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That there exists a group of biblical Hebrew verbs which appear in both transitive and intransitive grammatical constructions has long been recognized. However, explanations of this phenomenon among modern BH grammarians, especially regarding the grammatical status of the Object, have been unsatisfactorily vague. Many issues relevant to the BH transitivity alternation (e.g. valency, transitivity, lability, verb classes, and constructional semantics) have received sustained treatment in the broader linguistic community. The purpose of this dissertation is to offer an extended treatment of the BH transitivity alternation utilizing the theory and methods of Cognitive Grammar and the related (sub)discipline Construction Grammar. This investigation explains the relationship of these BH verbs to their associated nouns with reference to the prototypical and schematic transitive event.

Many BH verbs which permit the transitivity alternation exhibit significant semantic overlap allowing them to be categorized and analyzed as "verb classes." The benefit of analyzing verbs by class is that it increases the amount of data (an important feature when working with a dead language) and, more importantly, it enables the isolation of common lexical qualities that contribute to a verb's ability to appear in alternate constructions. The BH verb classes analyzed are: Verbs of Dressing and Undressing (לָבַשׁ, עָדָה, עָטַף, פָשַׁט, עָטָה, אָזַר, הָגַר, לָבַשׁ, עָדָה, עָטַף, פָשַׁט, עָטָה, אָזַר, הָגַר), Verbs of Dwelling (חָנָה, שָׁכַן, יָשַׁב, גוּר, חָנָה, שָׁכַן, יָשַׁב, גוּר), and Verbs of Fullness and Want (עָבַר, יָצָא, שָׁרַץ, זָרַע, נוּב, מָלֵא, שָׂבֵעַ, שָׁטַף, פָרַח, נָטַף, נָזַל, הָלַךְ, יָרַד, עָלָה, עָבַר, יָצָא, שָׁרַץ, זָרַע, נוּב, מָלֵא, שָׂבֵעַ, שָׁטַף, פָרַח, נָטַף, נָזַל, הָלַךְ, יָרַד, עָלָה). After a consideration of BH verb classes, the same
methods are applied to a selection of miscellaneous BH verbs which also exhibit the transitivity alternation (ריב, שכב, ריב). This study concludes that the BH transitivity alternation is licensed and limited by conceptual factors. Though often translated and interpreted as essentially synonymous expressions, verbs exhibiting the transitivity alternation actually offer alternate construals of the realities they represent and therefore should be regarded as having different meanings. It is argued that the meaning of these BH verbs must be established on the basis of the unique combination of verbal and constructional (or syntactic) semantics. Both transitive and intransitive constructions construe verbal meaning in accordance with certain conventionalized image schemas. Such construal is based, at least in part, on the imagination, goals, and intentions of the speaker.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

In Prov 8:12 Lady Wisdom begins her encomium with these words:

(1) Prov 8:12

The difficulty of Prov 8:12, often noted by commentators, revolves around Wisdom's use of the typically intransitive verb שָׁכַן with what appears to be a direct object, עָרְמָה ("prudence," or, "cunning").¹ Uncertainty regarding the relation of Obj to the predicate is evidenced by the variety of translations of which the following are representative:

(2) a. Locative: "I, wisdom, dwell in prudence" (RSV)
   b. Comitative: I, wisdom, live with prudence" (NRSV)
   c. Resultative: "I wisdom have made prudence my dwelling" (ASV)

Lady Wisdom is undoubtedly asserting some relationship she enjoys with עָרְמָה; however, the nature of the relationship is difficult to identify on account of the unconventional use of the intransitive verb in a transitive construction. While there is perhaps something appropriate about the elusive Lady Wisdom beginning her speech with enigmatic words, this dissertation develops the idea that the difficulty lies more in our present understanding of the semantics and/or pragmatics of the verb-construction combination than in any intentional obfuscating on the part of the author.

Prov 8:12 is just one example of the topic of this study, namely transitivity alternations in Biblical Hebrew (henceforth BH). That there exists a group of BH verbs which, though typically intransitive, can take what appears to be an object has long been recognized as peculiar, if not problematic, by BH grammarians, lexicographers, and translators. Though almost every modern

---

¹ "Scholars have deemed this a difficult verse, given the verb škn, 'to abide,' which seems inappropriate semantically and lacks a prepositional object." William Brown, Character in Crisis: A Fresh Approach to Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 37. For a detailed treatment of שָׁכַן see 5.3.4 below.
BH grammar identifies and discusses this phenomenon, the grammars are unsatisfactorily brief and vague about the linguistic processes at work, with the result that there is a lack of agreement regarding the nature of the linguistic phenomenon as well as which verbs exhibit the phenomenon. Recently the object nominal complement in the transitivity alternation has been given the, to my knowledge, previously unattested label, "complement accusative," a designation whose merits will be evaluated in the course of this study.²

1.1 Goals of the Study

The impetus for this study is the common though somewhat vague description of these verbal alternations as intransitive verbs occurring with an object in certain (unspecified) circumstances.³ Though all the BH grammars agree that there is a unique relationship between these verbs and their associated nouns, this phenomenon lacks a detailed linguistic treatment. The goal of the present study is to fill this void. This investigation will attempt to identify the nature of the relationship between these intransitive verbs and their associated nouns and in so doing specify what linguistic factors license and limit this phenomenon. Naturally, the results of this study will have implications for the translation and exegesis of those passages in which these verbs occur. Such implications will be elucidated throughout.

The major questions this dissertation will address are these 1) Is the common notion of an "intransitive verb taking an (direct) object" the most accurate description of the linguistic phenomenon? 2) What semantic or pragmatic factors license the valence adjustments? 3) What role, if any, do the verb classes and grammatical constructions play in creating meaning? 4) What

² Bill Arnold and John Choi, A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 16. Waltke-O’Connor were the first to use the designation "complement accusative," for this phenomenon though, unlike Arnold and Choi, they classify verbs of dwelling, of which שכן is one, under a different heading. IBHS 10.2.1h, 168.

³ Defining the "Complement Accusative," Arnold-Choi write, "The object is a noun used with certain intransitive verbs, which take on new transitive meanings through a modification of their original meanings." Guide, 16.
is the nature of the semantic shift that takes place with the introduction of the object and how do these shifts compare with the typologies of similar alternations found in other languages? 5) What causes the semantic shift (e.g. the verb, the object, the combination of the two, the grammatical construction, or a mix of any or all of these)? 6) What is the status of the second nominal (direct object, non-object nominal complement, etc.)?

Many issues relevant to the BH transitivity alternation (e.g. valency, transitivity, lability, and constructional semantics) have received sustained treatment in the broader linguistic community. The goal of this study is to apply the insights and methods of modern linguistics, especially those of Cognitive Grammar and related (sub)disciplines, to the BH transitivity alternation with a view toward establishing the unique sense and exegetical significance of these verb-construction combinations. The theory and methods of Cognitive Grammar that are relevant to this study will be treated in chapter 3 below.

In short, the purpose of this dissertation is to provide a comprehensive analysis of the BH verbs undergoing the transitive alternation from a Cognitive Grammar perspective. More broadly, my hope is that this project will contribute to the modest but growing field of cognitive approaches to the Bible by utilizing newer theoretical models to elucidate old linguistic cruxes. After commenting on the paucity of research on verb classes as they relate to transitivity, Dixon and Aikhenvald remark, "The transitivity and derivational propensities for verbs of different semantic types is a large topic, which should be a focus for future research." The final aim of this project is to contribute in some small measure to that future research.

---


In some respects, delimiting any linguistic corpus has a certain arbitrary quality to it. Languages, as is well known, do not change overnight. In fact, a good argument can be made (as it has been, for example, by the editors of *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*) to include the Hebrew of Ben Sira and Qumran with BH as a sort of pre-Rabbinic corpus of literature. However, Michael Patrick O'Connor has argued that such a grouping of "dialects," at least for lexicographical analysis, is, in his words, "wrong headed." O'Connor's objections are based on what he considers to be the realities of historical linguistics and the exigencies of lexicographic procedure.

Regarding historical linguistics, which has more relevance for this study, O'Connor argues against grouping the language of the Hebrew Bible and Ben Sira with the language of Late Second Temple period represented in the DSS and inscriptions. The former are undatable and are preserved only in manuscript tradition in contrast to the latter which are "to varying degrees archeologically datable." He says, "Such a separation does not require a dating for the biblical material, but only a separation of it from material that can be dated on other grounds." Second, he notes the distinct "scriptural turn" of the Hebrew of Qumran and Ben Sira saying that the "Hebrew of the Late Second Temple Period is in deeper and more various ways than Biblical Hebrew a scriptural language, a language full of quotation and paraphrase." This makes the


8. O'Connor, "Semitic Lexicography," 193. A similar position is taken by Elisha Qimron whom O'Connor quotes approvingly: "Since DSS Hebrew and that of the Bar-Kokhba letters are the only dialects whose time and place are known, we should try to classify the other types of Hebrew by comparing them to these two dialects." "Observations on the History of Early Hebrew (1000 B.C.E.-200 C.E.) in Light of the Dead Sea Documents," in D. Dimant and U. Rappaport (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research.* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 10, Leiden: Brill, 1992), 360.


matter of continuity between BH and Qumran Hebrew a much more complex issue than the editors of the *DCH* suggest.\footnote{On this point O’Connor cites the following statement by Elwolde as misleading: "We were struck by the small quantity of new vocabulary at Qumran, or, put another way, the high degree of continuity between the vocabulary of the Bible and that of the scrolls." "Developments in Hebrew Vocabulary Between Bible and Mishnah," in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 26; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 48-49.}

The corpus of this study, therefore, is the Biblical or Classical Hebrew language as it is found in the Hebrew Bible (HB). There is no doubt that the language of the HB evidences linguistic variation due in part to dialectal differences as well as diachronic developments, both of which will be taken into account in the course of this study as they pertain to the variation of usage and distribution of these verbs. Though diachronic issues will be addressed, the overall approach is synchronic as it seeks to elucidate the semantics of these verb-construction combinations found in a more or less uniform linguistic system.

It should be noted, however, that from the point of view of Cognitive Grammar the diachronic and synchronic approaches may not be as disparate as they are often regarded. Comparing the diachronic focus of historical-philological semantics of the pre-structuralist period with the synchronic focus of the post-structuralist (Cognitive Grammar), Dirk Geeraerts comments,\footnote{Dirk Geeraerts, "History of Lexical Semantics," in *Topics in Cognitive Linguistics*, Ed. by Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1988), 647-77, esp. 661.}

The basic difference is the shift from a diachronic to a synchronic approach to semantics, mirrored by the fact that the emphasis shifts from the mechanisms of semantic change to the internal prototypical structure of polysemous lexical concepts. The prototypical view of natural categories is so to say the synchronic side of the diachronic coin; what appears as diachronic change from one point of view, is merely the realization of synchronically available possibilities from another.\footnote{Dirk Geeraerts, "History of Lexical Semantics," in *Topics in Cognitive Linguistics*, Ed. by Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1988), 647-77, esp. 661.}

In other words, the same cognitive processes at work in diachronic change (polysemy, metaphor, metonymy, meronomy, grammaticalization, etc.) may be considered from a synchronic
perspective to be conventionalized extensions of prototypical structures. Finally, as they shed light on the linguistic processes at work in BH, evidence from cognate languages (and non-cognate languages for that matter) will be assessed.

1.3 Verbs to be Studied

The task of delimiting the verbs for this study presents an initial difficulty. This difficulty is seen, for example, in the variation of verbs cited in the standard BH grammars as evidencing what I am calling the "transitivity alternation." The methodological difficulty may be summarized as follows: the data that one identifies as representing a particular linguistic phenomenon is to a large degree determined by what one presupposes the linguistic phenomenon to be. Conversely, what one understands a particular linguistic phenomenon to be is in part determined by the data selected for analysis. For example, both GKC and Waltke-O'Connor place the issue of transitivity at the center of their description while van der Merwe et al. speak in terms of nominal complementation (non-object). While there is much overlap in the verbs cited, van der Merwe et al. include verbs of movement (not included by GKC or Waltke-O'Connor) while GKC and Waltke-O'Connor include verbs of dressing (not included by van der Merwe et al.). The decision to include and exclude verbs is determined in part by the theoretical presuppositions at work. Naturally, the various descriptions and explanations offered by the grammars will be evaluated in the course of the study.

The starting point of this study, however, is not one specific description made by one grammar, but a general description of all or most grammars. Broadly speaking, there is a general consensus that some BH verbs that do not typically appear with an object (or nominal complement) can, at times, do so. There are a group of what may be called 'core verbs'; verbs

---

13. GKC §117u, 368; IBHS 10.2.1h, 168; BHRG §33.2.3, 244. For a more detailed treatment of the BH grammatical descriptions see 2.3.3.2 below.
which most, if not all, of the grammars cite as representative of this phenomenon. The approach of this study is to analyze the linguistic phenomenon at work in these core verbs and then, based on that analysis, to determine whether or to what extent peripheral cases cited in some grammars manifest the same linguistic realities.

It is of interest that the core verbs by and large fall into verb classes, a phenomenon which will be useful on the methodological level and of interest on the theoretical level. On the methodological level, if substantial parallels can be demonstrated between verbs in terms of both their semantics and syntactic behavior, then the behavior of other verbs in the class can be brought to bear on what might otherwise be insufficient data. On the theoretical level, the existence of syntactic uniformity among verbs with overlapping semantics offers insight into the basic cognitive structures at work that sanction (or limit) the phenomenon.

The salient feature of the core verbs in BH is an increase in valency (i.e. the number of arguments, see 3.4.2 below) without a valence-increasing operation. What is striking in the case of BH, as opposed to English, is that BH verbs undergoing the transitivity alternation increase valence without the conventional morphological valence-increasing operations, namely a stem change. The English example, 'to break,' evidences a common type of alternation called the causative/inchoative alternation. Unlike English, which does not have a valence-increasing operation at the morphological level, BH does have productive valence-increasing morphemes in the form of stems. BH typically introduces notions of causation through the use of the Hiphil and, less often, Piel derived stems. For example, שָׁמַע (‘to hear’) patterns as follows:

(3) a. Gen 3:8: 

He heard (שמע - Qal) the voice of the Lord God

b. Deut 4:10:

And I will cause them to hear (שמע - Hiph) my words.

Similarly, נב ('to sprout,' or 'to prosper') represents the same basic alternation:

(4) a. Ps 92:15:

They still produce (fruit) (נוב - Qal) in old age

b. Zech 9:17:

Grain will cause young men to flourish (נוב - Polel), and new wine young women.

However, Prov 10:31 says:

(5) Prov 10:31:

The mouth of the righteous produces (נוב - Qal) wisdom

This occurrence of נב is perplexing in that it clearly undergoes an increase in valence both with and without the valence-increasing morpheme of the Polel stem. The question this dissertation addresses regards the conceptual motivation and semantic nuance of such alternate construals.

In addition to the "change of valence" criteria, there is a rarer but related phenomenon where the nominal complement changes semantic role without a formal change in the verb. A change in the semantic role naturally entails a corresponding change in the meaning of the verb or clause.

(6) a. Jer 1:17

But you, gird up your loins

b.1 Sam 2:4b

And those who stumble gird strength
Interestingly, Qal אזר never occurs without a second nominal. However, as seen in (6), the semantic (or thematic) role of the object is different in 6a and 6b. 6a specifies the [Dressee] and 6b specifying the [Dress].

These two criteria — change of valence and change of semantic role — cover the evidence delineated in the standard grammars.

1.5 Thesis

The theoretical model undergirding this thesis will be outlined in chapter 3; however, my general argument may be stated at outset. Though often translated and interpreted as essentially synonymous expressions, BH verbs appearing in different syntactic constructions — in this case, the focus is transitive and intransitive constructions — offer alternate construals of the realities they represent and therefore should be regarded as having different meanings. "Meanings," here is used broadly to cover both pragmatic and semantic realities.

The sense of a BH verb must be established on the basis of its unique combination of verbal and constructional (or syntactic) semantics. A verb evokes a particular semantic frame which is organized, at least in part, by the syntactic structure in which it is placed. In some cases, the particular syntactic construction may supply a semantic element not inherently evoked by the verb as it is conventionally used. In other cases, the syntactic construction is foregrounding/backgrounding a conceptual element that is present in the verbal frame. BH verbs, like the realities they represent, are subject to a variety of alternate construals. Syntactic constructions, in this case the intransitive and transitive constructions, construe verbal meaning

---

15. See 4.2.2 for treatment of אזר. This category "change of semantic role" would also include the role alternations of לבשׁ in which [Dresser] and [Dressee] seem to switch conventional syntactic placement as seen, for example, in Judg 6:34.
in accordance with certain conventionalized image schemas. Such construal is based, at least in part, on the imagination, goals, and intentions of the speaker.
Chapter 2: History of Treatment

The designation "accusative" derives from Classical Greek and Latin linguistic description of grammatical case markings. Systems of case markings serve to identify nominals as having particular syntactic and semantic functions. Languages which formally mark cases differ with regard to the number and functions of the cases they mark. Old French has two cases, classical Greek five, Latin seven, Russian ten, and Finnish, famously one of the more complex systems, around fifteen. Cross-linguistically, some cases appear to be more basic or core than others, and the nominative (Nom) and accusative (Acc) cases are uncontroversially the most basic, associated as they are with the grammatical Subj and Obj respectively.

Classical Semitic languages such as Akkadian, Classical Arabic, and the various Early Northwest Semitic languages formally distinguished two or three cases by means of sufformatives. A proto-Semitic case system has been reconstructed as follows.

16. R. L. Trask, The Student's Dictionary of Language and Linguistics (London: Arnold, 1997), 35. While few, if any, would dispute the syntactic function of morphological case markers, that they have a semantic function is widely disputed. For a discussion of the dispute as well as a defense of the semantic function of grammatical markers, see Ronald Langacker, Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction (Oxford: OUP, 2008), 93-94. The semantic function of cases is central to the theoretical outlook of this study, namely Cognitive Grammar. The details and defense of this perspective will be given in ch 3.


18. Though our knowledge of the Proto-Semitic case system is fairly certain, Hasselbach offers an important caution regarding the study of any proto-language: "Since no natural language is homogenous or absolutely regular, proto languages are consequently by necessity idealizations and approximations at best of how a presumed ancestor language might have looked. In other words, they have no true counterpart in natural language... [W]e have to be aware of the fact that proto languages, and consequently Proto Semitic, are not static and do not reflect a single point in time. This means that proto languages can exhibit signs of various diachronic stages that reflect different periods in their development." Rebecca Hasselbach, Case in Semitic: Roles, Relations, and Reconstruction (Oxford: OUP, 2013), 2, 6. Cf. R. M. W. Dixon, The Rise and Fall of Languages (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 45.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Endings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Dual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>- u</td>
<td>-ū</td>
<td>- ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive19</td>
<td>- i</td>
<td>- ī</td>
<td>- ay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>- a</td>
<td>- ī</td>
<td>- ay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1 Proto-Semitic Case System

Generally speaking, the cases in case-marked Semitic languages correspond to the typical case functions in other known Nom-Acc case-marked languages. The Nom designates the grammatical subject (Subj) as well as nominal predicates. The Acc is "adverbial," marking direct objects (DO) as well as certain destinations or goals and adverbial expressions (e.g. time, manner, etc.). The genitive (Gen) is essentially adnominal, occurring with prepositions and specifying a relationship between two nominals by means of the construct state.

---

19. Note that formally, the Gen and Acc are identical in the plural and dual forms and therefore are sometimes termed the 'oblique' case.

20. Ergative-Absolutive languages manifest a similar uniformity of usage though the case markings on nominals are systematically different from a Nom-Acc language. In an ergative system the single argument (Subj) of an intransitive clause is marked the same as the Obj in a transitive clause.

2.1 The Accusative in Biblical Hebrew

By the end of the second millennium B.C.E., the Northwest Semitic case system had disappeared through the dropping of the final short vowel.\textsuperscript{22} Therefore the language of the Hebrew Bible, the earliest texts of which date from the late second millennium, does not feature overt morphological case endings.\textsuperscript{23} Though acknowledging the absence of morphological case endings, most BH grammars continue to employ the traditional case labels to designate syntactic functions. Joüon-Muraoka is representative in this regard: "We shall employ the usual terms \textit{accusative}, \textit{genitive}, and \textit{nominative} by analogy with Latin. Although case endings have almost entirely disappeared from Hebrew, all these originally morphological categories are now largely syntactic ones."\textsuperscript{24} Similarly, Waltke-O'Connor summarize the prevailing view regarding the continued usefulness of case labels for BH: "In a formal descriptive analysis of Biblical Hebrew we cannot properly speak of cases. Nevertheless, from a historical, comparative, and syntactic viewpoint we can differentiate three distinct 'cases,' that is, sets of syntactic functions, of the noun: nominative, genitive, and accusative."\textsuperscript{25}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{22} \textit{IBHS} 1.5.2f. This is a brief description of what was undoubtedly a very long and complicated process. Joshua Blau proposes a two-stage process for this development: "First, final \textit{i/u} were omitted, but \textit{a} was retained, giving rise to the opposition -\textit{a} (=accusative, including adverbial): \textit{Ø} (representing nominative/genitive, including vocative). Later, final -\textit{a} was elided as well." \textit{Phonology and Morphology of Biblical Hebrew} (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 267.
\item \textsuperscript{23} There continues to be an interesting discussion about possible remnants of the old case system persisting formally in BH. Waltke-O'Connor mention place names containing the old nominative plural (e.g. \textit{פְּנוּאֵל}, Gen 32:32), suffixed forms of certain monosyllabic family terms containing the old genitive singular ending (e.g. \textit{אָב} > \textit{אָבִיךָ}), and possibly a few forms like \textit{לַיְלָה} and \textit{אַרְצָה} containing the old accusative ending. \textit{IBHS} 8.2 a-d. This last suggestion is highly unlikely to be an example of the old accusative ending. However, since none of the nominal complements of BH verbs exhibiting the transitivity alternation feature a debatable remnant of the old case system, this discussion will be pursued no further.
\item \textsuperscript{24} Joüon-Muraoka, p. 440.
\item \textsuperscript{25} \textit{IBHS} 8.1d. For a discussion of this practice in the field of linguistics, see Andrej Malchukov and Andrew Spencer, "Introduction," \textit{The Oxford Handbook of Case} ed. by Andrej Malchukov and Andrew Spencer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 2.
\end{itemize}
2.1.1 Objections to the "Accusative" in BH

This practice, however, has not been without its detractors. Building on Theodor Nöldeke who almost a century earlier called into question the usefulness of the "accusative" label for BH linguistic description, J. Hoftijzer surveys the range of uses of accusative-marked nominals in classical Arabic and concludes that cases have no independent syntactic or semantic value but rather function only in relation to other case-marked nominals in the clause.26 Hoftijzer maintains, therefore, that the label "accusative" is unserviceable in BH (as well as other Semitic languages that have lost case markings). He says, "This is not only because of the formal point of view that these cases in these idioms no longer occur, but also due to the fact that one cannot speak of, for example, typical accusative functions."27

Hoftijzer's desire to avoid the term accusative except for morphologically case-marked languages is echoed by Jan Kroeze who offers a further objection to the label based on pedagogical concerns.28 In place of the traditional accusative labels, Kroeze proposes a three-fold descriptive analysis based on morphology, syntax, and semantics; the last has a rigorously functional flavor as it specifies patient (affected/effected), receiver, addressee, location, direction, source, regard, content, measure, interested party, instrument, material, medium, manner, role, route, time, duration, purpose, and cause.29 Kroeze, however, does not demonstrate an awareness


27. J. Hoftijzer, "Remarks Concerning the Use of the Particle 'T in Classical Hebrew," 7.

28. Regarding the frequent analogy made between BH and overtly case-marked Semitic languages like Akkadian and Classical Arabic, Jan Kroeze remarks,"that doesn't help the student, and especially the beginner, a lot. Very often the student doesn't know these other Semitic languages. And he or she can't see the accusative in BH. It is simply not acceptable, and rather confusing, to teach the student of BH the whole Semitic system so that he or she can learn to guess which nouns and adjective could have been in the accusative. Therefore, one should try to describe the BH system synchronically. This implies that the term and concept accusative cannot be used for BH any more." "Alternatives for the Accusative in Biblical Hebrew," in Studien zur hebräischen Grammatik, ed. Andreas Wagner OBO 156 (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: Göttingen, 1997), 11.

29. Kroeze acknowledges that it is possible that even more semantic functions could be added to this list.
of the now established usage of "accusative" for the "abstract case" function as it is employed in the generative tradition nor the prototypical case function as it is employed in cognitive-functional circles.

Recent studies of cross-linguistic typologies and linguistic prototypicality suggest that Hoftijzer's claim that it is impossible to "speak of typical accusative functions" is almost certainly incorrect. Though case-marked languages undoubtedly exhibit a variety of disparate and seemingly unrelated uses of a given case, there nevertheless appears to be an identifiable set of related functions of particular cases. Linguists from different theoretical perspectives have identified what are variously designated core, central, or (proto)typical functions of cases. This is most obviously evident with oblique cases, but, as will be argued below, it is also the case for the Nom and Acc as well. From a cognitive perspective, syntactic functions are inextricably tied to semantics and they evidence a radial structure based on conceptual proximity to a prototype.\(^{30}\)

Hoftijzer's objection to case meaning, specifically that the variety of seemingly unrelated usages of a particular case empties the case of any semantic value, is in fact a common objection made in linguistic literature. To this point Langacker's response is helpful: "It is quite evident that the oblique cases make a definite semantic contribution in many (if not all) of their uses .... Semantically the oblique cases are typical complex categories, comprising networks of related senses each centered on a prototype. If the subject- and object-marking cases depart somewhat from this model, it is only by virtue of the abstract nature of their meanings."\(^{31}\) As will be discussed below, it is not the case that BH has no case markings. The use and distribution Obj

30. The theoretical foundation of this will be discussed in detail in ch 3.

Prep  nav situates BH among other languages that employ Differential Object Marking (see 2.2 below).

However, despite their weaknesses both Hoftijzer and Kroeze rightly highlight the importance of verbal semantics and syntactic patterning of verb classes for establishing the status of a nominal complement. Similar views are expressed by Waltke-O'Connor: "Verbs can govern a variety of kinds of objects, and the range of objects associated with a particular verb is at base a feature of the verb. Classification of objective accusatives is therefore based on various categorizations of the verbs." Presumably the verb categorization Waltke-O'Connor have in mind refers to the semantics of the verb. It is this point, the contribution of verbal semantics to the status and classification of the nominal complement, that this study explores from the perspective of Cognitive Grammar.

Kroeze expresses an additional objection, specifically that employing the accusative label for non-case-marked languages like BH, risks illegitimately importing the accusative functions from case-marked languages (especially Classical and other Semitic languages) and that it therefore hinders the analysis of BH nominal complements on their own terms. This concern is valid. However, it should be noted that Kroeze's concern applies not only to the comparison of case-marked with non case-marked languages, but also to the comparison of two case-marked languages. On this point, Martin Haspelmath offers an important note of caution about the use of case labels. According to Haspelmath "the transfer of case labels from one language to another should not be understood as meaning that we are dealing with 'the same case.'"

33. IBHS 10.2.1a
35. "This means that case labels are valid only for particular languages. When talking about Latin, an expression like 'the dative case' has to be interpreted as 'the Latin dative case'... For convenience, similar case labels are
conventional practice of employing the term "accusative" to label certain syntactic-semantic functions, and with Haspelmath's caveats in mind, this study will continue to employ the label with the understanding that it refers to language specific qualities. The specific qualities of the accusative will be outlined below.

2.1.2 Description of the Accusative in BH

Under the broad category accusative, the standard BH grammars commonly distinguish the subcategories Objective, Adverbial, and Double accusative (sometimes called ditransitive). Objective accusatives includes the affected-object, the effected-object, and internal accusatives (including cognate and non-cognate). Adverbial accusatives include designations of time, location, manner, state, limitation, and specification. Double accusatives refer to verbs that have two objects associated with them.

The salient feature that distinguishes Objective from Adverbial accusatives is the notion of requirement. If the Obj is perceived as required or necessary for an expression to be meaningful, then it is labeled an Objective accusative. Objects which are considered optional, by contrast, are typically classified as Adverbial. These correspond to the common distinction between complements and adjuncts. According to van der Merwe, et al., "Complements cannot be omitted without changing the meaning of the clause or without making the clause ungrammatical. Direct objects are examples of complements. Adjuncts, however, add


36. To Kroeze's concern about the pedagogical usefulness of the accusative label, its well-established usage in the BH grammatical literature as well as its use in the theoretical linguistic literature would speak highly in favor of retaining the label. However, the serviceability of the label for pedagogical purposes is really beside the point of this study.
information to the core of the clause and may be omitted without changing the basic meaning of
the clause." Though the labels *complement* and *adjunct* are consistently employed throughout
the linguistic literature, most recognize that they can be misleading if taken as hard and fast
categories. In many cases it is difficult to determine if a given nominal is a complement or
adjunct, and it is even more difficult to articulate a universal criterion or test that, when applied
to any noun phrase (NP), would establish it as one or the other.

Older grammars, like GKC and Joüon-Muraoka, employ language of "subordination" to
the verb with indirect (adverbial) accusatives being more "loosely" subordinate to the verb than
direct accusatives. It is unclear in these grammars if the nature of the association described in
terms of proximity is conceived as being a graded reality, though the designation "loose"
suggests that it is.

In English, the double accusative construction is closely associated with verbs of transfer
and, as will be suggested below, the construction itself contributes the basic semantic notion of
"giving." Waltke-O'Connor note that BH has a much wider usage of the double accusative
construction which, though including notions of transfer (e.g. Isa 27:4; Jer 9:1), also includes
notions of creation (things made + materials), appointment (person appointed + rank; and
similarly, person named + name) as well as certain verbs involving an instrument or medium
(
, Mic 7:2; הָנָּה, Mal 3:24; יַעַסְק, Ps 45:8).  

38. "It is widely admitted, however, that a verb can be complemented basically in two ways, either by an object or
by an adverbial, although it is often notoriously difficult to draw a line between the two." T. Muraoka, "On Verb
Complementation in Biblical Hebrew," *VT* 29.4 (1979): 425-35; *IBHS* §10.2a 162-63. For a discussion of this
issue in general linguistics see John Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* (Cambridge: CUP, 1968),
§8.1.1.
39. GKC §117a, 362; §118a, 372; Joüon-Muraoka §125a, 440.
40. *IBHS* 10.2.3c-d, 174-75.
Significantly for this study, many BH grammars acknowledge a group of senses associated with the ditransitive syntactic construction. For the ditransitive construction, the relation of the different constructional meanings to each other (e.g. polysemy, metaphor, etc.) as well as their internal structure as category members — that is, whether they evidence instances of a general sense or relation to a prototype — is an interesting question and is being explored by a number of researchers. Importantly for this study, however, is the observation that what is true of the ditransitive construction — that it is associated with certain senses of meanings — may in principle be true of simple transitive constructions as well.41

2.2 The nota accusativi

A tremendous amount of debate has revolved around the origin, function, and meaning of BH Obj marker אָּ. Muraoka is certainly correct when he says, "No single particle has given rise to more widespread and also mutually more contradictory discussion that this so-called nota accusativi."42 Even the conventional (and generic) classification of אָּ as a particle betrays certain theoretical commitments which have recently been challenged with the alternative label, Object Preposition (Obj Prep).43 While it is clear that its use is connected with the definiteness of the Obj, its variability of usage with definite Objs as seen, for example, in (7) a and b below, has elicited a considerable number of explanations.

(7) a. 1 Kgs 6:1 לֹא שָׂם יְהוָה אֵלָיו

And he built the house for YHWH (without אָּ)

41. Cognitive Grammar argues that this is the case though the meaning is more abstract than the ditransitive construction.


b. 1 Kgs 6:9

And he built the house. (with אַתָּה)

Treatments of the variable usage of אַתָּה may be broadly divided into those which appeal to emphasis and those which appeal to its function in marking the accusative. Those which understand אַתָּה as having developed from an original emphatic particle — notably Albrecht, Meyer, GKC, and Waltke-O’Connor — appeal in large measure to its use with the grammatical Subj, its use in passive constructions, and its variable usage with the DO (as seen in (7) a and b above). 44 The following are illustrative:

(8) a. 2 Kgs 6:5

And the axe-head (אַתָּה marked) fell into the water.

b. Gen 27:42

And the words of Esau (אַתָּה marked) were told to Rebekah.

The most significant problem with the emphatic hypothesis is the numerous instances, pointed out by Alfred Wilson and others, in which אַתָּה is used without any clear sense of emphasis and, conversely, instances in which אַתָּה is absent where it would naturally be expected. 45 Wilson offers dozens of examples of this phenomenon in close or contiguous verses. 46 Ezek 4:5 and 6 are illustrative:


45. Wilson, "The Particle אַתָּה in Hebrew, I," Hebraica 6.2 (1980): 139-50, 146. Other difficulties with the emphatic hypothesis are the origin of אַתָּה as an emphatic and the notion that this supposed core meaning persists in the attested forms of BH. For an extensive treatment of the arguments for and against the emphatic hypothesis, see Bekins, Transitivity, 40-46.

