical level.\textsuperscript{152} In this way, the present root could follow the same pattern as stative roots. Whatever level the derivation occurs on, the intuition still appears viable that the Niphal assumes an action took place on the Patient. Thus the Niphal assumes a Patient, as opposed to the semantic role of the subject, a Mover.

While this verb parallels stative position verbs in deriving the Patient subject, we can see that the verb follows the pattern of stative aspect for the Niphal. In all three cases of the verb in Exod. 40:36-37, the verb refers to the state resulting from the action. The Israelites’ journeys depended on the cloud’s position, not its movement. Even in the second occurrence, where the Niphal appears in the yiqtol, the state is emphasized. The yiqtol in this instance refers to the habitual nature of the event.

\subsection{4.4.3.2. Passive does not assume an Agent}

The most common motion verb that appears in the Hitpael is הָלַךְ hlK, “go; walk.” The root appears 64 times in the Hitpael, and once in the Niphal.\textsuperscript{153} As a result, we can get a good idea what the Hitpael means, and get further information from the contrast between the Hitpael

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{151}] The root נָשַׁל ns£ appears in the Hiphil 258 times.
\item[\textsuperscript{152}] I discussed how Jenni demonstrated this above, section 2.2.3.2.1.
\item[\textsuperscript{153}] It is also the second most common Hitpael in the HB.
\end{itemize}
and the Niphal. The passive of “go; walk” is more commonly expressed with a Hitpael than a Niphal. Nevertheless, “go; walk” can be used as a stative Niphal in BH, according to what my theory would predict.

103. kāšēl -kiṇṭōtō  nēhēlāktī  ninʕārtī  kāʔarbeḥ
like.shadow-as.lengthen.it go:Niphal:QTL:1cs shake:Niphal:QTL:1cs like.the.locust
Like a shadow as it lengthens I am gone (Niphal); I am shaken like a locust (Ps 109:23).

104. waʾyyithallōkū  miggōy ʾel-gōy mimmamlākāḥ ʾel-ʾam ʾaḥēr
and.go:Hitpael:WAYY from.people to-people from.kingdom to-nation another
And they wandered around (Hitpael) from nation to nation, from (one) kingdom to another nation (Ps 105:13).

The context of Psalm 109 describes the state of the speaker. The previous verse describes him as “poor” and “needy,” and his heart has been “pierced” (or “injured”), and here, the speaker is “shaken.” The context, thus, suggests a stative use of this verb. As a result, the Niphal of hlk points to the speaker’s state, that he has been stretched to the point of obscurity, just like a shadow, so now he is “gone.”

We find that the Hitpael of this root points to walking around, an activity as opposed to a state. So the author describes walking from this place to the next with no apparent goal in example 104. We saw the same understanding of the path in examples 100 and 101, where the Hitpael in sentence 104 demonstrated that no distinct path was traversed.

154 The Niphal of a motion verb is counterintuitive, since in English we think of “go” as an activity more often than a state. Nevertheless, we have the idiom, “He is gone,” which is a euphemism for, “He is dead,” which describes a state.

155 Evidence shows that this meaning of the Hitpael of hlk closely parallels the Piel of the same verb. Compare, for example, the two very similar contexts of Pss 42:10 (Piel) and 43:2 (Hitpael). According to the theory I am advocating, the Hitpael is a passive, and thus reduces emphasis on the subject. The activity is then emphasized. The Piel, in contrast, is not a passive, so the emphasis on the subject is unmarked.
4.4.3.3. Motion in Niphal with exceptional Hitpael

We see the Niphal/Hitpael distribution of the root הָלַל mlత, “flee,” sharply contrasts with הָלַק hlK, “go; walk.” The former appears 63 times in the Niphal, and only twice in the Hitpael (and never in the Qal); the latter appears once in the Niphal and 64 times in the Hitpael. Section 4.2.3 showed some of the subtle distinctions that arise from the interaction between situation and viewpoint aspects. According to normal tendencies, the Niphal is used especially often in the perfective aspect. Even when it is in the yiqtol with a future sense, the idea is perfective (e.g., Gen 19:20). This common viewpoint aspect arises from the stative situation aspect that is common to this root, with a focus on the subject already being in a “fled” state. The Hitpael focuses more on the activity of fleeing. We note this contrast in the following examples.

105. וָהוֹלֶךְ בָּהֹקְמַה יִמְמַלֵּךְ
and.walk:Qal:PTPL in.wisdom he escape:Niphal:YQTL

. . . the one who walks in wisdom, he will escape (Niphal) (Prov 28:26).

106. מִפְּיוּ וַלָּפֶּשַּׁים יָהַלְוַק קִדּוֹדֶה יֵיטָמַלַּתוּ
from.mouth.his firebrands go:Qal:YQTL like.sparks fire escape:Hitpael:YQTL

From his mouth firebrands go out, sparks of fire escape (Hitpael) (Job 41:11).

The Niphal example points to a particular outcome. It talks about the result of walking in wisdom, which is to escape (though what he or she escapes from is not mentioned). While the Hitpael is common to the wisdom genre to describe how one should act in general, the Niphal in this example presents the outcome of “walking in wisdom.” One traverses a path to safety. In contrast, the Hitpael in the second example, number 106, depicts the unusual image of sparks “escaping.” No specific path is implied. (Where would they go?) The image does not offer a “state” of having escaped that results from the escaping activity, and, hence, no specific endpoint.
These examples do not exactly follow the types of transitions that occur among the stative intransitives, but further analysis demonstrates how the root can be understood as a transition. Above, in section 3.6, I stated that the distinction between the Niphal and the Hitpael can be based on the situation aspect of “transition,” made up of a state and an activity, of which the Niphal represents the former and the Hitpael the latter. If \( x \) is a state, a transition represents beginning at \( \neg x \), undergoing an activity, and becoming \( x \). Such a transition is not intuitive in English for \textit{flee}. This is because \textit{flee} in English is an activity and does not have a clear end point; it only includes “leaving” and not “arriving” anywhere. As a result, the phrase \textit{the fled criminal} is ungrammatical. However, \textit{escape} assumes a final state: safety. Thus we are allowed to say \textit{the escaped criminal}. This BH root, therefore, resembles the English \textit{escape} more than \textit{fled}, and hence my translation.

We see that the Hitpael can also cover the meaning normally expressed by the Niphal.

\textbf{107.} \begin{align*}
\text{bə̀řî} & \text{ úbīšārî} \hspace{0.5em} \text{dābqāh} \hspace{0.5em} \text{cāsmī} \hspace{0.5em} \text{wā̲pētmallā́h} \hspace{0.5em} \text{bə̀ř} \\
\text{to-skin.of} \hspace{0.5em} \text{in-skin-my} \hspace{0.5em} \text{and-in-flesh-my} \hspace{0.5em} \text{cling} \hspace{0.5em} \text{bone-my} \hspace{0.5em} \text{and-escape:Hitpael:YQTL} \\
\text{śinnā́y} & \hspace{0.5em} \text{teeth.my} \\
\end{align*}

To my skin and to my flesh my bone clinged; and I \textit{escaped} (Hitpael) with the skin of my teeth (Job 19:20)

This Hitpael presents a problem for my theory. The situation does not seem to refer to Job in the process of escaping like the Hitpael in example 106. It is possible that the verb focuses on the activity of escaping rather than the end point, but the context does not suggest why this would be the case. Job is speaking from a point where he has already escaped, and he describes the state he is in as one where he still has “the skin of his teeth.” Perhaps Job is using the Hitpael in a metaphorical sense. As he finds himself repulsive to family, friends, and strangers, he has been
“escaping,” but since they still hate him, he has not reached a point of safety yet. Such a
metaphorical sense, though, is impossible to determine with a single occurrence.\textsuperscript{156}

Another motion verb that appears most often in the Niphal is the root הָנָה ngš, “approach.” One particularly difficult trait of this verb is that the initial n of the root makes the
verb indistinguishable from the Qal in the prefixing forms (yiqtol and wayyiqtol). HALOT thus
indicates that the Niphal is only used for Qal qatal and participle forms; similarly, the Qal is not
expressed in the qatal or participle forms. One could parse many of the prefixing forms of the
Qal as Niphals, but this is not the standard interpretation. The only unambiguous Qals are
infinitives and imperatives. For this reason I will stay with unambiguous, suffixing forms of the
Niphal for this analysis.

Here is a clear example of the usage of this verb in the Niphal.

\begin{verbatim}
108. wūhinneḥ nāḇî̂ ʾeḥād niGGaš niGGaš niGGaš niGGaš                 ēl-ʿaḤ̄aḇ me|lek-yiSrāʿ ēl wayyōʿ mer . . .
        and-behold prophet one approach:Niphal:QTL to-Ahab  king.of-Israel  and-said . . .
        And behold, a prophet approached (Niphal) Ahab, king of Israel, and said . . . (1 Kgs 20:13).
\end{verbatim}

This verb follows a similar pattern to the previous verb, חָלֹת mlḥ, “flee,” in that it implies a
concrete endpoint to the path. The prophet walked up to the king and at that point began talking.

Other examples are not as clear, however.

\begin{verbatim}
109. wəniggaš mōšeḥ lōḥaddō ʾel-yhwh wəhēm lṓ yiggāšū
        and-approach:Niphal:QTL Moses alone  to-yhwh and-they not approach:Qal:YQTL
        And Moses alone will approach (Niphal) Yhwh, and they will not approach (Qal)
        (Exod 24:2).
\end{verbatim}

Immediately one notes the semantic identity between the Qal and Niphal. The difficult trait of
this root is apparent here. The other question this raises is whether the path ends at Yhwh

\textsuperscript{156} One should note that one only finds this root in the Niphal in Sira (16:3; 36:1).
himself. This verse paints an odd picture of Moses coming right up to the edge of Yhwh.

However, since this verb is used when interlocutors approach one another for the sake of speaking, then perhaps this would be a natural way of expressing Moses’ motion towards Yhwh before the latter spoke.

In a way further reminiscent of the previous verb, נמל, “flee,” an odd Hitpael of נגש appears.

A couple of points are notable here. First, no endpoint seems to be implied, but simply the motion forward. While the endpoint in example 109 was not so clear, the endpoint in this Hitpael example is even less clear. Perhaps in the present example, Yhwh is also understood to be the endpoint. Nevertheless, even if Yhwh is the implied endpoint, this fact is not stressed by the context. Second, this Hitpael follows a Niphal of the verb קבש, “gather.” The order of events appears to be that the nations are to gather together and then begin to approach. It is possible that HALOT interpreted the situation in this way when they translated this verb as, “to get moving.” In this way, the Hitpael refers to an inceptive action.

The above motion verbs use the Niphal and Hitpael for different effects. Verbs that normally imply a distinct endpoint of the path employ the Niphal most often. Even in the verb הלך, “walk,” in the previous section, used a Niphal to express a specific endpoint in an exceptional context. Hitpaels are used in exceptional circumstances. With the first of the verbs in this section, מל, “flee,” the Hitpael is used twice: once in an idiomatic sense (example
(example 107). The second example, though, might be a figurative sense of “escape,” meaning, “live through.” With the second verb of this section, מָשַׁ וָגוּ, “approach,” the verb normally appears in the Niphal in the QTL and participle, while the prefixing forms are disputable. In the clear Niphal forms, an endpoint is clearly indicated in most cases. One case of a Hitpael of this root exists. This example appears to emphasize the motion towards an indistinct point, that is, the movement activity, rather than arriving at the endpoint. The Niphal in the cases in this section refers to an endpoint, rather than a state per se, though the Hitpael appears to emphasize an activity or path.

4.4.3.4. Interaction between situation and viewpoint aspect

In the following example, we see that the Niphal yiqtol can be used to express an iterative state.

111. יָלַקְדָה הַלֹּהֵם יִמְמָלְלָה יִמְמֶנְנָה וָעֶהֹטָה יִלְלַקְדָה בָּהָה
toh lipnè håëlônîm yimmâlî yimmâmâ wâhôtâ yillâked bâh
good to.face the.god escape:Niphal:YQTL from.her and.sinner

The good before God escape (Niphal), but the sinner is captured (Niphal) by her (Qoh 7:26).

This instance of the Niphal is difficult to analyze in the system I propose. The yiqtol represents an imperfective aspect, and the Niphal refers to the culminating state. On the surface, the verb refers to the activity the subject is performing, whether it is “escaping” or “being captured.” The activity occurs habitually, that is, sinners tend to get trapped, and good people tend to escape. Based on this understanding, one might expect a Hitpael instead of this Niphal, since the subject
does not end up in a particular state. Moreover, in this sort of wisdom genre, the Hitpael usually expresses the conduct of a person.

BH may use the Niphal *yiqtol* if a given individual will go through a transition to a culminating state, and the process repeats with the next individual, that is, an iterative sense. This verse presents a general rule that applies to many individuals. The following verb that expresses the alternative, being captured, is similarly in the Niphal *yiqtol*. A Hitpael in this context would refer to the activity of fleeing, without the culminating sense in its purview. Since the context focuses on where each type of individual will end up, the Hitpael would not be appropriate.

Examples 103 and 104 also offered a contrast between situation and viewpoint aspect. One might predict that an activity of situation aspect, since it does not culminate in a new state, should correlate with the imperfective of viewpoint aspect, which focuses on an action that is not completed within the purview of the expression. Significantly, the present Hitpael verb (*activity aspect*) is in the *wayyiqtol*. The result is a perfective understanding of the wandering to and fro, that is, an activity that ends, but not in a state. The activity is viewed in its entirety. So while we often see a correspondence between the Hitpael and the imperfective, activity situation aspect and imperfective viewpoint aspect to not always correlate.

---

157 This type of “gnomic” Niphal occurs often in legal literature. See, for example, the common Niphal verb לְכָּל, “eat,” that occurs 11 times in Leviticus 6-7. See above, note 37. They refer to what one is allowed to eat or not eat. In this way, the author is expressing several “eating” events, where the Pat ends up in an “eaten” state each time. The other option is to interpret these Niphal *yiqtols* of מִהל כָּל as future one-time events. In that case, the same analysis as in example 105 would apply.

158 This loose correlation between situation and viewpoint aspect differs some from Russian. In Russian, the stative passive must appear in the perfective aspect, while the process passive may occur in the imperfective or perfective.
4.4.4. Lexical middle

4.4.4.1. “Bow down”

“Self-move” as used by Grüneberg refers to actions performed by a subject on its own body (Grüneberg 2003:48-50). Among the roots in the category, “self-move,” each root appears in either the Niphal or a t-form exclusively, except two roots: one Hitpolel of נבהת $mwt$ occurs alongside 22 Niphal examples, and the root $w$ $w$ $w$ $w$ $t$, “distorted; bowed down,” includes four Niphals and one Hitpael. I consider them the same root because of their close phonological and semantic proximity.

112. na`awêti šahôti ʿad-maṣōḏ kol-hayyôm qōḏēr hillāḵti
bend:Niphal:QTL until-very all-the.day gloomy walk.Hitpael:QTL
I am bent (Niphal), I am bowed very much, all the day I walk gloomy (Ps 38:7).

113. bayyôm šeyyāzûľ šōmrē habbâyiṯ $w$ $w$ $w$ $w$ $t$ ṣanšē heḥâyišt
in.the.day that.trembled watchers house and.bend:Hitpael:QTL men the.strength
ùbāštľ haṭṭōhănōt
and.stop the.grinders:FEM

On the day that the guards of the house tremble, and the men of strength bend over (Hitpael), and the women who grind are idle when they have become few (Qoh 12:3).

The contexts of sentences 112 and 113 do not clearly distinguish the difference in meaning between the two stems. Both contexts describe a depressed feeling. In the former verse, the

---

159 I have assigned the following roots to this group: $n wd$, “shake,” $m wt$, “moved,” $w wh t$, “distorted; bowed down,” $g s$, “shake around,” $pl s$, “shudder,” $h w h$, “bow down,” $h y l$, “writhes,” $r s$, “trembled,” and $hw z$, “crooked.”

160 BDB places these two roots under separate entries, though they seem to bear the same meaning in this pair of verses.
speaker is depressed because of the burden of his iniquities (Ps 38:5); in the latter, the speaker is describing the “days of evil.” Moreover, both verbs are *qatals*.

It is possible that the Niphal and Hitpael distinguish between higher and lower agency in these contexts, respectively. Perhaps the Niphal implies an Agent more strongly than the Hitpael does, and so Ps 38:7 emphasizes that it is an outside force—his iniquities—that make him bow. The Hitpael in Qoh 12:3, then, does not emphasize an outside Agent, and so the strong men’s position is an action that is another symptom of the “evil day.” These entities involved in the bending situation would perhaps better be referred to as Causes, though, rather than Agents, since they do not directly make the person bent over.

These examples do not offer clear cases of state and activity, but when I apply my theory to them, we can see a distinction that the author is potentially conveying. While agency may have played a role in what stem the author used in the two examples, the author used situation aspect to depict bending over as a state or an activity. The first example depicts the speaker in a state of being bent over. While he was bowed over, he walked around. In the second, we can say that the strong men did not hunch over and stay so, but continued in the activity of bending, either individually or as a group. We imagine guards trembling, then cowering over in fear or shame, until the next time they hear a noise and tremble and cower. The Hitpael conveys that in those bad days, this is the common activity in which the guards engage.\(^{161}\)

This pair of examples demonstrates a context that does not force the author to use one verb stem or another. Occasionally it appears that the author has a choice which verb stem to

---

\(^{161}\) A similar situation obtains in the pair כָּנַכָּה דַּלָּל (Niphal) and כָּנַכָּה גֶּפֶן (Hitpael), which both mean “tremble,” in Jer 50:46 and Ps 18:8, respectively. Both contexts describe the trembling of the ground, the first because Babylon is captured, the second because Yhwh is angry. Since the latter also has a Qal of כָּנַכָּה גֶּפֶן, the author conveys the possibility that the ground is the Agent of its own trembling.
use, whether the Niphal or Hitpael. When he picks one, I claim that the choice expresses his view of the event, which will color the depiction of the entire scene. He could have switched where he placed the Niphal and Hitpael in these two examples. The first scene would have depicted an individual who had been bending over often because of his iniquities. The second would have placed the strong men in a continuous bent-over state. In these two examples, the scene does not overly determine what verb stem must be used. As a result, we can hypothesize how the choice of verb stem influences the author’s depiction of the scene.

4.4.4.2. **Idiomatic Niphal (“fight”)**

Several roots with meanings related to “fight” occur most often in the Niphal to convey a direct active sense. Three of these roots are המלחמה *lhm*, “fight, go to war”; מנהלאפ *nsh*, “struggle”; and מלחם *ptl*, “wrestle.”\(^{162}\) None of them appears in the Hitpael in BH with the sense “fight.”\(^{163}\) Moreover, they all appear to describe activities.

The most common of these verbs is המלחמה *lhm*, “go to war.” Often this verb can be understood as “go out to war,” conceived of as a path with “war” at its endpoint.

\(^{162}\) The root המלחמה *lhm*, “go to war,” is the root with the most number of Niphal occurrences in the HB, 167 occurrences.

\(^{163}\) The root המלחמה *lhm*, “go to war,” appears very rarely in the Qal (3 times, vs. 165 times in the Niphal), exclusively in the Psalms. A homonym of the root (“eat”) can appear in the Qal. The root מנהלאפ *nsh*, “struggle,” occurs three times in the Hiphil, twice in Num 26:9 with a causative sense (“agitate”) and once in Ps 60:2 with a sense identical to the Niphal. A homonym—or distant relative—of the root מלחם *ptl* (“twist”) occurs in the Hitpael.
114. kî-tiqrê’nâh milḥâmâh wônsâp gam-hû ʿal ʿal-Söºn´ênû
for-happen war and-join:Niphal also-he over-enemies-our

wônilḥam -bânû woʾälâh min-hâʾâreš
and-fight:Niphal:WQTL-in-us and-go.up from-the-earth

For war may occur, and indeed they might join (Niphal) our enemies and make war (Niphal) with us and rise up from the ground (Exod 1:10).

In this context, Pharaoh expresses his concern that the Israelites might come out against him to make war. This action sounds like a campaign that includes going and fighting. Some cases of this verb, therefore, are translated, “go out to war (against).” The Niphal is a natural stem for these cases because the action is conceived of as a path with an endpoint, at which point the fight takes place. The action assumes the whole path is traversed.

Many other cases of this verb in the Niphal, however, translate most naturally as “make war,” which sounds more inceptive or activity-related, rather than the end of a path. Let us examine the following example.

115. wayyābôʾû wayyaḥānû yaḥdâw ʿel-mê mērôm lōhîllāḥēm ʿim-yišrāʾêl
and-came and-camped together to-waters.of Merom to-fight:Niphal:INFC with-Israel
And they came and camped together at the waters of Merom to make war (Niphal) with Israel (Josh 11:5).

The context describes the reaction of the kings to Joshua and the Israelites’ defeat of the Canaanite coalition at the waters of Memrom. Fighting and war are the reason behind the “coming” and “camping” of those kings. The paths are traversed before the “fight” verb is engaged. As a result, the verb in question appears to refer to an inceptive activity, that is, the kings want to begin to fight. In this way, the Niphal covers semantic territory normally encompassed by the Hitpael.
The next verb, נָשָׁה nəš̄a, “struggle,” occurs most often in the Niphal (5 times).\textsuperscript{164} It also occurs three times in the Hiphil, meaning, “agitate” (twice in Num 26:9) or “fight” (Ps 60:1). Its single occurrence in the Qal (Jer 4:7) may come from a homonymous root meaning, “pull down, break.”\textsuperscript{165} It never occurs in the Hitpael. Here is an example of the Niphal.

116. \textbf{wayyinnasū} 
\begin{verbatim}
šənêhem baśṣāḏeh wə̂n maṣṣîl
and-struggle:Niphal:WAYY two-them in-the-field and-there.is.not savior
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
bēnêhem wayyakkō hāʾehāḏ ’et-hāʾehāḏ wayyāmeṯ ṭōto
between-them and-struck-him the-one ACC-the-other and-killed ACC-him
\end{verbatim}

And the two of them struggled (Niphal) in the field, and there was no one to save them, and the one struck the other and killed him (2 Sam 14:6).

This appears to represent a typical Niphal situation, where the struggle has ended. The narrator describes the end of the “path” of the struggle, which resulted in the final death blow. Thus we can see a natural use of the Niphal in this case.

In the other four cases of the Niphal of this root, however, it is more difficult to conceive of them as typical Niphal situations. They appear to present a struggle in progress, without a clear endpoint in sight. Here is an example.

117. \textbf{wayyinnasū} 
\begin{verbatim}
baṃmaḥāneh ben hayyiśrōʾēlīt wə̂is
and-struggle:Niphal:WAYY in-the-camp son.of the-Israelite.FEM and-man
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
hayyiśrōʾēlī
the-Israelite
\end{verbatim}

And in the camp the son of the Israelite woman and a certain Israelite struggled (Niphal) (Lev 24:10)

\textsuperscript{164} The root shares its form with a homonym that occurs five times meaning, “burn, destroy,” similar to יָשָׁה yəša “burn, kindle.”

\textsuperscript{165} Perhaps this instance is related to the root נָשָׁה nəš̄a “be destroyed,” with an unusual assimilation of the nun.
The following verse describes how the Israelite woman’s son blasphemed during the fight. Thus the struggle is an event in the background of the more significant crime on behalf of the one man. The end of the struggle is not in view. Along the “path” of the struggle, a blasphemy occurred. Such a case would often employ a Hitpael, so here the Niphal covers some more common Hitpael territory.

Finally, we have the root הָלַט הָלַט הָלַט הָלַט, “twist, wrestle.” The root occurs four times in the Niphal, but only once with the meaning, “wrestle.”

118. נָפַעְתָּל עֵלֶה נָפַעְתָּל נָפַעְתָּל נָפַעְתָּל נָפַעְתָּל מֵאָה-לוֹתִי גָּמְ-יָּאָּכֹלְתִי
wrestle.of God wrestle:Niphal:QTL with-sister-my also-prevailed
I have wrestled (Niphal) great wrestlings with my sister, and indeed I prevailed (Gen 30:8).

This example appears to be a more natural Niphal situation, namely, it focuses on the endpoint of the action. Rachel looks back on her competition with her sister and sees she has won the match. Since the endpoint is in view, the Niphal is a natural stem for this expression.

The tendency of “fight” verbs towards the Niphal for their active sense is puzzling. The first issue is the exclusion of the Hitpael among these roots. Lexical exclusion could have caused this phenomenon. In other words, these roots, either as individual roots or as a semantic class, excluded the Hitpael as a possibility for idiosyncratic reasons. A related possibility is that the situation inherent to these roots excluded the Hitpael as a possibility for semantic reasons. It is also possible that the roots could have appeared in the Hitpael, but we simply do not find these Hitpaels in the HB corpus. This last reason is least likely, especially in the case of לָחָם, “fight, go to war.” That root appears so many times that an accidental lack of Hitpael is improbable. We are left with the first option, lexical exclusion.
Later stages of the language demonstrate a shift in the use of the Hitpael of these roots. This may imply that the roots were always capable of appearing in this stem, but did not, or may show that a paradigmatic shift in the use of the Hitpael occurred. In RH the meaning “battle” for לָחָם $lh_m$ appears in the Niphal, just like in BH. The Hitpael of this root—which never appears in BH—means “contest, dispute,” according to Jastrow (703-4). This latter meaning is normally covered by the root נֶצב $ykh$ in BH in the Hitpael. Later stages of the language appear to allow the Hitpael to cover its more “native” territory in לָחָם $lh_m$. Similarly, נֶצה $n$h appears in the Niphal and Hitpael in RH with the same meaning as the Niphal in BH, according to Jastrow (928). In contrast, חָלֶת $pt$ never appears in RH—either in the Niphal or Hitpael—with the meaning “wrestle,” but only “pervert, twist,” according to Jastrow (1254-55).

This diachronic development likely indicates one of two things. One possibility is that the root changed in its use of stems. Formerly lexically Niphal, the lexical entry of these roots changed to allow Hitpaels. The other possibility is that these verbs always contained potential Hitpaels in BH, but never realized them until RH. The latter option seems less feasible with the first verb, לָחָם $lh_m$, “fight, go to war,” however, considering the large number of Niphals. It seems highly unlikely that among 167 examples, a context never arose that would suggest the use of a Hitpael. Perhaps external influences caused the root to change. A broader change was likely occurring, however, since נֶצה $n$h, “struggle,” also underwent this change. So either the use of the Hitpael changed or the situation of this semantic category. Below, in Chapter 5, I will look more into the diachronic development of the Hitpael.

166 Such influences could be exemplified by the Mesha’ stele, lines 11, 19, and 32, where this root with this meaning appears with ת infix before the second radical.
4.4.4.3. Speech

Only two exceptional roots among all the speech roots have Niphal and Hitpael forms, רמא and נב "say, boast," and נב "prophesy." "Say" only has two occurrences of the Hitpael, whose meanings are unclear. In contrast, "prophecy" is well-represented in both stems: 86 Niphals and 28 Hitpaels. Because the latter is better represented in both stems and bears a consistent meaning in both stems, I will examine it here.

"Prophesy" demonstrates tendencies we would expect when contrasting the Niphal and the Hitpael.

The first example, the Hitpael, describes what the prophets were doing, that is, the activity that they were performing. The event stresses the ongoing activity, without emphasizing an endpoint.

In contrast, the second example describes with a Niphal the specific content of the prophesying event. Obtaining the content of the prophecy implies that the prophetic event has reached its endpoint.

The structure of נב allows the event to unfold upon the Experiencer, not the information. On the semantic level, the subject of the verb is not the spoken word but the
prophet. Moreover, in the Niphal and the Hitpael the verb can take an object. Since we never see the verb outside of the Niphal or Hitpael, I will take the basic event structure from those stems.

Situation aspect is expressed differently with this verb than with others we have seen, although the divergences relate in clear ways to previously observed patterns. The event structure of \( \text{deliver} \) consists of an action by a prophet, the Experiencer, that culminates in the prophetic word, the Theme, being spoken. Situation aspect applies not to the spoken word but to the subject—the prophet—and whether the Experiencer has reached the culminating point of the action or not. As we saw in the previous example (119), BH can use a participle to describe whether the prophet is performing prophetic actions culminating in a spoken word, or whether he or she has already completed the prophetic task of uttering the word. Uttering the word correlates to the activity expressed by the Hitpael, and *having* uttered the word to the culminating state, expressed by the Niphal.

These two examples stand out because they demonstrate this contrast with participles. BH, like Ancient Greek and English, allows passive participles to be used attributively. With the Niphal/Hitpael contrast, one can tell if the subject noun is in that state or is in the process of reaching that state. Ancient Greek allows this distinction also, with various tenses and aspects of

167 The verb bears an object in 1 Kgs 22:8/2 Chr 18:7 (Hitpael); 1 Kgs 22:18/2 Chr 18:17 (Hitpael); Jer 20:1 (Niphal); 23:25 (Niphal); Jer 23:26 (Niphal), 32 (Niphal); 25:13 (Niphal), 30 (Niphal); 26:12 (Niphal); 27:10 (Niphal), 14 (Niphal); 29:21 (Niphal). In cases where the verb does not have a noun phrase object, the verb may be followed by a quotation, i.e., information. This is similar to English “know,” which can take a noun as the object (*I know the solution.*) or information (*I know [that] you want the solution.*).

168 On the semantic level the subject of this verb functions like \( \text{deliver} \), “consider, perceive,” as we saw above (in the section 4.2.2.2.2). Furthermore, both verbs make use of the Niphal/Hitpael contrast extensively. The two verbs differ, however, as \( \text{deliver} \) does not show the even distribution between stems (86 Niphals vs. 28 Hitpaels) that \( \text{deliver} \) does (22 Niphal and 22 Hitpael). Both stems of \( \text{deliver} \) occur often in the participial form, for example.
the passive or middle participle. English does not allow one to distinguish between stative and activity passives with a participle, though. English attributive passive participles can only depict the culminating state, and an activity passive cannot be expressed with a participle. So the situation aspect of BH helps situate the BH passive participle typologically.