And you shall bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. (no Obj Prep)

And you shall bear the iniquity of the house of Judah (Obj Prep)

In contrast to the emphatic hypothesis is the accusative hypothesis of which there are a number of iterations. A common view is that את is employed to disambiguate potentially confusing expressions. Proponents of disambiguation argue that את marks the accusative in situations where it is uncertain which nominal is functioning as the Subj and which the Obj.

Citing the work of Edith Moravcsik, W. Randall Garr asserts that this view cannot be sustained in light of cross-linguistic evidence. In languages which evidence variation in object marking it is rare for disambiguation to be a strong motivating factor. In BH in particular, there are simply too many occasions in which Obj Prep את is used in situations that are patently unambiguous (e.g. 1 Kgs 6:9 above) and therefore its presence requires alternative explanations.

Another version of the accusative hypothesis explains the usage primarily in terms of style. In this view, expressions with and without Obj Prep את are essentially synonymous, and the difference in usage is described in terms of pragmatic factors. Wilson, for example, says: "All difficulty, however, disappears, if we assume that, whatever its original force, את came to be used only as a sign which the writer or speaker, might, according to his fancy or inclination, use or not use." Muraoka's view may also be characterized as stylistic or pragmatic. Muraoka strongly

47. See, for example, Francis I. Andersen, "Passive and Ergative in Hebrew" in Near Eastern Studies in Honor of William Foxwell Albright. Ed. by Hans Goedicke, (Baltimore: JHU Press, 1971), 14. Though he takes into account individuation hierarchy (see below), Michael Malessa's analysis of את may also be classified as essentially disambiguation. Untersuchungen zur verbalen Valenz im biblischen Hebräisch (SSN 49; Assen: van Gorcum, 2006).


49. Wilson, "The Particle את in Hebrew, I," 146.
rejects the emphatic hypothesis and argues that the את mainly marks the accusative though he admits its usage is fairly free and unpredictable. ⁵⁰ Regarding its variable usage with definite DOs Muraoka suggests that a diachronic development of conventionality may be involved as well as a particular author's desire to bring a noun into prominence in a specific speech event. ⁵¹ The salient point of appeals to style is that the Obj Prep את carries no discernible semantic value.

More recent iterations of the accusative hypothesis revisit the puzzle of variable usage and distribution of את in light of linguistic typologies and prototypical transitivity. Geoffrey Khan was the first to point out that the seemingly arbitrary usage of the Obj marker in BH (and also in other Semitic languages) in fact follows certain hierarchical parameters related to individuation, parameters of which definiteness is only one of many. ⁵² Other notions, like specificity, concreteness, and textual prominence are motivating factors in את usage. Khan offers the following chart as a summary outline of individuation/salience hierarchies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuated/Salient</th>
<th>Non-individuated/Non-salient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Definite</td>
<td>&gt; Indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Non-reflexive complement</td>
<td>&gt; Reflexive complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Specific</td>
<td>&gt; Generic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Concrete</td>
<td>&gt; Abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Qualified</td>
<td>&gt; Unqualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Proper</td>
<td>&gt; Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 1st &gt; 2nd &gt; 3rd &gt; Human</td>
<td>&gt; Inanimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Textually Prominent</td>
<td>&gt; Incidental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2 Individuation Hierarchies ⁵³

---


⁵¹. Muraoka, *Emphatic Words*, 150; Joüon-Muraoka §125j, 446-47. It is unclear, however, how bringing a noun into a more prominent position is notably different from emphasis. Muraoka does admit that emphasis is a complex phenomenon.


⁵³. Taken from Khan, "Object Markers," 470.
Khan demonstrates that the more qualities of individuation that are present the more likely it is that the יָא marker will used. Conversely, the more non-individuated elements are present, the less likely the nominal clause will be יָא-marked. Based as it is on the notion of graded transitivity (see 3.2) and object individuation, Khan's analysis is able to account for the statistically significant regularity of the usage of the Obj Prep, both its regularity (e.g. with human proper names, interrogative מִי, nominal qualified by a relative clause) as well as its seemingly irregular usage (e.g. indefinite objects which he notes are often qualified with a modifier thus increasing in specificity).

Khan's thesis has been developed in a number of subsequent studies on the Obj Prep, notably those of Garr, Malessa, and, most recently, Bekins. Of these, Peter Bekins' study is the most comprehensive. Bekins situates BH among languages featuring a Differential Object Marking (DOM) system. Studies in languages featuring DOM systems have correlated the presence or absence of the accusative marker with notions of transitivity, particularly as it is motivated by the perceived individuation of the Obj (generally appealing to animacy or definiteness) as well as prominence within the discourse. DOM languages may be sub-classified as those featuring Symmetric and Asymmetric DOM systems. Asymmetric DOM systems feature variable null/ Acc marking on Objs (e.g. 1 Kgs 6:1, 9 cited above). Symmetric DOM systems, by contrast, feature Acc/ Oblique (Obl) marked objects as seen, for example, in the following:

(11) a. Judg 20:6  רַנְגֶּהוּ

And I seized my concubine


55. Bekins, Transitivity. Malessa's and especially Garr's studies are discussed in detail below (2.3.3.3 Specialized Studies) since both the focus of their analyses (beyond the use of יָא) and their approach approximates those adopted in this study.
b. Judg 1:6 וַיִּשַׁת אֹתוֹ אֵלָה

And they seized him

Symmetric and Asymmetric systems are not mutually exclusive and Bekins demonstrates that BH evidences both systems. Bekins notes that the effect of the BH grammars treating נָמַך-marked and null-marked nominal complements under the single category "accusative" effectively "neutralizes the significance of overt object marking."\(^{56}\) He summarizes his conclusions as follows: "While asymmetric DOM is influenced by discourse-pragmatic features related to the information status of the referent of the object phrase, symmetric DOM has semantic motivations related to parameters such as affectedness and aspect. These patterns of variation are relatively independent, but both can be explained by prototype transitivity."\(^{57}\)

Though Bekins consistently distinguishes between pragmatic and semantic motivation for linguistic realities, as will be argued below in ch 3, these categories are not as neatly distinguished as many, including Bekins, suppose.

In light of Bekins' study, it is an oversimplification to say, as Hoftijzer does, that BH has no overt case-markings. Bekins demonstrates that BH regularly features overt marking of the accusative case, though the usage is variable. The variability follows established cross-linguistic patterns based on notions of prototypical transitivity. Surprisingly, Bekins treats few of the verbs undergoing the transitivity alternation featured in this study. Nevertheless, many of his conclusions, especially those that bear on the semantics of the Obj Prep and the prototypical transitive clause, are pertinent to this work.

The significance of these recent treatments (i.e. Khan, Garr, Melessa, and Bekins) of BH Obj Prep נָמַך for the present study is threefold. First, in addition to issues of pragmatics and


\(^{57}\) Bekins, *Transitivity and Object Marking in BH*, 198.
discourse analysis, each treatment introduces semantics into the equation as a possible motivation for the presence (or absence) of the Obj Prep. Though not explicitly drawing on cognitive linguistics as a theoretical method, the general outlook of these treatments is amenable to the form-function pairing commitments of cognitive approaches.

Second, to a greater or lesser degree, each employs not only the well-established methods of the comparative approaches — focusing as they do on comparisons within the Semitic or Afro-Asiatic language groups — but also appeals to the more recent linguistic typological approaches. On occasion both Khan and Garr also appeal to analogous phenomena outside the immediate language families of BH. Bekins is the most thorough in this regard as he describes BH in relation to other known DOM languages.

Third, the semantic and pragmatic motivation for BH יָּדַע does pertain to some of the verbs under discussion in the present study. To give just one example, Qal לבש typically patterns with [Dress], that is, the clothing put on, as the syntactic Obj. However, on four occasions [Dress] appears in the null-marked Subj position and the [Dressed] in the יָּדַע-marked position as seen in (12) below:

(12) Judg 6:34

The spirit of the Lord clothed Gideon

The role and function of יָּדַע, naturally, comes into play in the explanation and interpretation of these unconventional constructions. 58

2.3 The Transitivity Alternation in Historical Perspective

The linguistic peculiarity of at least some of the BH transitivity alternations has long been recognized by Bible translators, commentators, and grammarians. This section will offer a

58. For a full treatment of לבש see 4.2.1 below.
survey of the different approaches to the transitivity alternation as they are found in their works.\textsuperscript{59} The historical divisions followed are, admittedly, arbitrary but hopefully helpful in structuring the material along the lines of the broad contours of biblical and linguistic scholarship.

2.3.1 Ancient

Besides the biblical texts which on occasion provide what may be regarded as intertextual evidence, the primary evidence of ancient interpretation of the transitivity alternation comes in the form of ancient versions.\textsuperscript{60} To be sure, it is impossible to derive a full-blown grammatical theory from the versions (or any other ancient Jewish or Christian writings) and all the evidence they provide must be taken as indirect. Even as indirect evidence, however, the use of versions in lexicographical analysis presents a number of challenges. James Barr notes the following mitigating factors that must be accounted for in the use of the versions for lexicographical analysis: 1) the translators were working from a different Hebrew text, 2) the versions themselves may have been corrupted in their complex history of transmission, 3) the translators were imprecise, 4) the translators had certain stylistic proclivities (especially favorite words used freely to translate a number of different Hebrew words) which prevailed over conventional expression, 5) etymologizing, 6) paraphrasing, and 7) influence from other versions (e.g. LXX influenced by the Targums) or Jewish interpretation.\textsuperscript{61} Also, at times, the meanings of the versions themselves are not adequately understood. In light of these obstacles, great caution

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
59. A comprehensive treatment of translations and commentaries is outside the scope of this study. The survey offered here is meant to be representative and is, on account of space, necessarily selective.

60. E.g. regarding intertextuality, the transitive usage שׁרץ (Qal) in Ps 105:30 is almost certainly motivated by its similar use in Exod 7:28 and may be elucidated with reference to it.

\end{flushright}
needs to be exercised in the use of the versions for BH lexicography; the evidence from the translations needs to be weighed against other factors.

Nevertheless, Barr rightly maintains that when carefully used the versions may provide invaluable evidence for the lexicographic task, especially for elucidating the ancients' understanding of a given word or text. Jan Joosten expresses similar sentiments regarding both the difficulties and continued usefulness of the LXX for BH lexicology:

Septuagint renderings are very often the earliest witness to the correct interpretation of Hebrew words. But its authority is hard to assess. The Greek translators seem to have had access to lexical information of good quality. But they also err often enough. Some Hebrew words are rendered with such a wide range of equivalents that it appears the translators are simply guessing. Thus, even the felicitous renderings of the Septuagint may elicit skepticism. When a Hebrew word is translated correctly, is it because the translators disposed of authentic linguistic knowledge, or because they guessed the meaning correctly from the context? In spite of widespread skepticism, much of it justified, no Hebrew lexicographer has been emboldened to jettison the Septuagint altogether.

The specific contributions of the versions to the ancients' understanding of the transitivity alternation will be cited under the relevant verbs; however, a few examples are listed here by way of illustration. At times, it appears that the translators were either working from a different text than that represented in the MT or, perhaps more often, simply misunderstanding the Hebrew text and/or erred in their translation. For example, in Ps 120:5 the dwelling verb יבר needs to be exercised in the use of the versions for BH lexicography; the evidence from the translations needs to be weighed against other factors.

Nevertheless, Barr rightly maintains that when carefully used the versions may provide invaluable evidence for the lexicographic task, especially for elucidating the ancients' understanding of a given word or text. Jan Joosten expresses similar sentiments regarding both the difficulties and continued usefulness of the LXX for BH lexicology:

Septuagint renderings are very often the earliest witness to the correct interpretation of Hebrew words. But its authority is hard to assess. The Greek translators seem to have had access to lexical information of good quality. But they also err often enough. Some Hebrew words are rendered with such a wide range of equivalents that it appears the translators are simply guessing. Thus, even the felicitous renderings of the Septuagint may elicit skepticism. When a Hebrew word is translated correctly, is it because the translators disposed of authentic linguistic knowledge, or because they guessed the meaning correctly from the context? In spite of widespread skepticism, much of it justified, no Hebrew lexicographer has been emboldened to jettison the Septuagint altogether.

The specific contributions of the versions to the ancients' understanding of the transitivity alternation will be cited under the relevant verbs; however, a few examples are listed here by way of illustration. At times, it appears that the translators were either working from a different text than that represented in the MT or, perhaps more often, simply misunderstanding the Hebrew text and/or erred in their translation. For example, in Ps 120:5 the dwelling verb יבר

62. "In philological treatments the versions have been evaluated primarily not as witnesses to a different text, but rather as witnesses which, while they follow from the same text..., provide confirmatory evidence for, or clues towards, a different understanding of it." Barr, Comparative Philology, 240. Barr does, however, raise serious questions about the ability of the versions to speak to matters of grammar, though he only offers translating grammatical word classes (noun, verb, etc.) as an example. Comparative Philology, 265-66.

(Qal) + locative accusative PN (משׁך) clearly presented a problem for the ancient translators with the LXX, Vulgate, and Jerome all translating משׁך as a verb meaning, "draw, draw out, endure."  

(13) Ps 120:5 (LXX 119:5)

MT: יָרָק yI;t ∞ yIlœ_hÎywáøa

LXX: οἰµμοι, ὅτι η παροικία μου ἐµακρύνθη

Vul: heu mihi quia incolatus meus prolongatus est

It is unclear if the difficulty was caused by the geographical problem of sojourning in Meshech (in the North) and Kedar (to the East) at the same time (a physical impossibility which continues to confuse modern interpreters and translators) or the unconventional collocation of גור (Qal) with a non-Prep marked object. Regardless, the usefulness of the versions in this case is negligible.

It does appear, however, that in some instances the ancient translators did perceive semantic significance in alternating constructions and preserved this in their translation. Edward Cook cites the LXX and Vulgate as evidence that the nominal complement accompanying שָׁרַץ (Qal) in Gen 1:20, Exod 7:28, and Ps 105:30 was regarded as a DO in a transitive construction rather than an adverbal or zero-marked Obl Obj. He says,

In antiquity [the transitive interpretation] was the most widespread interpretation. The Septuagint in Gen 1:20 translates with a transitive verb: "let the waters bring forth (exagagetō) creeping things" (similarly v 21), in Exod 7:28 "let the river belch out (exereuxetai) frogs," and in Ps 105:30 "their land produced (exērpsen) frogs," with the noun complements in the accusative

64. Frank-Lothar Hossfeld and Erich Zenger, Psalms 3. (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2011), 301.
65. The Vulgate translation of the Psalter is infamously complex. The alternate translation — not corrected by Jerome to accord with the Greek text of Origin’s Hexapla — (heu mihi quia peregrinatio mea prolongata est) does not impinge on question under discussion.
66. See discussion under 6.3.1.1 below. Edward Cook, "Alternating Constructions with Biblical Hebrew שָׁרַץ 'to swarm," (forthcoming), 22. I am grateful to Dr. Cook for allowing me to see an advance copy of this manuscript.
case. The Vulgate likewise for the Genesis passages used transitives: forms of the verb *producere*, "to bring forth" (Gen 1:20 *producant*, 1:21 *produxerant*) and for the Exodus and Psalms passages, forms of the verb *ebullire*, "to produce in abundance" (Exod 7:28 *ebulliet*, Ps 105:30 *ebullivit*).\(^{67}\)

In sum, the evidence from the translations is, as expected, varied. Of special importance for our purposes is the fact that at times some, though not all, of the translators were sensitive to the subtle semantic or pragmatic nuances of the transitivity alternations and sought to capture these nuances in their word choice or syntactic representation. Though caution is necessary, the versions offer insight into the ancients' understanding of a word or text, to use Barr's phrase. When relevant, the evidence provided by the versions will be highlighted throughout the course of this study.

2.3.2 Medieval

Regarding medieval Jewish commentators, Jacob Milgrom says, "Having lived in a premodern age, they are *a priori* written off as precritical. In page after page of this commentary [Leviticus 1-16], however, it will be demonstrated that they frequently anticipate the moderns and at times even supersede them."\(^{68}\) As will be seen below, Milgrom's insight applies equally well to medieval Jewish grammatical description as it does to their textual commentary.

The beginning of the formal linguistic description of Hebrew is typically traced to the work of Saadia Gaon (Saadia ben Joseph, 882-942 C.E.) whose works on lexicography (*Agron*) and grammar (*Kutub al-Lugha*) began a period of productive and creative linguistic description.\(^{69}\)

\(^{67}\). Cook also cites the evidence of Targums: "The verbal forms used in the Aramaic of Targum Onkelos, to some degree participate in the same ambiguity as the Hebrew original." "Alternating Constructions," 22.


\(^{69}\). Among the major social and historical factors which contributed to the rise of Hebrew grammar as an independent branch of literature, James Barr notes: 1) the standardization of the vocalic text by the Tiberian masoretes which would serve the grammarian as a faithful source of the Hebrew language, 2) the Arabic intellectual cultural influence, especially the grammatical description of the Arabic language which would serve as the basis for Hebrew description, and 3) Karaism with its emphasis on the biblical text as the sole authority in
Prior to the 10th century, grammatical issues pertaining to the biblical text were only on occasion taken up in the talmudic and midrashic literature and, as Barr notes, "care needs to be taken not to attribute linguistic aims to statements whose aims were midrashic or mystic." While an explicit grammatical theory is difficult to glean from the talmudic literature, that some interpretive cruxes involving the transitivity alternation are mentioned is notable.

Jewish grammatical works after the 10th century evidence a fairly sophisticated awareness of the linguistic issues involved in the transitivity alternation. The early Karaite grammatical tradition exemplified in Ibn Nūḥ's *Diqduq* categorizes verbal transitivity with reference to semantics. Intransitive verbs are designated as *fiʾl fī al-nafs* ("action within oneself") and transitive as *fiʾl fī al-ḡayr* ("action on another"). According to Khan, "The distinction between *fiʾl fī al-nafs* and *fiʾl fī al-ḡayr* is not, however, always as clear as one might expect. The reason for this is that the criterion for assigning the action expressed by the verb to one of these categories is not the occurrence of a grammatical direct object but rather the existence on the semantic level of a patient that is involved in the activity denoted by the verb." Thus, not only verbs taking prepositional phrases but also verbs taking DOs may be classified as *fiʾl fī al-nafs* if the action is not perceived as affecting the entity.

For example, though taking grammatical objects, the expressions, אֵלֶּה הַבָּשָׂם אַחֵרִים (Ps 7:8) and אֵלֶּה הַבַּשָּׂם אַחֵרִים (Ps 26:6) are regarded as *fiʾl fī al-nafs* because the objects are

---


unaffected by the verbal action. Conversely, the verb מָרַס in Judg 16:28 is regarded as fi’l fi al-gayr even though it is modified by a PP, בִּשְׂמַע לָאֵז. The Philistines, in this instance, are regarded as being (or soon to be) directly affected by the action. Furthermore, the same verb may be regarded as fi’l fi al-gayr in one context and fi’l fi al-nafs in another. This may be seen in the following alternation:

(14) Ps 83:16

Thus you pursue them with your tempest.

(15) Josh 2:7

And the men pursued after them.

In example (15) above, Qal רָדַף is regarded as fi’l fi al-nafs not because the object is governed by a preposition, but because the spies indicated by the pronominal suffix were not captured and thereby, were regarded as unaffected by the action designated by the verb. In contrast, Qal רָדַף in Ps 83:16 is regarded as fi’l fi al-gayr because the subject, namely God, pursues and presumably overtakes the wicked with his tempest.

It seems, however, that verbs may be classified as fi’l fi al-gayr with an unexpressed object only when the object is understood from the context. According to Khan, it is never the case, at least in the Diqduq, that an action denoted by a verb may be regarded as fi’l fi al-gayr without the patient being overtly expressed. He says, "If the activity of a verb may reasonably be considered to have an effect on a patient but no patient is specified in the clause, the activity is classified as fi’l fi al-nafs."76

73. Diq. Psa. 7:7, 26:6. Interestingly, whole verb classes such as verbs of perception and other mental processes may be described as activities fi’l fi al-nafs. Khan, Early Karaite Tradition, 109.

74. Judg 16:28: מָרַס מְסָרַס מִלְשָׁנָה מְשָׁרָה מְשָׁרָה מְשָׁרָה

75. Khan, Early Karaite Tradition, 110.

76. Khan offers the following example: "The verb מָרַס 'We have done evil' (Dan 9:5), for example, is said to be fi
With regard to the transitivity alternation specifically, Ibn Nūḥ notes the difficulty of Qal ḥīd in Lam 1:16 (מִיָּמִים יָרְדוּ עֵינִי עֵינִי) and proposes a solution consistent with his overall approach based on differing base forms (which for him means the imperative).

Note that the imperative of this is יְרֹד or יְרַד. It is a transitive verb like שְׁמֹר, from which is derived the form שֹׁמְרָה 'keeping (f.),' like יֹשְׁבָה 'sitting (f.).' The imperatives with the pattern of יְרֹד, שְׁמֹר, יְשֹׁב, סְגֹר or יְרַד are used as either intransitive or transitive verbs. For example, סְגֹר in וּסְגֹר דְּלָתְךָ (Isa. 26:20) (is transitive). Accordingly, the words מַּיִם יֹרְדוּ עֵינִי עֵינִי mean 'cause to come down' and not 'come down.' It has the pattern of שֹׁמְרָה. Whenever you encounter (a verb with) the imperative יְרֹד or יְרַד with yod, the meaning is 'bringing down' rather than coming down,' if 'the eye' is mentioned together with it, as in the verse מַּיִם יֹרְדוּ עֵינִי עֵינִי (Psa. 119:136) which means 'My eyes shed'. As for הָרְדָה וּזְרַד (Jer. 14:17), its imperative is רֵד and we may say that it means 'They come down from my eyes'. The verb would refer to דִּמְעָה which is a noun of class. Although הָרְדָה is plural and דִּמְעָה is singular, we have parallels to this. It is like עֹשֶׁק עָשְׁקוּ הָאָרֶץ (Ezek 22:29), where the form is not הָאָרֶץ עַמֵּי.

The widely used 11th c. Karaite grammatical text al-Kitāb al-Kāfi 'al Luğa al-Ibrāniyya by 'Abū al-Faraj Hārūn (a student of Ibn Nūḥ's, see below) also makes distinctions among verbs whose action is "transferred to a noun that follows the noun expressing the agent." Hārūn distinguishes those that have an effect upon an object such as מִזְבֵּחַ מֹשֶׁה (Exod 17:15), שָׁבַר רְשָׁעִים מַטֵּה יְהֹוָה (Isa 14:5) with "verbs that do not have such an effect," for example מָאַסְתִּי שָׂנֵאתִי חַגֵּיכֶם (Amos 5:21), קָרַבְתִּי לַמַּיִם (Ps 143:5), קָרַבְתִּי לַמַּיִם (Job 33:32). Hārūn does not elaborate on the relationship between these latter verbs and their object complements; however, he stresses

---

77. Translation by Khan, Early Karaite Tradition, 476. Commenting on Ibn Nūḥ's analysis, Khan says, "different properties of transitivity are attributed to two bases of what we would nowadays consider to be the same verbal stem... The motivation for this distinction is, it seems, the analogy of bases with the same pattern as יְרֹד, such as יְשֹׁב, סְגֹר, and יְרַד, which may be either fi al-nafs or fi al-gay. Early Karaite Tradition, 111.

that there is a qualitative distinction of their action from the action of verbs which have an effect on their object.\textsuperscript{79}

Hārūn also correlates semantic roles of Agent and Patient with grammatical Subj and Obj.\textsuperscript{80} Importantly, however, this generalization is qualified with reference to particular verbs and verb classes which deviate from the conventional pattern. Some verbs, it is noted, take the patient (or "status of the object") as the Subj. Hārūn explains this with reference to analogy:

Although in the case of some intransitive verbs such as נָפְלָה and נָפָלָה no actions are performed by the persons to whom the verbs are attributed, they nevertheless involve perceptible actions that are performed by others upon the people to whom the verbs are attributed. The people of the language have given these verbs the form of (verbs of expressing) actions that are performed by the people to whom they are attributed, on account of their being regarded as equivalent by analogy (in that they have the same form of verbs) such as נָעַם and נָעַמָה. The action in verbs such as נָפָלָה and נָפְלָה (II Chron 16:12), therefore, has the status of object.\textsuperscript{81}

To be sure, Hārūn is not working from a cognitivist theoretical model in any modern sense. However, it should be noted that his sensibilities and explanations approximate the cognitivist notion of prototypicality. As seen in the quote above, Hārūn has a sense of both what we may call the typical (or prototypical) usage of the Subj-Agent, as well as deviations from that prototype as exemplified in the verb נָפָלָה. The "deviation" is related to the prototypical examples by way of analogy. Unfortunately, Hārūn's theory of analogy is left undeveloped.

At times, the transitivity alternation is presented as legitimate but somewhat problematic, anomalous, or undesirable. In his magisterial Mikhlo\l (13th c.), David Kimhi says, "In the same conjugation, however, verbs may be both transitive and intransitive in meaning, e.g. הַצּוֹמֵחַ Ex

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{79} About the latter category Hārūn writes, "for these verbal actions are transferred to what is present and what is absent, what is alive and what is dead, a tangible entity and an abstraction, but it is not correct to say that they have an effect on their objects, as is the case with the first category of verbal actions." Khan, Karaite Tradition, I.15.2.
\item \textsuperscript{80} Khan, Karaite Tradition, I.20.1 ff; See also, I.15.2.
\item \textsuperscript{81} Khan, Karaite Tradition, I.17.3.
\end{itemize}
After arguing (contra his father) on the basis of the descriptive evidence for the legitimacy of the transitivity alternation within the same stem, Ḳīmḥī offers the following prescription: "But when a verb in the Ḳāl is intransitive, the Pi‘el or the Hi‘il of this verb and not the same conjugation should be used to denote the idea of the transitive." Though arguing for its legitimacy, Ḳīmḥī’s prescription suggests a degree of discomfiture with the transitivity alternation.

Similar interest in and explanation of the transitivity alternation is seen in some medieval Jewish commentary. In his analysis of שָׁרץ, Cook translates a particularly insightful passage from Abraham Ibn Ezra in which he explains the behavior of שָׁרץ in Exod 1:7 with reference to transitivity patterns of verb classes, saying that it is "of the intransitive verbs (מהפעלים ומסתרים במציאות ה עצם), like go, sit, stand, lie down. But [the occurrence in Gen 1:20] is of the transitive verbs (אחרי בדיבות תכלת אבר), like eat, guard, hire.... [the verb שָׁרץ] is like the verb שָׁב, which is sometimes intransitive, and sometimes transitive (יַצִּמְיָה וְהִצְמִיחָה)."

Khan’s summary of transitivity categorization in Ibn Nūḥ’s Diqduq both demonstrates the sophistication of linguistic analysis that obtained in the medieval period among Jewish grammarians as well as highlights some marked resemblances to modern cognitive treatments of the same phenomenon. He says, "The classification of the activity of a verb, therefore, is

83. It is difficult to reconcile this statement with his earlier statement "It is perfectly legitimate to use an intransitive verb in the transitive sense in cases where no other form of the stem occurs to denote the transitive idea." Chomsky, David Kimḥi, § 81f.
84. Though today Ibn Nūḥ’s Diqduq is generally studied as a grammatical work, in its day it was envisioned more as a commentary than a formal grammar.
determined not only by the inherent nature of the activity but also by the mention of specific patients that are involved in the activity. Speaking in particular of Ibn Nūḥ's focus on linguistic form, Khan says, "this concern with linguistic form arose from the conviction... that there was a direct link between form and meaning."

2.3.3 Modern

2.3.3.1 Lexica

Cameron Sinclair summarizes the treatment of the lexica as follows: "Verbs are often listed in dictionaries as with or without an (accusative) object, or alternatively as transitive in some cases and intransitive in others, implying that the same verb might occur rather freely as either one or the other but without explaining how this could be." Given the limited space and overall purpose of BH lexica it is not possible for their author(s) to offer extensive linguistic explanations of the lexemes or the constructions in which they occur. The lexica nevertheless do vary with regards to their sophistication in identifying grammatical anomalies and the semantic nuances of specific collocations and constructions.

In the majority of instances, the major BH lexica simply identify the various prepositions with which a verb collocates, and they may or may not mention the semantic role of the nominal governed by the preposition. In both BDB and HALOT, non-Subj nominal complements are labeled accusative (acc.) and then listed either exhaustively or representatively. On rare occasions mention is made of an exceptional, and perhaps grammatically significant, usage of an

86. Khan, Early Karaite Tradition, 110.
89. For a survey of the theoretical commitments of the 20th c. European dictionaries of BH, see O'Connor, "Semitic Lexicography", 173-212.
alternation. Under the entry for שֶׁרץ, HALOT mentions that "it is of grammatical interest to note
that in Gn 1:20-21 Ex 7:28 Ps 105:30 the subject of the vb. שֶׁרץ meaning to teem, swarm is not the
creatures themselves but the element in which the teeming creatures live, such as the water, the
River Nile, the land." Needless to say, the "grammatical interest," is left undeveloped.

This treatment may be compared to HALOT's entry for לֵבָשׁ. After an extensive entry for
the conventional usage which features the [Dresser] in the Subj position and the [Dress] in the
Acc, HALOT's second meaning mentions that לֵבָשׁ also occurs "with material for clothing as
subject" and gives the gloss "to clothe" along with the four passages in which this construction
appears. In this case, no mention is made of this being a grammatical peculiarity nor how the
sense is distinguished from the more expected usage of the Hiph to indicate causality.
Interestingly, Hiph לֵבָשׁ is given the same gloss, "to clothe." The comparatively short list of
verses cited for the second Qal entry may, however, signal to the astute reader that the Subj-
Dressing construction is not the conventional expression in which לֵבָשׁ occurs.

One further example may serve to illustrate the variable treatment of the transitivity
alternation. In HALOT, the sixth of seven entries for Qal שֶׁרץ is designated "special meanings" of
which six are listed (a-f). Under this heading the editors cite the single verse Prov 8:12
(שֶׁרֶץ תְּפַרֶה לְעֵינֵי פִּסְמֵהֶר) and offer the following as a translation: "I, wisdom, have been the
neighbour of cleverness." This example represents the opposite treatment to that exemplified
in שֶׁרץ. The grammatical peculiarity is left unmentioned and a fairly free translation is offered.

90. HALOT, 1655.
91. HALOT, 519.
92. HALOT, 1498. For this translation they cite Plöger, Proverbs, 85 and the reader is told to cf. also Gemser Spr
and GKC §117bb. For an analysis of Prov 8:12 see 5.3.4 below.
Alonso Schökel's *Diccionario Biblico Hebreo-Espanol* has considerable variation in its handling of the transitivity alternation. The entry for שׁרץ, for example, makes no mention of the syntactic patterns in which it is used. The entry lists three glosses (*Pulular, bullir, rebullir*) followed by seven citations which evidence all three syntactic patterns in which the verb is found (i.e. intransitive unmodified, intransitive modified by -ב, and transitive); however, the verses are not connected with a particular gloss or explanation. Needless to say, though Gen 1:20 is listed no mention is made of the somewhat anomalous usage of שׁרץ with an unmodified nominal complement.

The entry for לבשׁ, by contrast, is much more detailed regarding transitivity patterns. Transitive, intransitive, and figurative senses (*sentido figurado*) are distinguished and representative verses cited. Though grouped together with conventional (though figurative) usages, the unconventional [Dresser] *laḥaš* [Dressee] pattern is identified and described: "el espíritu envuelve, arrolla, se apodera." On at least one occasion Alonso Schökel's entry demonstrates remarkable sophistication (as well as remarkable concision befitting a lexicon) as it divides its entry for מלא into both transitive and intransitive usages, each subdivided into syntactic patterns. The syntactic patterns are described with reference to semantic roles and the basic or conventional sense of the constructions is provided. These conventional intransitive and transitive usages are distinguished from idiomatic usages ("algunas traducciones idiomáticas").

It is unclear why Alonso Schökel presentation of מלא differs so drastically from his treatment of שׁרץ as the latter appears to evidence similar (if not the same) linguistic phenomenon.

Franciscus Zorell's *Lexicon Hebraicum Veteris Testamenti* fairly consistently identifies differences in transitivity and semantic roles with discrete entries for the different senses.

---

Transitive and intransitive patterns are identified and the difference in sense is indicated by the gloss and/or Zorell's translation. The *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* follows the same basic approach as Zorell, though it categorizes usages in terms of "objects" instead of "transitivity."

The *DCH* is certainly superior to the other lexica in its thoroughness in listing collocations as well as the semantic roles of conventional Subjs, Objs, and Preps. In both, conventionality is indicated implicitly as the more conventional usages are listed first (under each stem) and the less conventional listed in descending order.