Occasionally we find Niphals among roots of “speech” verbs that appear to refer to activities of middle situation types.

120. **wattērāgnû** ḏē’ohōlēkem wattō’mōrû bōšin’at yhwh ṭōţānû
and.complain:Niphal:WAYY in.tents.your and.say by.hate yhwh us

hōśi’tānû mē’ēres mišrāyim
bring.out.us from.land.of Egypt

And you *complained* (Niphal) in your tents and said, “Because Yhwh hates us he brought us out of the land of Egypt” (Deut 1:27).

121. **gam yāšḥû šārim bī niḏbārû** ʾābdɔkā yāśī’h bōhuqqeq’kā
even sit princes in.me speak:Niphal:QTL servant.your muse in.statutes.your

Even when princes sit (and) *speak* (Niphal) against me, your servant muses on your statutes (Ps 119:23).

In these two cases, the verbs refer to middle situations, from the category of “speech action” (Grüneberg 2003:55). The actions described in the two verses are activities of negative speech, “complain” and “speak against.” As a result, we would expect to find Hitpaels in these contexts. Moreover, the first root, יָרָט rgn, “complain,” only appears in the Niphal—never in the Hitpael—and the second, דָּבָר dbr, “speak,” only appears in the Hitpael three times, and never with this negative connotation. I have not yet mentioned צָתַב sbc, “swear,” which appears in the Niphal

---

169 See discussion above, Chapter 3.

170 All three examples demonstrate an assimilated /t/, which makes the Niphal and Hitpael look very similar.
154 times and never in the Hitpael, or וָּנָה, “groan,” which appears 13 times, and only in the Niphal.

My theory is not able to explain these verbs. They all represent speech middle verbs in an activity aspect, and they only appear in the Niphal, and never in the Hitpael. I would expect them to appear in the Hitpael because these lexical middle verbs often appear in the Hitpael, especially when they refer to activities. The language may assign this category of verbs, “middle speech,” to the Niphal idiosyncratically. This phenomenon thus demonstrates the importance of the lexicon in determining the stem used by a root.

4.4.4.4. “Fall”

This subcategory is related to motion and self-move verbs. They all involve movement on the speaker’s part, and often the movement is performed on himself or herself, or sometimes involves a separate Agent, unlike self-move verbs. I have included שָׁמַת, נָפַל, “fall”; דֶּחָה, “thrust down”; דָּל, נָפָה (نشاط), שִׁחֲחוֹן, שִׁמַּחְשָׁרוֹן, שִׁמַּחְשָׁרוֹן, šhh (šyḥ), “brought low”; מַקִּיח, נָחָה, נָחַת, “sink”; קָשֵׁל, “stumble; felled”; רֶל, “reel”; and חֵמִיך, הָמִיק, “waver.” All of these roots appear in either the Niphal or Hitpael, but none appears in both. Unfortunately for our purposes, many of the examples are problematic, such as cases where the Qal and Niphal are not

---

171 BDB does not recognize the root in parentheses. BibleWorks 5 analyzes the Hitpolel as coming from the latter root. Interestingly, the yod never appears in any of the forms. Occasionally, though, the root acts like a hollow rather than a root with the second root letter doubled. The verbs bear the same meaning, so the roots should be seen as variants of each other. A result of this analysis is the problem of separating the Qal and the Niphal in prefixed forms. This root can only be understood as an unambiguous Qal when it acts like a hollow, and an unambiguous Niphal only in the suffixed forms. When it appears as a R2=R3 in prefixed forms, it is impossible to distinguish the Niphal from the Qal since R2, a guttural, cannot be doubled (e.g., Isa 29:4).
distinct, or the root is confused with another, or only a single example exists in the Niphal or Hitpael. These idiosyncrasies limit our analysis of this group.

The most common root is כִּישׁל kšl, “stumble; fell (trans.),” with many clear Niphal examples, though it presents its own problems. When one compares the Niphal with the Qal, one finds that the Niphal never appears in the qatal.\(^\text{172}\) In contrast, the Qal never appears in the yiqtol or any prefixing forms.\(^\text{173}\) This distribution differs significantly from what we have seen where the Niphal gravitates to the qatal and wayyiqtol. The following example presents a difficult problem for understanding why one verb form is chosen over another.

\(^{122}\) wəyisərāṯēl wəておくrāyim yikkāšlû baḵāwônēm kāšal gam-yəwəḏāh

\(\)and. Israel and Ephraim fall:Niphal:YQTL in.iniquity.their fall:Qal:QTL also-Judah

\(\)with.them

\(\)and Israel and Ephraim fall (Niphal) in their iniquity, Judah, too, has fallen (Qal) with them (Hos 5:5).\(^\text{174}\)

This verse will require further study beyond the present work with respect to the distinction between the Qal and the Niphal.\(^\text{175}\)

---

\(^\text{172}\) The only suffixing forms are the weqatal with a non-perfective sense in Dan 11:14, 19, 33.

\(^\text{173}\) One Qal yiqtol appears in Prov 4:16 Ketiv, but the Qere, Peshitta, Targum, and Vulgate read this as a Hiphil.

\(^\text{174}\) The first problem is how to interpret the tenses of the two verbs. With the first כִּישׁל kšl verb in an imperfective, one would translate it either as a present (as I have) or a future (with LXX), with an imperfective meaning. The second כִּישׁל kšl verb is in the perfect or perfective, and in the latter case can be translated in the past or future. Thus it seems to be either that these actions are understood as occurring before the pride has answered or after. The context (5:3-4) implies that Israel has already acted immorally, so I have chosen not to interpret the verbs in the future. The resulting image is Israel and Ephraim tripping and falling along, and Judah has done likewise at least once.

\(^\text{175}\) Another place for potential overlap is in the participles, for both the Qal and Niphal appear in participles of this root. Furthermore, some contrast is demonstrated between the finite forms of the Qal and Niphal in Jer 6:15, 21 and Hos 14:2, 10.
This subcategory proves to be especially problematic. No contrasts exist between the Niphal and Hitpael, the principal focus of our study. Moreover, the Niphal and Hitpael examples are too infrequent to develop an analysis of their patterns, and some would-be Niphal examples can also be construed as Qals. Finally, the most common Niphal root, נחש, “stumble; fell (trans.),” presents particular problems of distribution between the Qal and Niphal, which stymie efforts at analysis. This contrast between the Qal and Niphal requires further analysis that goes beyond the scope of this work.

4.4.4.5. Impersonal Niphal

4.4.4.5.1. “Storm”

The standard passivization model faces another problem when it confronts impersonal events. The verb may not have any arguments in its basic semantic structure. An impersonal semantic structure of the event does not have an Agent or Cause to demote, like other basic intransitives, and it may not have a Patient to promote, either. Whatever the S, it must have reduced agency. BH deals with this situation inconsistently, as we find three ways that the BH verbal system deals with impersonal events in the following three roots. Two of the roots deal with weather, יסח s’shr, “storm,” and מטר mtr, “rain.” Another root means “occur,” and is the Niphal of the root ייחוד hyh, “be.”

The first of the above roots, יסח s’shr, “storm,” uses a Niphal to express an impersonal expression.\(^{176}\) We find such an example in the following verse.

---

\(^{176}\) The single Hitpael occurrence, Dan 11:40, follows its common meaning of “act like.”
123. yáḇô ʿēlōhěnû wqʾal-yehěraš ʿēš-lopānāyw tôʾkēl úsōbīḥāyw  nišʿārāh
come god.our and.not-silent fire-to.face.his eats and.around.him storm:Niphal:QTL

mäʾōd
very

Our God comes and will does not keep silent. A fire devours before him, and around
him it is very stormy (Niphal) (Ps 50:3).

No Agent is present in the event. The expression parallels the English, “It became stormy.” The
expletive “it” in the English does not represent a semantic entity, and only functions as a place-
holder. Rather than an expletive pronoun, BH uses the Niphal with a third person feminine
singular ending for the verb. The Niphal in this case does not have an explicit subject; the
subject is null.177 Moreover, the Niphal here presents the event as the state of having become
stormy.178

4.4.4.5.2. “Rain”

The related stem, nṯr, “rain,” expresses the Patient by means of the Niphal, even
though the semantic structure of “rain” would not include a Patient. The simple event of raining
does not include any semantic roles, so it is difficult to understand what a passive of this verb
could mean. “Rain” is often expressed as an impersonal verb in Indo-European languages with
no semantic roles (e.g., English, German, French), though the expression is in the active voice

177 Such an impersonal expression could relate to the Niphal passives where the Pat is marked with 岬 ʿāt, a common direct object marker. Migsch claims that these impersonal passives with the object marker should be interpreted as passive, and not as an impersonal active (Migsch 2000). The Pual is a true passive. Its one occurrence means, “storm-tossed” (Isa 54:11).

178 The null subject reading comes from the majority reading of this verse (e.g., NRSV “a mighty tempest”; NJPS “it stormed”; LXX “(there is) a storm”; BDB “it is tempestuous”). This verse, however, could be read without the null subject, if one reads the 3fs subject as the fire. In this case, one would translate, “It [the fire] has become very stormy.” The Niphal would indicate that the fire had made a transition into the state of becoming stormy. This reading is similar to NAB (“[fire] storming round about”).
with a “dummy” subject (e.g., “it,” “es,” “il,” respectively). This root in BH does not appear in the Qal, but only in the Hiphil and the Niphal. In the Hiphil the verb most often means “make rain,” and Yhwh is usually the subject.\(^{179}\)

> Although the Hiphil only expresses the single semantic role of Cause, the passive verb appears to express a Patient as the subject. Here is the single Niphal occurrence of this verb.

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\text{124.} & h\ell\ql\h^h & 2\text{ha} & t\text{imn} & \text{mas} & t\text{er} \\
& w\h&h\ell\ql\h^h & 2\overset{\text{a} & \text{sh} & \text{et}}\text{i} & -\text{l} & -\text{t} & \text{am} & t\text{ir} \\
& c\overset{\text{a} & \text{le} & y} & h & t\text{i} & b\text{a}s \\
& \text{field} & \text{one} & \text{rain:Niphal:YQTL} & \text{and.field} & \text{which-not-rain:Hiphil:YQTL} & \text{on.it} & \text{dry} \\
& \text{One field} & \text{would be rained on (Niphal), and the field that it would not rain on (Hiphil), would be dry (Amos 4:7).} \\
\end{array}
\]

The Niphal here has a Patient as its subject, though Patient is not among the lexical semantic roles. Nevertheless, when BH wants to make the Patient of such an event the subject of the verb, it uses the passive, in this case, a Niphal. So the field, as the Patient in this example, is considered to be in the state of being rained on.

This same verse presents another impersonal verb, like in example 123, but in the Hiphil. The next verb in the sequence after the Niphal we looked at is הָרָגִים tamtir, “it will rain,” with the same root in the Hiphil. While the context offers a potential cause for this rain event, Yhwh, syntactically Yhwh cannot be the subject; the verb’s third person feminine singular agreement cannot agree with “Yhwh.” So Yhwh is not likely the subject. Instead, the third person feminine singular resembles the impersonal we saw in the impersonal Niphal of סַר s'ir, “storm,” above. The verb more likely has an impersonal subject, expressed as a third person feminine singular.

This impersonal active verb is also able to express a Patient, though the Patient is grammatically shaped as an adjunct and not as a complement. After the Hiphil verb we find the

\(^{179}\) Another root for “rain,” גָמ gšm, appears once as a verb, and that verb is in the Hiphil with gods (other than Yhwh) as the subject (Jer 14:22).
prepositional phrase, “upon it.” On the one hand, this could be a locative expression, to show where it would rain. On the other hand, we do not find examples of a Location or Goal as the subject of a passive in BH. The clause functions in parallel with the preceding clause, where the field is the subject of the Niphal and a Patient. Thus the semantic role of the field in this expression straddles the roles of Location and Patient, but the preceding passive impersonal expression leads me to read it as a Patient.

4.4.4.5.3. “Come to be”

Like “rain,” one would not expect “be” to passivize because it only bears a single semantic role. The root הָיָה, “be,” in the G includes a single Theme role in a stative aspect. Nevertheless, the verb appears 19 times in the Niphal. In the Niphal, הָיָה indicates that the Theme underwent a transition. While the Qal may represent a transition, the Niphal always does, namely, from non-existence into a state of existence (the existential use of “be”). Moreover, since coming into existence is perceived as instantaneous, we would correctly predict a lack of Hitpaels, since they would refer to the process of coming into being.

125. שָׁמַם וַשַׁמִּים נֵיהוּת נֵיהוּת נֵיהוּת נֵיהוּת בָּיְטָגָרָה
appalling and horrible be:Niphal:QTL in the land
An appalling and horrible (thing) has come to be (Niphal) in the land (Jer 5:30).

---

180 In English we can say, “The field was rained on,” where the field is considered the Patient. The preposition here seems to function more as a part of the verb, since the passive of the verb would be ungrammatical without it.

181 Two more occurrences of this verb, Dan 8:27 and Mic 2:4, are dubious.

182 The verb only appears in the qatal (19 times) and the weqatal (two times), and this preference for perfective further indicates the instantaneous nature of the transition.
The context of Jeremiah 5 describes the lies of the prophets and priests, which the people approve of (Jer 5:31). This deceit makes up the content of the “appalling and horrible” things that have come to be. Since these transition events have reached the culminating state of existing, the Niphal is used to indicate entering into that state.\(^{183}\)

When we see this verb in its sole occurrence with a personal subject, the subject is still a Theme that comes into existence. Usually this verb takes an inanimate, impersonal subject, but one time it occurs in the second person masculine singular with the meaning “come to be.” The object of “come to be,” that is what “you” have become, is marked with a preposition.

\(^{126}\) wayyādabber mōše\(^{h}\) wəhakkōhānîm ḫaləwiyûm ̂el kol-yišrā’ēl lō̂m mōr ḥaskēt ūšōma\(^{c}\) and.speak Moses and.the.priests the.Levites to all-Israel saying silent and.hear

yišrā’ēl hayyōm hazzeh niyyēṯā lō̂m lyhwh ̂elōhéyḵā Israel the.day the.this be:Niphal:QTL to.nation to.yhwh god.your

And Moses and the Levitical priests spoke to all Israel saying, “Be silent and listen, O Israel. Today you have come to be (Niphal) a people to Yhwh, your God” (Deut 27:9).

This personal use of this verb is enigmatic. It may be significant that the “people” phrase is grammatically not a direct object, but is introduced with a preposition. The Niphal signifies that a transition has taken place, and that the transition has resulted in the stative phase. In other words, the people did not exist at one point, but now exists, as a people belonging to Yhwh.

While the Qal more naturally indicates that the subject is in a stative phase, the Niphal emphasizes that a transition has taken place. Nevertheless, since this kind of personal use of the Niphal of this verb is so rare, it is difficult to make solid conclusions. In the end, we can see that

---

\(^{183}\) The Qal of the same verb can also mean “happen,” e.g., Exod 32:1. However, the Niphal remains distinct because it specifically refers to something that did not exist before coming into existence.
all the Niphals of היחי hyh indicate a Theme transferring into a state of being (existing) out of a state of non-being (non-existence).

4.4.5. Conclusions: Basic intransitive

Among the basic intransitive verbs we see that the situation aspect distinction holds in the Niphal and the Hitpael. I demonstrated this phenomenon within single roots, and between roots of the same semantic class, where one root appears in the Niphal and another in the Hitpael. On the occasions where the situation aspect coincided with viewpoint aspect, the different aspects functioned in a complimentary manner.

Specifically among the intransitive motion verbs, we find that this class of verbs depicts motion along a particular path or not, though the semantic role of the subject is idiosyncratic. The Niphal is used when the motion verb assumes a path that is completely traversed, and the Hitpael, no particular path. This function parallels the “maximal result” in Tagalog, as we saw there in motion verbs (section 3.6.3.2). I could not find a pattern among the subjects, however, as one assumes a Patient and others, a Mover.

Among the intransitive motion verbs with the meaning of self-movement, speech, and impersonal verbs, which are all categories among Kemmer’s middle semantic categories, the situation aspect distinction holds for the Niphal and Hitpael, though the semantic role of the subject is again idiosyncratic. We find some cases where the Niphal implies more of an Agent than the Hitpael does, which does not contradict my theory. Among impersonal verbs, the semantic role of the subject is highly idiosyncratic. Perhaps because of a paucity of roots that appear with in this impersonal passive, I could find no consistent theory to explain the assignment of semantic role to the subject.
The subject of the passives causes particular problems among these verbs. The basic stative and basic transitive verbs demonstrate reasonable consistency with their subjects, as their subjects fulfill the role of Patient or Mover consistently. In contrast, basic intransitive verbs display idiosyncrasies in how they assign a semantic role to the subject of a Niphal and Hitpael. The assignment of the semantic role to the subject is unpredictable for the most part. It could be for this reason that the Pual is so rare among these verbs. Among the verbs presented above, the latter stem only appears with the root ס/ָס s/s, “storm,” where it can be interpreted agentively (section 4.4.4.5.1).

4.5. **Summary: Niphal, Hitpael, and Situation Aspect**

This chapter presented examples of the BH Niphal and Hitpael and examined them in light of the model of passive and middle voices from Chapter 3. I divided the data into three broad categories: basic transitive (two participants), basic stative (one participant), and basic intransitive (one participant). The first group I further separated into basic Agent and basic Experiencer categories, in order to examine the salience of semantic roles on the Niphal and Hitpael.

Between the two groups of transitive verbs, basic Agent and basic Experiencer, the results were consistent. The A was always demoted, and the O nearly always promoted to S, whatever the semantic category of A. Neither stem monopolized one voice, but the Niphal most consistently expressed stative aspect, and the Hitpael, activity aspect. Nevertheless, some of the Experiencer verbs (more often than the Agent verbs) demoted the agency of the A without demoting it syntactically (see section 4.2.2.2.2). The A was thus demoted in some way in every
instance. We also saw that the Hitpolel and Hitpalpel tended to act like the Hitpael, and the Nitpael, like the Niphal.

Furthermore, the Pual appeared the majority of the time as an agentive passive. It functioned most consistently among the Agent transitives. Among the Experiencer transitive, stative, and intransitive roots, it often had to be interpreted as agentive. Additionally, the Pual enshrined some idiosyncratic meanings, sometimes exclusively as a participle. Nevertheless, the Pual could overlap with spontaneous actions, as an Agent was not always clear from the context. In those cases, an Agent could be supplied, but the context did not demand an Agent. Thus the Pual tended towards situations where two participants were assumed, from the point of view of the patient.

The two passive stems of stative roots follow similar patterns of situation aspect. Instances of statives in the passive suppose a transition unfolding on the S. Since the Hitpael represents activity aspect, the meaning “act as X,” which is unique to this stem, follows naturally. The inceptive use of the Hitpael also follows from activity aspect. The language also possesses roots that strongly or exclusively prefer one root over the other. We can thus presume that certain roots are typically viewed in the language as basically stative or basically an activity in the passive.

We saw more idiosyncrasies among basic intransitive verbs, although the verbs still followed our basic pattern. The Niphal represented stative aspect in the passive, and the Hitpael, activity aspect. Idiosyncrasies became apparent in the passivization process. Depending on the verb, the semantic role of the S was either a Patient or a Mover. At this point the role appears unpredictable. Further research is required into the semantic roles of the passive subjects of intransitive verbs. In the end, these verbs, as well as the basic transitive and basic stative verbs,
demonstrated that 1) the Niphal and Hitpael equally function as passivizing stems, and 2) the Niphal and Hitpael are distinguished by the situation aspect that each expresses.

Genre does not play a role in how the Niphal and Hitpael function. The present chapter included examples from poetry, prose, prophecy, and wisdom genres. The Niphal consistently referred to final states, and the Hitpael, ongoing activities. Nevertheless, certain genres present contexts where Niphals and Hitpael are particularly appropriate. Wisdom literature tends to describe the way that people should act, and so the Hitpael is appropriate to many contexts. At the same time, the outcome of actions in wisdom literature is expressed by the Niphal. In poetry and prose that describe simultaneous actions, the Niphal and Hitpael can be used to depict one action as ongoing and another as in its final state.

In the next chapter, I will look at how diachronic development affects the way that the Niphal and Hitpael function in BH and in later strata of the language.
CHAPTER 5. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENTS

5.1. INTRODUCTION

The function and distribution of the Niphal and Hitpael developed from the HB to Rabbinic Hebrew (RH), at least four centuries after the latest portions of the HB were written. The Niphal functions more adjectivally in RH, and the Hitpael becomes much less productive than in the HB. Furthermore, the Nitpael stem becomes much more productive, as opposed to BH, where the form appears only three times total, distributed among three roots.¹

The question arises, then, as to how and when this evolution took place. Two places stand out as the location for the stages in this evolution. First, the BH corpus, comprising the HB, inscriptions, and Sira, is generally understood to comprise multiple stages of historical development in the language.² While the Niphal and Hitpael do not typically make up the hallmarks of these stages, it is possible that these two stems underwent some sort of development. Thus I will look at roots in the various historical strata to determine what sort(s) of historical development may have taken place. Second, a later, datable corpus exists between the HB and the Mishnah, that is, the book of Ben Sira (Sira). This latter book was written during the early second century BCE (Di Lella 1992:931). Any distinct use of the Niphal and/or Hitpael in this book would provide insight into how these stems developed before reaching the RH stage of

¹ Those roots are יָשָׁר ys, “discipline, chasten,” קָפַר kpr, “cover, make propitiation,” וַעֲשֵׁה šwh, “be like, resemble.” See section 4.2.1.7.1 for discussion of the Nitpael in the HB.
² See Eskhult (2000); Polzin (1976); Sáenz-Badillos (1996); Hurvitz (1999, 2000); and the essays in Young (2003). Wesselius believes that the status of CBH in the Second Temple period to be “obscure” because of its literary nature (1999:345).
the language. Combining the results of both studies, one could establish a helpful trajectory for the Niphal and Hitpael, and understand their use in the BH corpus.

The precise limits of each historical stratum and its date are debatable, but enough texts have been established in a historical continuum for one to trace historical developments in the language. For this study, I will consider the stages Archaic Biblical Hebrew (ABH), Classical Biblical Hebrew (CBH), Exilic Biblical Hebrew (EBH), Late (Post-Exilic) Biblical Hebrew (LBH), and Sira. These four stages will help divide up the verbs for analysis.

In carrying out this study, I will approach the issue of historical development in two ways. First, I will compare the overall distribution of the Niphal and Hitpael in the HB, and compare it with the distribution in Ben Sira. More specifically, I will compare how many roots appear in the Niphal, Hitpael, and both in each corpus. Second, I will look more closely at some specific roots. The most helpful roots are those that appear in the Niphal and Hitpael in multiple stages of BH, as well as in Ben Sira. Thus I will examine "golden"  추진 l"ml, “hide”; יבר בyn, “understand, perceive”; קוב kbd, “glorious”; and קומ kkm, “be wise.” These roots appear in the Niphal and Hitpael in the most periods of BH, and they occur enough times in Ben Sira to determine with some certainty how they function at that later stage. I will also look at some roots that appear with less regularity among these stages to see if more information can be ascertained. In this way I will attempt to identify a shift in usage of the Niphal and Hitpael from BH to Ben Sira.

5.2. STATISTICAL COMPARISON

My first goal is to determine the distribution of the Niphal and Hitpael in various historical periods. Such an analysis can determine if one of these two closely related stems becomes more popular than the other, or whether one “crowds out” or replaces the other in
certain linguistic niches. Furthermore, this study can help determine whether the stems remain as productive in various historical stages.

For this experiment, I want to see how each historical period makes use of the Niphal and Hitpael options. First, I isolated those roots that appear at least once in either the Niphal or the Hitpael. Next, I sorted out these roots into three categories: 1) roots that appear in the Niphal and the Hitpael, 2) those that appear in the Niphal but not the Hitpael, and 3) those that appear in the Hitpael but not the Niphal. Then I counted how many of these roots appear in various time periods. The root need only appear in the Niphal or Hitpael to be counted in a period. For example, if a “Niphal and Hitpael” root appears in the Niphal in a period, I counted that as one “Niphal and Hitpael” root for that period.

By analyzing the data this way, we can see if one period prefers roots that favor one binyan or the other. For example, if a period demonstrates a strong showing among Niphal only verbs, then we would look into what this says about the Niphal stem in its diachronic context. Furthermore, if a period is moving away from roots that allow either stem, then the choices offered by the stem system of that period may be more limited. The following table tallies 38 total roots that occur in either the Niphal or Hitpael in ABH, 369 in CBH, 234 in EBH, 247 in LBH, 9 in the inscriptions, and 179 in Ben Sira. Of the nine roots represented by the inscriptional corpus, eight appear once in the Niphal and one in the Hitpael. I have also included a bar with all 507 roots for the entire biblical corpus, for the sake of comparison.

____________________

3 For an explanation of these historical strata see section 1.4.
4 I discussed this Hitpael above, in section 4.2.1.5.3.
Table 7. Percentage of roots in the Niphal, Hitpael, and both in five periods.

First I will look at the bottom trend line, which tracks the proportion of the roots that appear in both the Niphal and Hitpael. This trend line follows the upper boundary of the hatched portion on the chart. The biggest difference we see is between CBH and Sira, a difference of 6%. The trend that we see, however, is not statistically significant. We can thus conclude that the distribution of roots that occur in both the Niphal and Hitpael does not change significantly over time.  

Second I will look at the upper trend line, between the groups of roots that only appear in the Niphal (black) or the Hitpael (white), but not both. The trend of the “Niphal no Hitpael” category rises gradually from ABH to CBH, and reaches its climax at EBH. Subsequently, the

---

5 I would like to thank Doug Hemken, statistical computing specialist, for his assistance with statistics (p.c.).
trend moves downwards from EBH to LBH to Ben Sira. The low of Ben Sira, however, is higher than ABH. The “Hitpael no Niphal” category follows the same curve, but inversed. There are two significant levels. The high points for the use of Hitpael only roots are ABH and Sira, and CBH, EBH, and LBH are the highest point for “Niphal only.” Without the ABH and Sira points, the change from CBH to EBH to LBH is not statistically significant.\(^6\)

Multiple interpretations of these phenomena are possible. We may look at the phenomenon as two trends, where one goes up and another down. In this case, we would look for two historical phenomena that would cause a shift away from Hitpael only and then back towards Hitpael only, and, in a parallel fashion, towards Niphal only and then back away from Niphal only. When we look at the change from ABH to CBH/EBH/LBH, it is difficult to account for this shift. Perhaps ideas that were expressed at one time with a Hitpael of one root came to be expressed by a Niphal of another root. In this way, the Niphal only roots occupied linguistic niches previous occupied by Hitpael only roots.

In contrast, the shift from CBH/EBH/LBH to Sira is easier to explain. By the period of Rabbinic Hebrew, the Niphal has become much less productive, and the prefixed-t forms (especially the Nitpael) are becoming more popular. When we look at the CBH/EBH/LBH to Sira change, we can also posit that Sira has new reasons to use the Hitpael, and fewer reasons for the Niphal. Hitpael neologisms may be becoming more common. For example, if the Hitpael moved into a new grammatical niche, such as a new meaning or species in a later period, then we would expect a flourishing of new verbs in the “Hitpael only” category to fill this new niche. Another possibility is that the uses of the Niphal and Hitpael stay the same, but the contexts that

\(^6\) Doug Hemken (p.c.).
arise in the later periods lend themselves more towards the use of the Hitpael than the Niphal. For example, if later texts present more contexts describing activities, while older texts present more stative contexts, then we would expect more Hitpaels, which have always filled this niche. So either a new niche for the Hitpael has opened up, or more occurrences of the standard Hitpael niche have become available. The reverse may have happened to the Niphal, that is, fewer niches for that stem may appear in later texts. We can thus explain the second half of this trend historically, but the first half is more difficult.

We may also look for a single trend that can explain the increase of Hitpael only roots from ABH to CBH/EBH/LBH, and from CBH/EBH/LBH to Sira. Genre could play a role because ABH and Sira are entirely poetry, while CBH/EBH/LBH are largely narrative. Perhaps ABH poetry chooses Hitpael. Ten of the nineteen roots that appear in the Hitpael in ABH refer to “act like X” or mental processes, for example. Since Sira is also poetry, perhaps this is why we see a higher incidence of Hitpael only roots. Moreover, the text of Sira is particularly concerned with how a person ought to act, which could make the Hitpael more appropriate. I established in 4.5 that wisdom literature, because it focuses on how people should act, demonstrates a tendency to use Hitpael forms. It is more difficult to explain why poetry in general would demonstrate this kind of preference. Historical factors and genre factors likely influenced the distribution we see in Sira, but they provide a less adequate explanation for the developments from ABH to later stages.

Our corpus lacks what we would most need in order to make more solid conclusions: a corpus of roots that appear in significant numbers of Niphals and Hitpaels through all the periods. Such a set of roots would allow us to control for the indiosyncrasies of individual roots. We do not have such a corpus. Nevertheless, we have a few roots that appear in all or most
historical periods. They will allow us to make provisional conclusions about the influence of
diachrony on the distribution of the Niphal and Hitpael. In the next section I will look more
closely at specific occurrences of roots in various time periods. I will begin by looking at those
roots that appear in both the Niphal and Hitpael throughout all or most periods. This will help us
track any evolution of meaning of the stems by controlling for a change in root. Then I will look
at some of the new Hitpaels in the later texts to determine the nature of the new Hitpael niches,
whether they demonstrate new species of the Hitpael or a greater number contexts for them to
inhabit. For the Ben Sira texts, I draw from edition published by The Academy of the Hebrew
Language and the Shrine of the Boook (1973). The vocalizations are my own.