In each lexicon, the organization of the data betrays certain interpretive or theoretical commitments. To give just one example, *DCH's* entry for Qal רָז implicitly categorizes the less common nominal complement as something other than an Obj. The gloss for the active usage for Qal רָז is given as "gird oneself." And the Subjs (typically animate humans) and Objs (typically body parts, e.g. חֲלָצַיִם, "loins," ) are listed. However, the unconventional collocation of Qal רָז with חַיִל, is simply cited under the Subj heading as, "כשׁל נִי ptc. *one who stumbles* 1 Sam 2:4 (± חַיִל [with] strength)," as opposed to being cited as another Obj with a different semantic role. Such interpretive decisions are inevitable for a lexicon. They reveal, however, certain theoretical and/or exegetical judgments of the editors.

What this survey demonstrates is a spectrum of treatment that the transitivity alternations receive in the lexica. It is rare that grammatically peculiar alternations are identified as such (though it does happen as in *HALOT's* entry for שָׁרַץ, see above). More commonly, collocations are listed and basic glosses offered. Normal or conventional usage is typically indicated by entries being listed according to descending number of occurrences.

95. This has led T. Muraoka to conclude in his review of the *DCH* that it is "often serviceable as a database where deficient as a dictionary." Quoted in O'Connor, "Semitic Lexicography," 200.

2.3.3.2 Grammars

With a few notable exceptions, verbs which undergo the transitivity alternation are typically treated under the category, if not the label, Objective Accusative.

a. GKC

Despite the advances in linguistic analysis since the publication of the second English edition in 1910, GKC remains the most detailed and sophisticated treatment of the transitivity alternation of the BH grammars.97 GKC offers a largely diachronic developmental explanation: "Many verbs originally intransitive (sometimes even in form) may be used also as transitives, in consequence of a certain modification of their original meaning, which has gradually become established by usage."98 However, other possibilities are mentioned, specifically that the development may have been from transitive to intransitive and/or that both forms were in use at the same time:

It is certainly difficult to decide whether some verbs, which were afterwards used absolutely or joined with prepositions, were not nevertheless originally transitive, and consequently it is only the supposed original meaning, usually assigned to them in English, which causes them to appear intransitive. In that case there is of course no syntactical peculiarity to be considered, and a list of such verbs would at the most be requisite only for practical purposes. Moreover, it is also possible that certain verbs were originally in use at the same time both as transitive and intransitive... Finally the analogy of certain intransitives in constant use may have led to the intransitives of kindred meaning being also united directly with the accusative, so that, in other words, whole classes of verbs came to be regarded in a particular aspect as transitives.99

97. Cook puts it like this: "Despite its age, GKC is still the only Hebrew grammar to discuss (rather than describe) the phenomenon of verbs that are both transitive and intransitive." "Alternating Constructions," 4. To be sure, the German GK edition had gone through many editions prior to 1910, so the 1910 edition is not technically the second edition.

98. GKC §117u, 368.

99. GKC §117v, 368.
Despite GKC's engagement with the theoretical issues surrounding the transitivity alternation, Cook rightly notes that the linguistic processes described by their expressions "modification of their original meaning" and "analogy" are "not explained further and remain unclear."\(^{100}\)

b. Joüon-Muraoka

Joüon-Muraoka employ the labels direct and indirect accusative for objective and adverbial complements respectively. Under the direct accusative they state, "[s]ome semantic categories of verbs require the accusative," and then go on to cite verbs of abundance (verba copiae and inopiae) and verbs of wearing (verba induendi and exuendi).\(^{101}\) Though unfortunately left undeveloped, Joüon-Muraoka make the intriguing suggestion that "the accusative with some verbs implying motion can probably be explained as having arisen on the analogy of the accusative of the verba copiae."\(^{102}\) For example:

(16) Prov 3:10

```
וַתֵּלֵשׁ אֵשֶׁר שָׁקָרָה נְפֹרָהָ בְּנֵבָדָה
```

Your barns will be filled with abundance,
and your vats will burst forth new wine.\(^{103}\)

However, Joüon-Muraoka classify verbs of dwelling as taking an indirect (or adverbial) accusative of local determination. They say, "This accusative, which is not common outside

\(^{100}\)Cook, "Alternating Constructions," 4.

\(^{101}\)Joüon-Muraoka §125d, 443-44.

\(^{102}\)Joüon-Muraoka §125d, 443-44.

\(^{103}\)Joüon-Muraoka §125d, 443-44. They also cite הָנַף in Judg 5:4; הָנַף in Jer 9:17, יָרַד in Jer 9:17; מַלְוָה in Joel 4:18, and זָב in Lev 15:33.
certain nouns, may have originated as an extension of the accusative of motion."  

Regarding verbs of filling, Joüon-Muraoka note — though they do not register an opinion on the matter — that "according to some grammarians, we have here an adverbial accusative. For Arabic grammarians, the accusative of verbs like maliʿa "to be full" is a tamyīz (accusative of specification)." A tremendous amount has been written on tamyīz in Semitic languages, most extensively on Arabic and to a lesser extent on Ge‘ez, Hebrew, and, Akkadian. As seen for example in the above quote by Joüon-Muraoka, tamyīz is often described as an accusative of specification. Nathan Wasserman however has demonstrated that tamyīz is better regarded as a subvariety of this broader category since tamyīz evidences clearly delimited semantic parameters for usage.

According to Wasserman, tamyīz refers to "only the specific bi-componental construction comprising a noun in the accusative case accompanied by a predicative stative." The salient feature of a tamyīz construction is the inalienable character of the POSSESSUM, that is the thing or quality that characterizes the POSSESSOR. Wasserman offers an example from Old Babylonian in which the demoness Lamaštu is said to be īṣat rittī (short-palmed, or short with regard to her palm).

After surveying OB literary texts, Wasserman concludes:

---

105. Joüon-Muraoka §125d n. 1, 444, emphasis original.
108."It should be stressed that inalienability is precisely one of the aspects which distinguishes T(amyīz) from other related accusative constructions." Wasserman, Style and Form, 30.
The POSSESSUM may be one of the following semantic categories: a part of the body, a general physical manifestation, a mental faculty or feeling, a physical trait, or an inseparable covering for the body. All these are typical categories which in many languages occur in inalienable constructions. The quality attributed to the POSSESSUM is always related in some essential way to the POSSESSUM. For instance, swiftness > knees; strength > limbs; length > palms or fingers; abundance/shortage > food/hunger, etc. The inalienable relations expressed by T(amyīz) are manifold, combining all the pertinent components of the construction; The POSSESSUM forms an inseparable part of the POSSESSOR, and the QUALIFIER attributes an essential quality to the POSSESSUM.\footnote{110}{Wasserman, Style and Form, 42.}

The possibility that the transitivity alternation is explicable in some manner with reference to tamyīz will be explored below.

c. Waltke-O'Connor/ Arnold-Choi

The first to use, if not coin, the term complement accusative for the BH transitivity alternation, Waltke-O'Connor situate the transitivity alternation firmly in the category of objective accusative. They describe the complement accusative in the following way: "A complement accusative specifies the noun associated with an intransitive verb under certain conditions."\footnote{111}{IBHS, 10.2.1h, 168.} They cite two verbal categories as taking the complement accusative, verbs of fulness and want, and verbs of wearing, donning, or doffing clothes. Like Joūon-Muraoka, Waltke-O'Connor treat verbs of dwelling as taking adverbial accusatives.

In contrast to GKC's treatment, Waltke-O'Connor's linguistic description of the complement accusative is remarkably vague. First, the nature of the association between the noun and the intransitive verb is not at all clear. Based on its category distinction, it is clearly not an affected or effected object (the traditional DO), nor the internal accusative of either the
cognate or non-cognate variety. Nor is it the so-called "datival accusative" which they reserve for a pronominal object where a prepositional object would be expected. The complement accusative is clearly another category the mechanics of which are needless to say, a bit vague.

The second difficulty with Waltke-O'Connor's description of the complement accusative is the notion that these intransitive verbs may take a complement "under certain conditions." The conditions which license and limit this phenomenon is an intriguing notion, indeed, it is the impetus for this study. However, there is no mention as to what those conditions may be.

By and large, Arnold-Choi follow the grammatical sketch of Waltke-O'Connor and on this point they even employ the term *complement accusative* for the transitive alternation. Two things are notable, however, about their treatment. First, unlike Waltke-O'Connor, Arnold-Choi make a brief mention of the linguistic mechanism at work, namely diachronic change, a notion they seem to be getting from GKC. They describe the complement accusative as "a noun used with certain intransitive verbs, which take on new transitive meaning through a modification of their original meanings."\(^{112}\) Also, in contrast to Waltke-O'Connor, Arnold-Choi include dwelling verbs under this category as well as under the adverbal accusative of place.

d. Van der Merwe, et. al.

As mentioned above, Van der Merwe, et al. eschew the label "accusative" altogether opting instead for the more descriptive designation "nominal complements" and "nominal adjuncts" with a number of subclassifications under each. The transitive alternation is treated under the heading "Other nominal complements (non-object)" and includes verbs of abiding (what we are calling dwelling), movement, and a condition of being full or covered.\(^{113}\) As the

---

113. *BHRG* §33.2.3, 244. The other major categories of nominal complement are *One Object* and *Two Object*. 
name of the category suggests, non-object complements appears to be a catch-all category for what seem to be necessary elements (hence complement) of uncertain status regarding its relation to the verbal actions.

e. Gary Long

Though Gary Long's *Grammatical Concepts 101 for Biblical Hebrew* is not a traditional reference grammar his special focus on the semantics of BH verbs (even at an introductory level) makes his work of interest for this study. Long refers to all objects directly governed by verbs as "adverbial" which he subclassifies with the traditional complement/adjunct distinction. He labels the transitivity alternation as "Internal Non-cognate Adverbial Complements." He says, "The internal non-cognate AC is commonly associated with intransitive verbs that belong to particular semantic fields." Similar to Van der Merwe, et al. above, Long regards these verbs as semantically intransitive, yet requiring a complement to achieve their communicative intent.

Long acknowledges, however, the difficulty of applying the categories of complement/adjunct in some instances including the transitivity alternation: "A fuzzy line separates an internal non-cognate AC from an adverbial adjunct/modifier... [non-cognate ACs] are somehow regarded as necessary with the verb, while the adverbial adjunct/modifiers are somehow not as necessary. This can be a difficult distinction to make, however." For Long, as for others, verbs undergoing the transitivity alternation exist in a grey area between clear object complements and more loosely associated and semantically optional adjuncts.

2.3.3 Specialized studies

Expressions featuring the transitivity alternation have typically been treated more or less peripherally in studies on related matters (e.g. studies on the accusative "case," the accusative marker, preposition alternations, individual word studies). A few studies, however, offer a somewhat more focused and sustained treatment of the phenomenon. The different approaches to the transitivity alternation offered in these studies may be broadly categorized as diachronic, contextual, and semantic.

2.3.3.1 Diachronic

Drawing on comparative evidence from classical Arabic, Naphtali Kinberg proposes a strictly diachronic explanation of the BH transitivity alternation.117 Speaking of the alternation between Acc- and Prep-marked complements, he says, "This phenomenon reflects the shift from a synthetic to a more analytic type of language, a process characteristic of the Semitic languages." Kinberg notes that Mishnaic Hebrew shows a clear preference for Prep-marked over את-marked/ null-marked complements, both adverbials and direct objects.119 This, he argues, is the conclusion of a longer process already evident in the biblical text in which a synthetic syntax is giving way to an analytic one. The presence of the synthetic structures, in this case the את-marked/ null-marked complements, are to be regarded as archaic forms if not


This same process may be observed in movement from Classical Arabic to Judaeo-Arabic and Christian-Arabic.

It should be noted that Kinberg's argument only addresses a subset of the verbs under consideration in this study, specifically those verbs which manifest symmetric alternations (Acc/Obl). On the macro level, Kinberg is undoubtedly correct in his assessment of BH compared to Mishnaic Hebrew, the latter evidencing a transition from synthetic to analytic type syntax. That some of the BH variation may be explained with reference to diachronic change is also, almost certainly correct. However, diachronic change by itself does not adequately account for all the Acc-Obl marked complement variation in the Hebrew Bible. The passages that Kinberg adduces do not seem notably archaic nor is there a clear reason to suppose the presence of an archaism. Perhaps more importantly, Kinberg's evidence does not manifest any obvious pattern of distribution that would correlate to known textual layers dating from different periods. Hiphוּר, for example, appears both with Obj Prep -ָּא and Prep -ָּ in two texts traditionally attributed to the same source or textual layer.

(17) a. Exod 7:20

He lifted the staff

b. Exod 14:16

And you shall lift your staff

---


121. "Thus Christian Arabic and Judaeo-Arabic even uses the preposition bi- instead of the accusative, and Judaeo-Arabic even uses the preposition 'ilā with verbs which in Classical Arabic govern the accusative." Kinberg, "Notes," 11.
Finally, even if, as seems to be implied by Kinberg, two more or less synonymous forms are available for an expression at a given period of BH the motivation for using one form over another remains to be explained.  

2.3.3.3.2 Contextual (or Collocational)

A contextual or collocational approach to the transitivity alternation is seen in T. Muraoka's influential article "On Verb Complementation in Biblical Hebrew." Muraoka addresses the issue of alternations between Prep governed pronominal complements and suffixed pronominal complements. Muraoka's primary goal is to establish rules (re-writing rules?) that will disambiguate the sense of the suffixed (what Muraoka calls "syntactically fused") forms, forms which could encode either the Obj marked or the Prep marked sense. However, he admittedly touches on wider, more theoretical issues of the nature of verb complementation and the problems and possibilities of classifying complements. It is this latter point that is of interest for the transitivity alternation. Muraoka tries to resolve the terminological problem by opting for a strictly formal description of verb complementation.

It is customary to distinguish between direct object and indirect object. It is hardly justifiable however to see, as is sometimes done, an indirect object in lō of both nātatī lō sēper and ‘āzartī lō. Such an analysis does not serve any good purpose, as long as the terms are taken in a logical and semantic sense. I for one would advocate a more transparent, formally based twofold classification of "bare object" (BO for short) as in rāʾītī melek, šalāḥtī melek

122. These difficulties are, to my mind, the most problematic issues with Kinberg's thesis. For the sake of space, this assessment is not meant to be an exhaustive treatment of the issues involved. It can be noted, however, that Kinberg does not address the possibility that a number of his examples of "asyndectic adverbial complements" may be nominals in the process of being grammaticalized as prepositions (e.g.  הַנַּבִּי in Gen 38:11, מְרֹן in Gen 18:1).


124. "One of the questions which arises out of the present enquiry is why it is that the neat, and sometimes even meaningful, formal distinction between say,  אָשָׁה ˈoṭi "you seized me" and  אָשָׁה ́bī "you held me down", came to be neutralised in the fused phrase אָשָׁה ́bānī?" Muraoka, "Verb Complementation," 429.
etc. and "prepositional object" (PO) as in ‘āzartī l,melek, bāṭaḥī b,melek, etc.

As is indicated in the above quote, distinguishing formal and semantic properties allows for the analysis of verb complementation to be conducted at a verb or verb class specific level.

Muraoka illustrates his proposal by taking up the problem of locative complements with verbs of motion, specifically its ambiguous status as either an object or adverbial. Though he is unable to establish re-writing rules that would provide a conclusive test for "objecthood" of the complement with the verbs הָלַך and בּוֹא, he does appeal to analogy with verbs of dwelling (stative verbs) to argue for their classification as a locative (closer to object than adverb). He says, "Dynamic locatives can be easily considered as a logical extension of static locatives. There is every reason to believe that the two groups are deeply related to each other in their inner logical structure." Though the nature of the logical extension (metaphor, polysemy, meronymy, etc.) and the nature of the relation of the groups is left unspecified, Muraoka's point is insightful as far as it goes.

2.3.3.3.3 Semantic

Garr's study specifically addresses the question of the semantic distinctives of verbs of motion and intransitive verbs which occur with direct and oblique objects. He identifies two parameters which motivate the variable expressions of the object, namely affectedness and

126. Garr, "Affectedness," 121. Another study that adopts a semantic approach to verbal alternations is Malessa's work on verbal valence. Untersuchungen, 67-127. Malessa analyzes Qal/Hiph הראה, Qal חזה, Hiph נבט, Qal שמע, Hiph רוח with a view toward determining the semantic nuance of different valence patterns. Though he employs a more statistical or corpus method, his overall approach is quite similar to Garr's. While both Garr and Malessa agree on aspect being a parameter motivating syntactic representation, Malessa argues also for intentionality of the Subj as a central parameter where Garr argues for affectedness of the Obj. Malessa says, for example, "Wird der Wahrnehmungsgegenstand dagegen als EPräp (z) oder ELok realisiert, ist das Verb in bezug auf die Aktionsart und die Intentionalität des Subjekts markiert." (Untersuchungen, 127) It should be noted that these parameters are not mutually exclusive. Both also appeal to conception or construal of an element as motivating syntax.
aspect. Garr notes that affectedness is a graded reality and therefore a patient "may be affected by the verb to different degrees."\(^\text{127}\) He cites the following to illustrate that the degree of affectedness is grammatically marked in BH.\(^\text{128}\)

(18) a. Gen 31:54

\[\text{they ate bread}\]

b. Prov 9:5

\[\text{eat some of my bread}\]

c. 2 Chr 30:18

\[\text{yet they ate the passover}\]

Garr explains the differences in affectedness as follows: in Gen 31:54 the extent of the action is unspecified, in Prov 9:5 the extent is incomplete, and in 2 Chr 30:18 the extent is complete.\(^\text{129}\)

The second parameter Garr identifies as motivating object realization is aspect. Some variation in object realization of transitive verbs, Garr argues, is attributable to the perfectivity or imperfectivity of the verbal action. For example:

(19) a. 2 Sam 23:12

\[\text{But he took his stand in the middle of the plot and defended it, and } \text{struck down the Philistines}. \text{ The Lord thus wrought a great victory.}\]

b. 2 Sam 23:10

\[\text{But he got up. } \text{He kept striking down Philistines until his arm got tired and his hand stuck to his sword; the Lord thus wrought a great victory on that day. Then the troops came back to him, but only to strip (them).}\]

\(^{127}\)Garr, "Affectedness," 121.

\(^{128}\)Translations are Garr’s, "Affectedness," 121.

\(^{129}\)Garr, "Affectedness," 121.
Garr explains the variation in usage as follows:

In 2 Sam 23:12, Shammah is portrayed as having defeated the Philistines. There is no internal complexity to this event and no indication of its duration. It is viewed as a complete whole, whose patient is marked as a direct object. In v10, however, the battle lasted until Eleazar's hand failed. During that period of time, he continued his assault on the Philistines, presumably winning an incremental victory. The situation therefore has both duration and internal temporal constituency. In this case, the patient is an oblique object. Thus in transitive verbs, direct object marking correlates with perfectivity, and oblique marking with imperfectivity.¹³⁰

Garr's study has been summarized at length because its focus and, to an extent, its method is closest to the present study. Garr seeks to identify the sometimes subtle yet significant semantic nuances of the various syntactic patterns or representations of certain verbs and verb classes.

2.4 Conclusions

This survey has demonstrated that the transitivity alternation has been a known phenomenon since ancient times and has presented difficulties for grammatical explanation since the dawn of Jewish grammatical thought in the medieval period. At least as early as the medieval Jewish grammarians, explanations have appealed to the semantics of the particular verb as well as to analogies with similar verbs and verb classes. Modern treatments of both lexica and grammars evidence a clear lack of consensus regarding the status of the nominal complement of these verbs especially their status along the complement-adjunct continuum. While this issue has not yet been treated from a cognitive linguistic perspective, many of the earlier treatments, especially in the medieval period, have touched on aspects that anticipate the kind of insights brought to bear by a cognitivist approach.

Chapter 3: Theory and Method

The difficulties presented by the BH transitivity alternation revolve around the issue of the syntax-semantics interface. In many cases, transitivity alternations of a given BH verb appear to have the same meaning. For example the verb חָנָה ("to camp") typically collocates with Prep -ב + LOCATION.

(20) 1 Sam 4:1b :q`EpSaAb …wñnDj My™I;tVvIlVp…w
And the Philistines camped in Aphek.

However, 2 Sam 17:26 expresses LOCATION (ד"נ ג"א) as an unmodified nominal complement.

(21) 2 Sam 17:26 :d`DoVlˆ…gAh X®r™Ra M$ølDvVbAa ◊w ‹ lEa ∂rVcˆy NAj§I¥yÅw
Translations generally render these two constructions similarly (with no discernible difference in meaning — either semantic or pragmatic) if not identically, with 2 Sam 17:26 reading something along the lines of, "Israel and Absalom camped in the land of Gilead." 131

However, given the usage and distribution of חנה throughout Samuel a question arises regarding the motivation of the rarer syntactic construction in 2 Sam 17:26 and its distinction (whether semantic, pragmatic, or both) from the conventional usage. Considering the BH data as a whole, the main theoretical questions that present themselves are: how does the change in syntactic representation — in this case, the change from a one argument to a two argument construction — affect the meaning of the verb? What qualities of the semantics of the verb allow for its usage in multiple syntactic constructions while for other verbs such syntactic variation is seemingly disallowed? And what motivates the use of a verb in different syntactic constructions in cases where the conceptual content is comparable if not identical?

131. So KJV, NIV, RSV, NRSV, JPS, ESV. For a full treatment of חנה see 5.3.3 below.
While there are no doubt a number of theoretical models that could offer viable answers to these questions, the approach adopted in this study is the relatively recent linguistic theory of Cognitive Grammar (CG). Based on the principles and insights of Gestalt psychology, CG offers, to use Ronald Langacker's words, an "intuitively natural, psychologically plausible, and empirically viable" framework for understanding language structure. Particularly relevant to this study, Langacker argues "that constructs adopted in CG are quite successful in allowing principled representations of the similarities and differences among expressions with comparable content." While the principles and constructs of CG will form the theoretical basis for this study, other complementary approaches will be employed as they prove useful in explaining the BH data. In particular, some of the insights and methods of Typological and Functional grammar, as well as Corpus Linguistics will be drawn on throughout.

132. Though CG is novel in many respects, Dirk Geeraerts has identified significant theoretical parallels between CG and the Historical-Philological Semantics of pre-structuralist linguistics. Notable among these are the historical, psychological, and hermeneutical orientation of both approaches. If Geeraerts is correct then, contra Lakoff, the so-called "classical" or "traditional" approach represented by Generative Grammar is better regarded as an anomaly in the history of linguistic theory and method. "History of Lexical Semantics," 674.


135. Ronald Langacker warns against what he calls the "exclusionary fallacy," the gist of which "is that one analysis, motivation, categorization, cause, function, or explanation for a linguistic phenomenon necessarily precludes another." He says, "From a broad, pretheoretical perspective, this assumption is gratuitous and in fact rather dubious, in view of what we know about the multiplicity of interacting synchronic and diachronic factors that determine the shape and import of linguistic expressions." Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Vol 1 (hereafter FOCG I, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1987), 28. However, Langacker clarifies that this does not mean that "all conceivable analyses be seriously entertained," but rather that those which "minimize deviation from natural tendencies" are to be preferred. Such approaches may be multiple and mutually enlightening. FOCG I, 55.

136. For the relationship between functional and cognitive approaches, see Jan Nuyts, "Brothers in Arms? On the
3.1 Theory of Cognitive Grammar

Evidencing many parallels with the earlier research program of Generative Semantics, CG has at its core the notion that language is integrally and systemically related to basic human cognitive domains and faculties. Meaning, for cognitivists, is equated with the mental activity of conceptualization and linguistic expression is therefore a representation (typically, though not always, verbal) of cognition. In CG, as well as in other cognitive approaches to language, language use is understood to operate on the basis of non-linguistic cognitive functions such as judgment, focus, orientation, perception, categorization, attention, memory, image-schemas, and viewing frames to name a few. In favor of the cognitive approach is its *prima facie* claim to intuitiveness and naturalness. Many cognitivists have noted that it should not be at all surprising that the same cognitive processes at work in, for instance, perceiving and reasoning are also at work in the linguistic expressions of those realities. This principle of an integrated cognitive system animates CG and serves as the driving idea in its explanations and analyses of language usage.

---

137. Cognitive Grammar arose, as it were, out of the ashes of the linguistic theory known as Generative Semantics the proponents of which engaged Chomsky and his followers — with their view known as Interpretive Semantics — in vigorous debate during a period spanning roughly the later 1960's to the early 1980's. For a history of the movements and the theoretical issues involved, see Randy Allen Harris, *The Linguistics Wars* (New York/ Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).


139. On the intuitive nature of the cognitive approach, Langacker argues, "If notions like 'noun' and 'subject' are universal and fundamental to grammar, it would seem both dubious and implausible to deny them a conceptual raison d'être. From a naive perspective (i.e. those who lack linguistic training), it is hard to fathom why our species would have evolved an autonomous grammatical system independent of conceptual and phonological content. Is it not more reasonable to suppose that grammar, rather than being separate and distinct, is merely the abstract commonality inherent in sets of symbolically complex expressions?" *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*, 6.
This theoretical commitment distinguishes CG from what has become the traditional view in which grammar (syntax) is understood to be separate and isolated from semantics. Though linguistics as a scientific discipline has developed and changed much since the 1957 publication of Chomsky's *Syntactic Structures*, his fundamental principle that "grammar is autonomous and independent of meaning," persists even today as the dominant theoretical framework in the field.140 Syntax, in this view, is believed to be a function of an autonomous language module which operates independent of and without reference to other aspects of cognition. To use Chomsky's words, "grammar is best formulated as a self-contained study independent of semantics."141

Elucidating and navigating the intricacies of the theoretical issues involved in the debate between cognitivists and generativists is beyond the scope of this study. Needless to say, in their classic forms the two theories and their methods of analysis are largely incompatible.142 Founded as they are on objectivist metaphysics the generative approaches evidence a rigorous formalism based on mathematical logic.143 The results are grammatical rules and models that resemble an algorithm. Such formalism, however, has been challenged by CG whose models of analyses are decidedly more concrete (often taking the form of diagrams) and whose frame of reference is

---


142. Since Chomsky's groundbreaking work there have developed a number of mediating positions between the two schools of thought. See, for example, Ray Jackendoff, *Foundations of Language: Brain, Meaning, Grammar, Evolution*. (Oxford: OUP, 2002), xi - xvi. What is described here is more or less the classic position as articulated by Chomsky and still maintained by most generative linguists today.

bodily experience, rather than a calculus. Mikołaj Domaradzki succinctly summarizes the differences — both theoretical and methodological — between the cognitive and generative paradigms:

Arguably, the most fundamental difference between the two concerns the role of the cognitive agent, for while the [generative approach] seeks to present an account of language that abstracts from it, the [cognitive approach] renders the subject its proper point of departure, assuming that neither language nor any knowledge of it can be considered independently of human cognitive mechanisms, these making our experience of the world coalesce with its conceptualization. A consequence of this constructivist assumption for language description is that the cognitive view departs from truth-conditional and rule-based account of language in favor of an account which makes allowances for the interface of grammar and meaning.144

What follows is an outline and explanation of the basic principles of CG and related approaches that pertain to the analysis of the BH transitivity alternation. Apart from illustrative examples, applications of the following principles will be applied to the BH data in the relevant chapters along with any theoretical information pertaining specifically to a verb or verb class.

3.1.1 Form-Meaning Pairing

Perhaps the central idea of CG has been expressed famously by Dwight Bolinger who said, "A difference in syntactic form always spells a difference in meaning."145 Agreeing with Bolinger, Adele Goldberg formalizes his theory in what she calls the Principle of No Synonymy: "If two constructions are syntactically distinct, they must be semantically or pragmatically


distinct. Pragmatic aspects of constructions involve particulars of information structure, including topic and focus, and additionally stylistic aspects of the construction such as register.\textsuperscript{146} Central to CG is what has become known as form-meaning pairing. Formal expressions of a language at every level are symbolic and therefore inherently meaningful. There is general consensus that such symbolism is a function of lexical items. The phonetic symbol /kæt/, for example, represents the "well-known carnivorous quadruped which has long been domesticated, being kept to destroy mice, and as a house pet."\textsuperscript{147} However, the idea that such symbolism also pertains to grammatical units like phonemes and morphemes as well as larger syntactic structures (e.g. transitive, ditransitive, and caused motion constructions) enjoys much less consensus in the linguistic community.

Grammar or syntax, in the traditional view, is independent of meaning and operates on its own principles. Building on Bolinger's insights, Langacker notes that the problem with the arguments often advanced in support of the traditional view is that they do not take into account differing levels of abstraction.\textsuperscript{148} Simply because a symbol — for example, a grammatical construction — is abstract does not mean it is meaningless. According to CG, both lexicon and grammar operate according to form-meaning pairings only at different levels of abstraction. Therefore grammatical items, like lexical items, are understood to be symbolic; however, their

\footnotesize{\cite{Goldberg1995} Goldberg, \textit{Constructions}, 67. Goldberg goes on to represent the \textit{Principle of No Synonymy} with the following corollaries.}

\textit{Corollary A:} If two constructions are syntactically distinct and S(emantically)-synonymous, then they must not be P(ragmatically)-synonymous.

\textit{Corollary B:} If two constructions are syntactically distinct and P-synonymous, then they must not be S-synonymous.

\footnotesize{\cite{Bolinger1977} Definition from OED.}

\footnotesize{\cite{Langacker2008} Ronald Langacker cites Bolinger approvingly, "our mistake has been to confuse generality of meaning with lack of meaning." \textit{Investigations in Cognitive Grammar} (Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2009), 111. Cited from Bolinger, \textit{Meaning and Form} (New York: Longman, 1977), 85.}
symbolism typically obtains at a higher level of abstraction or conceptualization than lexical items. As a consequence, in CG there is not a strict qualitative separation between lexicon and grammar. To use Langacker’s words, "There is no meaningful distinction between grammar and lexicon. Lexicon, morphology, and syntax form a continuum of symbolic structures, which differ along various parameters but can be divided into separate components only arbitrarily."¹⁵⁰

Langacker is emphatic that this position does not deny the existence of grammar or collapse the categories of grammar and lexicon into one another. Rather, he argues, this position recognizes that the differences between lexicon and grammar are scalar differences located along a continuum with lexicon at one end and grammar at the other.¹⁵¹ Divisions along the continuum, however, do not correspond to inherent properties within the categories — categories like lexical items, morphemes, and grammatical structures, etc. — but are employed simply for convenience.

An important implication of the cognitivist theory of form-meaning pairing is the rejection of the distinction between so-called "content words" and "function words." Langacker argues that "most (if not all) grammatical morphemes are meaningful" and that grammatical morphemes "contribute semantically to the constructions they appear in, and that their occurrence has a semantic rationale even when conventionally determined."¹⁵² Therefore, just as so-called English "function words" — like the preposition of, definite article the, and grammatical morphemes — may be analyzed for the semantic contribution they make to the sense of the construction or clause considered as a whole, so too may BH "function words" —


like רְשָׁפָה, רְשָׁף, and grammatical structures (like the construct) to name a few — be likewise analyzed.  

3.1.2 Construal

Construal refers both to the organization of cognition as well as the linguistic expression of that organization. Dirven describes the process of construal as follows: "A linguistic expression (be it word, phrase, sentence, or text) always imposes a construal on some body of conceptual content. When describing a situation or event, a speaker must make choices with respect to the scope, i.e., which aspects of the situation are to be included, as well as to the perspective to adopt regarding the situation." Using the visual metaphor of a scene, Langacker suggests that construal refers to the particular way in which the scene is viewed. He says, "In viewing a scene, what we actually see depends on how closely we examine it, what we choose to look at, which elements we pay most attention to, and where we view it from." The implication of the mental act of construal is that the form of a linguistic expression is not determined by the objective reality — that is, the ideas or experiences which it is in some manner representing. Rather, conceptual content may be organized and expressed in an almost infinite number of ways and is subject to the perspectives and goals of the speaker. At the same time,  

153. Though written more from a Functional-Typological than a CG perspective, Bekin's Transitivity and Object Marking in Biblical Hebrew would be exemplary in this regard. There is a sense in which the "content word" vs "function word" distinction is serviceable in the CG paradigm if it is understood to designate endpoints of a continuum and, most importantly, if the "function word" end of the continuum is not regarded as being void of meaning. Leonard Talmy, for example, speaks of "open class" and "closed class" words, the former corresponding to content or lexical words and the latter to function or grammatical words. Talmy is clear however that the "two subsystems have distinct semantic functions," and that these "specify different portions of a CR (cognitive representation)." Toward a Cognitive Semantics (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000), 21-22. In contrast, Waltke-O'Connor propound a more qualitative distinction between syntax and semantics as seen in their appeal to Chomsky's "Colorless green ideas sleep furiously" as evidence that grammar and lexis are "truly distinct." (IBHS 3.2.2 c).


construal is also subject to conventionalization. That is to say, mental experience and expression
is to some degree limited by general cognitive abilities as described below as well as by cultural
factors.

Though not exhaustive, Croft and Cruse's taxonomy of construal operations offers a
helpful outline of basic processes at work in cognition.¹⁵⁶

3.1.2.1 Attention

Construal involves the focusing of attention in terms of selection, scale, scope, and the
nature (static or dynamic) of the event or entity represented. The selection of focus highlights
certain aspects of the entity or event and "blurs" or backgrounds others. The element or elements
in focus are said to be profiled. For example, the lexemes "radius," "arc," and "circumference"
all profile a different aspect of a CIRCLE. To use Langacker's metaphor of a scene, profiled
elements could be said to be effectively "on stage."