5.3. Specific roots

5.3.1. Roots occurring in most periods

5.3.1.1. "Hide" מְלָכָה

This root is the only Agent passive root that demonstrates enough Niphal and Hitpael
examples in enough time periods in order to examine its uses over time. I discussed some of
these examples above in section 4.2.1.4.2, where I claimed that the Niphal of this root described
the final state of the action of hiding, and the Hitpael, the inception or activity of hiding. Both of
the examples above came from the corpus of CBH, Leviticus and Deuteronomy, respectively.

We can see the hint of a change from CBH to LBH. The following are two examples of
the Niphal from 1 Kings and the synoptic equivalent from 2 Chronicles.
1. wayyagged-läh šolomoh ṭet -kol-dōḇāre’ūhā lōq-hayāh dāḇār ne’lām
and-related-to.her Solomon ACC-all-matters.her not-was matter hide:Niphal:PTPL

min-hammēlek
from-the.king

And Solomon related to her all her matters. There was not a matter hidden (Niphal) from the king (1 Kgs 10:3).

2. wayyagged-läh šolomoh ṭet -kol-dōḇāre’ūhā wəlō -ne’lām dāḇār
and-related-to.her Solomon ACC-all-matters.her and.not- hide:Niphal:QTL matter

miššolomoh
from.Solomon

And Solomon related to her all her matters, and no matter was hidden (Niphal) from Solomon (2 Chr 9:2).

Here we see that the Niphal appears as an attributive adjective in the first example and a finite perfect verb in the second. The latter is thus more “verbal” and the former more “adjectival.” It is possible to read them both as a state, although the adjectival occurrence is easier to read in this way. The second suggests that there is more of a dynamic underlying the action, though. I interpret the first to mean that of all these matters, not one escaped Solomon’s notice. In the second example, I read the verb as a passive, that no matter was hidden by an unstated person. However, I cannot see a grammatical motivation for this change, but rather a purposeful change by the Chronicler to enhance the reader’s view of Solomon subtly.7 We can see that the use of this root in the Niphal in LBH is identical with how the Niphal of this root is used in Ben Sira.

7 It is not clear why this change was made in the text, but some ambiguity in the earlier text may have prompted it. Thus perhaps something besides historical development is the cause. Two other changes occur in the text, namely “king” to “Solomon,” along with a change in word order of the verb and dāḇār. In the later text, the noun intervenes between the passive and the prepositional phrase. Furthermore, the preposition min can either mean “by” in a passive sentence or “from.” Thus either no matter was hidden from the king, that is, all information was revealed to him, or no matter was hidden by the king, that is, the king had not hidden any matter. Perhaps the Chronicler moved the “matter” between the verb and prepositional phrase in order to make the agentive use of the
3.  

kî ṣeṭ-kol-ma'āšēh hāʾelōhîm yâḇî ḫomiṣpāṭ ḫal kol-ne'läm
for ACC-every-deed the.God will.bring in.judgment over every-hide:Niphal:PTPL
For God will bring every deed into judgment, (even) every hidden thing (Niphal) (Qoh 12:14 [LBH]).

4.  

kî pōlāʾōt ma'āšē yhwh wone'läm mē[ʔādām] po'ōlō
for wonders works.of Yhwh and-hide:Niphal:QTL from.[human] work-his
For the works of the Lord are wonders, and his work is hidden (Niphal) from humans (Sira 11:4).

We should note that the Ben Sira text is unvocalized, so we cannot tell for sure if it is a qatal or a participle. The Historical Dictionary (1973) understands this verb to be a qatal, while the LXX translates it as an adjective (krupta). Neither of these meanings differs from those seen above in Leviticus 5 (Chapter 4, example 20 above). Thus we do not see a historical development of the Niphal in this root.

Let us now turn to the Hitpael of this root. Above, in Chapter 4, example 21, we saw instances of this Hitpael in Deuteronomy 22. Here are two examples, one from EBH or LBH and one from Ben Sira.

5.  

kî-ṭir'ēh ḫā'ōm wəḵissîtô ūmibbōšārkā lō' ṣīf'allām
when-you.see naked and-cover-him and-from-flesh-your not hide:Hitpael:YQTL
When you see the naked, cover him; and from your kin, do not hide (Hitpael) (Isa 58:7 [EBH or LBH]).

verb less likely. We can note that the LXX translated the verb from parewrame, noj “hidden” in the 1 Kings example, and to parh/lqen “passed by” in 2 Chronicles.

8 See Fox (1999:363).

9 The extant Hebrew MSS of Sira are unvocalized. Thus the transcriptions of Sira are based on my own vocalizations of the consonantal text. In the present example, I am reading with the editors of the version of Ben Sira (The Historical Dictionary of the Hebrew Language: The Book of Ben Sira: Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary [Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language and the Shrine of the Book, 1973]).

10 The distribution of the qatal and participle of the Niphal very well may have changed during the course of time, as we know that the participle of the Qal shifts from a mixed verbal and adjectival form during the biblical period to a more verbal, present tense form during the Rabbinic period (Cook 2002:264-68). The Niphal, as a resultative, stative form did not follow the same path in the development of the participle, since the form became more adjectival and less verbal in the Rabbinic period. Thus the development of the Niphal is an important facet for understanding the diachronic development of the qatal and participle.
6. ḫôlôš ṭîḇzèh ṣô’ôlôṯ dal ṭôl tîf’âlîm mədakdēk nêpēš
and-not you.despise requests.of poor and-not hide:Hitpael:IMPV crushed.of spirit
So do not despise the requests of the poor, and do not hide (Hitpael) from the crushed in spirit (Sira 4:4).

Since going to hide from someone results in ignoring that person, these examples can also be translated “ignore.”

11 This is the same meaning the verb carries in Deuteronomy 22. It appears, then, that this Hitpael has been used consistently with the same meaning from CBH to Ben Sira.

5.3.1.2. “Understand, perceive” יֵבִי byn

This verb is an Experiencer verb that sometimes bears one and sometimes two arguments, much like the English “understand.” I analyzed this verb above, in section 4.2.2.2.2. The Niphal is almost always a participle, and it means “be intelligent, clever.” The Hitpolel of this root, according to HALOT, means “behave intelligently,” as well as, “direct one’s attention” (122-23). These meanings follow a standard Hitpolel function, as I discussed at length previously. For this reason, it is not easy to compare the Niphal and Hitpolel examples. Nevertheless, we can look at the Niphal examples over the passage of time.

7. hinneḥ ʿâṣîṭî kidbârēʾkā  | hinneḥ nâṭattî lôkā lēb ḥâḵâm
behold I.did as-words-your behold I.gave to-you heart wise

wônâbôn
and-understand:Niphal:PTPL

Behold, I did according to your words. Behold, I gave you a wise and understanding (Niphal) heart (1 Kgs 3:12 [CBH]).

11 HALOT defines it as “avoid” (835).
8. ki ṣēwil ʿammî ṣōṭî lōʾ yāḏāʾū bānîm sāḵālîm hēmmâh wōlō for foolish people-my ACC-me not know sons stupid they and-not

nāḇōnîm hēmmâh understand:Niphal:PTPL they

For my people are foolish; they do not know me; they are stupid sons, and they are not understanding (Niphal) (Jer 4:22 [EBH]).

9. wāḇām lōʾ laḥāḵāmîm lēḥem wāḇām lōʾ lannāḇōnîm ḍōšer and-also not to-the-wise bread and-also not to-the-understand:Niphal:PTPL riches And likewise, bread is not for the wise, nor riches for the understanding (Niphal) (Qoh 9:11 [LBH]).

10. ṭīb nāḇôn yāḇîn dāḇār man understand:Niphal:PTPL understand:Hiphil matter

An understanding (Niphal) man will understand (Hiphil) a matter (Sira 36:3).

All these examples demonstrate that the Niphal occurs as participles. They are all adjectival, whether attributive (examples 7, 10), predicate (example 8), or substantive (example 9). The variation does not appear significant among these examples.

Here are some examples of the Hitpolel of this root.

11. wāʾēṭbōnēn ṣēlāyw bâbbōqer wāḥīnēh lōʾ-hāyāh ṭānî ṭāʾšer and-understand:Hitpolel:WAYY to-him in-the-morning and-behold not-was son-my who

yālāḏṭî bore

And I looked closely (Hitpael) at him in the morning, and behold he was not the son whom I bore (1 Kgs 3:21 [CBH]).

12. wāḥīṭbōnēnu mōʾīḏ ūrōʾū hēn hāyṭāh kāzōṯ and-understand:Hitpolel:YQTL already and-see behold was like-this

And look very closely (Hitpolel), and see whether (something) had been like this (Jer 2:10 [EBH]).
13. mippiqqûḏeḇḵā ʾetbōnān ʿal-kēn sānēṯī kol-ʿōrah šāqer from-statutes-your understand:Hitpolel:YQTL therefore hated all-way false From your statues I gain understanding (Hitpolel); therefore I hated every false way (Ps 119:104 [LBH]).

14. ʾal tiṣṭaddēq liṯnē melek ūṯnē melek ʾal titbōnēn not act.righteous:Hitpel before king and.before king not understanding:Hitpolel:YQTL Do not act righteous before a king, and before a king do not act understanding (Hitpolel) (Sira 7:5).

I have listed the most diverse meanings possible from the various periods. One should note that each period uses this verb to mean “consider, look at,” in addition to any meanings represented above.¹²

The most diverse meanings of the Hitpolel, therefore, come in the later periods. All relate clearly to the root meaning of “understand.” The species of “become” and “act like X” appear in the later corpuses but not in the earlier ones. The meaning of “perceive” common to all periods falls in Kemmer’s semantic category of cognition middles (1993:135). In the case of this root, then, the root appears to have begun with a middle sense and later developed additional common Hitpael meanings.

We can see at this point that the Niphal of this root evolved little, while the Hitpolel changed in more interesting ways. The Niphal appears “frozen” in the adjectival, stative sense of “understanding,” from the earliest stages. Over the same periods, the Hitpolel represented middle meanings, but then gained further paradigmatic meanings from other Hitpael forms.¹³ So the “becoming” and “act like X” meanings existed, and this root filled out into those meanings. In this way, this root began to fill niches in later periods that it did not in earlier periods.

¹² For LBH, one finds the meaning “perceive, consider” in Job 11:11; 31:1; Ps 119:95; and in Sira 3:22; 9:5.

¹³ I am assuming that the Hitpolel is a phonological variation on the Hitpael. See section 4.3.2.1.
5.3.1.3.  “Be heavy, glorious” הָבוֹד kbd

This root is intransitive and a basic stative with either the meaning “heavy” or “glorious.”

This root differs from the above roots because its Hitpael rarely appears in the HB, but then much more commonly in Ben Sira. At the same time, the Niphal occurs often throughout the periods, but draws exclusively from the “glorious” meaning. I will begin by presenting Niphal examples.

15. wəฏrədāp ʔəḥārēhem wəṣikkābdāh ɓəparshōh ụḇəqəl-ḥelō and-pursue after-them and-glorify:Niphal:WAYY by-Pharaoh and-by-army.his
And he will pursue after them, and I will be glorified (Niphal) by Pharaoh and by his army (Exod 14:4 [CBH]).

16. hinni ʿālāyik ʿidōn wən nikbdṭi ɓətōqeq wəyādū kī-ʔāni yhwh
behold-I upon-you Sidon and-glorify:Niphal:QTL in-midst-your and-know that-I yhwh
baʿāsōṭi bāh šəpāṭīm
in-do-I in-it judgments

Behold, I am against you, O Sidon, and I will be glorified (Niphal) in your midst, and they will know that I am YHWH when I perform judgments in it (Ezek 28:22 [EBH]).

17. ुḥəṇu ḥabbāyit wəʔəršēh-bō wəṣekkābd
and-build the-house and-desire-in-it and-glorify:Niphal:WAYY
And build the house, then I will take pleasure in it and I will be glorified (Niphal) (Hag 1:8 [LBH]).

18. . . . mōšēl wəṣōpēṭ nikbdū [wəṣē]n gādōl miyyarēʔ ʔēlōhim
. . . ruler and-judge glorify:Niphal:QTL and-there.is.not great from-fear God
. . . ruler and judge are glorified (Niphal), but none is greater than the one who fears God (Sira 10:24).

All of these instances present either qatal or wayyiqtol verb forms. In each case, some implicit agent or speaker ascribes glory to the subject. In the first three cases, that subject is Yhwh, and
in the fourth, the ruler and judge. The Niphal thus functions as a passive consistently throughout these periods, and the meaning does not vary.\textsuperscript{14}

The development of the Hitpael of this root, however, is more obscure than the Niphal. This root only appears in the Hitpael in Nah 3:15 and Prov 12:9 in the entire biblical corpus. Hence it is difficult to trace the stem’s changes through the stages of the Bible. In Ben Siraa, however, the Hitpael of this root occurs four times.

19. šám tōqōlēk ṭēš takrītēk ḥēreb tōqōlēk kayyāleq hitkabbēd

There eat-you fire cut-you sword eat-you like-the-locust heavy:Hitpael:IMPV:2ms

kayyāleq hitkabbōdī kāḥarbeh

like-the-locust heavy:Hitpael:IMPV:2fs like-the-locust

There the fire will devour you, sword will cut you off like the locust. \textit{Become numerous} (Hitpael) like the locust! \textit{Become numerous} (Hitpael) like the locust (Nah 3:15 [CBH]).

20. tōb niqlēh wōēbed lō mimmatakkabbēd waḥāsar-lāhem
good unesteemed:Niphal and-servant to-him than-glory:Hitpael:PTPL and-lack-bread

The one who is lightly esteemed (Niphal) yet has a servant is better than one who acts glorious (Hitpael) and lacks bread (Prov 12:9 [CBH or EBH]).

21. ṭāl hitkabbēd bāqālōn ṭāḇîkā kī lō? kāḇōḏ hū? lōkā

not glory:Hitpael:YQTL in-shame.of father-your for not glory it to-you

Do not act glorious (Hitpael) in the shame of your father, for it is not glory to you (Sira 3:10).

The example from Nah 3:15 is very problematic. Morphologically, the verb changes from a masculine to a feminine imperative. Verse 3:13 described the city as filled with women, and uses feminine pronouns to address them. Here, however, we have both genders of the same verb,

\textsuperscript{14} In addition, one sees participles in Gen 34:19 (CBH); Sira 11:6. None appears in the EBH or LBH corpuses. The meaning of the participle of this root does not vary among time periods.
without any other explicit change of gender.  More importantly, it is not clear what meaning the verb is drawing from. I have translated as “multiply” along with NRSV and NJPS; however, one could translate the verb as “glorious.” A “multiplying” army is conceivably a “glorious” army, which explains the ambivalence in translation. Either way, this verb suggests that the people should make ready their army. If the verb means “glorious,” then its meaning is not clearly distinct from the examples of the Niphal, above. Perhaps the meaning of the Hitpael is more process-focused than the Niphal, but not enough evidence of the Hitpael exists to determine clearly.

In contrast, the above Proverbs and Ben Sira examples more clearly mean “act glorious.” The pointing of the Hitpael in the Proverbs example, however, is anomalous. Nevertheless, *HALOT* (456), Murphy (1998:87), and Clifford (1999:127) accept it as a Hitpael without comment, likely based on evidence from the Aleppo codex, where it is pointed as a standard Hitpael. The commentaries on Proverbs translate it as, “put on airs,” while *HALOT* translates, “boast.” In this way the verb falls into the Hitpael meaning, “act as X” (section 4.3.4). The example from Ben Sira likely follows this same meaning. Another translation of the Ben Sira text, though, could be “become glorious.” If we take the “shame” as the instrument, it would translate as, “Do not become glorious by/in the shame of your father.” Either would reflect a normal meaning of the Hitpael. For tracing the development of the verb, though, the Proverbs example is problematic because we cannot date the text precisely.

---

15 Perhaps the author intends to mock the city as feminine, and so addresses the obviously masculine audience as masculine first, and then addresses them as feminine. The full meaning of this mode of address goes beyond the scope of this study, however.

16 I believe that this same meaning occurs in the Hitpael of this verb in Sira 10:30-31, against *HALOT* who read there, “be honoured,” a passive sense (456).
As a result, we can see distinct trends for the Niphal and Hitpael of this verb. The Niphal meaning remains stable historically, as it bears similar meanings from CBH to Ben Sira. It always draws its meaning from the “glorious” meaning of the root. The Hitpael, however, appears to grow in popularity, from scant use in the HB to its more popular use in Ben Sira. In the more clearly discernable sense in Proverbs, it carries the “act as X” meaning of the Hitpael. The dating of this text, though, is not certain. The less clearly discernable occurrence in the verb in Nahum, though, may draw from either the “glorious” or “heavy” sense. Either case likely means “become,” perhaps related to a process. From its rare use in the HB, the Hitpael of this root filled in the “act as X” niche or continues in the “become” sense by the stage of Ben Sira.

5.3.1.4. “Be wise” הָכָם

This root occurs more often in the Hitpael than the Niphal. The Niphal occurs only in Ben Sira; the Hitpael occurs twice in the HB, and five times in Ben Sira. Both stems of this root thus seem to rise in popularity in the late stage of the language. The Niphal bears an adjectival sense.

22. yēš ḥāḵām lārabbīm neḵām ḫōnāpšō ḥū’ gōʔēl
   there.is wise to-the-many wise:Niphal:PTPL and-to-self-his he proud
When there is a wise person, he is wise (Niphal) for many, but to himself he is proud (Sira 37:19).

The sense of the Niphal is that he is considered wise by all. It seems to focus more on the state the person is in, rather than his or her actions. The author is relating this to the initial substantive adjective of the same root. I suggest that the first instance seems to focus on an ontological

17 The Niphal of the root appears for certain in Sira 37:19, 22. A third instance, Sira 37:23, is likely Niphal, although the form could also be interpreted as a Qal.
sense of being wise, while the latter instance demonstrates that the person is wise for many people; in other words, the wise person is considered so by others. However, to be more certain a thorough study of the adjective would be necessary, which lies beyond the scope of this work. In any case, this adjectival use of the Niphal mirrors that of the Niphal of דָּבָכ kbd, as we saw above. Since this use of the Niphal of the present verb did not occur in the HB, it appears this meaning may have developed later.

The Hitpael instances cover a range of meaning in the HB, and these meanings continue in Ben Sira, where the form is more popular.

23. **hāḇāh nīṯṭhakkamāh lō pen-yirbeh**
give wise:Hitpael:YQTL to-him lest-multiply
Come, let us deal shrewdly (Hitpael) with them, lest they multiply (Exod 1:10 [CBH]).

24. **ʿal-tohī šaddīq harbāh woʿal-tīṯhakkam yōṭēr lāmmāb tiššōmēm**
not-be righteous much and-not-wise:Hitpael:YQTL more for-what destroy:Hitpolel
Do not be too righteous, and do not act excessively wise (Hitpael); why destroy yourself (Hitpolel)? (Qoh 7:16 [LBH]).

25. **ūabal ʿēt ̇ maḥ tīṯhakkam**
and-not time what wise:Hit,YQTL
And when it is not time, why act wise (Hitpael)? (Sira 35:4).

These examples all appear with the same meaning, “act as X”; nevertheless, each requires some comment. Example 23 certainly means “act wise/shrewdly.” The action is undertaken in earnest, not in pretense, which is a common use of the Hitpael. (See section 4.3.2.1 above.) The next example, 24, can be taken in more than one way. Fox argues that this is not an instance of acting according to pretense (1999:261). As I said for the last example, the meaning “act as X” does not necessarily imply pretense, which aligns my interpretation with Fox’s. I explained above that the “act as X” Hitpaels focus on the activity related to a state rather than the state itself, as we see in the preceding example. Fox further states that this verb implies “becoming”
more than “acting,” because of the following verse that describes doing evil and being a fool. Similarly, I have shown that “becoming” is a common use of the Hitpael. Since the next verse refers to acting evil (in earnest) and being a fool, it is difficult to determine precisely which meaning is meant here. I have decided to translate “act” because it seems that acting like a wise person is more likely to lead to one’s destruction more than simply being wise, especially based on the actions described in the preceding verse. Finally, the Ben Sira verse, example 25, implies acting wise in earnest; nowhere in Ben Sira does it mean to act under a pretense of wisdom. In other Ben Sira example (6:32 and 38:24-25) the verb means “become wise,” implying a process of reaching a state rather than the taking the actions of the wise. Thus both meanings, “act as X” and “become,” exist for this root in the Hitpael in Ben Sira, while “act as X” is the predominant meaning in the HB.

In all these instances, the Hitpael presents the meaning of “act as X,” in contrast to the Niphal. Unlike the above examples we looked at (examples 20 and 21), this “act” does not imply pretense. All the instances depict the subject acting “wise,” according to the verbal root. The sense of “become” is possible in the Proverbs example and is clear in some Ben Sira examples. So it seems that the rare Hitpaels of this root in the HB began with an “act as X” meaning and spread into the niche of “become” clearly by the time of Ben Sira. The Hitpael contrasts with the Niphal of the same root, for the Niphal neither carries the meaning of “act as X,” nor the process of “becoming” the state, but reflects the state that the subject is in, or perceived to be in. This meaning follows closely on that of כְּבֵד kbd.
5.3.1.5. Conclusion

The Niphal and Hitpael evolved in different ways. The Niphal remained stable during the various stages of the roots examined above. It always refers to a state, which the subject is in or is perceived to be in. With the last root I looked at, הָכָה hkm, “be wise,” the Niphal does not occur in the HB, but occurs more than once in Ben Sira. In contrast, the Hitpael followed a more complicated course. In the first case, הָלָה l̄m, “hide,” the Hitpael did not seem to change significantly. In the cases of the three other roots, however, the Hitpael filled in the niches of “act as X” and “become.” While these meanings were likely potential meanings in the HB, they seem to be more common and more consistent in Ben Sira.

In the scope of these roots that exist in the Niphal and Hitpael over multiple historical strata of the Hebrew language, the meanings do not vary much. The Niphal remains closely related to the stative sense, and the Hitpael, to the activity and process senses. If the Hitpael of a given root had a middle sense, it began at an early stage; no root developed a middle sense later on. The Hitpael grew into niches for which the stem always had the potential to occupy, yet the potential was realized more strongly later on. Next, then I turn to the diachronic use of the Hitpael.

5.3.2. Diachronic comparison

This section focuses more on the development of how the Hitpael is used during different periods. The previous section looked at roots that demonstrated consistent use of the Niphal and Hitpael. I showed how the Niphal demonstrated very little change, sticking close to its adjectival, stative meaning. In contrast, the Hitpael appeared to vary more. Thus I will now turn
to roots with Hitpaels that do not necessarily demonstrate any Niphals. In looking at the Hitpaels in later texts, it is important to see how they compare to the Hitpaels of earlier texts. One can sort these roots into two groups. The first group comprises roots with Hitpaels in later corpuses as well as in earlier corpuses. The second group is composed of roots with Hitpaels exclusively in later corpuses.

I will begin by a diachronic comparison of the first group. If some historical development occurred in the Hitpael, then we would expect that instances that occur with more chronological distance would demonstrate more differences in meaning. So I will present different occurrences with these considerations in mind. Then I will turn to the second group. With diachronic change, one would expect to find new Hitpaels entering new niches in later corpuses. Thus those Hitpaels that occur in later texts but not in earlier ones will present an idea of where the Hitpael is spreading to by the later period. The examples in the second group, though, must be used with caution, as one must argue from the lack of occurrences in earlier texts. In this way, the examples from the first group hold more weight than the second group.

We can compare the use of the Hitpael in chronologically distant corpuses in order to determine if the Hitpael has shifted in the semantic range that it covers. In the following examples I will try to control for variations from one root to another. Otherwise, any difference in the use of the Hitpael could be attributed to forces occurring in different roots. I will begin with the two periods of ABH and LBH, which differ by many centuries. We find one root that occurs in the Hitpael exclusively in these two corpuses.
26. `im-nāḇār  


With the pure (Niphal) you act pure (Hitpael), and with the crooked you act perverse (Ps 18:27).

27. yīṯbārārû

Many will be purified (Hitpael), made white, and refined, but the wicked will act wickedly (Dan 12:10).

These two sentences are similar in meaning of the root יְבֵר brr, “pure”; the root itself has not changed. The Hitpael in each, however, does not function the same. In the former, the Hitpael covers the meaning “act as X,” while in the second means “become.” Thus the Hitpael in both of these periods covers semantic fields typical for the Hitpael in all periods. This particular root may have shifted in its utilization of the Hitpael, namely, a shift in the particular area that the Hitpael occupies. Without more evidence in both periods, however, it is impossible to say if an actual shift in the semantic area covered by the Hitpael occurred or if these two texts exhibit different uses of the Hitpael by coincidence.

One root occurs in the Hitpael exclusively in ABH, and demonstrates that the Hitpael covered the same semantic area as it did in later periods.

28. bōnē nēḵār  yīṯqāḥāšû

sone.of foreign cringe:Hitpael:YQTL-to-me to-hear ear  hear:Niphal:YQTL to-me

The sons of the foreigner cringe (Hitpael) before me, upon hearing, they were obedient (Niphal) to me (2 Sam 22:45).

This verb demonstrates a middle meaning, a “nontranslational motion action,” according to Kemmer’s categories (1993:56-57). We saw above in section 5.3.1.2 an example of a middle use
of the Hitpael for that root, which eventually developed a different meaning. Notably, in both cases of early texts, the Hitpael was used with a middle sense.

The Hitpael may have been pushed out of the middle usage of this root by other forces. The present example of the Hitpael occurs in 2 Sam 22:45, whose parallel text, Ps 18:45, is also considered ABH. The latter text, however, uses the Piel where the text I am analyzing here has a Hitpael. Moreover, later texts use the Piel of this root for this meaning (e.g., Ps 66:3). This root does not occur in the Hitpael elsewhere in the HB nor in Ben Sira. By the time of RH, the Hitpael of this root bears a different meaning of this root—“contradict” (Jastrow 629).

Next I will compare uses of roots over the time span between CBH and Ben Sira. In several of these examples we can see that a particular idiom that developed a root stays quite stable over the centuries. This first root, רָכָר mkr, “sell,” has a metaphorical sense, in addition to the literal sense. This metaphorical sense was shown above (section 4.2.1.6.2.3), and I will show it again here in addition to its later appearance.

29. wayyyō°mer mās̄ātî yā°an (hitmakkerkā) lāfās̄oṭ hāra° bọēnē yhwh
    and-said find because sell:Hitpael:INF-you to-do the-evil in-eyes.of yhwh
    And he said, “I found (you) because you sold yourself (Hitpael) to do evil in the eyes of YHWH” (1 Kgs 21:20).

30. wattiḏdal ḫaṭṭạtô mệrōd úḷəkəl rạ̄x̣āh hitmakker
    and-great sin-his very and-to-every evil sell:Hitpael:QTL
    And his sin was very great, and he sold himself (Hitpael) to every sort of evil (Sira 47:24-25).

Thus we see that this metaphorical use persisted over a great period of time. It is interesting to note that the Hitpael does not occur in RH at all, but only in Rabbinic Aramaic where Jastrow ascribes the meaning “to be made acquainted” to the Itpael (784). This meaning draws from another meaning of the root.
Another root, ח weekdays qwm, “rise up,” can carry a metaphorical sense “rise up against, oppose” in CBH. It appears in Ben Sira where it arguably carries the same meaning.

31. môšî‘a hōsî‘ mimmitqōmāmîm bîmînehkā
   save seek.refuge from-rise:Hitpael:PTPL by-right-your
   . . . the one who saves those who seek refuge from (their) enemies (Hitpael) with your right hand” (Ps 17:7).

32. mêhî‘aššēq cî‘im šîphāh lōkā mêhîqōmēm cî‘al
   from-oppress:Hitpael:INFC with handmaid to-you from-rise:Hitpael:INFC against beds-
   yuṣṣēvēhā
   her
   . . . from oppressing your handmaid, from rising up (Hitpael) against her bed (Sira 41:22).

The Hitpael of this root occurs as a substantive participle in Ps 17:7, as it does in every case in the HB. The word refers to enemies in every case, and all the occurrences are in poetry. The genre where this word occurs may help explain why it consistently carries this metaphorical sense. The Ben Sira example can imply that the addressee should not act as an enemy over his handmaid’s bed, that is, he should not try to seduce her. It could also be understood in a literal sense, meaning, not to rise up over her bed. Such an interpretation would imply a very similar situation, in any case. It is difficult to discern the Ben Sira text precisely as it is damaged somewhat at this point. Thus the metaphorical sense is the only sense in the BH that this root appears in, while the meaning could be idiomatic or literal in Ben Sira. By RH the Hitpael of this root never carries the metaphorical sense any more, but the definitions of Jastrow always mean “establish, endure” (1330-31). The root bears the “endure” meaning in the HB, but never

---

18 This word appears in Job 20:27; 27:7; Ps 17:7; 59:2.
19 The LXX reads this as ἐπιστῆς “come up to, approach.” This literal motion could imply a non-metaphorical reading of this verb.
in the Hitpael. Thus this Hitpael may be evolving from an early idiomatic sense to either a literal or a different idiomatic sense.

Overall we see that the use of the Hitpael does not vary greatly from early periods to later ones. The Hitpael always potentially fills the gap of “act as X,” “become,” and the middle. We also see that the Hitpael at times bears metaphorical meanings, which also can remain constant over long periods. As a result, I cannot see strong evidence among these comparisons that indicate a significant development of the Hitpael over time.

5.3.3. Instances isolated to late corpuses

Some roots only appear in the Hitpael in later corpuses. At this point I will analyze the development of these new examples of the Hitpael to see if the Hitpael itself is used in a new way. One root, šmm, “destroy,” develops a Hitpolel in later strata meaning, “marvel, be appalled.” The root bore this meaning in earlier strata, but never appeared in the Hitpolel. In CBH the root—in various stems—often refers concretely to a structure being destroyed, but can also refer to humans. The Hitpolel refers exclusively to human subjects.