Profiling occurs at all levels of linguistic expression. It may be seen in, for example,
lexical selection. Goldberg notes the different syntactic patterning of the nearly synonymous
verbs rob and steal.¹⁵⁷

(22) a. Jesse robbed the rich (of all their money).

b. *Jesse robbed a million dollars (from the rich).

¹⁵⁶ Only three of Croft and Cruse's four categories will be outlined here (with some modification) as they are the
most relevant to the issues presented by the BH transitivity alternation. I will omit the discussion of
"perspective," which includes viewpoint, deixis, and subjectivity/objectivity. The salient features of
"viewpoint" are covered under the related notion, "judgment." Croft and Cruse, Cognitive Linguistics, 40-73.
Croft and Cruse's four-way classification is followed by Zoltán Kövecses, Language, Mind, and Culture: A
Basic Introduction; FOCG I; and Talmy, "The Relation of Cognition to Grammar," in Toward a Cognitive
Semantics, vol. 1 offer comparable treatments.

¹⁵⁷ The following example is taken from Goldberg, Constructions, 45.
(23) a. Jesse stole money (from the rich).

   b. *Jesse stole the rich (of money).

   The reason for the syntactic constraints, Goldberg argues, is that the semantics of the verbs "rob" and "steal" profile different entities in the ROBBERY frame (for a discussion of frames see 3.1.2, "Constitution" below). The profiled elements are represented in **boldface** as follows.158

(24) a. rob <thief target goods> 

   b. steal <thief target goods> 

   However, in some instances the same lexeme may be used to profile different entities.

(25) a. The window is dirty.

   b. She came in through the bathroom window.159

   (25)a clearly profiles the window pane and (25)b profiles the frame or the window as an opening into a structure. Though both reference the concept WINDOW, each is profiling a different aspect of the window frame.160 The selection of focus, therefore, is different.

   Attention also operates with regard to the amount of detail that is profiled, that is its specificity or scale. The expressions "something happened," and "Warren was struck by lightning last Tuesday" may refer to the same event, though the former is much more general or coarse-grained than the latter. An entity or event, therefore, may be viewed at different levels of granularity. Croft and Cruse offer the following example:161

---

158.Goldberg, Constructions, 45.

159.Example taken from Croft and Cruse, Cognitive Linguistics, 48.


(26) a. She ran across the field.
   
   b. She ran through the field.

   According to Croft and Cruse, (26)b "invites the hearer to attend to the thickness of the vegetation in the field by using a preposition requiring a three-dimensional volume;" (26)a, by contrast, "construes the field as a two-dimensional surface without thickness."162 Croft and Cruse conclude that (26)a adopts a more distant or coarse-grained perspective than (26)b.

   The scope of attention refers to how much of the entity or event is profiled. Is the entity or event construed as bounded — a quality of count nouns and perfective verbs; or is the entity or event unbounded — a quality of mass nouns and imperfective verbs? Within a frame, certain entities are in focus and others are on the periphery. Those entities on the periphery may be said to be within the scope of attention (or part of the semantic frame), though not profiled.

   There are also cross-linguistically common or conventional shifts of attention. One such shift is the shift of focus from agent to instrument.

(27) a. John broke the glass with the hammer.
   
   b. The hammer broke the glass.

   Finally, the same event may be construed statically or dynamically. These correspond respectively to the focus of attention being on the event as a thing or a relation. Langacker offers the following example:

(28) a. The collapse of the Brooklyn bridge
   
   b. The Brooklyn bridge collapsed.

   (28)a construes the event statically and (28)b construes the event dynamically. The salient point is that virtually every facet of a given event, relation, or entity is subject to the

focusing or non-focusing attention of the speaker. Various linguistic operations, from lexical selection to grammatical form, contribute to the manner in which a thing or event is construed.

3.1.2.2 Judgment

Judgment refers to the psychological act of comparison. Langacker expresses the significance of judgment in the construal process as follows:

Fundamental to cognitive processing and the structuring of experience is our ability to compare events and register any contrast or discrepancy between them... I assume that this ability to compare two events is both generalized and ubiquitous: acts of comparison continually occur in all active cognitive domains, and at various levels of abstraction and complexity; regardless of domain and level, moreover, they are manifestations of the same basic capacity (or at least are functionally parallel).^{163}

Judgment as a linguistic phenomenon would include the construal operations of metaphor and categorization. Any metaphorical or figurative expression (a reality that is regarded in CG as both ubiquitous and scalar) represents an evaluation that says to the hearer, in effect, "Regard this thing/event like that thing or event." In this way, a judgment or comparison is established.

More immediately relevant to the issues involved in the BH transitivity alternation are the judgment operations of categorization and Figure/Ground alignment. The construing of any entity (at any level of abstraction) as a member of a category is to render a certain judgment about that entity (*categorization* will be expounded in more detail under Prototypes below, see 3.1.4). It is to claim, often implicitly, that this thing or event shares sufficient similarities to other things or events designated by a category. The placing of any verb in a transitive construction, therefore, is to make a categorical claim — namely that the action so described conforms to a greater or lesser degree to the meaning of the transitive grammatical construction.

The judgment operation most directly relevant to this study, however, is the mental configuration operation known as Figure/Ground. Figure/Ground selection refers to the orientation of two entities relative to each other, an orientation in which one entity (the Figure) is given more prominence or focus than the other (the Ground). For this reason Figure/Ground alignment is an asymmetric relation. According to Langacker, Figure/Ground describes many aspects of perception and cognition. A noise (Figure) is heard against the background of silence (Ground) and the act of categorization relates an entity (Figure) to the structure of a category (Ground). Applied to language, Figure then refers to the "primary focus within a profiled relationship" and Ground, if stated, the secondary focus.

Both the Profile (3.1.2.1 above) and the Figure and Ground in Figure/Ground alignment are two linguistic operations that convey prominence or salience. They bring an element, whether THING or RELATIONSHIP, into focus. Langacker summarizes the notion of salience as follows:

Like other aspects of construal, prominence is a conceptual phenomenon, inhering in our apprehension of the world, not in the world per se. However, merely acknowledging its conceptual nature is insufficient. Even at the conceptual level, the objects of our mental universe have no inherent status as profile, trajector, or landmark. These pertain specifically to the conceptualizations evoked as the meanings of linguistic expressions. How prominent a particular entity is - whether it functions as profile, trajector, landmark, or none of the above - depends on the construal imposed by the linguistic elements employed, in accordance with their conventional semantic values.

164. Croft and Cruse make the important observation that "Figure-ground alignment is an example of comparison in that the two elements of the scene are compared to each other; but unlike categorization and metaphor, the judgment is one of contrast rather than similarity." *Cognitive Linguistics*, 58.


166. Langacker, *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*, 70. Langacker uses the terminology Trajector/Landmark instead of Figure/Ground. To avoid confusion, I will use Figure/Ground throughout this study except when directly quoting Langacker.

Among other things like intonation and body language, salience is conveyed through syntactic representation. The Figure/Ground alignment naturally correlates with syntactic representation as the Figure is typically coded as the grammatical Subj and the Ground as the DO or Prep Obj.

3.1.2.3 Constitution

Building as it does on Gestalt psychology, CG adopts concepts and terminology from the parent discipline in its description of the overall structure of a scene. This includes both its component parts as well as their organization relative to each other, an organization often called its Gestalt. The Gestalt of a scene refers to such things as conventionalized patterns of force dynamics and structural schematization, concepts developed most extensively by Talmy. However, more pertinent to the issues involved in the BH transitivity alternation is the concept of frames associated with the work of Charles Fillmore. A frame, according to Fillmore, is "any system of concepts related in such a way that to understand any one of them you have to understand the whole structure in which it fits." Put another way, a frame is a "structured mental representation" of human experiences, experiences which would include both things and events.

Frames represent the encyclopedic knowledge a speaker/hearer brings to a particular speech event. The parade example is the word radius which evokes the frame CIRCLE. It is in fact impossible to conceive of the line segment denoted by the word radius without having the


169. Kövecses, Language, Mind, and Culture, 64. For a helpful comparison of Frame semantics with the Truth-Conditional semantics associated with structuralist and generativist theories, see Croft and Cruse, Cognitive Linguistics, 5-14.
background concept of a CIRCLE. The background knowledge (which may also be regarded as
the Ground against which the Figure is profiled) is the "frame."\textsuperscript{170}

Closely related to the concept of frames is the notion of image schemas. According to
Langacker, "lexical and grammatical resources of a language embody conventional imagery,
which is an inherent and essential aspect of their semantic value."\textsuperscript{171} At the risk of
oversimplifying a complex field of inquiry in CG, image schemas may be described as the
ordering of experience according to certain conventional structures, structures that have their
origin in bodily experience and are extended (through metaphor, metonomy, meronomy, etc.) to
abstract and non-bodily experience as well. Conventional image schemas include containers,
surfaces, paths, links, forces, and balance, to name a few.

The shape or function of many objects lend themselves to certain image-schematic
construals. However, citing an example from Herskovits, Croft and Cruse rightly note that there
are many examples of objects undergoing alternative construals according to different image
schemas.\textsuperscript{172}

(29) a. There is milk \textit{in} the bowl.

b. There is dust \textit{on} the bowl.

Croft and Cruse explain the motivation for the alternate construals: "since the function of
bowls is to contain potable liquids, the bowl is construed as a container with \textit{in} in (29)a, and
since dust is thought of as an extraneous substance, the bowl is construed as a surface with \textit{on} in
(29)b."\textsuperscript{173}

\textsuperscript{170}Langacker employs the terms "base" and "domain" for this background knowledge in ways that are identical to
Fillmore's notion of frames.


\textsuperscript{172}Croft and Cruse, \textit{Cognitive Linguistics}, 65.

The significance of image schemas for the BH transitivity alternation is evident from the following statement of Langacker: "Two expressions may be functionally equivalent and serve as approximate paraphrases or translations of one another, and yet be semantically distinct by virtue of the contrasting images they incorporate."\(^{174}\) As will be argued below, it is this alternative construal based on alternative image schemas that explains the contrasting syntactic expressions of many of the BH verbs that exhibit the transitivity alternation.

3.1.3 Motivation

According to Domaradzki, "cognitive linguistics combines its theory of syntax with its theory of motivation."\(^{175}\) Motivation offers important qualification to the principle of non-determinacy. Simply put, though linguistic expressions are not determined by the objective entity or event being described, linguistic convention and usage is nevertheless motivated by the entity or event. Lakoff summarizes this notion succinctly: "experience does not determine conceptual systems, [it] only motivates them."\(^{176}\)

While most if not all cognitivists agree with de Saussure's assertion that linguistic signs are arbitrary and linguistic expression therefore unpredictable, most will also affirm that linguistic expressions are motivated by the conceptualization of those realities without being predictable and rule-derived. This provides a cogent middle way between the generativist and

---


176. Lakoff, *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things*, 310. Similarly Domaradzki says, "Given the V + -er schema, cognitive linguistics maintains that such schemas can be extrapolated irrespective of whether we deal with lexical and figurative extensions or grammatical productivity, but it has to be borne in mind that in all cases the search for absolute predictability that is characteristic of formal languages is a wild-goose chase." "Cognitive Critique of Generative Grammar," 50.
structuralist positions since "its account of radial categories leads to the conclusion that more peripheral subcategories are neither computable or derivational (in the Chomskyan sense) from the central category nor completely arbitrary (in the Saussurian sense)."\textsuperscript{177}

For example, Langacker acknowledges that the noun \textit{staple} is obviously arbitrary.\textsuperscript{178} The little piece of metal might have been called anything. However, \textit{staple} referring to what it does makes the derived noun \textit{stapler} anything but arbitrary.\textsuperscript{179} Non-arbitrary though it is, it is notable that the suffix \textit{-er} does not have its expected meaning of "agent who completes a task." The noun \textit{stapler}, then, may be said to be motivated — though not predictably and in a rule-governed way.

Figure/Ground relations also obtain a certain conventionalized status based on motivation. Typically, it is the constitutive properties of the realities or \textsc{things} involved in the relation that motivate the organization of the scene, though other factors such as viewpoint might override the conventional organization. Talmy offers the following example as an example of motivated Figure/Ground relations:\textsuperscript{180}

\begin{enumerate}
\item The bike is near the house.
\item ?The house is near the bike.
\end{enumerate}

According to Talmy, the qualities of the \textsc{things} involved as well as the scene as a whole motivate (30)a as the conventional means of orienting the Figure and Ground. The size of the house compared to the size of the bike makes it the more natural selection as the Ground. Also,

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{177} Domaradzki, "Cognitive Critique of Generative Grammar," 51.
\item \textsuperscript{178} Langacker, \textit{FOCG} I, 12.
\item \textsuperscript{179} "The form is conventional, inasmuch as another form could perfectly well have been chosen for this concept, but it is not arbitrary in the sense of being unmotivated, given the existence of other signs." Langacker, \textit{FOCG} I, 12 n.2.
\item \textsuperscript{180} Talmy, \textit{Cognitive Semantics} I, 314.
\end{itemize}
the bike's mobility makes it more natural as the Figure which will be oriented relative to the (more) stable and stationary entity, that is the house. Furthermore, the house would more naturally fill the semantic role LOCATION, whereas a bike would not. This list could go on.\footnote{For a list of qualities that motivate Figure/Ground selection, see Talmy, \textit{Cognitive Semantics} I, 315-16, reproduced as Table 6.1 below.}

The point, however, is that all of these factors would motivate the expression, \textit{The bike is near the house}, as being the more conventional expression though would not determine its usage in any given situation. One could imagine a situation in which a particularly famous bike was a known quantity in which the sentence (30)b would be appropriate in directing someone to an unknown house. This gives rise to the dictum in CL that, "while virtually everything is motivated, very little is subject to absolute predictability."\footnote{Langacker, \textit{Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction}, 88.}

The concept of motivation provides a potentially fruitful avenue for revisiting lexical items and their syntactic environments that have traditionally been interpreted as synonymous (e.g. 1 Sam 4:1 and 2 Sam 17:26, see above). Furthermore, Kinberg's explanation of the variable usage of Obj Prep \textit{איה} outlined in chapter 2 (see 2.3.3.3.1) falls short precisely on this point. Kinberg does not satisfactorily address the question of motivation (and hence the question of meaning), specifically, why one form is used over another during a period of transition from synthetic to analytic language type. The theory of motivation developed in CG (and summarized by Goldberg in 3.1.1 above) would postulate a semantic or pragmatic motivation.

\subsection*{3.1.4 Prototypes}

Developed by Eleanor Rosch in psychology and then applied to linguistics by George Lakoff and others, the theory of prototypes challenges the classical Aristotelian model of

Rosch's groundbreaking experiments demonstrated, contra the classical model, that not all members of a category have equal status but rather members of a category are more or less representative or central than others. According to prototype theory, categories are gradient with central or core members being good representatives of the category and peripheral members being less good representatives.\footnote{Lakoff makes the important observation that Rosch's positions developed significantly over time and that her later views based on further experimentation were that prototype effects do not necessarily entail particular category structures. Lakoff states, "it is not widely known that Rosch abandoned the idea that prototype effects directly mirror category structure and that prototypes constitute representations of categories... It is important to bear in mind that prototype effects are superficial. They may result from many factors. In the case of a graded category like tall man, which is fuzzy and does not have rigid boundaries, prototype effects may result from degree of category membership, while in the case of bird, which does have rigid boundaries, the prototype effects must result from some other aspect of internal category structure." Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things, 44, 45. Cf. Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, "Polysemy, Prototypes, and Radial Categories," in The Oxford Handbook of Cognitive Linguistics, ed. by Dirk Geeraerts and Hubert Cuyckens (Oxford: OUP, 2007), 145.} The most central (or best-example-of) member of a category is said to be the prototype. An oft cited illustration is the category CHAIR for which a four-legged piece of furniture with a seat and a back is central and therefore good example of the category. Stools, high-chairs, car-seats, and bean bags, then represent less good instances of the category CHAIR. Categories, therefore, are said to be "blurred at the edges" and resemblance to a prototype is a matter of degree.

It is difficult to overstate the importance of prototypicality for CG. It is applied to almost every aspect of linguistic analysis and it is critical as a paradigm for categorization and construal. Prototypical transitivity (which will be developed below, see 3.2) is the application of the process
of categorization through radial categories in the domain of syntax. Naturally, a given culture will express certain concepts, including transitivity, in prototypical ways and non-prototypical ways, a notion that of course parallels unmarked and marked constructions respectively. The prototypical form is the more or less conventional mode of expressing a concept; however, as we will see, conventionality can be contravened for semantic or pragmatic purposes.

3.1.5 Constructions

If not a subfield of CG, Construction Grammar (CxG) is certainly a closely related discipline that shares the same theoretical foundations. Broadly speaking, CxG — developed with some variation by Fillmore, Goldberg, Langacker, Croft, and others — maintains that meaning is inherent at all levels of linguistic representation (phoneme, morpheme, lexeme, syntax, etc.) and therefore any form-meaning pairing — or construction — may be regarded as having a semantic value even if only at a general and abstract level. CxG rejects the notion that meaning is essentially the result of combinatory rules and points to the plethora of idioms that could not be understood on the basis of a componential analysis.

Of interest for this study is the implication of CxG for lexicography. According to CxG, verbs do not need to be assigned unusual senses to explain idiosyncratic usages for which the semantic weight may be borne by the construction. For example, what Goldberg calls the "Cause-motion construction" explains how typically intransitive verbs like laugh and sneeze may take an object in examples (31)a and b:

(31) a. The crowd *laughed* me out of the room.

b. He *sneezed* the napkin off the table.

In both examples, the DO is contributed through the semantics of the construction which may be represented as: Cause x to move y. The DO x is an argument of the construction and not a typical argument of the verb. Similarly, Goldberg argues that the ditransitive construction in English carries with it the notion of transfer associated with the verb *give*.

(32) a. Stan *gave* Sue the book.

b. Stan *baked* Sue a cake.

Common constructions would include the transitive construction, the intransitive construction, the passive construction, the ditransitive construction, and the middle construction. However, it is not the case that any verb may appear in any construction. Clearly, some combinations are infelicitous (e.g. "*Jack saddened me the letter" would not work as a ditransitive construction). According to Goldberg, the viability of a combination of verb and construction resides in the ability of the event type designated by the verb to be integrated with the event type designated by the construction. Such relations between verb and construction manifest certain patterns such as *means, result,* and *precondition.* Though the verb does not need to project all the semantic roles designated by the construction, it does need to be able to integrate the semantic roles of the construction. This is achieved typically by selecting elements

---

186."Although I have argued that constructions have meaning independently of verbs, it is clearly not the case that the grammar works entirely top-down, with constructions simply imposing their meaning on unsuspecting verbs." Goldberg, Constructions, 24.


188.Goldberg notes that it is unclear why these relations are privileged and not others. She says, "Why should means, preconditions, and to a lesser extent, the manner involved in an event be more likely candidates for use in a construction which implied the entire event than, say, the mood of one of the participants? This deeper question is difficult to answer, but if we consider certain verbs' inherent semantics to bear a *metonymic* relationship to the semantics of the construction, we may find a partial explanation." Goldberg, Constructions, 65.
from within the semantic frame. According to Goldberg, "The semantics associated with the
construction defines a semantic frame, and the verb must inherently designate a particular salient
aspect of that frame." The semantics of larger constructions, like a syntactic construction,
exhibit the same variation and expansion that may obtain at the lexical level — that is they may
undergo expansions on the basis of metaphor, polysemy, meronomy, etc.

The contribution of CxG for the issues presented by the BH transitivity alternation
regards the transitive construction. In contrast to the ditransitive or caused motion constructions,
the transitive construction operates at a more abstract and general level of meaning.
Nevertheless, as a construction it should be expected to carry semantic freight at some level of
generalization. The semantics of the transitive construction will be elaborated under Transitivity
below (3.2). The argument of this study is that verbs exhibiting the BH transitive alternation
achieve their meaning, at least in part, through the semantic contribution of the transitive
construction.

3.2 Transitivity

Commenting on the problematic verb יָשָׁה (שׂוּשׂ, "to be glad" + 3rd pl suf) in Isa 35:1,
Alec Motyer says,

Since in English it is impossible for an intransitive verb to govern a direct
object it is common to alter the MT, understanding the final m as ditto graphic
of the initial m of the next word (midbar). It should not be overlooked,
however, that Hebrew is more flexible in its use of intransitive verbs than
English is and often does construe them with direct objects. 'Be glad over
them' is correct linguistically and theologically... 190

189. Importantly for Goldberg's model is that at least one participant role of the verb and one argument role of the
construction must match (e.g. patient, mover, etc.). That is to say, the construction can not contribute all the
semantic roles needed to make the expression meaningful. Goldberg, Constructions, 65.

190. Alec Motyer, The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction and Commentary (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic,
1993), 273, n 2. Emphasis mine.
Motyer's classification of verbs into rigid categories of "transitive" and "intransitive" is fairly typical. However, if quintessential intransitive verbs like *laugh* and *sneeze* can take a direct object (see above (31)) it is not at all clear that English is less flexible in its use of transitives than BH. It is more likely that in Isa 35:1 we are dealing either with a textual error or with a unique sense of the verb-construction combination that we have not yet understood. While languages will certainly differ with regard to which verbs may appear in a transitive construction, notions of transitivity are almost certainly universal. According to Åshild Næss, transitivity is "a central phenomenon in the structure of human languages, and ... it appears to be universal."\(^{191}\)

The problem of the traditional practice of labeling verbs as either "transitive" or "intransitive" was recognized at least as early as 1927 by Otto Jesperson who wrote:

> It is customary to divide verbs into *transitive* and *intransitive*. But in English at any rate, it is impossible to make a sharp distinction between two classes, and we should rather speak of a transitive and an intransitive *use* of verbs, for many verbs which are generally transitive, i.e. take an object (or two objects) are very often used without any object, and other verbs, which are as a rule intransitive, may at times be connected with an object.\(^{192}\)

Though their insights are anticipated in many respects, Hopper and Thompson's article "Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse" undoubtedly marks a watershed in the history of the linguistic study of transitivity.\(^{193}\) In it they delineate parameters of transitivity "each of which suggest a scale according to which clauses can be ranked" (see Table 3.1)

---


Two of Hopper and Thompson's conclusions are particularly significant for the present study. First, as is evident from the nature of the parameters outlined in Table 3.1, transitivity is related to conceptual realities. This is in contrast to strictly formal explanations of transitivity which understands transitivity as basically a valence issue, that is, one that refers to the number of arguments accompanying a given verb. According to Hopper and Thompson, transitivity is not a singular property attributable exclusively to the verb or to the nominal complements, but is rather a global property dependent on a variety of parameters that are properties of the clause.

Therefore the likelihood of an event being expressed by a transitive clause is directly correlated with the number of high transitivity parameters it contains or is conceptualized as containing. According to Næss, "semantic transitivity is a property which may be assigned both at the level of the clause and of the individual verb." The labels "transitive" and "intransitive" as they are applied to verbs must therefore refer to the type of clause in which they are typically or conventionally found. To categorize a verb as "transitive" is to say that its meaning is compatible, in certain contexts, with the meaning of a transitive construction.

---

However, in contrast to the ditransitive or caused-motion constructions it is less easy to discern how the transitive construction may be said to have meaning. After all such a variety of expressions employ the transitive construction so that delineating a common denominator or a prototypical exemplar of the construction is difficult. However, Langacker's insight that abstract meaning is meaning nonetheless seems applicable to this issue (see n. 19 above). About the possibility of the transitive construction functioning in a similar manner to other constructions, Goldberg remarks:

It may well turn out that this construction is more like the others discussed in this monograph in that it may be more felicitous to assign a family of related meanings to it, with the prototypical "transitive scene" being the central sense. In this case, the central sense would be quite specific, being that of a volitional actor affecting an inanimate patient — a causative event. Extensions from the prototype would license a wider range of transitive expressions.¹⁹⁶

In contrast to the relatively specific conceptions evoked by the ditransitive (i.e. transfer) or the caused-motion constructions, cognitivists have posited more abstract, though not less meaningful, semantic models of the prototypical transitive scenario. This brings us to the second major contribution of Hopper and Thompson's study. According to Hopper and Thompson, transitivity should be regarded as a scalar (as opposed to a binary) reality, with clauses being more or less transitive inasmuch as they approximate the canonical transitive scenario, or what we are calling the prototypical transitive scenario. Næss summarizes both the substance and significance of Hopper and Thompson's thesis in the following manner: "transitivity is no longer

¹⁹⁶ Adele Goldberg, Constructions: A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 118. Though not using the terminology or theory of CxG, Goldberg's view is anticipated by Sally Rice who says, "The purpose behind my undertaking here is to show that even larger grammatical structures, specifically certain transitive clause types, are likewise polysemous and behave much like words and grammatical relations. That is, clausal forms, too can exhibit a range of meanings that are scalar, nondiscrete, and not always directly computable from a single symbolic string or fixed matrix. For example, a logically transitive clause... may or may not be considered transitive by the speaker for the purposes of passivizability. Indeed, it is counterproductive for a grammar seeking descriptive adequacy to isolate a clause type, based on predicate-argument structure, without reference to the lexical items contained therein or without an idea of the speaker's intent." "Toward a Cognitive Model of Transitivity" (Ph.D. diss., University of California San Diego, 1987), 44. Emphasis mine.
a matter of a simple subdivision into transitive and intransitive verbs or clauses; modern linguistics operates with transitivity as a gradable notion, where a clause may be less transitive than a highly transitive clause but nevertheless more transitive than a simple intransitive clause.”

Hopper and Thompson's insight on the scalar nature of transitivity has led to a search for the canonical or prototypical transitive scenario. According to Langacker, "The form of a clause is not itself enough to make it transitive. The key factor in transitivity is conceptual in nature — roughly the degree of approximation to a canonical agent-patient interaction." In this view, a transitive construction has a prototypical semantic value from which less typical transitive scenarios will evidence deviation in some respects (e.g. inability to passivize) but not others.

There have been a number of attempts, most of them complementary, to describe the prototypical transitive scene from a cognitive perspective. Langacker describes our conceptions of actions and events in terms of two complex archetypal cognitive models: the billiard-ball model and the stage model. The former is the more useful of the two for discussing transitivity. According to the billiard-ball model, our world is conceived as "being populated by discrete physical objects... capable of moving about through space and making contact with one another. Motion is driven by energy, which some objects draw from internal resources and others receive from the exterior. When motion results in forceful physical contact, energy is

---


198. According to Rice, the cognitive approach "assumes that transitivity, too, is a category that reflects prototype effects." "Toward a Cognitive Model," 5. Hopper and Thompson's notion of "cardinal transitivity" approximates what later became prototypical transitivity which stands in contrasts to the categorical view. The value of the former, according to Rice, is that "the notion of a prototype allows for a more dynamic view of the interrelationships among transitivizing and detransitivizing elements in a sentence or in a discourse." "Toward a Cognitive Model, 37.

199. Langacker, *FOCG* II, 283-84. Langacker's stage model is briefly treated under Construal 3.1.2.
transmitted from the mover to the impacted object." The character of the prototypical billiard-ball event is an action chain in which an object or "head" makes energetic forceful contact with another object, the "tail," resulting in the transfer of energy. There may be any number of intervening "balls" in the action chain; however, the prototypical transitive event involves two participants corresponding to the head and the tail of the action chain.

In her study of transitivity from a cognitive perspective, Sally Rice offers the following description:

The prototypical transitive clause describes an event in which two entities are involved in some activity; the activity is conceived of as being unilateral, thus, the two entities are nonequivalent or asymmetrical; because there is movement and effect, contact between the two entities is presumed to be important; the second entity is directly affected in some way by the contact; and finally, the entities are taken to be distinct from each other, from their locale or setting, and from the speaker/conceptualizer.

Næss refines Rice's proposal arguing that the prototypical transitive clause is one in which the agent and patient are maximally distinct categories the salient properties of each being volitionality [Vol], instigation [Inst], and affectedness [Aff]. What makes these categories maximally distinct is that essential to the definition of the prototypical agent and patient is "the explicit absence of the defining properties of one category from the definition of the other." Therefore, the prototypical agent is one which is [+Vol], [+Inst], [-Aff] and the prototypical patient is [-Vol], [-Inst], [+Aff]. As clauses deviate from the semantics of this prototype, they will evidence lower degrees of transitivity.

200. On the pervasiveness of this model for cognition Langacker says, "This archetypal folk model exerts a powerful influence on both everyday and scientific thought, and no doubt reflects fundamental aspects of cognitive organization." *FOCG* II, 13.

201. *FOCG* II, 283.


Unsurprisingly perhaps, transitivity is based on conceptualization and is therefore a matter of construal. Though working primarily in the tradition of Functional-Typological grammar, Næss expresses the heart of the cognitivist approach with its emphasis on construal operations when she says, "formal transitivity depends not only on the semantic properties of the objective situation, but also on the way in which this situation is construed by the speaker — which participants or aspects of a situation are cast as more or less prominent or relevant in the context." Rice takes the conceptual basis of transitivity one step further arguing that transitivity is essentially a construal operation. Based on her study of peripheral cases of transitivity in English, Rice concludes that transitivity emerges as a conceptual phenomenon that serves as a "linguistic device optionally employed by a speaker to conceptualize and organize the actions of entities in the world in order to convey a certain attitude about an overall event to someone else." According to Rice, "There are not always strict criteria that determine membership in natural categories. Category inclusion is sanctioned by conceived approximation to a prototype as adjudged by the conceptualizer."

Transitivity in this study is therefore assumed to be conceptually (as opposed to syntactically or lexically) grounded. Langacker's billiard-ball model as well as Næss' maximally distinct category hypothesis will be drawn on throughout for their explanatory value for the BH transitivity alternation.

204. Næss, Prototypical Transitivity, 17.
205. Rice, "Toward a Cognitive Model," 5. Regarding her theoretical outlook, Rice says, "My premise is that much of the content of a clause is not available in the overt morphology. Rather, it is imposed on the meaning of the clause by a speaker's particular psychological perspective." "Toward a Cognitive Model," 12.
3.3 Verb Classes and Alternations

Recent years have seen an explosion of interest in verb alternations among linguists of a variety of theoretical persuasions. One of the main reasons for this is that the use of verbs in different syntactic environments is believed to shed light on, among other things, semantic nuances not typically captured in the traditional lexicon. The parade example is the locative alternation illustrated by the English verb load. Load may feature either CONTAINER or CONTENTS in the syntactic DO position as seen in the following:

(33) a. Stan loaded the cart with hay. (container-locative)
   b. Stan loaded hay onto the cart. (content-locative)

While it was once thought that the meaning of these two sentences is essentially synonymous, studies on the semantics of alternating verbs have argued convincingly that there are significant semantic differences between the two usages. In the container-locative construction (33)a, the container is construed as completely affected. In this case, the cart is completely loaded so that a sentence like, *I loaded the cart with hay and then I loaded it with corn*, would sound non-sensical. In contrast, the content-locative construction in (33)b does not construe the cart as completely loaded and therefore it is not conceived as necessarily wholly

---


209. The extent of semantic differences among alternating constructions remains a hotly debated issue. Levin, for instance, rejects the widely held notion (especially among cognitivists) that the ditransitive variant of the dative alternation entails "successful transfer." "Semantics and Pragmatics," 69-73. However, her treatment of the verbs *clear* and *wipe* clearly indicates that she is open to some degree of interaction between syntax and semantics. B. Levin and M. Rappaport Hovav,"Wiping the Slate Clean: A Lexical Semantic Exploration," *Cognition* 41 (1991): 123-51.
affected. A sentence like *I loaded hay on to the cart and then I loaded corn* would sound perfectly fine.

As the notion of *loading* involves the movement of a thing into a container it is natural to assume that verbs with similar senses will evidence the same alternations. However, verbs such as *pour* are found only in the content-locative position:

(34) a. I poured the water into the glass
    b. *I poured the glass with water

*Fill*, by contrast, is used only in the container-locative construction:

(35) a. *I filled the water into the glass.
    b. I filled the glass with water.