33. wāʾeštômēm ʿal -hammarēh waʾēn mēḥin
   and-marvel:Hitpolel:WAYY about-the-vision and-no.one understand
   And I marveled (Hitpolel) regarding the vision, and no one could explain (Dan 8:27).

34. yōrdē hayyām yṣṣppērū qāṣēhū lišmōʾē ʿoznēnū ništômēm
   go.down the-sea recount depth-its to-hear ear-our marvel:Hitpolel:YQTL
   Those who go down to the sea recount its depth; we marvel (Hitpolel) at the hearing of our ear (Sira 43:24).

---

20 The Hitpael of this verb occurs in Ps 143:4; Qoh 7:16; Isa 59:16; 63:5; Dan 8:27.

21 Lev 26:32 has both of these meanings.
The Hitpolel appears to be based on a more metaphorical meaning of the root בֶּל עֶשׁ šmm. The root bears both a concrete sense, that is, an actual structure being destroyed, and an abstract one, that is, one’s psyche being “destroyed,” from the early periods of BH. During the period of RH the Hitpolel can mean “astounded” or “waste, ruined” (Jastrow 1597). While the root continues with this meaning into the later strata, it is borne by stems other than the Hitpael, although Jastrow cites examples of the Hitpolel in RH. So the Hitpolel appears to prefer the more abstract sense, although the more literal sense may have been latent in the periods of LBH and Ben Sira. Moreover, this verb represents a cognitive process verb that commonly is represented by the middle voice (Kemmer 1993:131). Thus for this reason, as well, the Hitpolel of this root is used in these contexts.

The root בָּשֶׁפ špk, “pour out” occurs in the Hitpael only in later periods of BH, never elsewhere in the HB or in Ben Sira. The Hitpael can bear a literal sense, as in the following example.

35. tišṭappekįš knah ʔabnō-ḡōḏēš bōrōʾš kol-ḥūšōṯ
pour:Hitpael:YQTL stones.of-holy at-head all-streets
The sacred stones are being poured out (Hitpael) at the head of all the streets (Lam 4:1).

In this sense the action appears iterative; some stones are poured out here and there in the course of several, similar actions. The Hitpael of this root can also bear a metaphorical sense.

36. bōhišṭappek nakšām ʾel-ḥēq ʾimmōṭām
at-pour:Hit.INF life-their to-bosom.of mothers-their
. . . as their life pours out (Hitpael) on their mothers’ bosom (Lam 2:12).

22 It occurs in Job 30:16; Lam 2:12; 4:1.

23 The same sense appears in Job 30:16.
The notion of life being poured out refers metaphorically to the process of dying. Thus this is a process, on the one hand, and a metaphor on the other—both of which are common for the Hitpael. As a result, it appears that this root appeared only late with its process and idiomatic senses, though we do not find the root in the Hitpael in Ben Sira. Thus it is impossible to determine if this root appeared exclusively in this particular period by coincidence, or if its binyan, the Hitpael, was in a particular stage of development that encouraged the development of this particular root.

Above, in section 4.4.3.3, I discussed the use of נל任せ mlṭ, “flee,” which appears only twice in the Hitpael, both in Job, and never in Ben Sira. In one case, in Job 19:20, the verb appears to carry the same or nearly the same meaning as the very common Niphal of this root.\textsuperscript{24} We can see that the root crept anomalously into this niche of the Niphal briefly during this period, never to occur again.\textsuperscript{25} In another case, Job 41:1, the Hitpael is iterative, referring to sparks “escaping” like the flames coming forth from YHWH’s mouth. In this way, these Hitpael examples occupy the niche of the iterative, as well as a motion verb normally occupied by the Niphal.

In another instance above, section 4.2.1.6.2.1, I looked at נֵל מֵIJד lkd, “take,” which only occurs in the Hitpael in Job 38:30 and 41:9. In both cases the verb carries a unique nuance of the root, “hold fast,” whether ice or the scales of the leviathan. This meaning relates logically to the common meaning of the root, so it is an abstract meaning, but not entirely idiosyncratic. In any case, the Hitpael is called upon to cover a specific meaning of this root.

\textsuperscript{24} Sixty-three out of 95 instances of this root are in the Niphal.

\textsuperscript{25} Jastrow offers a RH example of the Hitpael of this root with a passive meaning, “you will be saved,” which is similar to the Niphal (789).
Now I will turn to roots that only occur in the Hitpael in Ben Sira and never in the HB.

We find one example of a root, נח, “groan,” that is used only in the Hitpael in Ben Sira (three times), and only in the Niphal in the HB (13 times).

37. ûbimšöl räšä’ yëºnäh çäm
   and-by-rule wicked sigh:Niphal:YQTL people
   And when the wicked rule, the people groan (Niphal) (Prov 29:2).

38. úlɔä’hɔr ɔaši̯g ɔmäray úlɔ’anḥåṭi ɔṯ’añnah
   and-to-end approach words-my and-to-groan-my groan:Hitpael:YQTL
   When you reach my words, then you will groan (Hitpael) with my groan (Sira 12:12).

The other two examples of this verb in Ben Sira carry the same meaning as example 38. Thus we can see that the Hitpael in Ben Sira covers the same meaning as the Niphal in the biblical instances. It is not clear, however, why the Hitpael took over this previous Niphal function. We have seen that the Niphal carries a stative function consistently in those verbs that occur in many periods of the history of Hebrew. Perhaps this stative use is becoming more exclusive, so that Niphals that previously lay on the border of state and activity are now being expressed by Hitpaels.

Another root that is common in the HB, ḫaq, “far,” never occurs in the Hitpael in the HB, but does in Ben Sira—both times in one verse. Similarly, the root ḥqb, “close,” occurs often in the HB, but never in the Hitpael. It appears once in the Hitpael in Ben Sira, coincidentally in this same verse.
39.  `al titqārēb pen titrāhēq wə`al titrāhēq pen
not close:Hitpael:YQTL lest far:Hitpael:YQTL and-not far:Hitpael:YQTL lest

tiśśānē²
hate:Niphal:YQTL

Do not act overly close (Hitpael) lest you become distant (Hitpael), and do not act aloof (Hitpael) lest you be hated (Niphal) (Sira 13:10).

We can identify two different senses of the Hitpael in this verse. The first occurs with the first and third Hitpael, where the stem is used in its “act as X” meaning. The second meaning occurs in the second Hitpael verb, where it bears the “become” meaning. Lining up all these Hitpaels brings an extra emphasis to the text, complementing the use of the opposite verbs “far” and “near.” Nevertheless, these Hitpaels display common meanings of this stem, so while the verbs themselves are neologisms, the stem is functioning in a standard way.

One verb that occurs in the Hitpael in Ben Sira never occurs as a verb at all in the HB. The root תֶּזֶה swd only occurs as a noun in the HB, “secret, counsel,” but five times as a Hitpael in Ben Sira, where it means, “tell secrets.”

40.  `im pōṭēh ʿal tisTayyed kī lōʾ yāḵōl lōḵassōt sōḏkā
with fool not tell.secret:Hitpael:YQTL for not can to-keep secret-your

Do not tell secrets (Hitpael) with a fool, for he cannot keep your secret (Sira 8:17).

Thus we have an innovation in Ben Sira, that is, a Hitpael with this meaning. Moreover, this verb does not occur among the RH definitions of this verb in Jastrow (961). The question arises why Ben Sira used the Hitpael in this context. This meaning of the verb assumes reciprocal speech, which clearly falls in the category of “naturally reciprocal events,” and these are often marked as middles (Kemmer 1993:104). Thus this verb appeared in the Hitpael seemingly because of the middle notion it expresses.
In one case, Aramaic may have influenced the appearance of the Hitpael in Ben Sira. A similar phenomenon occurs with the root לָעַב $blb$, “mock.” This root occurs once in 2 Chr 36:16 (LBH) in the Hiphil, and once in Ben Sira 30:13 in the Hitpael. The verbs appear to share the same meaning. Two possible conclusions can be drawn. One is that the Hitpael of this root is encroaching on the territory of the Hiphil in this instance. Another solution is that some variation was allowed for this verb. Jastrow cites the Hiphil meaning in RH, and an Ithpa‘al of this root in Aramaic (713). As a result, it does not seem that the Hitpael replaced the Hiphil meaning. Instead two possible stems were possible: the Hiphil, which became the choice for RH, and the Hitpael/Ithpa‘al, used by Ben Sira and Aramaic.

From these examples, overall development of the Hitpael is difficult to discern among these roots whose first Hitpaels occur in later corpuses. The Hitpael follows certain tendencies, which are common to all periods. The stem is commonly used for the meanings “act as X” (e.g., $qrq$, “close”), “become” (e.g., $rqh$, “far”), and middle (e.g., $swd$, “secret”). So in contexts that describe such events, one finds the Hitpael. Moreover, it appears that idiomatic and metaphorical meanings attach to the Hitpael, although this is not isolated to later strata of the language. In one case, לָעַב $blb$, “mock,” the unique Hitpael occurrence in Ben Sira perhaps shares a common origin with the Aramaic equivalent. These data present results common to the conclusions of the last section, namely, among roots that exist in the Hitpael in early and late

26 The Ithpa‘al is the Aramaic equivalent of the Hebrew Hitpael.

27 Another potentially interesting case of expressions similar to Sira and Aramaic is the root $tgr$, “trade.” This root never occurs in the HB, and Jastrow has no entry for it in RH. The root occurs in Aramaic, however, according to Jastrow (1646-47). In both Sira and in Aramaic, the root appears in the Hitpael/Ithpa‘al only. However, it is not clear that the form of the verb in Sira 37:11 must be a Hitpael.

28 The Arabic cognate of this root means “play” in the Qal.
corpuses, an overall shift in the function of the Hitpael is not evident. As a result, the number of roots with attested Hitpaels but no attested Niphals likely grew in later strata of the language as new contexts multiplied, presenting situations that most naturally fit with the Hitpael. Thus even in the stages of LBH and Ben Sira the Hitpael was a productive stem, building on a well-known repertoire of meanings. Finally, it is possible that the Aramaic Ithpa‘al may have influenced the later usage of the Hebrew Hitpael.

5.4. **CONCLUSIONS: DIACHRONIC INFLUENCE ON THE NIPHAL AND HITPAEL**

As we reexamine the statistics above, we can eliminate with relative security the possibility that the basic functions of the Niphal and Hitpael changed. As we saw above, the language does not shift significantly vis-à-vis preference for Niphal and Hitpael roots vs. Niphal or Hitpael only roots. We can see that the basic meaning of the Hitpael did not change from the earliest stages of the HB to the post-canonical book of Ben Sira. Moreover, the Niphal showed even more consistent usage over time, perhaps excluding all but the most “typical” stative uses. Thus it seems that the shift in relative use of roots that occur only in the Niphal, only in the Hitpael, or both, coincides with a shift in the types of contexts presented.

Genre may play a role in distribution of the Niphal and Hitpael, though it does not affect the function of the binyanim. Sira seems to present more contexts for the Hitpael than earlier texts do, as it offers fewer contexts for the Niphal. As a result, it uses a higher number of Hitpael only verbs. This could result from being part of the wisdom genre, which discusses how one acts and what one becomes and how one thinks. All these situations call most likely for a Hitpael. Conversely, wisdom literature is less concerned with describing a state of affairs, as narrative material does, and thus wisdom literature calls less often for Niphal-only verbs. In
examples of wisdom literature in Chapter 4, however, we find that the Niphal is used to describe the outcome of actions. Perhaps even within the wisdom genre we can find some variation in distribution of situation aspect. Furthermore, the idiomatic and abstract uses of roots in poetry also coincide with common uses for the Hitpael. As a result, it is not surprising that Job also demonstrates some intriguing, neologistic uses of Hitpael-only verbs. The inscriptive evidence noticeably lacks Hitpaels and demonstrates few Niphals, especially with respect to contemporaneous biblical texts. This number is likely not statistically significant. If it is significant, the lack of Hitpaels may have arisen because the terse nature of the texts; namely, they focus on outcomes and states rather than incomplete or simultaneous processes and activities in the passive and middle voices. With so few examples of either binyan, though, it is difficult to conclude definitively on their distribution.

While this diachronic study of the Niphal and Hitpael solidifies my conclusions above regarding the uses of these two stems, in spite of time period, it raises interesting questions that cannot be answered here. It appears that the genres of wisdom literature and present particular situation types more regularly than other genres, such as narrative. This fact may influence the use of other verb forms, such as the qatal/yiqtol distinction, or the use of Piel vs. Hiphil. Examining the situation types in Wisdom literature further could render results significant for other areas of the grammar of Hebrew.
CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSIONS

6.1. METHODOLOGY

6.1.1. Questions from previous approaches

I would like to begin my conclusions with a summary of methodology. In most previous approaches, the distinction between the Niphal and the Hitpael include large swaths of overlapping functional territory, especially with the meaning of passive, middle, and reflexive (section 2.4). Defining this overlapping area is a desideratum for understanding the function of these two stems.

While Hebraists accurately understand the function of passive, some characterizations of do not accord with the analyses I have presented. First, some approaches claim that the passive requires both the demotion of the subject and the demotion of the object. We have seen that BH and other languages allow passives without object promotion in two-argument sentences and in one-argument sentences with no object at all (sections 3.3.2). Second, many Hebraists are inclined to view the territory of the passive function as exclusive from the reflexive. As I demonstrated in section 3.4.3, Modern Greek allows some ambiguity between the passive and reflexive, just as BH does. Without an explicit reflexive pronoun in the Niphal and Hitpael, BH does not disambiguate between reflexive and passive morphologically. Third, their definition of passive falls short because it does not explain why some active verbs fail to passivize. In BH we often encounter dilemmas of verbs “missing” from the derivational paradigm, but we cannot tell if they are missing because of historical accident or the nature of the verbs. English, though,
shows that some active verbs, especially those relating states such as weight, cannot be passivized, unless they are reconceived of as active verbs (section 3.3.3).

In a similar way, one can advance many Hebraists’ theories by defining the concepts “reflexive” and “middle voice” more precisely. First, some Hebraists view the middle voice as particularly abstract. Thereby they include disparate meanings in a single category. (See section 2.2.2.4.) Second, Boyd sees that the middle and passive differ because the passive allows an unexpressed Agent, while the middle does not (section 2.2.3.2.3). This view, though, is untestable. According to this definition, the middle cannot express an Agent, but the passive often does not express it. Since most Hebraists, excepting Boyd, do not believe Hebrew has a specific middle stem, a Niphal or Hitpael that expresses a Patient but not the Agent will always be ambiguous with respect to whether it could express the Agent or not. Third, Hebraists are not yet unified around a single definition of the middle. Boyd (1993), for example, defines the middle exclusively from the passive and reflexive (section 2.2.3.2.3), while Creason (1995) defines the middle as including the reflexive (section 2.2.3.2.4).

The advent of more cross-linguistic analysis furthers the understanding of these categories. Many scholars define the passive and middle according to classical languages, such as, Ancient Greek and Latin. Significantly, some Hebraists are able to come closer to defining the middle and passive more accurately thanks to more cross-linguistic sources. Boyd (1993) relies on Geniušienė (1987), who predominantly draws from Baltic and Slavic languages. (See section 2.2.2.4.) Similarly, Grüneberg (2003) draws on Kemmer (1993), whose book on the middle voice cites data from scores of languages. (See section 2.2.3.3.2.) Further interaction between BH and these cross-linguistic theories on the middle, though, is required. Little cross-linguistic data on the passive are prominent in any of these theories.
Earlier Hebraists, such as GKC, Speiser, Dombrowski, and Joüon-Muraoka, posited relationships among stems *a priori* based on form (section 2.4). In this paradigm, the Qal originally had a passive (Qp), and a reflexive (Niphal). Similarly, the Piel has the passive Pual and the reflexive Hitpael, and the Hiphil has a Hophal, but the reflexive analogue is unclear. These relationships, though, reflect verb forms and not functions. The passive Qal is not productive in the period of BH; the Niphal often displays passive meanings, and the Hitpael is occasionally not reflexive, but is passive or middle or neither. While the formal relationships are clear, the BH data do not support such an arrangement of forms. As a result, Hebraists propose an earlier stage in the language where the paradigm held in this way.

Therefore, Hebraists have not been able to define the Niphal and Hitpael distinctly from each other. When the stems are arranged in a paradigm according to form, they do not stick to their assigned functions, and Hebraists continuously strive to understand this disconnect between form and function. The Niphal and Hitpael overlap in many ways, as we have seen. This overlap prompts Hebraists to examine more in depth the areas in which they overlap: passive, middle, and reflexive. At this point, those further examinations have begun well, while demanding further development with the use of further cross-linguistic data.

### 6.1.2. Insights from previous approaches

Putting aside the problems in these studies, we glean from them valuable insight into understanding the relationship between the Niphal and Hitpael. First, Hebraists such as Jenni show that the passive, middle, and reflexive are not expressed in BH as they are in Indo-European languages. Only Boyd (1993) would say that the Niphal is almost exclusively a middle stem, while other Hebraists accept more overlap between the stems (section 2.2.3.2.3). Bicknell (1983) especially recognizes that the various passive stems (from which she excludes
the Hitpael) serve largely the same function (section 2.2.3.2.2). All of these scholars recognize that these categories cover much of the function of these stems, though they fall short in some way. Boyd (1993) defined all the ways that the Niphal and Hitpael of the same root relate to each other, and in almost all cases, they do not differ by diathesis. Second, on a related point, they all see that the two functions demote the subject, which is the key to understanding these stems. They do not all agree on how exactly the subject is demoted, however, though most see it as demoted syntactically in the passive.

Third, Hebraists have hinted at a relation of the Niphal and Hitpael to situation aspect. Few have developed this idea much, unfortunately. Bicknell (1983) saw the passive as resultative, but as mentioned above, she did not include the Hitpael in her study (section 2.2.3.2.2). Siebesma (1991) saw that various stems correlated to particular verb tenses/aspects, and hinted at a Niphal-stative and Hitpael-activity correspondence (section 2.2.3.1.3). In this way, these Hebraists have laid the foundation of a Niphal-Hitpael relationship based on the passive and situation aspect. Their models for understanding the stems show that in many ways the Niphal and Hitpael do much the same thing, though they differ in subtle ways.

6.1.3. Language comparison
When modern scholars began studying the Niphal and Hitpael, they compared various languages to BH. At first, they used classical languages as a starting point. Now, though, study has broadened into other languages. Sophisticated cross-linguistic and typological comparisons lie at the crux of a successful analysis of the passive and the Niphal and Hitpael overlap because they bring typical areas of overlap into relief. When we understand the phenomenon of the passive broadly, we have a model to understand seemingly odd behavior in specific cases in the Niphal and Hitpael. Languages often demonstrate an overlap between the passive and static,
adjectival, resultative, and perfective uses. I demonstrated this phenomenon in the BH Niphal, as well. The middle often relates to activities and incompletely actions, including habitual and iterative meanings. These phenomena are also apparent in the BH Hitpael. Furthermore, the middle often performs a “passive function” in languages, as we see in BH (section 3.4).

All languages demonstrate demotion of the A in the passive, but not all promote the O. BH allows the passive of intransitive Qals, which has caused some problem for the models presented by Hebraists. As a result, some Hebraists have posited Piel and Hiphil as “intermediate” forms. In other words, the Qal produces a Piel or Hiphil, which, in turn, produces a Niphal or Hitpael. However, these Piel and Hiphil forms are not always extant in the HB. This lack of intermediate forms is not a barrier in my system, as we see that passivization of one-participant verbs occurs in many languages, though it is rarer than passivization of two-participant verbs in the languages where it appears.

Finally, many languages, including BH, have more than one passive voice. These languages offer insight into how and why languages use various passive voices. Scholars have always known that BH has more than one passive voice, though they have often not included the Hitpael in this category. Hebraists have not looked at other languages with multiple forms for this function, however. Other languages suggest new ways to understand this function. Often languages have more than one passive to express different situation aspects. One of the passives focuses on the completed state entered into by the S, while the other notes the ongoing activity before entering the final state. In this way, one passive is more stative, and the other, more process-oriented (sections 3.3.1, 3.6.3).

This comparative study, therefore, can lay to rest some aspects of the Niphal and the Hitpael that are seen as exceptional, for we note that these phenomena are typical across
languages. The passive need not occur with an underlying direct object, as the passive universally functions to demote the A. Situation aspect often distinguishes between passive voices that are otherwise very similar. Overlap between the middle and passive is common, as the middle often fulfills a passive function.

6.2. **Situation aspect and Niphal/Hitpael contrast**

A particularly difficult problem in BH with respect to the Niphal/Hitpael contrast is texts where the Niphal and Hitpael of the same root appear in the same context. Sometimes these examples are nearly identical sentences spread throughout a story, or they may occur close to one another, even in adjacent sentences. We saw examples of these throughout Chapter 4. We can assume that the author was either trying to be redundant or that the author was trying to convey a subtle contrast. Situation aspect can explain the distinction, as we saw above, where the Hitpael represents an activity taking place on the S, and the Niphal, the final state entered into.

Sometimes either the Hitpael or Niphal is overwhelmingly represented in a given root. In these cases, it is not immediately clear why the author would “break” from what seems to be the standard expression of the passive. The author may use the rare form in order to express a less common situation aspect of the verb.

Situation aspect also explains tendencies of the two stems to prefer certain TAM forms. I noted that the Niphal has a higher preference for perfective forms of the verb, while the Hitpael tends towards imperfective forms. Siebesma (1991) and IBHS posited that stems tended to supplet one another’s TAM forms, so the passive of a root may only occur in the Niphal in the perfective, and the Hitpael in the imperfective (section 2.2.3.1). If this suppletion has occurred, it is not widespread; nevertheless, situation aspect can explain it. Since stative aspect refers
closely to the final phase of an action, and activity aspect to the ongoing phase before the end, we find a correlation between those aspects and the perfective and imperfective, respectively. Thus situation aspect explains phenomena that have previously not been addressed. Rare and suppletive Niphal and Hitpael forms can be traced back to a contrast in situation aspect. Moreover, texts that express the root in both stems in similar or the same context exploit this aspectual distinction between the stems.

Among verbs with motion we saw that some overwhelmingly, and even exclusively, preferred the Niphal. This includes motion verbs *per se*, such as הולך *mlt*, “flee,” and נגש *ngš*, “approach,” as well as verbs that include motion, such as some of the hide verbs. In these cases the Niphal appears to focus on the resultative of the transition, upon which point the new state begins. For example, in the verb “approach,” the person moves from far away closer and closer (the activity) until he or she arrives at the transition point; now the mover has become “close” as he or she reached the final point of the motion (the state) and is no longer moving closer. This function is the same as the “maximal result” observed in Tagalog (section 3.6.3.2).

Other passive stems came up in the discussion of the Niphal and Hitpael. The Pual appears often as an agentive passive, most often among Agent transitive verbs. Exceptions arise, where the situation could also be understood as spontaneous or even reflexive middle. Moreover, the Pual can show lexical idiosyncrasies in some cases. This tendency of the Pual towards agentive situations with two participants explains the common observation that the Pual is related to the Piel. In addition to the formal resemblance between the two stems, they both tend to function in the same area of the transitivity spectrum. If they are related on clear formal and functional planes, then it is less problematic if a Pual does not demonstrate a Piel counterpart. The Pual is not necessarily derived from the Piel, but both function in a similar,
high transitivity domain. The Qp often has an ambiguous form, since the Masoretes do not usually recognize it, so is hard to distinguish with certainty from the Pual or Hophal. It can appear as a stative, but in the one Niphal/Qp minimal pair, the Qp was more of an activity verb. The situation aspect of the Qp, thus, require further study.

6.3. Diachronic Analysis

Chapter 5 compared the use of the Niphal and Hitpael on a diachronic axis. First, I analyzed the distribution of roots in the historical periods of BH and Ben Sira, according to whether examples existed of the root in the Niphal, Hitpael, or both. I concluded that the earliest and latest periods use more Hitpael-only roots, and fewer Niphal-only roots, which may indicate a growth in contexts demanding a Hitpael. Genre and historical development appear to play important roles, although their role is clearer with Sira than with ABH. Second, I looked at roots that appear throughout most or all the historical periods under examination. The Niphal remained stable as a stative stem, and the Hitpael stayed true to its middle, become, and “act as X” functions. I noted that individual roots gained some new Hitpael functions in later periods, though the stem did not stray from its common meanings. Third, I singled out the Hitpael, since it appeared with the most new uses, to see if the new uses followed any pattern in development. I compared Hitpael uses of later and earlier corpuses. While individual roots acquired new uses in the Hitpael in later texts, the Hitpael uses stayed consistent. Fourth, I looked at roots that occur in the Hitpael only in later corpuses. Again, these Hitpaels fell within the categories of the Hitpael distinguished above.

These results raise the question of the significant decline of the Niphal and Hitpael in RH and the rise of the Nitpael. The trajectory of ABH through Ben Sira does not present as drastic a
change in the use of these stems as does the jump from Ben Sira to RH. This result seems counter-intuitive. It seems, therefore, that the diachronic shift alone does not explain the shift in the verbal system. Other factors likely contributed to the change, such as contact between Hebrew and other languages, especially Aramaic. The development of the RH verbal system lies beyond the scope of this work. Nevertheless, this drastic change from earlier Hebrew to RH highlights how stable the Niphal and Hitpael relationship stayed during the periods of Biblical Hebrew and Ben Sira. The Hitpael may have drifted into some of the territory occupied by the Niphal earlier, but any drift was subtle. The inscriptive evidence may lack Hitpaels because of historical accident or because of the terse nature of the texts, as they focus on final states rather than ongoing activities. The statistically tiny sample of Niphal and Hitpael examples, though, limits how sure we can be about any generalizations.

6.4. UNDERSTANDING THE TEXT

A deeper appreciation for the subtleties expressed by the BH verbal system offers us a more accurate appreciation of the language. We can see how the language fits typologically among languages. Additionally, BH as its own system displays characteristics distinct from Indo-European languages. Translators must take particular note of these characteristics. Passive participles express a distinction that Indo-European languages do not. Indo-European languages (e.g., English, French, Dutch, and German) do not allow aspectual distinctions in participles. BH allows for passive participles marked for aspect, that is, Niphal participles represent states, and Hitpaels, activities. English must express this distinction with a different mechanism, as the passive participle (e.g., “made”) is stative. Any activity passive would have to be expressed with a progressive passive participle (e.g., “being made”) or an active (e.g., “acting like X”).
Conversely, the lack of distinction among the passive, reflexive, and middle should warn us against applying Indo-European categories onto BH too hastily. Bicknell (1983) noted this caution. Nevertheless, many Hebraists have taken for granted the notions of “passive” and “reflexive.” These linguists are native speakers of languages that formally distinguish between the passive and reflexive much more commonly than BH. The latter language, though, lumps these functions together often into a single form, leaving the reader to distinguish them from context.

The BH author uses the contrasts in his language to convey his ideas, and as readers we must be sensitive to these contrasts to understand his meaning. As non-native speakers we can otherwise miss subtleties the author’s Hebrew-speaking audience would have been able to understand. For example, a BH author can use a Hitpael followed by a Niphal to depict the entirety of the action: process followed by final state. Similarly, the author allows the reader to be present at various points in an action, before or after the completion of the passive event, and can use this feature to move the reader back and forth in time, or from one character’s viewpoint or another’s.

Ultimately, a clearer understanding of the BH stem system enlightens our comprehension of the BH language as a whole. Once we see another piece of information packed into the verbs, we are able to release and make use of that knowledge to appreciate the texts of the HB more fully, for exegesis and/or translation.

6.5. Further study

The situation aspect explains the vast number of examples of the Niphal and Hitpael, but some exceptions remain to be explained. The Niphal most often expresses the resulting state of a
transition, and the Hitpael, the activity. However, I have demonstrated some examples that lie outside of this explanation. I have called them “abstract” and “idiomatic” uses. While this nomenclature is adequate for the current study, these examples provoke further questions. Further study may be able to track minor, secondary forces that underlie the Niphal and Hitpael, which in these exceptional cases go against the theory I propose here.

Highlighting the way BH expresses situation aspect opens new routes for further study. A new, exhaustive evaluation of the other passive forms of the language, the Qal passive, Pual, and Hophal should be undertaken. I have begun to look at the Pual, as seen above, and have noted that the Pual tends to occupy an area of higher transitivity (two distinct entities, resultative states) than the Niphal and the Hitpael. The Pual also has its own idiomatic uses. This is only the beginning, however; further, more purposeful examination of that stem would be in order. Since these other passive forms appear, albeit much more seldom than the Niphal and Hitpael, they likely demonstrate further subtleties of the passive system in BH. Searching for other languages with such a range of passive forms would also benefit this analysis. Furthermore, how voice and situation aspect intersect in those languages would be useful.

One should also look for other ways in which BH expresses situation aspect. At this point, I have demonstrated situation aspect in the passive voice, a detranstivizing function. Perhaps a similar distinction exists in the transitivizing function in the active voice. Jenni (1968) has suggested a factitive-resultative distinction in the Piel and Hiphil, and this could be tested further outside of BH. Perhaps one could develop this category with more cross-linguistic research, namely the area of situation aspect in transitivizing functions. Situation aspect may be the distinction Jenni is noticing. If situation aspect can be shown to play a part in transitivizing
functions, then we could conclude that situation plays a major part in the derivialational verbal system in BH.

A case study, evaluating how the LXX translators understood the Niphal/Hitpael contrast in BH, would develop the timeline of developments in BH. In those cases of minimal pairs, where the BH author was trying to convey a subtle distinction, one could examine whether Greek demonstrates the same distinction in some way. Conclusions arising from such a study would help solidify diachronic models of development of BH.

Finally, I hope that this use of a typological, cross-linguistic model for evaluating BH can bear fruit in other areas of study. Since the first Hebrew scholars drew on the scholarship of Arab linguistic researchers, Hebraists have acknowledged the importance of typological study. As more linguistic knowledge becomes available, we will be able to see more clearly how BH fits into the scheme of human language. As we understand BH more clearly, our knowledge of the biblical text will only deepen.
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