Building on the work of Rappaport Hovav and Levin, Steven Pinker notes that the syntactic variability of *fill* verbs and syntactic limitation of *pour/fill* verbs may be explained with a finer-grained consideration of the semantics of the verb, especially the type of action each verb denotes. The action designated by the verb *pour* is regarded as changing the state of a liquid, or moving a liquid (in a particular manner) and not something done to a container. Thus *pour* and similar verbs resist the container-locative construction. Conversely, *filling* is regarded as changing the state of the container and not as doing something to the contents. Thus *fill* and similar verbs resists the content-locative construction. *Loading*, in contrast to both *pour* and *fill*

---

210 Steven Pinker, *Learnability and Cognition: The Acquisition of Argument Structure* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989), 77-82. Pinker's work is heavily dependent on Rappaport and Levin's unpublished manuscript "A Case Study in Lexical Analysis," 1985, written for the MIT Center for Cognitive Science. Though working in the generative-transformational paradigm Stephen R. Anderson was one of the first to connect syntactic representation with the semantics of the verb. He says, "If semantic interpretation also takes place at this [deep] level, it is possible to state the idiosyncratic properties of verbs in a unified way: verbs like *load, smear, spray* have two possible interpretations of the following PP (one which is consistent with the reading of a *with*-phrase, and the other of which is consistent with the reading of a pseudo-directional like *on the wall*), while those like *litter, cover* on the one hand, and *throw, pitch* on the other have only one possible interpretation of the PP which differs from one class to the other." "Deep Structure in Semantic Interpretation," *Foundations of Language* 7 (1971): 387-96, esp. 395.
verbs, is an action that may change the state of either the container or contents and therefore it may be employed with either in the DO position. Regarding the locative alternation of load and similar verbs, Pinker says, "These are two different construals of the same event, a bit like the gestalt shift in the classic face-vase illusion in which the figure and ground switch places in one's consciousness. In sentences with the hay and the wagon, the flip between figure and ground is not in the mind's eye but in the mind itself — the interpretation of what the event is really about."211

In her programmatic work English Verb Classes and Alternations, Beth Levin categorizes and analyzes an extraordinary number of English verbs (though ironically her study is called a "preliminary investigation") according to their usage in different syntactic patterns (e.g. intransitive, transitive, ditransitive, and with a variety of prepositions).212 Levin summarizes the value of such an analysis as follows: "Distinctions induced by diathesis alternations help to provide insights into verb meaning, and more generally into the organization of the English verb lexicon, that might not otherwise be apparent, bringing out unexpected similarities and differences between verbs."213

As Levin's quote suggests, research into verb class alternations is directly applicable to the study of the BH transitivity alternation. Though we are unable to engage in an intuitive evaluation of permissible and impermissible usages of a given BH verb, it is believed that an analysis of the various attested patterns will nevertheless shed light on fine-grained semantic nuance of the verbs along with the constructions in which they are found. Furthermore, since

211. Pinker, The Stuff of Thought, 43-44.
213. Levin, English Verb Classes, 15.
GKC's treatment of the BH transitivity alternation it has been noted by most major BH grammars that many of the verbs undergoing the transitivity alternation are members of verb classes, that is, they belong to a group of verbs that are perceived as having a similar meaning. A consideration of the syntactic patterns of other verbs within the verb class may likewise shed light particularly on seemingly idiosyncratic usages of a particular verb.

3.4 Terminology

Terminology in linguistics is infamously difficult as very often different linguists employ identical labels for different phenomena. While most technical terms and concepts will be defined as they are introduced throughout this study some basic terminology should be defined and explained at the outset.

3.4.1 Complement and Adjunct

As mentioned earlier, the labels "complement" and "adjunct" are conventionally used to refer to the perceived necessity of a verbal argument. Complements are perceived as somehow necessary to the meaning of the verb and adjuncts are perceived as optional. Though helpful, these labels may be misleading if they are regarded as fixed or isolated categories (see 2.3.3.2 e). As will be argued below, notions of "grammaticality" and "meaningfulness" are more subjective and context dependent than many BH grammars acknowledge.

Many events designated by verbs can be alternately construed so that the presence or absence of a DO is more dependent on the speaker's perspectives and intentions than on a requirement of the verb or clause. For an English example consider the following:

(36) a. Jack ate.
   b. Jack ate a steak.
Here, the presence or absence of the DO is not a requirement of the verb, but is dependent on the goals and intentions of the speaker. To be sure, this does not render the labels *complement/adjunct* and *direct/indirect object* unserviceable; rather they may be regarded as end points on a continuum and the difference between them being scalar or gradable. José García-Miguel captures the gradable quality of the complement (or argument)/adjunct distinction: "what distinguishes arguments and adjuncts is the (relative) obligatoriness of the former and the (relative) optionality of the latter." As will be seen, some clausal elements are best analyzed as falling somewhere on the line between complement and adjunct.

Nor does the relative or gradable quality of "obligatoriness" suggest that all verbs may exhibit such syntactic variation. It is only those verbs whose semantics are compatible with the semantics of the transitive construction (Goldberg's "semantic coherence principle") that are able to exhibit the transitivity alternation of the sort seen in (36) above.

### 3.4.2 Valence

The term "valence" was conscripted for linguistic description from the field of chemistry where it is used to refer to the combinatory potential of elements with other atoms in the formation of chemical compounds. In linguistics, valence refers to the number of arguments that accompany a verb in a particular usage. A verb may be said to have one, two, three and on rare occasion, possibly four arguments, an argument typically regarded as a complement (as opposed to an adjunct). An intransitive construction would have a valence of one, a transitive a valence

---


of two, and a ditransitive a valence of three. It is likely a universal feature of languages that they possess operations that increase and decrease the valence of a verb. Common valence increasing operations include: causitivization, applicatives, dative shifts, possessor raising. Decreasing operations include: reflexives/reciprocals, passivization, middle constructions, antipassives, object demotion/omission, and object incorporation.\textsuperscript{216} BH features many of these valence adjusting operations. Notably, many are the functions of the stem system. The Hiphil and the Piel often increase valence, typically by one. The Niphal, Hithpael, and Hophal typically reduce valence, typically by one.

Regarding the variation of valency patterns of Hebrew verbs, Cameron Sinclair says, "It is well known that many Hebrew verbs exhibit considerable variation in the number of object noun phrases with which they are constructed. Certain verbs that usually appear as transitive occurs elsewhere without any visible object. Others that take two objects in some occurrences also appear with one or none at all." \textsuperscript{217} Sinclair is certainly correct as far as the data goes. However, as he later speaks of this phenomenon as an "apparent irregularity" and a "problem," one is given the impression that there is something particularly unusual about the state of affairs in BH. However, a similar variety of usage is seen in English. The English verb \textit{sell} may be used in the following valence patterns:

(37) a. Ditransitive: John sold Amy the book.

\hspace{2cm} b. Transitive: John sells books.

With a shift in semantic role:

(38) Intransitive: Travel books sell well in the summers.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{216}Thomas E. Payne, \textit{Describing Morphosyntax} (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 174-222.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{217}To be sure, Sinclair does proceed to elucidate "a number of regular grammatical processes which bring about a systematic and predictable change in the number of noun phrases with which they can be constructed." Sinclair, "The Valence of the Hebrew Verb," 63.}
And a metonymic shift in the semantic role [Agent]:

(39) Intransitive: That corner shelf in the front of the store sells well.

Valence in CG is both relative and gradient. According to Croft and Cruse, valency elaborates a particular substructure of a predicate. They offer the example, **Heather sings** for which the predicate **sings** is relational as it requires a singer; **Heather**, on the other hand, is non-relational because "the concept of a person does not presuppose another concept."\(^{218}\) **Heather**, then, is the argument of **sings**, and the clause **Heather sings** has a valence of one. Croft and Cruse illustrate the gradient and relative character of valence with the following example:

(40) I was reading this on the train

In this example, "I" and "this" would traditionally be analyzed as complements and "on the train" as an adjunct. However, Croft and Cruse point out that this is an oversimplification. They note:

Reading is a localizable activity: reading takes place in a location, as well as involving a reader and a thing read. This is not true of all predicates: one cannot say for instance that \(^{218}\) *John was widowed on the train*. Hence the location of the reading event is a substructure of the semantic structure of **read**, and **on the train** also elaborates that substructure of **read**. The solution to this apparent paradox is that the substructure of **read** elaborated by **on the train** is much less salient in the characterization of the reading event than the substructures of **read** elaborated by **I** and **this**.\(^{219}\)

The critical point of Croft and Cruse's description is the notion of salience. **On the train** is much less salient as a location and so it is more of an adjunct than a complement. However, "much less salient" is obviously a relative assessment. Returning to the earlier example of **Heather sings**, the bivalent expression **Heather sings an aria** is analyzable, then, as elaborating what is clearly part of the substructure of the event. One cannot sing without presumably singing

---

\(^{218}\) Croft and Cruse, *Cognitive Linguistics*, 281.

a song. Salience, however, as indicated by Croft and Cruse, is a relative and gradient notion as it can bring into view (on to the stage) realities which are more or less closely associated with the substructure of the relational figure.

3.4.3 Lability

The conventional description of verbs undergoing the transitivity alternation as "intransitive verbs which sometimes take an object" raises the question of whether we are dealing with a linguistic phenomenon known as lability. Broadly defined, labile verbs — also called ambitransitive verbs — are verbs which can be used either transitively or intransitively without any formal change. Naturally the different usages entail a difference in verbal meaning. The parade example of labile verbs in English is the verb 'to break' which can be used intransitively (e.g., 'the cup broke') or transitively (e.g., 'Henry broke the cup').

As is the case with many labels and categories in the field of linguistics, the usage of the terms "labile" and "ambitransitive" differs significantly between linguists. The broadest and most general usage of the label "labile," as transitive/intransitive alternations without any formal change would certainly include much of the BH phenomena under consideration. As mentioned above, the alternations being studied are those which occur within the same stem, typically the Qal, and therefore meet the formal criteria. Most, though not all, vary in terms of the valence structure which typically changes transitivity in some measure.

That being said, a great deal of the work being done on lability focuses on specific types of alternations, for example causative/inchoative, reflexive, reciprocal, passive, etc. Some, like Martin Haspelmath, define lability exclusively in terms of one alternation, usually the causative/

---

inchoative.221 One of the foremost researchers on lability from a typological perspective, Alexander Letuchiy, offers the following parameters for lability:

   i) labile verbs have at least two distinct uses, one transitive and one intransitive;

   ii) the syntactically privileged argument (subject) in these different uses has different semantic roles.222

   Letuchiy's parameters exclude Obj Drop verbs like English "to eat" and BH לָבְשׁ, where the subject is the [Dresser] in both intransitive and transitive usages.223 However, as we will see, לָבְשׁ in Judg 6:34 (נָוּץ סְפַר הַמַּלְאָכִים אֲשֶׁר יָבֹא וּלְבָשׁ) appears to meet Letuchiy's criteria. At best, however, most of the BH verbs would fall into a category Letuchiy calls quasi-labile, a linguistic phenomenon not given much attention in the typological literature devoted to lability. Therefore, the approach of this study will not be dependent on previous linguistic work on lability, but will employ Letuchiy's taxonomy where appropriate.

3.5 Final Note on Methodology

   Though more of a Corpus linguist than a Cognitive linguist, Patrick Hanks shares many of the basic theoretical perspectives of CL. Hanks, for example, makes the following claim:

   "These two facts (the verb's transitivity patterns and the semantic types of its arguments) determine the way in which we interpret it."224 This claim succinctly expresses the basic methodological approach of this dissertation. Much of the methodological approach adopted in

   ___________________________

221. Martin Haspelmath, "More on the Typology," 87-120.
223. Obj Drop verbs are verbs that are grammatical with and without an Obj. These must be distinguished from Pro Drop languages in which pronouns may be dropped in certain contexts where their referent is inferable from the context. Obj Drop corresponds to context-independent variation and Pro Drop is context-dependent. These are discussed in 4.2.1.1 below.
this study has already been mentioned in the theoretical description above. To summarize briefly, BH verbs which exhibit the transitivity alternation will be categorized according to syntactic form and analyzed with a view to establishing the unique semantic or pragmatic significance of the patterns. Specifically, we will consider how such conceptual realities — for example, semantic roles, Figure/Ground orientation, event constitution, transitivity, perspective, type of verbal action, to name a few — contribute to the overall meaning of the clause. Verbs with similar meanings will be analyzed according to verb classes to increase the data sample and to elucidate similarities of patterns within and between verb classes.

There are, however, two more methodological considerations that need to be addressed. First, in line with the typical approach of Cognitive Grammar, the following study will be usage-based. According to usage-based theories of language, meaning is usage. Croft and Cruse outline two parameters that govern usage-based models: "two usage-based properties are assumed to affect grammatical representation: the frequency of occurrence of particular grammatical forms and structure, and the meaning of words and constructions in use." Therefore, speculation about how a verb could have been used will be kept at a minimum.

Second, since BH is no longer a spoken language the approach will inevitably be corpus-based. The corpus, as mentioned in the Introduction (1.2) is the Hebrew of the Hebrew Bible. Given the corpus-based nature of the study, certain insights from Corpus Linguistics will also be employed throughout. Most notably the goal of delineating normal or ordinary usage from

227. Remarking on the difficulties that arise from the use of intuitive evidence to invent data, Hanks says, "Problems... are compounded by the monumental implausibility of many examples and scenarios that linguists and philosophers invent. They do this because they want to explore the boundaries between possible and nonpossible syntactic structure or meaning, but in the course of doing so they unwittingly trample over constraints of naturalness and textual well-formedness." Lexical Analysis, 20.
abnormal and extraordinary will be an important factor in analyzing the data. Such delineation is determined simply by establishing frequency of usage.

From a corpus linguistic perspective as developed, for example, by Hanks in his "Theory of Norms and Exploitations," the question that must be asked concerning these verbs is not only, "do they verbs appear as intransitives or as transitives," but perhaps more fundamentally, "how do they normally appear?"\textsuperscript{228} That is to say, what is their normal usage and with what words do they normally collocate? In so doing, allowance is made for exceptional and extraordinary usage.

The hope is that such an approach will prevent basing the meaning of a verb on what may be an exceptional usage. Exceptional usages do, however, have their own meaning which must be analyzed with reference to conventional ways words and constructions (or language in general) may be exploited. That is to say, there is a certain conventionality to unconventional usage. Hanks' summary is apt: "It sometimes happens that frequencies are roughly evenly distributed across a number of patterns of a word, but more often one or two patterns are dominant, while other patterns may be quite rare. Rare patterns are recognized as patterns, despite their rarity, because they have distinctive meanings."\textsuperscript{229} Simply put, the method employed in this dissertation is, 1) identify the conventional and unconventional usages (norms

\textsuperscript{228}Hanks summarizes the method of the Theory of Norms and Exploitations as follows: "[I]t is necessary to recognize that there is no sharp dividing line between norms and creative exploitations. For most words, there are normal uses, but there is also a gray area of more-or-less acceptable usage... A norm is a pattern of ordinary usage in everyday language with which a particular meaning or implicature is associated. A pattern consists of a valency structure, together with sets of preferred collocations. A norm is identified quite simply by grouping similar corpus lines together around a phraseological prototype. Judgment is required to decide what counts as 'similar'. A group of similar uses all having a similar meaning constitutes evidence for the existence of a pattern of normal usage. Similar uses of a word are grouped together, unusual uses are put on one side for later analysis as exploitations, and then the number of corpus lines in each group is counted to discover the comparative frequency of each pattern in the sample, 92."

\textsuperscript{229}Hanks, \textit{Lexical Analysis}, 92. Emphasis mine.
and exploitations) of verbs undergoing the transitivity alternation, and 2) analyze them with reference to construal operations outlined in CG.
Chapter 4: Verbs of Dress

Though there are some differences between grammars as to which verbs manifest the transitivity alternation, every major English language BH grammar includes the category of "Dress verbs" (variously designated) as exemplifying this phenomenon. Drawing on verb class studies in Latin linguistics, GKC refers to these verbs as *verba induendi* and *exuendi*.\(^{230}\) Waltke-O'Connor say that "verbs of wearing, donning, or doffing clothes can take a complement," and similarly, Arnold and Choi: "Other verbs sometimes taking the *complement accusative* are verbs of robing and disrobing."\(^{231}\) Using the designation "nominal complements (non-objects)," Van der Merwe et al. restrict this category to stative verbs that "refer to a *condition of being full or covered*."\(^{232}\) The grammars, necessarily selective in their citations, vary significantly in their identification of which particular Dress verbs manifest the transitivity alternation. Some, like לָבַשׁ, are cited by most (though not BHRG). Others, like ראֵן, are cited by only one (IBHS). And some, like רחב, are, surprisingly, given its diversity of syntactic representation and similarities to ראֵן, not listed by any grammar. Every verb cited by the grammars as well as some that carry the same or similar semantic notions and exemplify the transitivity alternation will be treated in this chapter.

Dressing and undressing are part of the everyday human experience. However, the relative complexity of the event accounts for the wide variety of cross-linguistic expressions employed to denote the typical Dress scenario. In a recent cross-linguistic study of dressing and undressing events, Frank Seifart, et al. describe the complexity from the point of view of the

\(^{230}\)GKC §117y, 369. Similarly Joüon-Muaoka §125d, 444.

\(^{231}\)IBHS §10.2.1h, 168; Arnold-Choi 2.3.1d, 16 (emphasis original).

\(^{232}\)Though they cite only מלא in Isa 1:15, "*a condition of being covered*" presumably includes verbs of wearing. Other verb classes listed under this category are "verbs of abiding" and "verbs of movement." BHRG §33.2.3, 244 (emphasis original).
event structure: "[Dressing and undressing] involve the caused motion of an object of clothing and its attachment in a certain position to a certain body region." Conceptually, the basic semantic profile of verbs of Dress is: <Dresser, Dressee, Dress>, and the prototypical transitive scenario is of a [Dresser] clothing or covering a [Dressee] with a [Dress].

Using the categories of cognitive grammar, Langacker defines a reflexive construction as, "one in which a single participant fills the semantic roles of both the trajector and the landmark." BH Dress verbs, therefore, may be regarded as semantically reflexive because the basic sense of the unmarked lexeme envisions the Agent of the action as also the Patient. In this case, the [Dressee] is the same as the [Dresser] in the unmarked usage. This usage is consistent with cross-linguistic typologies. Taxonomies of reflexive verbs reveal that semantic reflexives often consist of a relatively small group of verbs having to do with bodily action, especially acts of grooming, dressing, and bodily care. According to Aki-Juhani Kyröläinen, "the data suggest that the Semantic Reflexive forms a small cluster of semantically related verb centered on profiling an event type grounded in bodily action."


235. I have chosen the designation "semantic reflexive" as opposed to "middle" because the former is more descriptive of the phenomenon in question and less commonly associated with the presence of a morpheme. However, by "semantic reflexive" I have in view basically the same linguistic realities designated as "middle," by Suzanne Kemmer in her magisterial work on the middle voice, *The Middle Voice* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1993). Kemmer distinguishes direct reflexives (what Langacker calls "true" reflexives) from the middle voice or, what I am calling semantic reflexives, on the basis of the relative distinguishability of the participants. She identifies two qualities that constitute "middle" meaning: 1) the Initiator is also an Endpoint or affected entity and 2) the event is characterized by a low degree of elaboration. *Middle Voice*, 337; Langacker *FOCG* II, 367-71. Notice the similarities between Kemmer's first characteristic and Näss's Affected Agent below. Critically, for Kemmer, middle is a semantic phenomenon that receives in some languages morphological coding. BH does not have a middle morphological marker, though certain verb classes — like Dress verbs — display qualities that show striking resemblances to the semantics Kemmer describes as "middle."


As will be seen below, Dress verbs appear in a variety of constructions (e.g. intransitive, transitive, ditransitive) the semantics of which are complicated in part by the semantic reflexivity of the predicates. The goal of this chapter is threefold: 1) to outline and categorize the various constructions which feature verbs of dress, 2) to classify them as norms or exploitations as far as is possible given the limited data, and 3) offer a linguistic description of their semantics based on the principles, methods, and categories of cognitive grammar. In addition to the theory and methods of cognitive grammar outlined earlier, Næss' work on prototypical transitivity proves useful in providing categories for analyzing Dress verbs. By way of preliminary methodological considerations, therefore, Næss' argument will be outlined in brief.

4.1 Methodology

After defining the prototypical transitive scenario as one in which an agent [+Vol], [+Inst], [-Aff] acts on a patient [-Vol], [-Inst], [+Aff], Næss acknowledges that a great many transitive clauses do not fit this prototype. However, it is precisely these deviations from the prototype that account for many peculiarities in the syntax-semantics interface. One such deviation that Næss treats at length is the "Affected Agent." According to Næss, the Affected Agent "concerns cases where the agentive participant is further characterized by the main defining property of Patients, namely, affectedness." Næss largely limits her treatment to

Yliopisto, 2013), 261.


240. Næss, Prototypical Transitivity, 52. To be sure, Næss is not the first to identify the affectedness of an agent as a salient feature informing verbal behavior.
"ingestive verbs" (i.e. verbs of eating and drinking), which, from a cross-linguistic perspective, are the parade example of Affected Agent verbs. However, the salient features of ingestive verbs outlined by Næss are in many respects applicable to Dress verbs as well. In his cross-linguistic study of passive participles, Haspelmath connects Dress verbs with, among others, ingesting verbs: "What 'drink', 'eat', 'learn', 'see', and 'put on', 'wear' have in common is that the agent is saliently affected by the action... with ingesting verbs and verbs of wearing both the agent and the patient are affected, and not surprisingly in some of these verbs the resultative participle can have either active or passive orientation."²⁴¹

In contrast to the prototypical Agent of a transitive clause, the semantic specifications of prototypical Affected Agent are: [+Vol], [+Inst], [+Aff]. In a given event featuring an Affected Agent, two participants may be conceptualized as affected by the action, either the Affected Agent or a Patient (not the Affected Agent) more proximately related to the head of the action chain. Either one may be selected as the limiting argument, that is, the argument whose affectedness serves to measure out the event. Carol Tenny describes the affected argument as "one that makes the event described by the verb delimited, by undergoing a change of state that marks the temporal end of the event."²⁴² As they "measure out" and impose "delimitedness" on an event, affected participants function as measuring arguments that determine the extent and conclusion of an event.²⁴³ In the prototypical transitive scenario, the Obj-patient is affected by the Subj-agent and serves as the measuring argument that marks the natural endpoint of the event as he/she/it undergoes a change-of-state or location.

²⁴² Carol Tenny, Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1994), 158.
²⁴³ Tenny, Aspectual Roles, 158.
While agreeing with her analysis of the affected argument as a measuring argument, Næss rightly objects to Tenny's limiting the measuring argument to one instance of measuring and to only an internal argument. 244 Næss maintains that "it is in fact possible for an event to have two potentially measuring arguments, although only one of them may function as an actual measuring argument in any given clause." 245 The decision regarding which argument is to function as measuring out the event is not a matter of the objective data, but of perspective and construal. To quote Langacker: "As a general point, the objective properties of a complex occurrence do not themselves determine the subject/object alignment of a clause describing it. There is no secure basis for predictions or even strong expectations concerning that alignment until various aspects of construal have been decided, most importantly the selection of a profile." 246 The Affected Agent, therefore, is conceivably just as much a potential candidate for measuring out an event as an affected object. Næss concludes:

If Affected Agent arguments may function as measuring arguments, this provides a fairly straightforward explanation for the frequent occurrence of 'eat' in two alternative syntactic contexts, either with or without an overt direct object. The choice of which argument should be taken to measure out an event such as that of eating is in reality a question of perspective. Either one may choose to focus on the objectively most affected participant in the event, the Patient, whose affectedness is immediately observable to any objective bystander. Or else one may focus on the most salient effect from the agent's point of view, namely the effect that the agent registers directly on himself and which constitutes his motivation for engaging in the act of eating. If one wishes to focus on the effect on the agent, then this effect can be construed as measuring out the event. On such a construal, the agent is cast as the endpoint of the event, and the event is completely described once the agent has been specified - both the initiating entity and the endpoint of the action are included in the description of the event, since they are both the same entity. When the event is construed in this way, the reference to the patient is simply superfluous, since the event already has a delimiting

244. Næss, Prototypical Transitivity, 56.

245. Næss, Prototypical Transitivity, 56 (emphasis original).

246. Langacker, FOCG II, 331.
Analogous to Næss' description of "ingestive verbs," the [Dress] as an event participant can be understood as only "incidentally affected." Bringing about a change-of-state for the [Dress] is not typically the goal of the action. Rather, the goal of the action is to affect a change-of-state of the [Dresser], from unclothed to clothed, unadorned to adorned, etc. Furthermore, [Dress] is typically non-human and therefore from a cognitive perspective less salient. The human [Dresser] being both the Figure and Ground (Trajector and Landmark) in a reflexive scenario lends itself to the intransitive construction in which the Subj-Agent/Patient fills both roles.

Commenting on the potentialities of construal, Næss says, "casting an Affected Agent as the single argument of an intransitive construction highlights the effect of the action on the agentive participant, and backgrounds that on the Patient. In Kemmer's terms, the 'Initiator' is also an 'Endpoint' - an affected participant - and it is this fact which is highlighted by the use of an intransitive construction, where the other potential Endpoint of the event is demoted or suppressed." This accounts for a common cross-linguistic feature of Affected Agent verbs, that they manifest, among other patterns, the "intransitive behavior" of indefinite object deletion. In light of Næss' analysis, it is not at all surprising or unusual for Affected Agents to appear in formally intransitive constructions.

247. Næss, Prototypical Transitivity, 57.

248. "[The] effect on the object is not what the agent's intention is primarily engaged in achieving in the case of 'eat'; we do not, under normal circumstances, eat in order to achieve an effect on the food, but in order to achieve an effect on ourselves. The agent's main purpose for eating is to still his own hunger, not to make the food disappear; the food itself is only a means for achieving a physical effect on oneself." Næss, Prototypical Transitivity, 71 (emphasis original).

249. Næss, Prototypical Transitivity, 61.
4.2 Analysis of Verbs of Dress

4.2.1 לָבַשׁ

4.2.1.1 Qal לָבַשׁ

Pattern 1: [Dresser] לָבַשׁ

By far the most common verb of Dress, Qal לָבַשׁ represents what is perhaps the most basic action of dressing. However, the one argument construction, Qal לָבַשׁ + [Dresser], is extremely rare. There are only two clear examples, Hag 1:6 and Job 27:17:

(41) Hag 1:6

You sowed much, but brought in little, you eat without being satisfied, you drink without being filled, you clothe yourselves but no one is warm.

(42) Job 27:17

He will lay it up, but the righteous will put it on, and the innocent will divide the silver.

However, a distinction needs to be made between these two usages of Qal לָבַשׁ. In Hag 1:6 the implied Obj Dress (clothing of some sort) is contextually unspecified and non-specific in reference. This may be contrasted to the intransitive use in Job 27:17 where the Obj [Dress] is specified in the context and referential. The "it" that the righteous will put on is the clothing mentioned in the previous clause: (Job 27:16b). Sinclair's distinction is

To mitigate any confusion regarding the direction of reading created by combining English semantic role labels and BH verbs, « will be employed to indicate the direction intended. Patterns will not be subdivided on the basis of word order, but only valency. The unmarked VSO word order will be used in the pattern headings, however, variable word order will be addressed under the relevant valency pattern as it proves significant for understanding the verbal semantics.

250. Hag 1:6 and Job 27:17 are cited by BDB and DCH (but not HALOT) as "without an object." BDB also cites Gen 28:20 as an Obj omitted construction: , but it is better analyzed, as an Obj fronted construction with the Agent-Subj indicated by suffixed Prep י. However, the [Dress] Obj, namely , is clearly indicated in the main clause. What is unusual about the use of לָבַשׁ in Esth 6:8 is its collocation with י. However, the [Dress] Obj, namely , is clearly indicated in the main clause. What is unusual about the use of לָבַשׁ in Esth 6:8 is its collocation with י which apart from further examples should probably be taken as a resumptive pronoun (cf. Lev 16:23).
between pure intransitives and ellipted objects delineates the different usages in Hag 1:6 and Job 27:17. He says that, "transitive verbs used intransitively must be clearly distinguished from transitive verbs whose objects have ellipted. By definition, anaphoric ellipted objects can always be identified from antecedents indicated in the context." Næss makes the same distinction with her categories context-dependent/-independent object deletion. In Job 27:17 the Obj is recoverable from the context, in Hag 1:6, there is no Obj mentioned in the context and so the intransitive construction has a unique function, namely that highlighting or focusing on the affectedness of the agent (or in this case the unaffectedness) which would be the result of the action denoted by the verb. In Næss' terminology, Hag 1:6 is context-independent, Job 27:17 is context-dependent.

Though many have appealed to lexical semantics as licensing indefinite object deletion (IOD), Rice and Goldberg have argued that object deletion is better regarded as a construal operation. Rice says, "certain construals of transitive events are such that they focus on the active participant and leave the acted-upon participant unspecified, and most importantly, to be filled in by a default value." Goldberg, to use Næss' somewhat exaggerated summary, argues that, "in the right context, just about any transitive verb in English can be used without an object." Goldberg cites a number of examples of the even less-expected phenomenon of patient argument omission in causative constructions. She concludes that the license of IOD in

254.For a summary of the arguments for locating the Obj Del license in the lexicon as well as a critique of these arguments, see Næss, Prototypical Transitivity, 130-32.
256.Næss Prototypical Transitivity, 132.
257.Adele Goldberg, "Patient Arguments of Causative Verbs can be Omitted: the role of information structure in
causative constructions is to be found in the notion of discourse prominence, especially topic and focus. This applies no less to simple transitive constructions as it does to causative construction. IOD with semantic reflexives serves the discourse function of focusing or foregrounding the effect of the verbal action on the agentive participant.

Næss incorporates Goldberg's insights regarding the discourse-pragmatic function of Obj Del into a larger analysis that includes syntax and semantics. She wishes not only to account for the extraordinary uses (like those cited by Goldberg), but also for the clear cross-linguistic reality that certain verbs (like verbs of ingesting and dressing) more frequently, consistently, and easily attest IOD than others. Næss concludes, therefore, that IOD is a "mechanism of syntactic detransitivization available for clauses which in various ways deviate from the semantic transitive prototype." Her comments on the variable usage of Affected Agent verbs *eat* and *drink* pertain equally well to BH Dress verbs:

> the specialised meanings of objectless 'eat' and 'drink' can be readily understood as a function of the semantics of these verbs in combination with the semantics of the IOD construction... omitting the object with these verbs amounts to highlighting the effects that the action has on the agentive

argument distribution" *Language Sciences* 23 (2001), 503-524, esp, 506. She offers the following examples:

a. The chef-in-training chopped and diced all afternoon.

b. Tigers only kill at night.

c. The singer always aimed to dazzle/please/disappoint/impress/charm

d. Pat gave and gave, but Chris just took and took.

e. The revolutionary new brooms sweep cleaner than ever

f. The sewing instructor always cut in straight lines.


259. The expression "object deletion" must be understood from a cognitive perspective to refer to the absence of an Obj argument that is conventionally present in normal usage. Obj Del, as it is used in this study, does not refer to the dropping of an argument "required" by the verb or present at a deep structure level. Deletion is relative to the conventionalized presence of an Obj.

260. Næss, *Prototypical Transitivity*, 141. I disagree, however, with Næss' criticism of Goldberg. Goldberg explicitly states that lexical meaning as well as constructions (the two things Næss wishes to account for) contribute to the meaning of a clause as much as the pragmatics of discourse prominence. Goldberg, "Patient Arguments," 505.
participant, while backgrounding those on the patient, by omitting the patient argument altogether.\textsuperscript{261}

Næss rightly identifies these three elements — indefiniteness, non-specificity, and non-referentiality — as a controlling factor for Obj omission (IOD = indefinite object deletion).\textsuperscript{262} She also notes the significance of the Affected Agent verbs' deviation from the prototypical transitive scenario as a motivating (and perhaps limiting) factor in IOD. She says that the "property shared by the omissible objects with affected-agent and effected-object verbs is a relatively low degree of distinctness.... Patient participants of affected-agent verbs are not maximally distinct from the Affected Agent, and that they are omissible because the Affected Agent may itself be construed as the endpoint of the event, by virtue of being affected."\textsuperscript{263}

The use of Qal נָחַּ֨שׁ in Hag 1:6 accords with conventional cross-linguistic operation of IOD. Its understood Obj (clothing of some sort) is indefinite, non-specific, and non-referential. From a discourse prominence perspective, it is the affectedness of the agent that is in view. The broader context of Hag 1:6 is YHWH's indictment of his people for their negligence in rebuilding the temple. For this negligence the censures enumerated in Hag 1:6 have come upon them. The

\textsuperscript{261}Næss, \textit{Prototypical Transitivity}, 141-42.

\textsuperscript{262}Næss uses "indefinite object deletion" to "refer to the use of a verb without an overt object, where the semantics of the verb implies that some object is present, but where the specific referent of the omitted object is not expected to be retrievable from context. The term "\textit{indefinite} object deletion" derives from the fact that such omitted objects must always be interpreted as indefinite. \textit{Prototypical Transitivity}, 125.

\textsuperscript{263}Næss, \textit{Prototypical Transitivity}, 128. Næss conclusion impressively accounts for the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic realities of IOD constructions considered cross-linguistically and warrants being quoted at length: "Indefinite object deletion, then, functions much like antipassivization in that it is essentially a syntactic mechanism used in contexts of low semantic transitivity. The omission of the object in many cases serves to highlight the particular properties of the agentive participant, for instance its affectedness by the event in question. The analysis in terms of semantic transitivity not only explains why IOD is considerably more common with some verb types than with others (affected-agent verbs, where the agent can be construed as the 'endpoint' of the event, and effected-object verbs, whose objects are inherently nonreferential and therefore easily omissible), but also why it may be licensed for just about any verb in the right context... semantic transitivity is a property which may be assigned both at the level of the clause and of the individual verb." \textit{Prototypical Transitivity}, 144-45. Næss' comments regarding effected-object verbs will bear directly on Verbs of Filling and will be taken up again in chapter 6.
essence of the various censures is that Israel is experiencing futility in their labor, their efforts are not yielding the desired and natural results. That the affect of the Agent is in view is clear from the result clauses: "but you harvested little... but you never have your fill... but no one is warm." The Subj-Agents in this case are not experiencing the expected effects of their labor. The IOD construction, in this case, serves to highlight the desired affectedness (or lack thereof) of the Agent.

Notably, and in contrast to the passive construction (see pattern 4 below), the Subj in the IOD construction is construed as active. In the absence of a specified Obj [Dress], the measuring argument, is the [Dresser]. Conceptually, it is when the [Dresser] is dressed (as opposed to when the [Dress] is put on) that the event is conceived as completed. Though the pure intransitive (context independent IOD) usage of Qal לְבַשׁ is infrequent, it should not be regarded as an exploitation because it is consistent with well-attested cross-linguistic operations of IOD both in terms of its syntax and semantics. 264

Pattern 2: [Dress] [Dresser] לְבַשׁ

The most frequent use of Qal לְבַשׁ is with an accompanying Obj indicating [Dress]. The event structure is of a Subj-Agent [Dresser] clothing him/her/itself with an article or type of clothing, Obj-Patient [Dress]. The following are representative of the conventional usages of Qal לְבַשׁ:

264. On the ubiquity of Obj Del cross-linguistically, see Næss, Prototypical Transitivity, 124. Næss' division of lexemes into those which have obligatory arguments (one, two, or three) and those which have optional arguments (what she calls, "pseudointransitive," "labile," or "ambitransitive") is, however, a bit idealistic. As argued above, valency structure is not likely the feature of a lexeme, but a combinatorial convention based on the conceptualization of the event. Some verbs which one would think were obligatory in their one argument structure (like laugh, see ... above) may combine with a cause motion construction (e.g. They laughed her out of the room), and the classic three argument verb give may occur in a one argument construction as in n. 27 d above.
(43) Gen 38:19
she removed her veil from upon her and she put on her widow's garments.

(44) 1 Sam 28:8
And Saul disguised himself; he put on other clothes.

(45) Song 5:3
I had taken off my robe, how was I to put it on,
I had washed my feet, how could I soil them.

(46) Lev 16:24
And he shall wash his body with water in the holy precinct, and he shall put on his clothes.

That the Obj in some Qal לְבָשׁ constructions is marked with the Obj-Prep את־, as in Lev 16:24 above, suggests that these constructions may rank higher on the transitivity scale than their intransitive usages (and perhaps their non את־ marked usages as well).\(^\text{265}\) However, in both the Obj Prep marked and non-marked instance, the Obj [Dress] is specific, identifiable, and referential, and therefore should be regarded in these cases as a DO and having a clear, though qualified patient status.\(^\text{266}\) Naturally, in the act of dressing the clothing is affected. However, since the orientation of the clothing around the human body is not the goal of the action, the Subj-Agent is the more direct or ultimate patient and features as the end point or goal of the action. Conceptually, [Dress] ranks lower for patient status than the [Dressee]. It is perhaps for this reason, namely that the affectedness of the agent is the ultimate goal at the conceptual level, that the את־ marked construction is the minority construction, Qal לְבָשׁ showing clear preference

\(^\text{265}\) For other examples of the את־ marked Obj see Lev 16:32 and 21:10. It is also possible that the use of the Obj Prep את־ in Lev 16 is motivated by certain discourse-pragmatic goals of referring back to the [Dress] mentioned early (Lev 16:4) in the discourse without the Obj Prep. This would be consistent with the variable usage of asymmetric DOM systems as outlines by Bekins. \textit{Transitivity}, 139-40.

\(^\text{266}\) The problematic evidence from the passive construction will be treated under 4.2.1.2 below.
for the unmarked DO construction. The [Dress], therefore, functions as a sort of quasi-patient which may exhibit more or less salience in a given expression based on the goals of the speaker.

As can be seen from the four examples above, Qal הבשׁ is used for an activity, that is, it represents the dynamic action of dressing oneself with a garment as opposed to being in a state of being dressed in clothing. There are, however, clear stative usages as in the following:

(47) Exod 29:30

Seven days the priest in his place from his sons shall wear them.

(48) Job 7:5

My flesh is clothed with worms

Diachronically, the development of the active and stative forms is difficult to determine. G. R. Driver argues for the historic priority of the stative qātēl form over the dynamic qātal, and T. L. Fenton argues the opposite.268 GKC, however, rightly notes that "it is also possible that certain verbs were originally in use at the same time both as transitive and intransitive, e.g. perhaps הבשׁ to be clothed along with הבשׁ to put on (a garment)."269 From a synchronic perspective there is a clear semantic relation between the two senses: dynamic = entering into the state of being dressed, stative = being in a state of being dressed (stative). Or, perhaps more simply and to include the typical Obj [Dress], dynamic = Subj puts on clothing, and stative = Subj is dressed in clothing. That agency is backgrounded or uninvolved in the stative usage is significant for the passive constructions (see pattern 4 below).

---

267. To be sure, there are some occasions where the sense is unclear (e.g. Lev 16:35, cf. RSV and JPS). By and large, however, the context is sufficient to select the intended meaning.

268. IBHS 22.2.3.e, 367.

269. GKC §117v.
Pattern 3: [Dressee] [Dresser/Dress]

On four occasions, Qal לבשׁ appears with arguments that do not resemble the conventional semantic role structure.

(49) Judg 6:34

לֹא רוּת הַשְׁמֵשׂ אֶל דֵּדֶנְי

The spirit of the Lord *clothed* Gideon

(50) 1 Chr 12:19

וַתִּבְשֶׁה יָם דָּג אֶל בְּיַשֶּׁה

And a/the spirit *clothed* Amasai

(51) 2 Chr 24:20

וַתִּבְשֶׁה יָם אֲדָגְיָה אֶל אָמָסָי

The spirit of God *clothed* Zechariah

(52) Job 29:14b

וַתִּבְשֶׁה יָם אֶל מֶשֶׁר שִׁפְתֵּי נָחָלָי

I put on righteousness, and it *clothed* me,

my justice, like a robe and a turban.

In three of the four instances the Obj HUMAN is identified by the Obj Prep אַט־, a feature that would preclude an attempt to regard the HUMAN Subj-Agent as figuratively putting on the spirit as a sort of clothing. If the semantics of the conventional two argument construction (pattern 2) were adopted then the spirit of the Lord is depicted as "putting on" the Obj HUMAN.

The spirit is on the inside and Obj HUMAN (e.g. Gideon) is functioning as the clothing. This is, in fact, how many of the versions and older translations render the Hebrew.

(53) Judg 6:34 according to older translations and versions:

LXX: καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐνέδυσεν τὸν Γεδεον

Vul: spiritus autem Domini induit Gedeon

Luther: zog der Geist des Herrn Gideon an
However, more recent translations clearly find the traditional interpretation unsatisfactory and present the event with Gideon as the [Dressee] and the Spirit filling the role of both the [Dresser] and [Dress].

(54) Judg 6:34 in modern translation:

RSV: But the Spirit of the LORD took possession of Gideon (similarly NRSV)
NIV: Then the Spirit of the LORD came on Gideon
ESV: But the Spirit of the LORD clothed Gideon
JPS: The spirit of the Lord enveloped Gideon

Nahum Waldman argues convincingly that the sense of "to cover, to clothe" is to be preferred for two reasons. First, it accords with the conventional biblical imagery of divine investiture and empowerment. Citing 1 Sam 19:20, 23, Isa 11:22, he says, "these translations, in departing from the strict analysis of lbš as 'wear' and understanding it as 'cover, envelop,' are influenced by other biblical passages in which the rūaḥ of the Lord, not in the sense of 'life force' but as an external prophetic or charismatic enhancement, is on the outside." Furthermore, and perhaps more convincingly, Waldman notes that this unconventional usage of Qal לְבָשׁ accords with traditional imagery of ANE cultures in which verbs of clothing and covering are used with the secondary sense of overwhelming or overpowering. He says, "the imagery of 'cover, envelop, clothe' in the special sense of 'overpower, overwhelm' is well attested in Sumerian and Akkadian literature and has echoes in biblical Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, and Talmudic Aramaic."
Regarding the origin of the BH image schema, Waldman suggests that in BH the "historic image was syntactically restructured in transmission." He says this may have occurred on account of a misunderstanding of the Hiph לְבָשׁ in which the omitted Obj [Dress (Enhancing Quality)] gave rise to the Qal usage to account for the two- instead of three-participant structure.

A perhaps simpler model, however, is that Qal לְבָשׁ developed the secondary sense of "covering, overpowering, overwhelming," through metaphorical extension. Two metaphors readily present themselves: First, TO BE COVERED IS TO BE OVERWHELMED/ OVERPOWERED. To cite just one of Waldman's examples, puluḥti melammēja iktumšunuti ina qirib mātišunu imqussunu ħattu ("my awesome radiance overwhelmed them, terror falling upon them in the midst of their land").

A second related metaphor is: CLOTHING IS A QUALITY. To adopt or exhibit certain qualities (either positive or negative) is like clothing oneself in them. Through the metaphorical extension of personification, qualities are not just put on by a [Dresser], but may come from without as an exterior force and overwhelm or envelop an individual. In this case, they still function as the [Dress], though through personification are construed with features of the [Dresser], notably agency, volition, and instigation. In this view, the sense of Job 29:14, then, would be "I put on righteousness and it covered me, my justice, like a robe and a turban."
The covering that Job is speaking of is an overpowering investiture in which the enhancing qualities (righteousness and justice) overwhelm and animate Job. Though Waldman does not develop the point, he does touch on the connection I am proposing here when he says,

I do not deny, however, that the images of wearing enhancing qualities and of being overwhelmed by powers that clothe and cover are related. In both cases, an additional force is added to the wearer. The difference, of course, is that the wearer of positive enhancing qualities is free to act in a more effective manner in his best interests, while the one who is clothed by a negative, overpowering force has lost his freedom.  

Though his explanation of the origin of this unique sense is speculative, Waldman is certainly correct that the biblical usage of "clothing" for "overpowering" is at home in the traditional imagery of the ANE cultures of which it is a part. Regardless of its origin, however, this sense of Qal לָבַשׁ should clearly be seen as a secondary norm on the basis of its frequency and distribution (i.e. four occurrences in three books).

4.2.1.2 Qal Passive and Pual

The difficulty with the proposal adopted here, namely that the accompanying Obj of Qal לָבַשׁ in the two-argument active construction is a DO, concerns the use of לָבַשׁ in passive constructions, namely the Qal passive and the Pual. The ability to passivize is an almost universally recognized feature of a transitive verb or clause and is therefore a standard test for determining whether an Obj is a DO. In the traditional view, the passive construction raises the DO-Patient of an active transitive construction to the Subj-Patient position of an intransitive construction. For example:


(55) a. Stan kicked the ball. (active)
   
   b. The ball was kicked (by Stan). (passive)

This more or less prototypical example of passivization may be compared to the Qal passive and Pual of בָּלָשׁ:

(56) Ezek 9:2

And another man was among them dressed in linen. (Qal passive ptc)

(57) 1 Kgs 22:10

And the king of Israel and Jehoshaphat, king of Judah were each sitting on his throne dressed in royal robes. (Pual ptc)

That the passive constructions do not exhibit the promotion of the Obj to the Subj position is, for most BH grammarians, evidence that the Obj is something other than a DO in the active constructions and/or that the clause is something other than transitive. This is undoubtedly the motivation behind the somewhat ambiguous labels given to the Objs of בָּלָשׁ, like "complement accusative" (IBHS) and "other nominal complements (non-object)" (BHRG).

The theoretical foundation of these analyses, however, is that the purpose of the passive construction is primarily syntactic and only secondarily semantic. The emphasis on the semantics of grammatical constructions found in Cognitive and Construction Grammars, however, offers a more integrated approach where the passive has a primarily semantic function which is reflected in the syntax. In her study of the Dutch passive, Louise Cornelis notes that,

most analyses of the passive (in any branch of linguistics, formal as much as functional) have depended too heavily on the relation of the passive with its active counterpart: the passive is usually analyzed vis-à-vis its active counterpart, either as a result of a grammatical operation or as a pragmatic alternative. I will propose an analysis of the passive as a primarily independent construction, i.e. independent of an active counterpart.  

The passive, in this view, offers a unique perspective on the scenario denoted by the verb, specifically a viewpoint in which agency is backgrounded. In contrast to the maximally distinct clausal participants that is characteristic of the prototypical transitive scenario and its corresponding passive scenario, semantic reflexive verbs feature a clausal participant who plays more than one role, the Agent and the Patient. Commenting on what he calls "true" reflexives, Langacker says, "although the designated process involves multiple semantic roles, the normal expectation is that these roles will be filled by a single participant. Typical examples include verbs of grooming (such as wash and shave), posture (stand, sit, lie), and non-translational motion (stretch, turn, bow)... since events of this sort are intermediate between canonical transitives (two roles, two participants) and the most elementary kind of intransitive (one role, one participant), languages have different ways of coding them."281

The effect of the passive construction on לבשׁ is that it foregrounds the Subj's role as patient and backgrounds his or her (or anyone else's) role as agent. The agent who performed the action of dressing is unimportant, and it is probably accurate to say that the notion of agency is absent from the scenario denoted by the passive constructions of לבשׁ altogether. It is significant, therefore, that the only occurrence of passive לבשׁ is as a participle.282 As such they trade exclusively on the stative sense of the Qal active construction. Passive לבשׁ never has the sense of someone being dressed by an agent, either overtly marked by a PP or implicit in the context. The single use of the Qal active participle in Zeph 1:8 provides a helpful contrast to the semantics of the active/passive alternation:


282. The Pual participle is only used in the plural. It may be that it is preferred instead of the Qal passive participle because the scenario involves multiple individuals. Interestingly, the Qal passive is never used as an absolute, but only in the construct on three occasions (Ezek 23:6; 23:12; and 38:4). The Pual may be regarded as the passive counterpart of the pluractional sense of the Piel.
And on the day of the Lord's sacrifice,  
I will punish the officials and the sons of the king,  
and all those who put on foreign attire.

The Qal active participle of לָבַשׁ clearly has in view the agency of the [Dresser]. The [Dresser] is conceived as active in the event of dressing. In Zeph 1:8, YHWH pronounces his judgment against those who have sinned through religious syncretism represented by the action of *putting on* the clothing of foreigners. The passive construction, in this case, would presumably reduce the sense of culpability that the author wishes to convey. With the active participle comes into view the concept of agency, a concept absent in the passive participle.  

The question remains, however, about the status of the second nominal in the לָבַשׁ passive constructions (Pual and Qal passive). If the Subj is the patient affected by the action, what is the status of the overtly expressed [Dress]? As mentioned above, the semantic reflexive character of Dress verbs allows for two potential patients to be expressed overtly, the [Dressee] and the [Dress]. However, conceptually one of the potential patients is more ultimate than the other. That is to say, the change-of-state of the [Dressee] is the conceptual endpoint of the action and the [Dress] is only an intermediate patient, the manipulation of which affects the ultimate patient. As with most things in CG and CxG, affectedness exists on a spectrum. Therefore, the affectedness of the Obj may be more or less salient based on the construction in which it is found. The active construction increases its affectedness, the passive decreases its affectedness. The Obj [Dress], therefore, exhibits a sort of quasi-patient status in the passive constructions.  

The motivating factor in this unusual alternation is the low transitivity of semantic reflexive verbs and the clauses in which they appear. Again, Langacker is helpful: "Hence a true reflexive and a middle represent successive degrees of departure from the archetypal conception
of distinct objects interacting asymmetrically - they share the property of conflating dual rules in a single participant. The state denoted by the passive constructions is low on the transitivity spectrum. In addition to the absence of agency, the scenario ranks low on distinguishability of participants.

4.2.1.3 Hiphֵל

In contrast to Qal הָפַלְתָּה הָפַלְתָּה, Hiphֵל הָפַלְתָּה is always accompanied by an Obj specifying the [Dressee]. With eight exceptions, Hiphֵל הָפַלְתָּה is ditransitive, taking Objs designating both the [Dress] and the [Dressee]. In the Hiphil constructions, the [Dressee] is always distinct from the [Dresser]. Gen 41:42 is typical in this regard:

(58.2) Gen 41:42

וכָּלָתָה קָרָא חָפְרָה שֶׁבַּה

And he clothed him in garments of fine linen.

The [Dressee] almost always occurs either marked by the Obj Prep אֶת־ or as the pronominal suffix. This syntactically and iconically designates the [Dressee] as the ultimate goal of the action. When Hiphֵל הָפַלְתָּה appears in a transitive construction with one Obj — not accompanied by either the Obj [Dress] or [Dressee] — the omitted Obj is always identifiable from the immediate (usually preceding) context ([Dress]: Gen 3:21; 27:15; Esth 6:9, 11, though 2 Chr 28:15 may be an exception with [Dress] following and modified by מַן; [Dressee]:Prov


284. Those that deviate from this pattern are as follows: Ps 132:16, 18 depart from the unmarked VSO word order and front the [Dressee]; Job 39:19 the [Dressee] is definite on account of pronominal suffix. The only unmarked exception, then, is Isa 50:3 in which [Dressee] and [Dress] are unmarked. Nevertheless, [Dressee] precedes [Dress] perhaps indicating its position as most affected.
According to the data, therefore, the two argument (bivalent) construction of Hiph לֵבַשׁ appears to be a context-dependent usage.

From the available evidence, it is clear that the adding of an argument (i.e. changing the valency) is not the primary function of the Hiphil construction with Dress verbs, but rather it is the conceptual separation of the Agent from the Patient. The Hiphil changes the image schema of the event structure to a more prototypical transitive scenario. The agent is no longer the one being dressed as in the Qal, but rather is the one dressing a Patient. The [Dress] occurs either further down the action chain or closer to the chain head (depending on which way the scene is construed). Either way the [Dress] is not the ultimate goal of the action and so is never marked with the Obj Prep.

4.2.2 אזר

4.2.2.1 Qal אזר

Pattern 1: [Dressee] [Dresser] אזר «

Though identified by Waltke-O'Connor as an intransitive verb, Qal אזר always occurs with a second participant role profiled in the syntactic DO position. Of its five occurrences in the Qal active stem, אזר appears with a DO specifying the [Dressee] four times. In three cases the DO is a body part that is girded.

(59) a. Jer 1:17

But you, gird up your loins

285. The omission of [Dressee] in Prov 23:21 may however be motivated by its gnomic character in which case this would be an example of the IOD in a causative construction and would fit nicely with the descriptive analysis provided by Goldberg, "Patient Arguments."

286. IBHS §10.2.1h
b. Job 38:3  מָתְנֶי צֹאֲבִּים מִצְחַר צַוְעָה

Gird up your loins like a man.

c. Job 40:7  חֲלָצֶי צֹאֲבִּים מִצְחַר צַוְעָה

Gird up your loins like a man.

In each instance, the DO specifies the part of the body that one typically girds, namely the loins (מָתְנֶי, Jer 1:17; חֲלָצֶי, Job 38:3, 40:7). It is likely that "gird the loins" has, through metonymic extension, taken on the sense of dressing or equipping the whole person in preparation for an official or professional task. Importantly, however, in all three instances of Qal active עָרַג the Agent who is depicted as carrying out the action of girding is also the one whose body part is being girded. Again, the agent is also the one affected by the action. Though objectively (that is, to the outward observer) there is only a single participant acting on himself, the event is construed with two participants. The DO — being the second most prominent clausal participant — is a part of the whole. When compared with the usage and distribution of Qal חָרָג (see 4.2.3 below) which has roughly the same semantic notion, it may be that the DO=[Dressee] pattern was the more exceptional of the two patterns. Qal חָרָג occurs in the DO=[Dressee] pattern six out of 43 times (two out of 43 if those modified by the PP ב + [Dress] are excluded).

A notable exception to the semantics of this pattern, however, is found in Job 30:18.

(60) Job 30:18  נָעַר הָעָנִי מִצְחַר צַוְעָה לְפָשַׁת מֵעָיִן אֲנָחָנוּ

With great power my garment is disfigured

He girds me like the collar of my tunic.
The difficulty of Job 30:18 is evidenced by the variety of translations and emendations.\footnote{This verse is so beset with difficulties that some interpreters do not attempt a translation." Marvin Pope, \textit{Job} (AB, Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1973), 223. For a thorough treatment of the array of suggested meanings of this difficult verse, see Clines, \textit{Job 21-37} (Waco, Tex.: Word, 2006), 953-55.} For our purposes, it is notable that in the B colon, [Dresser] and [Dressee] are clearly distinct entities. The dresser is either God, or, less likely, the garment personified, and the [Dressee] indicated by the Obj pr. suf. is clearly Job. Both BDB and \textit{HALOT} parse יָנָאֵר in Job 30:18 as a Qal Impf 3ms. Job 30:18 would be a clear exception to the conventional semantics of pattern 1. However, Job 30:18 exhibits the same pattern exemplified in the secondary usage of Qal לָבַשׁ (see 4.2.1.1 pattern 3 above). The [Dresser] is the external agent covering the [Dressee] patient with him/itself. The basic sense of Dress verbs in this construction is "to overwhelm," "overpower," which makes sense in the context. God (or the garment personified) is depicted as "overpowering" or "overwhelming" Job like a garment of clothing that girds him.

Pattern 2: [Dress][Dresser] אזר «

Waltke-O'Connor cite 1 Sam 2:4 as an example of the complement accusative taken by verbs of wearing, donning, doffing clothes:

\begin{verbatim}
(60.2) 1 Sam 2:4b :לָיְיָד גַּרְתָּב מֵי־יָיִל וְנֵלַע

and those who stumble are armed with strength (trans.Waltke-O'Connor)\footnote{\textit{IBHS} §10.2.1h}

Following many English translations, Waltke-O'Connor render the verb as a stative intransitive and the syntactic object with a prepositional phrase: "they that stumbled are girded with strength" (similarly, KJV, JPS, ASV, NIV). Other translations, however, render the noun חָיִל as the direct object, "but the feeble bind on strength" (RSV, similarly, NRSV, NASB, ESV). Though figurative, בִּדְוַע in the syntactic DO position clearly refers to the [Dress] rather than the
It trades on the image of one's clothing imparting positive qualities (see 4.2.1.1, pattern 3 above).

It is not immediately apparent why Waltke-O'Connor selected Qal רָאָם with Obj [Dress] as opposed to the more frequently attested רָאָם with Obj [Dressee] for their example of the "complement accusative." Do they consider the former a complement accusative and the latter something else? Nor is it clear why they consider Qal רָאָם to be an intransitive verb since it never appears without a second participant role profiled. What Waltke-O'Connor identify as a transitivity alternation is in this case better described as a semantic role alternation. However, relabeling a phenomenon is not the same as explaining it. The question remains: What licenses such a semantic role alternation? It should be noted that conceptually both the [Dressee] and the [Dress] have a valid claim to Obj status in accord with Næss' observation that in the case of Affected Agent verbs either the Agent or the Patient may be construed as affected, and therefore may serve as the measuring argument the change of which delimits the event.

I suggest that the thematic role alternation of [Dressee] and [Dress] is an example of what Josefien Sweep calls a Metonymic Object Change (sometimes called predicative metonymies). Broadly speaking, metonymy as a linguistic phenomenon is a cognitive process by which two things are related "based on contiguity, that is conceptual closeness in reality." According to Sweep, therefore, Metonymic Object Changes (MOC) are "contiguity-based shifts of a verb's argument slot." Such DO shifts follow certain familiar patterns such as OBJECT INVOLVED -

289. BDB labels the usage of Qal רָאָם in 2 Sam 2:4b as "figurative," and HALOT "metaphoric."


ACTION, AGENT-ACTION, CONTAINER-CONTENTS, LOCATION-LOCATUM, etc. Sweep connects the conceptual structure of the contiguity relations to the verbs' semantic frame. Alternations in this regard can be understood as a "highlighting effect within a frame." What Sweep refers to as a "highlighting effect" is roughly equivalent to the construal operation of focusing discussed above. The locative alternation, Sweep argues, can be explained with reference to metonymy within the semantic frame. Here she follows Richard Waltereit in arguing that the locative alternation manifests a Figure/Ground effect within the "conceptual-semantic frame evoked by the verb." Sweep provides the following alternation as an example:

(61) a. Mary planted roses (in the garden)
   b. Mary planted a garden (with roses)

The verb "to plant" activates a semantic frame the core elements of which are 'agent' (planter), 'theme' (locatum), and 'ground' (location). The difference in thematic role, in this case between locatum and location, is the result of profiling different substructures within the semantic frame, or, to use Sweep's words, highlighting different frame elements. Critically for Sweep:

Within the context of the verb, both direct objects form one conceptual unity or gestalt. The gestalt character or contiguity relation between both possible direct objects plays an essential role in the combining process of verb and

---

292."It seems less important to try to enumerate the possible types of contiguity than to acknowledge that contiguity is a relation of experiential 'togetherness,' where experience is to be understood in the broadest sense." Waltereit, "Grammatical Constraints on Metonymy," 234.


295.Sweep, "Metonymy Determining the Type of Direct Object," 31; Waltereit, "Grammatical Constraints on Metonymy," 238.


direct object. Hence, the interpretation of the direct object slot (i.e. the argument place) is metonymically changed, rather than the direct object or the verb as such.298

In the case of Qal ראר, the contiguity is between the location and the locatum similar to the familiar English locative alternation:

(62) a. Henry loaded the cart (location profiled)
    b. Henry loaded the hay (locatum profiled)

Interestingly, the English verb 'to load' can be used in a reflexive sense and yet still permit the locative alternation:299

(63) a. Henry loaded his back (with hay) (location profiled)
    b. Henry loaded hay (on his back) (locatum profiled)

Similarly, Qal ראר + [Dress]/[Dressee] exemplifies the locative semantic role alternation. Though not every pattern is attested, I suggest that the Qal active ראר patterns like certain English verbs of grooming or bodily care. For example, the English verb "to lather" can occur in the following syntactic patterns:

(64) a. George lathered.
    b. George lathered himself.
    c. George lathered his face.
    d. George lathered Stan's face.

It is unclear whether to posit two verbal senses for ראר or to underspecify the lexical meaning and attribute the different senses to the combination of verb and DO. In favor of the latter view, Sweep is adamant:

299. I am grateful to Beth Levin for this insight (personal communication)
Based on contiguity relations between both possible direct objects the argument slot can be occupied by the location or by what is in the location (i.e. the locatum). In other words, neither the verb's lexical meaning nor the expressed direct object is metonymically shifted, but only the combination of the two, i.e. the class or type of argument connected as a direct object to the verb.  

Goldberg, also not inclined to proliferate verbal senses, recognizes the need in some cases to posit multiple senses. Goldberg suggests the following criteria for establishing multiple senses of verbs: "all and only [participant] roles which are obligatorily expressed in finite sentences are profiled." According to Goldberg's schema, then, the two senses of Qal רזא profiles the following participants (in bold) according to the extant data:

1 - רזא: <Dresser, Dressee, Dress>
2 - רזא: <Dresser, Dressee, Dress>

It seems likely, however, that given the similarity of meaning and patterning between Qal רזא and Qal חגר (as well as the highly limited amount of data for Qal רזא) that Qal רזא likely permits the single argument construction with the meaning "to gird oneself" (cf. 4.2.3.1). If this is the case, then it is really only the [Dresser] who is obligatorily specified, the other two participant roles being optional and imposing their own viewing arrangement on the semantic frame. This would yield the following profile:

1 - רזא: <Dresser>
2 - רזא: <Dresser, Dressee>
2 - רזא: <Dresser, Dress>

Underspecifying the verbal meaning and allowing the particular constructions to impose the profiled status on the semantic roles therefore seems preferable. Qal רזא is basically monosemous but allows for contextual modulation.

300. Sweep, "Metonymy Determining the Type of the Direct Object," 32.
301. Goldberg, Constructions, 56.
As stated above, passivization is a well-known test for transitivity and אזר occurs in the passive constructions, Niphal and Qal passive once. Niph אזר resembles Qal passive לבר in that the Subj-Agent of the active construction is preserved as the Subj-Patient, here as a substantive participle. The [Dress] however, is governed by Prep -ב.

(65) Ps 65:7

heiroihem baLamah nefesh bemidkheh

the one who established the mountains by his strength,
who is girded with might.

Qal passive אזר however, places the [Dress] in the Subj position and the [Dressee] is governed by Prep -ב.

(66) 2 Kgs 1:8b

אזרו אתו פרה bükah vetha

And a leather belt was girded upon his loins

It is unclear if these two examples of the passive constructions represent conventional usage. Lacking more data points it is difficult to draw firm conclusions. However, it is perhaps significant that the passive is again exclusively represented by the participle and denotes a state rather than a patient effected by a dynamic action. Also, the variable expression of the [Dressee] indicates that מתי and חלציה are not necessarily (but only optionally) construed as DOs, that is as the end of the action chain envisioned by the verbal action designated by Qal אזר.

The event depicted with Qal אזר can helpfully be contrasted with Piel אזר. Of its six occurrences in the Piel, four evidence an increased valency to include both [Dressee] and [Dress] thus profiling each major participant of the Dress frame.303

(67) a. 2 Sam 22:40
And you girded me with strength for the battle

b. Ps 18:33
The God who girded me with strength

c. Ps 30:12
And you have girded me with gladness

Importantly, in each of these instances the Agent performing the action of dressing is distinct from the Patient who is being dressed. In this regard, constructions with Piel אזר more closely approximate the transitive prototype where the agent is maximally distinct from the patient in terms of affectedness. In every case the Obj-Patient [Dressee] is identified by a pronominal suffix, iconically highlighting its position as the ultimate goal of the action (see 4.2.1.3 above). Interestingly, three of the four have חָיִל as the object girding (cf. 1 Sam 2:4 above).

The other occurrence of Piel אזר, Isa 45:5 profiles only the [Dresser] and [Dressee].304

(68) Isa 45:5
I gird you, but you do not know me.

303.Since 2 Sam 22:40 and Ps 18:40 are effectively the same example only the former is given.

304.Though אזר in Isa 50:11 is clearly a Piel part of אזר, the emendation to מְאִיר suggested by BHS and HALOT (and attested in the Syriac, mgwzly) makes good sense of an otherwise difficult clause.
In Isa 45:5, God is portrayed as girding a group of people or a part of the body (loins?) of a group of people construed as an individual (hence 2ms suffix) with a [Dress]. The transitive construction of Piel אזר evidences the semantics of the IOD construction as outlined by Goldberg. What God is girding them with is unspecified and non-referential in the context. The two argument construction of Piel אזר is therefore context-independent. The discourse significance of the IOD [Dress] construction is that it focuses attention on Patient [Dressee] and their change-of-state. God, therefore, is claiming to have girded (perhaps with the sense of equipping) Israel, but his efforts have gone unrecognized.

Piel אזר more closely approximates the prototypical transitive scenario. The participants are maximally distinct and the Agent Subj acts upon the Patient Obj effecting a change-of-state. For אזר, the semantic import of the Piel conjugation is not so much that it increases valency, though it typically does, but more basically that it conceptually distinguishes the Agent and Patient. Semantically, the Qal/Piel of אזר alternation closely resembles the Qal/Hiph לבש alternation.

4.2.2.4 Hithpael אזר

The three occurrences of Hith אזר are uniformly monovalent.

(69) Isa 8:9 (2x)

בֵּן שֵׁם עֹלֶה לִפְנֵי אֲדֹנָי לְמִלְשָׁנָה אָרֶץ

הָאָרֶץ לֵפָנֶיךָ נֹשֶׁאָה נַחַל;

Be broken O peoples, be shattered,
Give ear all the ends of the earth
Gird yourselves and be shattered,
gird yourselves and be shattered.

(70) Ps 93:1

יִרְחַה מֶלֶךְ נָא חַזְק מַעֲשֶׂה לָהֵם לַחַזְק לְמָה אָרֶץ

The LORD reigns, he is clothed with majesty,
the LORD is clothed with strength, he girded himself.
The Hithpael stem is primarily attributed a reflexive meaning.\textsuperscript{305} Since Qal וָא already signifies reflexive action (as the agent also serves as the patient of the action), the question arises regarding the unique semantic contribution of a reflexive morpheme. The contribution of the Hithpael stem (what Langacker calls a \textit{relational reflexive marker}) in a prototypically transitive clause is to specify "the identity of two participants that would otherwise be coded as the subject and object of a transitive verb."\textsuperscript{306} Since the basic form of the verb already indicates this reality, the function of the Hithpael can be said to focus or emphasize the reflexive aspect of the verbal action, an aspect that is more or less implicit in other constructions. A similar phenomenon can be seen in two of the English examples above ((64), repeated here for convenience), both describing an event in which George prepares his face to shave by covering it with soap.

(71) a. George lathered (and then shaved).

b. George lathered himself (and then shaved).

The contribution of "himself" in (71)b (what Langacker calls \textit{nominal reflexive marker}) is that it focuses on the reflexive nature of the action. Langacker notes, however, that "nominal and relational reflexive markers are semantically quite similar."\textsuperscript{307} The only essential difference is that of profiling. The nominal reflexive marker profiles the participant and the relational reflexive marker profiles the process (i.e. the action indicated by the verb). That there is a measure of redundancy between the semantics of the verb and the semantics of the reflexive derivational marker is not a problem within the CG theoretical framework. Langacker says,

One such assumption is that an element is meaningless unless it contributes information not specified elsewhere in the same expression. By now,

\textsuperscript{305}\textit{IBHS} 26.2, 429-31. It may at times also be used with the associated sense of reciprocal action (\textit{IBHS} 26.2g, 431) and, even less often, a passive (\textit{IBHS} 26.3, 431).

\textsuperscript{306}Langacker, \textit{FOCG} II, 369.

\textsuperscript{307}Langacker, \textit{FOCG} II, 369-70.
however, it should be apparent that all grammatical constructions involve a certain amount of semantic overlap, and that full overlap — where the meaning of one element is fully subsumed by that of another — is just an expected limiting case. Redundancy must therefore be distinguished from meaninglessness.\textsuperscript{308}

In sum, the semantics of "girding" associated with the root אזר are compatible with a number of different constructions. It can take an Obj specifying the [Dress] (1 Sam 2:4) and, slightly more frequently, an Obj specifying the [Dressee] (Jer 1:17; Job 38:3, 40:7) in simple transitive constructions. Both should be regard as DOs construing the action chain tail from different perspectives. The semantic role (agent-preserving) alternation is an example of MOC where different core-arguments from the verb's semantic frame feature as DOs on account of their conceptual contiguity. Similar, if not identical, LOCATION-LOCATUM thematic role alternations are known in English. The derived constructions Niphal and Hithpael profile different aspects of or offer a different perspectives on the event complex denoted by the verb.

4.2.3 חגר

חָגַר occurs almost three times as often as the semantically similar אזר and is compatible with a remarkable variety of syntactic constructions.\textsuperscript{309}

4.2.3.1 Qal חגר

Pattern 1: [Dresser]

Qal חגר appears in an intransitive construction five times, twice unmodified and three times modified by a Prep (ב + [Dress] 2x; על + [Dressee] 1x). Like the intransitive use of Qal

\textsuperscript{308}Langacker, FOCG II, 187.

\textsuperscript{309}The verb חגר occurs 44\textsuperscript{x} compared to 16\textsuperscript{x} with אזר.
the meaning of Qal חגר, in the unmodified intransitive construction focuses on the affectedness of the agent. This construction should be analyzed as an IOD.

(72) a.1 Kgs 20:11

Say, "Let not the one who girds himself boast as the one who ungirds (lit. opens).

b. Joel 1:13

Gird yourselves and lament, O priests.

The action denoted by Qal חגר has clear associations with lamentation and arming for battle, girding sackcloth and a sword (or perhaps armor) respectively. It is rare, however, for the [Dress] to go unspecified. Though its usage is infrequent according to the BH corpus, Qal חגר in an IOD construction denotes the agent assuming the posture or position associated with the act of girding a particular [Dress]. In this way the affectedness of the agent may be seen to be salient in the IOD construction.

Pattern 2: [Dressee][Dresser] חגר«

(73) 2 Kgs 4:29

And he said to Gehazi, "Gird your loins"

Occurring only twice, Qal חגר in the unmodified two argument construction Subj [Dresser] + Obj [Dressee] is rare. The [Dressee] in both is לוגינא ("loins") and should be analyzed as a DO. Though the Obj is "direct" in the sense that is the second most prominent nominal in the clause, the clause is nevertheless low on the transitivity spectrum. לוגינא, as a part of the Agent-Subj is not undifferentiated from the Subj at a conceptual level. The alternation of

310. The other instance is 2 Kgs 9:1. By unmodified I mean without further syntactic elements that would change the event structure or profiling of the elements in a particular frame.
[Dressee]/[Dress] in the DO position exhibits MOC (see 4.2.2.1, pattern 2 above for description of MOC).

Pattern 3: [Dress] [Dresser]

Qal חגר occurs 15 times in the two argument Subj [Dresser] Obj [Dress] construction.
The [Dress] is typically one of two sorts: weaponry in preparation for battle or sackcloth in an expression of mourning.

(74) a. 1 Sam 25:13

And David also girded his sword.

b. 2 Sam 3:31

Rend your clothes and gird sackcloth.

The [Dressee]/[Dress] alternation of Qal חגר (patterns 2 and 3 respectively) should be analyzed as a MOC along the same lines as Qal אזר.

This alternation is a shift in profile within the semantic frame of GIRDING. It does not reflect different senses, but a contextual modulation of the same sense. Both the [Dressee] and [Dress] should be regarded as DOs in their respective two argument transitive constructions.

Both patterns 2 and 3 may take Prep מ + [Dress] or [Dressee] respectively thereby expanding the number of profiled elements of the frame though without adjusting the basic event structure.

(75) a. 1 Kgs 20:32

And they girded sackcloth on their loins and ropes on their heads.

311. For a full description of the Metonymic Object Change, see 4.2.2.1, pattern 2 above.
b. Prov 31:17

She *girds* her loins with strength.

In both cases, the verbal action is still reflexive (cf. pattern 4 below). Though both the [Dress] and [Dressee] participants are overtly represented, the participant represented as the DO is the more salient of the two and should be regarded as the ground (or landmark). The phenomenon resembles the PP expanded examples of MOC, ((61) above, repeated here for convenience).

(76) a. Mary planted roses (in the garden).

b. Mary planted the garden (with roses).

It is likely that the motivation for the use of the PP כְּלֵמיָהָוְיַנ in 1 Kgs 20:32 also has a pragmatic motivation as it allows for the verb (יַנֵּלֵיָו) to be gapped in the second clause. Not specifying the [Dressee] as "loins" in this construction may leave the impression that the soldiers girded both sackcloth and ropes on their heads.

Pattern 4: [Dress] + ב [Dressee] [Dresser] חָגַר

Meaning: x [Dresser] *girded* y [Dressee] with z [Dress]

Though the syntax of pattern 4 is the same as the expanded PP ב + [Dress] of pattern 3 the event structure that it describes is significantly different. Pattern 4 occurs only twice, and both times in the same verse.

(77) Lev 8:7

And he *girded him* by means of the sash... and *he girded him* by means of the finely embroidered ephod.

In Lev 8:7, Qal חָגַר is not reflexive as the Subj-Agent (Moses) is depicted as girding the Obj-Patient (Aaron) with the sash and ephod. Though rare, this alternation exhibits a common
cross-linguistic phenomenon. Verbs which are semantic reflexives in their basic or default sense, (e.g. English verbs of grooming, bodily care, and dressing — e.g. to lather, to dress) can take on a causative with the introduction of an Obj that is extraneous to the default frame. To use English lather as an example, the verb's event participants would be [Latherer] [Latheree] (which is the same as [Latherer] in the reflexive sense) and [Lather]. However, introducing a [Latheree] distinct from the [Latherer] elicits a causative meaning from an otherwise reflexive construction.

(78) a. George lathered (himself, his hands, shaving cream)
   b. George lathered Stan (with shaving cream)

It is striking, however, that the verb does not undergo the expected stem change to the Hiphil, an operation which, as we saw above, distinguishes the Agent from the Patient. This construction is semantically related to the Qal ditransitive construction (pattern 5).

Pattern 5: [Dress] [Dressee][Dresser] הָנֵךְ

Qal הָנֵךְ appears in a ditransitive construction twice:

(79) Exod 29:9 מֹדֶה אֲשֶׁר בְּנֵךְ אֲשֶׁר בְּנֵךְ בְּנֵךְ

And you shall gird them with sashes, Aaron and his sons.

(80) Lev 8:13 מֹדֶה אֲשֶׁר אִדֵּנָה אֲשֶׁר אִדֵּנָה

And he girded them with sashes

The ditransitive construction is related to pattern 4 in that the Qal הָנֵךְ takes on a causative meaning and the [Dressee] is no longer coreferenced with the [Dresser]. The difference between the patterns is the absence of the Prep -ב governing the [Dress] in the ditransitive. Goldberg has demonstrated that the ditransitive construction in English is closely
associated with the concept of transfer. Waltke-O'Connor rightly note that the ditransitive construction has a much broader range of usage than its English counterpart. Notably, they provide a unique entry for verbs of Dress in a ditransitive construction consistent with their notion of the complement accusative: *direct object + complement object*.

Waltke-O'Connor's taxonomy seems to proliferate usages (or senses) of the ditransitive construction unnecessarily and a number of their usages could be related under the general sense of: *change state of x by means of y*. A thorough treatment of the semantics of the BH ditransitive is outside the scope of this study. However, that the sense "change state of x by means of y" is sufficiently attested as a construction may be seen in the following examples:

(82) a. Gen 2:7

And the LORD God formed the man of dust from the ground.

b. Mal 3:24

And I will strike the land with destruction.

c. Ps 8:6

And you crown him with glory and honor.

The benefit of CxG is that it minimizes the proliferation of senses for clearly related uses of an individual verb. Goldberg has demonstrated that some of the semantic weight can be born


313. *IBHS* 10.2.3a, 173. Waltke-O'Connor distinguish no less than nine usages of the ditransitive in BH.

314. *IBHS* 10.2.3e, 176-77.

315. Here I would include Waltke-O'Connor's *direct object + means, object of the causation predicate (person or thing) + the means or complement of the verbal predicate, verbs denoting planting, and of course, direct object + complement object*.*IBHS* 10.2.3b-e, 174-77. The instrumental sense of the second nominal in the ditransitive construction should be seen as a subcategory of a more general or abstract sense of this construction which just specifies *means* of some sort. As seen from the examples of the ditransitive construction ((82)a) its sense might also include not just *change state of x*, but *bring x into being/existence by means of y*. Goldberg argues that syntactic constructions, like lexemes, evidence polysemous extension of senses. *Constructions*, 89-91.
by the grammatical constructions themselves. Regarding Qal חגר, it is unnecessary to specify two distinct senses, a reflexive and a causative. The sense, "change state of x by means of y" is clearly associated with the ditransitive construction and Qal חגר is compatible with the meaning of this sense. The ditransitive construction, therefore, contributes the causative notion to an otherwise reflexive verb. The second nominal, the [Dressee], is always prioritized — either with the Obj Prep or, with other Dress verbs, as a pronominal suffix — indicating its conceptual status as the ultimate end or goal of the action.

It should be noted that the root חגר, interestingly, never appears in the Hiphil. The reason for the use of the Qal ditransitive instead of the expected Hiphil construction is unknown as there are not clear semantic distinctions between the Qal and Hiph constructions as they combine with verbs of Dress. It can be said, however, that no Dress verb that occurs in the Qal ditransitive also occurs in the Hiphil. This suggests that the motivation for the use of one over the other lies in the diachronic development of the language.

4.2.3.2 Qal passive חגר

Pattern 1: [Dress] [Dressee] חגר

Qal passive חגר occurs nine times exhibiting the same syntactic and semantic pattern as Qal passive/ Pual לובש. 316

(83) 2 Sam 6:14

And David was girded with a linen ephod.

Qal passive חגר only occurs as a participle and designates a Subj-Patient [Dressee] in a state of being girded or equipped with Obj [Dress]. The variation in types of Subjs which collocate with Qal passive חגר — HUMAN-group (נש דוד, Judg 18:16,17) HUMAN-

316 One exception being Dan 10:5 in which [Dress] is governed by Prep -ב.
individual (1 Sam 2:18; 2 Sam 6:14, 20:8, 21:16), HUMAN-body part (פְּרֵיָתָה, Exod 12:11) — is a function of construal operation of the windowing (or scope) of attention. The window of focus may zoom in to the "smallest" conceivable entity that may ordinarily be described as girded (e.g. נְזָרֵיָה, Exod 12:11), or conversely zoom out to describe a large group of people in such a state (e.g. לְבַשׁ נְזָרֵיָה אֲלֵיה, Judg 18:16). Qal passive לְבַשׁ shows the same patterning as Qal passive לְבַשׁ and should be analyzed similarly (see 4.2.1.2 above). It removes the concept of agency, and construes the Subj as a patient [Dressee] who is girded with [Dress].

4.2.4

4.2.4.1 Qal

Pattern 1: [Dress] [Dresser]

Occurrences only eight times, and only in the Qal, with the sense of adorning oneself עָדָה II is rendered by HALOT as "adorn oneself with" and BDB as, "ornament, deck oneself." The Subj always indicates [Dresser] and the verbal action is semantically reflexive. With a single exception, the Obj typically indicates [Dress] which is some sort of jewelry or ornamentation. Isa 61:10 is typical:

(84) Isa 61:10

חָנְדָה יְבִא לְפָנָיו אֵלֶּה תְּאֹסֵר בְּמִסְפֹּרֵתָה בְּרָכִּים;

Like a bridegroom puts on a headdress,
and like a bride puts on her jewels.

Job 40:10 metaphorically extends the ornamentation to a positive or enhancing quality that is put on like jewelry, namely "majesty" and "dignity."

Pattern 2: [Dress] [Dressee] [Dresser]

317. HALOT, 789.
Though the data is highly limited, the ditransitive use of עדה which occurs only once in Ezek 16:11 appears to be relatively rare.

(85) Ezek 16:11

I put adornments on you;  
I put bracelets on your hands,  
and a necklace on your neck.

This usage of עדה in Ezek 16:11 is especially notable when compared with the conventional use of עדה two verses later.

(86) Ezek 16:13

You put on gold and silver.

The author of Ezek 16 is clearly aware of the conventional usage of Qal עדה. Both the BHS critical apparatus and BDB suggest emending עדה to a Hiph ('וָאַ) undoubtedly to make sense of the ditransitive with the sense of something like: "to cause someone to be adorned."

Though the ditransitive usage of Qal עדה is unconventional, the similar patterning of Qal חגר (see 4.2.3.1 pattern 5 above) militates against emendation. The ditransitive use of Qal עדה is likely a secondary norm rather than an exploitation. Like Qal חגר, Qal עדה obtains its causative sense by the ditransitive construction and its placement of a HUMAN [Dressee] as the most prominent DO.

4.2.5

4.2.5.1 Qal עטה

Pattern 1: [Dresser] עטה «

In one instance עטה appears with one argument, [Dresser] and is unmodified by a PP.

(87) Song 1:7:

Why should I be like one who wraps herself  
by the flocks of your companions?
The meaning of Qal עטה in Song 1:7 has been the source of a great deal of speculation, but the various theories have resulted in little by way of scholarly consensus.\textsuperscript{318} If, as seems likely, the MT is correct in its spelling (and indeed, if the traditional interpretation of\textit{to wrap} is correct) then we simply have another instance of an IOD construction with a verb of dressing. The scenario denoted by the participle is of a woman who has wrapped herself. The woman is the Affected Agent who has brought about the state of affairs through her own action. The significance or the connotation of her wrapping herself and its resultant state remain obscure.

Qal עטה occurs four times with the PP עַל־שָׂפָם indicating the object covered or cloaked, namely the lip.\textsuperscript{319} For example:

(88) Lev 13:45b

\begin{verbatim}
{אָּשֶׁ֖ר הָעֹלָ֣ם יָשְׁבַת

and he shall cover his lip.

The nature of the ritual action described in Lev 13:45 is disputed. The injunction is found in the context of the purity laws regarding various skin (or scale) diseases and deals with the comportment of the individual afflicted with a skin disease. In Ezek 24:17 and 22, the same expression refers to the rite of mourning and in Mic 3:7 it refers to a more general humiliation of all the people which will render them speechless. Milgrom cites Ibn Ezra approvingly when he appeals to the rabbinic understanding that the afflicted "lowers the mantle over his head like a mourner 'in the manner of the Arabs.'"\textsuperscript{320} In this view, the [Dresser]'s own clothes are the

\footnotesize
\begin{enumerate}
\item Various proposals about Qal עטה in Song 1:7 interpret the action of wrapping as 1) a sign of mourning, 2) sign of a harlot, 3) a disguise. The meaning "to wrap oneself" is attested by LXX περιβαλλομένη. Some have posited a metathesis reading the word עטה as an Aramaized form of עטה, which means, "to wander." However, the Aramaic is probably the etymologically original form. (I am grateful to Edward Cook for this insight). This meaning is attested in the Tg, Syr, and σ and Vul. And the NEB offers a meaning based on the Arabic for "delouse," see HALOT, עטה II. After surveying the available evidence, Roland Murphy concludes that "the meaning is not obvious in the context." Song of Songs (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 131.
\item Also, Ezek 24:17,22; and Mic 3:7.
\item Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16, 803.
\end{enumerate}
understood Obj (though still context-independent). If Milgrom is correct that the practice has in view the prevention of airborne contaminants (either real or symbolic), then it is important that the mantle is oriented over the mouth. 321

From a CG perspective, two viable explanations present themselves. One explanation is that the collocation Qal עטה + DO [Dressee] is perfectly felicitous, but simply never occurs in the corpus of the Hebrew Bible. In this case, we would have an alternation between Qal עטה + DO [Dressee] and Qal על + [Dressee]. In accordance with the principle of no synonymy, there would necessarily be a semantic or pragmatic difference between these two constructions, though it may possibly be quite minimal. It may simply be a desire to emphasize the orientation of the mantle over the mouth that could have motivated the otherwise unattested use Qal על + Prep על + [Dressee].

It is also possible, however, that the [Dressee] may be prohibited from appearing in the DO position on account of selectional restrictions. That is to say, there is an aspect of the verbal semantics of Qal עטה that would make DO [Dressee] infelicitous. An analogous example may be seen in the selectional restrictions of English fill/pour verbs relative to the semantically similar load (see (33), above). English pour profiles MOTIONMANNER (or changing the state of a liquid and not container) and therefore does not typically allow the container-locative construction. Similarly, BH Qal עטה may profile the MOTIONMANNER of the [Dress] — in this case the change of state of the [Dress] by virtue of wrapping or cloaking it on oneself — and thereby resist the change-of-state construction that would characterize the DO [Dressee] pattern. Though it is difficult to decide between these two (or other) possible options, the use of Prep על + [Dressee]

321 Milgrom draws on Ibn Ezra, among others, for this view. Regarding the orientation of the mantle over the mouth, Milgrom says, "That he also covers his eyes and a good part of his face is clearly incidental." Leviticus 1-16, 803-4.
in the Hiphil construction (see pattern 4.2.5.2 below) suggests this latter explanation to be preferable.

Pattern 2: [Dress] [Dresser]

Qal עטה takes an object in six of its 11 occurrences. In these instances the Obj always designates the [Dress]. For example:

(89) a. Isa 59:17d

and he wrapped himself with zeal as a cloak.

b. Ps 109:19:

And let it be for him like a garment he wraps, and for a belt, every day he girds it.

Qal עטה in the two argument construction patterns similarly to other Dress verbs as it takes the [Dress] as its DO. It is clearly a semantic reflexive; a [Dresser] always coreferences the [Dresee]. This, along with the fact that [Dress] is not marked by the Obj Prep, suggests a low placement on the transitivity spectrum.

4.2.5.2 Hiph

Hiph עטה occurs only twice and follows the expected semantic pattern of distinguishing Agent from Patient.322

(90) Ps 89:46

you wrapped shame upon/over him

322. The other occurrence of Hiph עטה is in Ps 84:7: ("Those who pass through the Valley of Bacah, they regard it as a place of springs, also the early rains wrap [it?] with pools.") The sense of the B colon is difficult, however, it seems best to understand the Obj [Dresee] to be gapped from the A colon, its specific reference being the Valley of Bacah, which is indicated by the resumptive pronoun והו-.
Though all three participants are overtly expressed, the [Dressee] is governed in Ps 89:46 with Prep על. As mentioned above, this may be accounted for as a selectional restriction based on the semantics of the verb which profiles MOTIONMANNER, and which is incompatible with the change-of-state construction.

4.2.6

4.2.6.1 Qal עטף

The two occurrences of Qal עטף as a verb of wearing pattern differently. Given the paucity of data, it is impossible to tell which, if either, would be have been more conventional than the other.

Pattern 1: [Dress] [Dresser] עטף«

(91) Ps 65:14b ותנפכו עטף<br>and the valleys envelop themselves with grain

Pattern 2: [Dressee] -ל + [Dress/Dresser] עטף«

(92) Ps 73:6 לֹא בָּנַע עָלָיו עִנָּיִיתָם וְלֹא לֹא שֵׁלֵדּוֹן לְוֹא :כָּל בְּרֹא הָאָרֶץ עַל עָלָיו עָלָיו עִנָּיִיתָם וְלֹא לֹא שֵׁלֵדּוֹן לְוֹא .

Therefore pride is their necklace, a garment of violence envelops them.

Like Qal and Hiph עטש, pattern 2 governs [Dressee] with a preposition (though -ל instead of -על). This may indicate a similar selectional restriction. Qal עטש may profile MOTIONMANNER of the [Dress] and resist the change-of-state construal represented by DO [Dressee] construction.

323. עטף appears in Job 23:9 with the meaning, "to turn."
4.3 Analysis of Verbs of Undress

In accordance with cross-linguistic generalities, BH verbs of Dress are far more differentiated than verbs for Undress. According to Seifart et.al, this pattern reflects the source-goal asymmetry.\(^{324}\)

4.3.1 פשט

4.3.1.1 Qal פשט

Pattern 1: [Dresser] פשט

The meaning of Pattern 1 is, [Undressers] undress (themselves). Isa 32:11 is the only instance of an intransitive use of Qal פשט.

\(93\) Isa 32:11

פלשׁהוּ מֵעָנָן יִהְבְּךָו. יֵעָנָן יִהְבּוּךָו.

strip and make yourselves naked

Like the intransitive use of Qal לבשׁ (see 4.2.1.1, pattern 1 above), intransitive Qal פשט manifests IOD. In the intransitive construction, the Subj-Agent is highlighted as the Affected Agent, that is, also the Patient the stripping of whom is the goal of the action. The focus is the Subj's change-of-state from dressed to undressed.

Pattern 2: [Dress] [Dresser] פשט

The action denoted by Qal פשט (occurring 8x) is that of stripping or taking off an article of clothing [Dress]. In seven out of eight occurrences, the garment removed is profiled as the DO in a transitive construction with the meaning: [Dresser] takes [Dress] off of him/herself. The coreference of [Dresser] and[Dressee] in the Qal construction places Qal פשט firmly in the

semantic reflexive category. The use of Qal פָשׁט in Lev 6:4 reveals something of its semantic relation to the action denoted by Qal לבש.

And he took off his garments and he put on other garments.

However, unlike verbs of Dress, Qal פָשׁט never takes [Dressee] as the DO. It is unclear if this construction is prohibited on account of a semantic selectional restriction. If it is, the restriction may be that Qal פָשׁט profiles the [Dressee] holistically so that the action of undressing can not focus in or window a certain part of the body.

The Obj is marked with Obj Prep את marker in five cases (Lev 6:4, 16:23; Ezek 26:16; Ezek 44:19; Song 5:3). The two cases where the object is unmarked, the verb takes a pronominal suffix (1 Sam 19:24; Neh 4:17).

4.3.1.2 Hiphil פָשׁט

Occurring 15 times, Hiph פָשׁט appears in a remarkable variety of syntactic constructions. It divides between transitive (9x) and ditransitive (5x) constructions. The basic event structure is that in which an Agent [Undresser], which always appears in the Subj position, strips a Patient [Undressee] of an article of clothing [Dress]. Both [Undressee] and [Dress] appear in the canonical DO position and often both Objs are marked by Obj Prep את. Typical of the three argument expression is Gen 37:23:

(95) Gen 37:23: And they stripped Joseph of his tunic, the tunic of many colors which was upon him.

325. The single instance of the intransitive use of the Hiph פָשׁט is found in 2 Chr 35:11:

("And they slaughtered the passover sacrifice and the priests threw the blood they received from them, while the Levites were flaying (it).") This Obj deletion appears to be context dependent as the Levites are presumably flaying the particular (specific) sacrifices references in the context.
The two argument use of Hiph לָשֵׁט can profile either the [Dresser] or the [Dress] as the DO:

(96) a. Lev 1:6

And he shall flay the burnt offering,

b. 1 Sam 31:9

And they stripped his armor

The two argument [Undressee]/[Undress] alternation of Hiph לָשֵׁט should be analyzed as a MOC (see 4.2.2.1 pattern 2 above). The salient difference between the Qal and the Hiph transitive construction is not valency (as both may appear in a bivalent construction), but the conceptual status of the Agent and Patient. In the Qal, the Agent is also the Patient (Affected Agent). In the Hiphil, the Agent [Undresser] and Patient [Undresssee]/[Undress] are distinguished participants, and the event structure more closely resembles the prototypical transitive scenario in which the Agent acts on a Patient to bring about a change-of-state.

4.3.1.3 Piel and Hithpael

Piel לָשֵׁט only occurs three times and only as an Inf cst. The object of the verbal action specified in two cases (1 Sam 31:8; and its parallel in 1 Chron 10:8) are the ones being stripped: אֶת־הַחֲלָלִים. In one instance, the object is omitted but may be identified from context (2 Sam 23:10) and is both specific and referential. Piel לָשֵׁט is only used to denote the action of stripping the slain after a battle. The motivation for the use of the Piel instead of the Hiphil (which also has a causative sense) is its sense of plurality of action appropriate for the multiple strippings of multiple corpses of their armor and weapons.

Hith לָשֵׁט occurs once in 1 Sam 18:4 and it clearly focuses on the reflexivity of the verbal action.
Jonathan stripped himself of the cloak which was upon him, and he gave it to David, and his armor, even his sword, and his bow and his belt.

Unlike the passive construction, the reflexive preserves the agency of the Subj, and in this case keeps the Obj on-stage as the second most salient participant. Hith פשט focuses on the reflexive character of the predicate and should be analyzed the same as Hith רא (see 4.2.2.3 above).

4.4 Conclusions

The description of BH Dress verbs as essentially intransitive verbs that may take an object or may occur in a transitive construction is misleading at best. The vast majority of occurrences of verbs of dress is with an Obj that is, in the two-argument construction, best analyzed as a DO. The transitive usage, therefore, should be regarded as the most conventional usage. Typically, the DO profiles the role of [Dress]. However, for most Dress verbs the DO [Dressee] construction is sufficiently attested to warrant classifying this construction as a secondary norm. This alternation exhibits a common cross-linguistic phenomenon that is described in cognitive terms as Metonymic Object Change. Conceptual contiguity of entities within a semantic frame allows for the profiling of different entities and results in the adjustment of the profiled scene, though not requiring a change in the basic semantics of the verb.

The particular semantic property of Dress verbs that licenses the variation in argument structure is their semantic reflexivity, especially the feature of the Affected Agent. This is accompanied by the corollary phenomenon of low transitivity. Low transitivity, however, must not be mistaken for no transitivity. Rather, it contributes to the variable representation of participants involved in the Dress scenario. In an active construction, either the [Dressee] or the
[Dress], can potentially be construed as the DO based on the goals of the speaker and the image schema he or she wishes to invoke (change-of-state or caused motion). Conceptually, however, one participant, namely the [Dressee], is always more ultimate than the other. When both participants are profiled in the ditransitive constructions, the [Dressee] always indicates the endpoint or goal of the action. This is typically indicated syntactically through the use of the Obj Prep "את-" marker. It may also be indicated iconically by encoding the [Dressee] as the pronominal suffix or by fronting the [Dressee] participant in a O1VSO2 construction.

The BH examples of Dress verbs in the IOD alternations follow well-established linguistic principles, specifically those based on the agent being understood as affected on a conceptual level. The motivation for the IOD is pragmatic, serving a pragmatic function of focusing on the affectedness of the agent. The intransitive use of Dress verbs appears to be exceptional. Exactly how exceptional it was is difficult to say. The fact that almost every Dress verb (אָזַר is the exception) displays an intransitive usage suggests that this was not an exploitation and perhaps not all that uncommon. Conversely, when the use and distribution of each Dress verb is considered individually, their appearance in intransitive constructions is noticeably infrequent and largely (though not exclusively) limited to certain syntactic-semantic environments. Notably, it is rare for a context-independent intransitive usage to occur in a finite clause. This corresponds to at least one of Goldberg's parameters for IOD, namely that it refers to habitual, iterative, or generic statements.326

Similarly, the passive form of verbs of Dress only appear as participles. The function of the passive is to background the agency of the Subj. However, since the Subj may also be construed as the affected entity, the patient, the same referent may be preserved in the Subj

position in a stative scenario very low on the transitivity spectrum. The passive participles
describe a state of affairs, namely that of being dressed in some sort of clothing.

One of the transitive usages exhibited by Qal לֶבֶשׁ and Qal אָזַר should be analyzed as a
secondary norm where these two Dress verbs have the sense of "to overwhelm," "to cover," or "to
overpower." These secondary norms also follow certain established linguistic principles, namely
that of metaphor of personification and are at home within the wider conceptualization of the
ANE imagination.
Chapter 5: Verbs of Dwelling

This chapter examines a variety of BH verbs that express the conceptual notion Dwelling. The semantic profile of BH dwelling verbs is uniformly the single participant <Dweller>. However, the frame, to use Fillmore's terminology, of dwelling verbs includes the participant or circumstance [Location]. With BH dwelling verbs, the [Location] element is conventionally expressed with a Prep (typically -ב or -ל). It is difficult, if not impossible, to conceive of the action or state of dwelling without the concept [Location] being present at some level of the basic domain. That is to say, all dwelling is a dwelling somewhere. However, the "somewhere" in BH is not a core argument of the verb, that is, it is not obligatorily expressed. Therefore the [Location] element is not considered a lexically profiled participant.

Hebrew grammars differ in their classification of verbs of dwelling. Most classify them as verbs which exhibit the transitivity alternation. GKC, for example, describes verbs of dwelling as taking an accusative that expresses "either the place or the thing at which or with..." 327.

---

327. This is evident from the various intransitive usages in which the [Location] element is neither expressed nor inferable from the context. To be sure, most unmodified intransitives are best regarded as context-dependent Obj [Location] deletion. That is, the [Location] is inferable from the context. However, dwelling verbs in comitative and temporal expressions suggest that [Location] was not perceived as obligatory. For example, Gen 34:16 says, "inator:ماا wir م¶AoVl …wny™IyDh◊w M$RkV;tIa …wnVb∞AvÎy◊w("And we shall dwell with you, and we will be one people"). Here, the expression focuses on the [Company] participant and the [Location] element is left unexpressed. Of course, the act of "dwelling together" would take place in some [Location], an element evoked by the verb but not necessarily expressed. That [Location] is a frame element may be demonstrated by contrast with the comitative sense in which [Company] is neither an obligatory argument nor an element evoked from the verbal frame. When one engages in the act or exists in the state of "dwelling" that act or state necessarily takes place in a [Location] (whether expressed or unexpressed), but it does not necessarily take place with [Company]. The [Location] therefore, is regarded an element of the verbal frame or domain and optionally expressed, whereas the [Company] participant is not present in the frame.

328."[V]erbs lexically determine which aspects of their frame-semantic knowledge are obligatorily profiled. Lexically profiled roles are entities in the frame semantics associated with the verb that are obligatorily accessed and function as focal points within the scene, achieving a special degree of prominence. These profiled participant roles correspond to those participants which are obligatorily brought into perspective, achieving a certain degree of 'salience.' Profiling is lexically determined and highly conventionalized — it can not be altered by context." Goldberg, Constructions, 44 (emphasis mine). Cf. Langacker, FOCG I, 183-89.

---

142
which any one tarries.”

Likewise (and with reference to GKC), Arnold-Choi categorize verbs of dwelling as verbs taking the Complement Accusative. However, for יָשֹׁב at least, GKC also designates its nominal complement as a loci accusativus (accusative of place) with a looser subordination of the accusative to the verb. It is unclear if GKC and Arnold-Choi intend for verbs taking a loci accusativus to be considered a subset of the larger category of verbs exhibiting "transitivity alternations" and, if so, why verbs of motion are not similarly classified. Van der Merwe et al. describe "verbs of abiding" as taking (non-object) complements, thus implying that the locative is somehow essential to the meaning of the verb though its function is in some way different than a DO.

Waltke-O'Connor, on the other hand, do not treat "verbs of dwelling" under their heading "Complement Accusatives," a category for which they cite only verbs of fullness/want and verbs of wearing, donning, or doffing clothes. Rather, they describe "verbs of dwelling" as sometimes taking adverbial accusatives of place. Similarly, Joüon-Muraoka describe these verbs as taking an indirect accusative of "local determination":

"The place where one is (without motion) is usually preceded by the preposition 'in, or 'at. But sometimes the noun is not preceded by any

329. GKC §117u, 368; and bb, 370 (emphasis original).

330. Interestingly, on this point Arnold-Choi employ the same labels but depart from the classification schema of Waltke-O'Connor whose grammatical description they typically follow. A Guide to Biblical Hebrew Syntax, 2.3.1d, 16.

331. GKC §118g, 373. Similarly, Arnold-Choi use the designation adverbial accusative of place (2.3.2a), 18. Curiously, the latter's examples only cite verbs of motion.

332. BHRG §33.2.3, 244.

333. Though only listing two verb classes as verbs which take the complement accusative, Waltke-O'Connor's brief description suggests they conceive of other verb classes fitting this category: "Several classes of verbs take a complement accusative." IBHS § 10.2.1h, 168 (emphasis mine).

334. IBHS 10.2.2b, 170. Unlike the complement accusative, Waltke-O'Connor identify the accusatives of place as adjuncts, that is, optional complements to the verb the absence of which would not change the meaning of the verb in any significant way. IBHS 10.2.2a, 169.
preposition; it must then be regarded as being in the accusative of
determination. This accusative, which is not common outside certain nouns,
may have originated as an extension of the accusative of motion.\textsuperscript{335}

Though Joüon-Muraoka do not cite dwelling verbs as a category of "verbs requiring an
accusative" (their designation for what we are calling the transitivity alternation), they do
mention motion verbs, verbs with which dwelling verbs are often connected.\textsuperscript{336} The merits of
this common connection will be explored below.

In principle, there is nothing problematic or exceptional about a language encoding a
[Location] or [Setting] as an Obj. In these cases, location-as-object is not a DO.\textsuperscript{337} That is to say,
it is not conceived of or construed as a participant in the action or the tail of an action chain, but
rather as a setting in which the action takes place (also often called a "circumstance"). Notably,
and obviously given the latinate terminology, the \textit{loci accusativus} is common in both Latin and
Greek. Langacker cites Classical Nahuatl and Mixtec, both of which also use non-oblique
nominal complements to specify a non-DO location.\textsuperscript{338} Importantly, the [Location] in both of
these languages is not considered a DO (in his example from Classical Nahuatl, Langacker notes
that the DO lacks the Obj prefix on the verb).\textsuperscript{339} The situation with BH, however, is more
complex. BH employs both location-as-object (what BH grammars often designate \textit{loci}

\textsuperscript{335} Joüon-Muraoka §126h, 457-58.
\textsuperscript{336} Joüon-Muraoka §125d, 443-44.
\textsuperscript{337} Langacker designates such objects \textbf{direct participants}. According to Langacker, a direct participant qualifies
as neither subject nor direct object, but is "specified directly by a nominal, rather than through a relational
predication such as a prepositional phrase." He says, "Nothing in principle precludes the existence of a special
construction allowing the direct (non-periphrastic) elaboration, by a nominal, of a participant that does not have
the status of either primary or secondary clause-level figure." \textit{FOCG} II, 341.

\textsuperscript{338} This would be opposed to a DO location, that is, one that is a participant in the action. For example: "In the
field, the farmer cut the grass" features the setting ("in the field"). Alternately, "The farmer scorched the field
with fire" features (the field) not only as setting but as participant as well. Langacker, "Grammatical
Ramifications of the Setting/Participant Distinction," 388.

\textsuperscript{339} Langacker, "Grammatical Ramifications of the Setting/Participant Distinction," 388.
accusativus, henceforth Obj [Location]) and location-as-Oblique Object (henceforth Prep [Location]) in what are, at least according to the prevailing analyses, semantically and pragmatically synonymous constructions.

The theoretical presupposition driving this study is well summarized by Langacker who, speaking in a similar vein to Bolinger (quoted earlier), says: "Grammatical markings and patterns call attention to subtle aspects of meaning and pose descriptive problems requiring semantic solutions."340 This chapter seeks to uncover the "subtle aspects of meaning" — semantic, pragmatic, or both — that motivate the BH alternating constructions of verbs of dwelling.

Notably absent from the BH grammars' descriptions of the so-called loci accusativus is a discussion of the frequency or distribution of this phenomenon. From the perspective of corpus linguistics and Hanks' TNE in particular, the relatively infrequent use of the loci accusativus with verbs of dwelling is striking and deserves explanation. If, as seems to be suggested by the grammatical and lexical descriptions, the Obj [Location] construction is basically synonymous with the Prep [Location] construction (typically with -ב or -ל), one would expect to find it used more frequently throughout the HB or more consistently by particular authors and in particular books. However, even a cursory survey of the usage in the biblical corpus reveals a strikingly uneven distribution of verbs of dwelling taking the loci accusativus. This unevenness suggests a semantic and/or pragmatic motivation for the marked usage of the Obj [Location] construction.

GKC lists the following verbs as verbs of dwelling that are used both intransitively and transitively: זָבַל, גוּר, יָשַׁב, שָׁכַב, שָׁכַן.341 Regarding זָבַל, however, Gesenius has likely misunderstood its sense in Gen 30:20 (the only use of this root as a verb in the HB) as having the meaning "to

341. GKC §117 bb, 370.
be round" which, on analogy with BH ד"ר could mean something like, "to dwell." The connection to "dwelling" has also been made on the basis of the noun ז"ב which, through an extension of its basic meaning "elevation," "height," is used with the sense of a "lofty abode" (e.g. 1 Kgs 8:13). However, both BDB and HALOT rightly understand BH זבל in Gen 30:20 to refer to the action of "exalting" or "honoring," perhaps related to Akk. zabâlu. Gen 30:20, הבש is therefore better translated: "Now my husband will honor/ exalt me" (so NRSV, JPS, ESV). Furthermore, though Qal שכב does exhibit the transitivity alternation, it is not properly categorized as a verb of dwelling. Therefore it will be treated separately in chapter 7. In addition to the verbs cited by GKC (though excluding זבל and שכב), Joüon-Muraoka mention חנה which should be included in this list.

This chapter will address the following questions: 1) what is the frequency and distribution of the Prep [Location] and Obj [Location] constructions and what is their significance, 2) what semantic qualities of the verb, the Obj complement, or the construction license verbs of dwelling to encode [Location] in the Obj position, and 3) are there semantic nuances and/or pragmatic constraints that motivate the use of the Verb of Dwelling + Obj [Location] construction?

After a survey of the loci accusativus in BH, I will lay out the particular methodological and theoretical framework of CG that explains verbs of dwelling in Obj [Location] constructions. Verbs of dwelling will then be analyzed with a view toward determining the status and function of the [Location] element in Obj [Location] constructions. To summarize my argument in

342. BDB, 259.
343. CAD XXI zabâlu: 1. "To carry, transport (a load)." The association is with the idea of lifting or raising up.
344. Joüon-Muraoka §126h, 457-48. T. J. Meek also identifies these same verbs (including חנה and excluding זבל) as constituting a verb class that takes the accusative of place. "The Hebrew Accusative of Time and Place" JAOS 60.2 (1940): 224-33. Meek's analysis will be considered below.
advance, however, the Obj [Location] construction increases the conceptual salience of the [Location] and thus serves to emphasize or foreground the [Location] element for various pragmatic purposes including contrast, clarification, foreshadowing, among others. The goal of this chapter is to elucidate the conceptual motivation for the unconventional usage of BH dwelling verbs in Obj [Location] constructions. For this reason only those collocations and constructions that bear directly or indirectly on the semantics of the transitivity alternation will be treated.  

5.1 Loci Accusativus

As noted in chapter 2, BH grammars typically treat the accusative with reference to other (mostly ancient) languages that feature overt grammatical case markings on the accusative. This holds for adverbial accusatives which specify things like time, manner, measure, and location. Though they do not mention distribution or semantic/pragmatic values of the constructions, Waltke-O'Connor touch on the issue of frequency, "Ordinarily location without movement is specified by a prepositional phrase with b or l, but an accusative may be used." With regard to the loci accusativus, a connection is regularly made between verbs of motion and verbs of dwelling, both of which, when overtly expressing the participant [Location], are said to specify the terminus of the action. In the case of motion verbs, the loci accusativus designates the GOAL in a SOURCE-PATH-GOAL image schema and the verbs of dwelling are

345. Some verbs of dwelling (e.g. ישב and חנה) collocate with such a wide range of prepositions that an individual analysis of each collocation with a view toward unpacking its unique semantic profile is beyond the scope of this project and would in any case distract from the goal of unpacking the semantics of a particular construction, namely the Obj [Location]. That being said, if the semantics of a particular PP construction sheds light on the constructions under consideration, they will be referenced and addressed.

346. IBHS 10.2.2b, 169-70 (emphasis mine).
thought to be constructed on analogy with this schema.\textsuperscript{347} This connection raises the question of the relationship between motion verbs and dwelling verbs with regards to the [Location] participant role. The GOAL is a natural endpoint of the action denoted by a motion verb and it signals the terminus of the action itself.

This connection between motion and dwelling verbs was developed in its most sophisticated form by Theophile Meek in his 1940 article, "The Hebrew Accusative of Time and Place." Meek sees such a close analogy between the two verb classes that he maintains that the \textit{loci accusativus} with dwelling verbs is \textit{exclusively} terminative (i.e. goal-oriented). Citing the dwelling verbs listed above, Meek comments, "all the verbs imply motion to the place where the settling down takes place."\textsuperscript{348} He lists the following as evidence:

(98) a. Gen 33:18 :רְיָוָה יָנֹק יַתְרָא נַעֲלֵי
He moved his camp to the front of the city

b. 2 Sam 17:26 :דִּבְd

[Absalom and Israel] moved his camp into the land of Gilead.\textsuperscript{349}

The problem with Meek's argument is two-fold. First, while the sense of "motion toward a goal" works with the two instances cited, it fails to work consistently across the verb class as a whole. Two examples will suffice:

(99) a. Prov 10:30 :דִּבְדִּבְדִּבְדִּבְדִּבְדִּבְדִּבְדִּבְדִּבְדִּבְדִּבְd

The righteous will never be shaken, and the wicked will not inhabit the land.

---

\textsuperscript{347}Joüon-Muraoka §126h, 457-58.

\textsuperscript{348}Meek, "The Hebrew Accusative," 226.

\textsuperscript{349}Meek's translation, "The Hebrew Accusative," 226.
b. Isa 57:15b

I inhabit a high and holy place.

It seems highly unlikely that Qal שָׁכַן in Prov 10:30 could mean something like, "And the wicked will not move to dwell in the land." The aphorism seems to envision a situation in which the righteous and the wicked are both already residing in the land. The warning and promise, however, is that the wicked will not continue to dwell or remain there (cf. Prov 2:21), not that they will somehow be prohibited from moving in to take up residence. Isa 57:15 also resists a terminative reading. In Isa 57:15, the meaning of the divine declaration is not that God will somehow "move to dwell in a high and holy place," but rather that such a dwelling place, with all of its royal and judicial overtones, belongs to him already.

Second, in the same article Meek himself demonstrates convincingly that BH has a productive morpheme indicating the same terminative notion he wishes to ascribe to the dwelling verbs + Obj [Location] construction, namely the terminative ה- . The availability of such a morpheme suggests that Obj [Location] construction may have a different semantic or pragmatic function. In sum, Meek's proposal does not have the explanatory power to handle the full range of data, and one is left with the question of the distinction between the verb of dwelling + Obj [Location] construction and verb of dwelling marked with terminative ה- construction.

Regarding Gen 33:18 and 2 Sam 17:26 ((98)a-b above), while the idea of "motion toward goal" is possible, it is not necessary to make sense of the verb in context.

Meek's proposal has not enjoyed wide acceptance. Both Waltke-O'Connor and Joüon-Muraoka (though originally written prior to publication of Meek's article Joüon's grammar has since been substantially updated by T. Muraoka) maintain that the Obj [Location] construction

---

350. This is not to deny the possibility of overlapping functions of constructions. I only wish to suggest that the ubiquity of the terminative ה- construction in BH mitigates against making "movement toward a goal" the primary or central function of the Obj [Location] construction.
expresses location "without motion." Nevertheless, the perceived analogy between motion verbs and dwelling verbs persists as an explanation for the Obj [Location] construction with verbs of dwelling. Meyer is typical in his explanation: "Dasselbe Objekt kann auch nach שָׁכַן, יָשַׁב 'wohnen' oder גּוּר 'sich aufhalten' stehen; z. B. יָגוּר אֳנִיּוֹת 'er verweilt bei den Schiffen' (Jdc. 5,17); so wohl auch: נַרְבֶּךָךָ 'das Schwert des Königs von Babylon kommt zu dir' (Ez 32,11)."

This appeal to analogy seems to be based exclusively on the presence of [Location] participant and does not take into account how that semantic role might be uniquely incorporated into exceptional expressions. As was suggested above, dwelling verbs do not consistently, predictably, or exclusively employ the Obj [Location] construction with the terminative sense in a manner directly analogous to verbs of motion (i.e. with a meaning along the lines of: "x moved to dwell in [Location]"). The Obj [Location] participant accompanying verbs of dwelling is not functioning as the GOAL in a SOURCE-PATH-GOAL schema. The common appeal to an analogy between the verb classes on the basis of their both featuring a [Location] fails to take into account the type of action specified by the verb classes and how those types of action are combined with the semantics of the transitive construction.

Though I have not found it argued anywhere, it seems to me that the best argument for analogy with verbs of motion must appeal to the dynamic sense of the basic dwelling verb Qal יָשַׁב. The dynamic sense, "to sit" may envision the seat or perhaps the sitting position as the GOAL of the action. As the sense of the verb Qal יָשַׁב was expanded through metaphoric polysemy to the more general sense "to dwell" (which will be argued below) the conception of final [Location] or [State] as GOAL was still preserved, thus allowing for the encoding of the

351. IBHS 10.2.2b, 169-70; Joüon-Muraoka §126h, 457-58.
352. Meyer §105.3b. So too: IBHS 10.2.2b, 169-70; Joüon §126h, 457-58; BHRG §33.2.3, 244.
[Location] element as the Obj-Goal of the action. The problem with this view, however, is that the Obj [Location] construction is never used with the dynamic sense of Qal ישׁב (and rarely if ever for the other verbs of dwelling). This suggests that the explanation resides elsewhere.

Alternative analyses have been offered for some of the expressions often classified by BH grammars as loci accusativus. These analyses call into question the "accusative" status of some, but not all, of the nouns so classified. Joüon-Muraoka, for example, suggest that the labial ב has been dropped through haplology before other labials, notably ב in בַּיִת and ב in פֶּתַח. So too GKC suggests that certain authors avoided the repetition of the labial ב before other labials for euphonic reasons. It is also possible that during the biblical period, בֵּית and פֶּתַח are undergoing grammaticalization and had come to function as prepositions in certain expressions. פֶּתַח + NP_abs means "at the entrance of x" and בֵּית + NP_abs means "in the house of x."

(100) a. Gen 18:1

and he was sitting at the entrance of the tent in the heat of the day

b. 2Kgs 11:3

And he was with her in the temple of the Lord hidden for six years.

In fact, grammaticalization may have been motivated by reasons of euphonic preference. Evidence that בֵּית and פֶּתַח are undergoing a grammaticalization as prepositions in certain contexts is evidenced by the fact that accusatives of this kind are almost without exception in the construct state. Driver notes that the expression "in the house" is never indicated by the absolute form בֵּית but is restricted to the construct (בֵּית, etc). The above analyses are not

354. GKC §118g, 373.
355. Despite his categorical claim, Driver does note some exceptions (Isa 16:2 and 2 Chron 33:20) to which may be added Isa 44:13. Despite these exceptions, Driver’s point is still valid and points in the direction of grammaticalization. S. R. Driver, Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel: with an introduction on Hebrew paleography and the ancient versions, and facsimiles of inscriptions, Oxford: Clarendon: (1890), 29, n 2.
mutually exclusive and if one (or both) of them is correct, then neither נֵבֶט nor פֶּתַח properly belong to the category of loci accusativus as they are essentially functioning, in certain contexts at least, as prepositions.356

Less convincing, however, is Joüon-Muraoka's inclusion of cardinal points as loci accusativus. They cite the following examples:

(101) a. Gen 4:16  נֵבֶט הַיֶּהוּדִי פֶּתַח יֶדֶם אֲשֶׁר נַגַּן:

And he dwelt in the land of Nod, east of Eden.

b. Josh 1:15  פֶּתַח הַיֶּהוּדִי פֶּתַח יֶדֶם אֲשֶׁר נַגַּן:

which Moses, the servant of the Lord, gave to you on the far side of the Jordan toward the sun.357

However, in both Gen 4:16 and Josh 1:15 the cardinal directions are more naturally understood as standing in apposition to the nominal governed by Prep -ב (דֵּרֶךְ and יֶדֶם respectively). A similar observation can be made for Joüon-Muraoka's other examples (i.e. Josh 1:4; 23:4; cf. Prov 8:3).

The classification loci accusativus as it is commonly used by grammars and cited by commentaries could stand to be more clearly defined and the examples culled or at least subdivided into different types. The linguistic phenomena at work with the quasi-prepositional use of נֵבֶט in Gen 18:1 ((100)a above) is not the same as those at work with the locative form of a noun seen in יֶדֶם (Ruth 3:14, see discussion in ch 7 below). When the larger context is accounted for, Joüon-Muraoka's citation of cardinal points do not seem to fit the loci accusativus at all. While the conclusions of this chapter may be pertinent to the status of the BH loci

Another understanding of Isa 44:13 will be argued below.

accusativus generally, my specific focus will be the so-called loci accusativus as it is found with verbs of dwelling.

5.2 Theory and Method

In traditional grammatical description (especially within the generative paradigm), "emphasis" is regarded as a strictly pragmatic feature of language usage and much of it is attributed to extra-linguistic realities (e.g. tone, volume, gesture, stress, etc.). CG, however, rejects a strict division between semantics and pragmatics. Langacker says that CG "takes an encyclopedic approach, rejecting as both unmotivated and untenable any strict or specific demarcation between semantics and pragmatics, or linguistic and extra-linguistic knowledge." This does not imply that there is no distinction between semantics and pragmatics nor that these categories are unserviceable. Rather, Langacker (and others working within the cognitivist tradition) are simply asserting that semantics and pragmatics must be regarded as poles of a single continuum of meaning. Divisions along the continuum are made somewhat arbitrarily.

The major point of connection between semantics and pragmatics is found in CG's understanding of "meaning." One of the central principles of CG is that "meaning is conceptualization" (see 3.1 above). If a THING or RELATION is conceptualized as being important or prominent, the linguistic expression that encodes such prominence may be said to


359. Langacker, FOG II, 4. Similarly, Gilles Fauconnier says, "Space configurations are built up semantically and pragmatically at the same time. There is no configuration corresponding only to the semantic information that would later be patched up by the pragmatics. Incidentally, this does not imply that the division between pragmatics and semantics disappears. We are free to call some of the processes involved in the construction semantic and others pragmatic; but there will not be any separate representations involved." Mappings in Thought and Language (Cambridge: CUP, 1997), 70-71 (emphasis mine).
"mean" something different than an expression that does not. Emphasis is essentially a construal operation, an expression of mental focus or attention. According to Langacker,

If a certain element is salient, as either a profile or a focal participant, where exactly does its salience lie? It does not lie in the outside world. If we look at our surroundings, we do not see objects bordered with heavy lines to mark them as profiles, nor is something intrinsically a trajector or a landmark. Like other aspects of construal, prominence is a conceptual phenomenon, inhering in our apprehension of the world, not in the world per se. However, merely acknowledging its conceptual nature is insufficient. Even at the conceptual level, the objects of our mental universe have no inherent status as profile, trajector, or landmark. These pertain specifically to the conceptualizations evoked as the meanings of linguistic expressions. How prominent a particular entity is — whether it functions as profile, trajector, landmark, or none of the above — depends on the construal imposed by the linguistic elements employed.  

Since meaning is located neither in the "outside world" nor in certain truth-conditional aspects of an expression, but rather in conceptualization, a pragmatic shift in prominence (whether through tonal stress or through grammatical construction) may rightly be regarded as a shift in "meaning." Therefore, even the most pragmatic aspects of a communication event (e.g. gesture) should be understood as semantic in nature.

Emphasis is a notoriously vague concept in linguistic description. What is often discussed in intuitive or notional terms, CG describes more naturally and concretely with reference to conceptual salience. To be sure, any event participant that is overtly expressed

---


361. Muraoka says, "A perusal of the literature relative to our subject has made it quite clear that the term 'emphasis' is often too rashly called in, like a pinch-hitter in the baseball game, without much thought being given to precisely what is meant by the term nor, more importantly, to the question why the writer or the speaker possibly felt the need for an emphatic form or construction." *Emphatic Words*, xi. Since the publication of Muraoka's monograph in 1985 much work has been done to delineate a more theoretically responsible view of emphasis.

may be regarded as salient in some respect. However, in CG salience is a matter of degree and varying degrees of salience may be conferred upon a participant via, among other things, grammatical constructions. A working definition of emphasis that will be used throughout this study, therefore, may be stated as follows: emphasis is the unconventional foregrounding of a conceptual element.\(^{363}\) Having only the text of the HB to consult, the emphasis under consideration will be grammatical in nature.

An event participant (noun) or relation (verb) that is expressed with an unconventionally high level of salience therefore may be said to be "emphasized." To use the terms of Langacker's scene model, an emphasized element receives greater focus or prominence within the viewing frame. As will be demonstrated below, BH dwelling verbs lexicalize various aspects of the dwelling event or the event participants. Conventionally, the [Dweller] participant is oriented in or at the [Location] via a Prep. However, in the Obj [Location] construction the same participant roles and same participant relationships as the Prep [Location] construction are profiled. The image schema remains the same, specifically, the [Dweller] is in or at a [Location].\(^{364}\) However, the Obj [Location] construction shifts the Figure/Ground (Trajector/Landmark) alignment with regard to the prominence of the Ground.

In the case of verbs of dwelling, the Ground is on rare occasions given greater prominence to indicate that there is something more significant about the [Location] than its simply being the circumstance for the action. The use of verbs of dwelling in transitive constructions consistently expresses an increased salience of the Ground-[Location] participant.

\(^{363}\) Curiously, in his study of emphasis in BH, Muraoka never offers a definition of what he means by "emphasis" nor a theoretical framework that would support such a definition. His position that "emphasis" is more of a psychological phenomenon than a logical phenomenon certainly anticipates the outlook of CG.

\(^{364}\) Corollary A of Goldberg's Principle of No Synonymy mentioned earlier (3.1.1, n. 16) is clearly relevant on this point and is repeated here for convenience: "If two constructions are syntactically distinct and Semantically-synonymous, then they must not be Pragmatically-synonymous." *Constructions*, 67.
The motivation for the foregrounding of the [Location] participant is often attributable to narrative, discourse, or poetic concerns. When possible, these will be highlighted throughout the analysis.

According to Langacker, "Aspects of construal include the perspective from which a scene is viewed, the relative prominence accorded its various substructures, the effect of expectations and background assumptions, and so on."\(^{365}\) The construal operation relevant to verbs of dwelling in transitive constructions is the "relative prominence accorded to its various substructures," in this case, the substructure [Location]. For verbs of dwelling, therefore, the transitive construction may be regarded as a focusing structure. However, Langacker's last mentioned construal operation, "background assumptions," is also relevant in that the transitive construction departs from the conventional grammatical representation of dwelling verbs, specifically the Prep [Location] construction.

5.3 Analysis of Verbs of Dwelling

5.3.1 ישב

5.3.1.1 Qal ישב

Qal ישב is the most basic BH verb of dwelling. It occurs approximately 770 times in the HB making it the most frequently attested dwelling verb (as well as one of the most frequently attested verbs) in the HB.\(^{366}\) Qal ישב may denote either the dynamic action of "sitting" or the

\(^{365}\) Langacker, "Grammatical Ramifications," 383.

\(^{366}\) A number of Ketib-Qere forms makes 770, the number given by HALOT, only approximate. Curiously, Accordance Bible Software tallies 930 hits for Qal ישב. Given the frequency of usage only a representative sample of the BH corpus was analyzed in depth. Specifically, I analyzed 300 occurrences of Qal ישב and supplemented relevant data points with more narrow searches of the HB via the Accordance database. This is in accord with the practices of CL in which a representative samplings of extraordinarily large number of citations may be used to draw conclusions. See Hanks, Lexical Analysis, 113-20.
state of "being seated." The dynamic/stative modulation of a posture verb like Qal יָשֹׁב accords with the behavior of similar verbs in cross-linguistic analyses. According to John Newman, "The dynamic postural meanings 'to sit oneself down', 'to move oneself into a standing position', and 'to lay oneself down' are closely connected semantically to the corresponding stative meanings and one and the same form may indicate either the dynamic or the stative meaning in languages."

Qal יָשֹׁב is also used to denote the more general action or state of "residing" or "dwelling" in a place or at a location. The relationship between the senses "sitting" and "dwelling/residing" is almost certainly a polysemantic metaphorical extension in which the postural sense "to sit" extends to the more general locative sense, "dwell" or "reside". A similar phenomenon is seen in the following English examples:

(102) a. The king sat on his throne. (active, telic)
   b. The king sat on this throne. (stative, atelic)
   c. The castle sat on the cliff for centuries. (stative, atelic)

GKC classifies Qal יָשֹׁב as exhibiting the transitivity alternation and cites the following as examples:

(103) a. Gen 4:20

He was the father of those who dwell in tents and amidst herds

367. BDB offers the following glosses, 1) "sit on," "sit down," 2) "remain, stay, tarry," and 3) "dwell." BDB, 443. Similarly HALOT, 444.


369. GKC §117bb, 370.
b. Ps 22:4

But you are the holy one, *one who inhabits (is seated on?)* the praises of Israel.

It is not at all clear, however, that GKC's examples do in fact construe the [Location] as an Obj. GKC's citations are only representative of a large number of instances in which Qal ישב is used as a participle in the construct state with the meaning, "the inhabitants of" or "the dwellers of" [Location]. The plural uses of participle Qal ישב (which unlike the singular are formally different in the masculine gender) suggests that [Dweller] nominal stand in a construct relationship to the [Location]: ישבים ("all the dwellers of the land," Josh 2:24). Though formally the same as non-construct forms, the singular forms of Qal ישב should also be regarded as constructs with the sense, "the dweller of" or "the one who dwells in/on/at." To my knowledge, Qal ישב never appears in an Obj [Location] construction. Nevertheless, the participant role alternation exhibited in patterns 1 and 3 below makes Qal ישב relevant for this study.

Pattern 1: [Dweller] ישב «

The unmodified intransitive usage of Qal ישב occurs infrequently. Of the 300 citations analyzed, it appears in the unmodified intransitive construction seven times. For our purposes, the various (and much more frequent) adverbial modifications of Qal ישב typically indicating

370. The orientation of the two nominals in construct create a Figure/Ground relationship in which the nomen regens profiles the Figure which is oriented relative to the nomen rectum Ground. This common construction shows an interesting alternation with prepositional construction: Qal ישב ptc + על/ב [Location]. Though outside the scope of this study, a comparison of these two constructions from a cognitivist perspective would be a fruitful line of inquiry.

371. This may very well be an historical accident and not evidence of a selectional restriction. If such a construction was permissible it would almost certainly exhibit the pragmatic emphatic function elucidated for the other dwelling verbs below. I am excluding finite forms in which the Obj [Location] is expressed by a pronominal suffix (e.g. Lev 18:25, 25:10; Num 13:32) as it is well known that pronominal suffixes are routinely substituted for PPs.
time or manner may be classified under pattern 1 as well. The following are representative of the range of usages:

(104) a. Gen 27:19 הִשָּׁבֵ֖ה אֶל־עָלָ֑מָה מְשִׁ֖רְתָּ
   Arise, sit and eat of my game.

b. Jer 8:14 יָ֖שֶׁב אֶל־עָלָ֑מָה מְשִׁ֖רְתָּ
   Why are we sitting? Let us gather together.

c. Mal 3:3 יָ֖שֶׁב אֶל־עָלָ֑מָה מְשִׁ֖רְתָּ
   He will sit as a refiner and purifier of silver.

d. 1 Sam 12:11 יָ֖שֶׁב אֶל־עָלָ֑מָה מְשִׁ֖רְתָּ
   And you dwelt in safety.

It is clear from these examples that Qal ישׁב may be used either in the dynamic (Gen 27:19) or stative (Jer 8:14) senses of "sitting," or, less often, "dwelling" (Deut 1:46). The intransitive construction that profiles the [Dweller] participant as the Subj focuses on the action of "sitting" or "dwelling" without regard to the either unimportant or contextually inferable [Location] in which that action takes place. There is no Figure/Ground orientation (at least not at the level of event participants). The [Dweller] is not oriented spatially relative to a Ground [Location] but is simply construed as an Agent performing an action.

Pattern 2: [Location] Prep [Dweller] ישׁב «

By far the most common usage of Qal ישׁב is in combination with a Prep + Obj. As indicated above (see n. 327) Qal ישׁב may collocate with a Prep (את or עם) with a comitative sense in which the [Dweller] is oriented relative to another [Dweller] or [Company].

372. Though distinct, the locative and comitative senses are conceptually related as [Company] participant may be an extension of the more basic concept "[Location] at which one dwells."
common, though is the use of Qal ישׁב + Prep [Location] construction in which the [Dweller] is oriented relative to a [Location]. The following are representative:

(105) a. Gen 13:12  
Abram dwelt in the land of Canaan.

b. Lev 25:18  
And you shall dwell upon the land in safety.

c. Isa 6:1  
And I saw the Lord, seated upon a throne.

d. Lev 14:8  
And he shall dwell outside his tent for seven days.

e. 1 Kings 2:19  
And she sat at his right.

The selection of preposition is motivated to a large extent by the qualities of the [Location] and the perception (or conception) of the [Dweller]'s relation to it. However, construal is also undoubtedly at work as the selection of different Preps evokes different image schemas. Compare, for example, Gen 13:12 and Lev 25:18 in which the former evokes the image schema of a point within a more or less bounded region, and the latter evokes the image schema of a point (or multiple points in this case) residing or resting upon a more or less planar surface. Of the 300 occurrences of Qal ישׁב analyzed for this study, 175 (58%) were modified by a Prep. The Prep [Location] construction should be regarded as a conventional or unmarked usage of Qal ישׁב.
Pattern 3: [Location] יישב «

Qal יישב exhibits a participant role alternation in the intransitive construction. On multiple occasions (11 according to BDB, 12 according to HALOT, see n. 373 below) the intransitive construction profiles the [Location] participant as the Subj as in the following:

(106) a. Isa 13:20 לֹא תְּכַסֵּב לֵבָנָה

And it (Babylon) will not be inhabited ever again.

b. Jer 17:25 וַתֵּשֶׁב יְרוּרִים לֵבָנָה

And this city will be inhabited forever.

c. Ezek 26:20 בְּמִלָּה אַשָּׁר תְּכַסֵּב

in order that you will not be inhabited.

d. Joel 4:20 בְּמִלָּה לֵבָנָה

But Judah shall be inhabited forever.

Generally, BH lexica and grammars render the Subj [Location] construction as a passive or medio-passive. For example, HALOT simply offers the gloss, "to be inhabited" without any comment on the unconventionality of the participant role profiled. BDB, however, makes a compelling suggestion for the meaning (and perhaps the origin) of Qal יישב in the Subj [Location] construction: "of a land or city, sit, abide seated in its place, fig. for be inhabited." The notion that the Subj [Location] construction is the result of metaphorical (BDB's figurative) extension is certainly plausible. The suggestion appears to be that a [Location] participant like "a city" or "a land" is depicted as "sitting" with the connotation of "sitting and doing what is proper to it or appropriate for it to do." For a city to "sit" would therefore mean that the city is "inhabited."

373. BDB, 443. They cite the following: Jer 17:6, 25, 50:13, 39; Ezek 26:20, 29:11, 36:35; Isa 13:20; Zec 2:8, 9:5, and 14:11.
BDB's proposal is insightful, plausible, and certainly consistent with the cognitivist understanding of language usage and development, especially development through metaphorical extension. One difficulty that may be registered against this view, however, is that Qal יָשָׁב in the Subj [Dweller] intransitive construction — which, according to BDB's analysis would be the source of the metaphor for the Subj [Location] construction — appears at least in Jer 8:14 ((104)b above) to imply the opposite, namely, that "to sit" means, "to sit not doing what is appropriate, proper, or desirable."

I believe a better explanation may be found at the level of the construction itself. The Subj [Location] alternation may be analyzed as an example of what Langacker calls a setting-subject construction.\(^\text{374}\) In setting-subject constructions, the Subj is more of a focal element than a participant; the [Location] therefore operates at a more schematic level. About the subject-setting construction, Langacker says, "conferring trajector status on the setting in which a process unfolds has the inherent result of heightening the prominence of the setting-process relationship itself."\(^\text{375}\) He offers the following examples.\(^\text{376}\)

(107) a. Thursday saw yet another startling development.

b. Independence Hall has witnessed many historic events.

In the Subj [Location] constructions of Qal יָשָׁב, the [Location] is more generally (or schematically) the Setting in which an activity occurs, namely the activity of "dwelling" or "residing." An English example perhaps conceptually closer to BH Qal יָשָׁב is the English verb sleep which may appear in the Subj [Location] construction as in: The hotel only sleeps twenty

\(^{\text{374}}\)Langacker, *FOCG* II, 346.

\(^{\text{375}}\)Langacker, *FOCG* II, 346. Interestingly, Langacker argues that the setting-subject construction trades on the "container-content" image schema. He says, "this 'container-content' relation between the setting and what happens within it automatically becomes a central facet of the processual profile when the 'container' is made the primary figure." *FOCG* II, 346.

\(^{\text{376}}\)Langacker, *FOCG* II, 346.
people, or The great room can seat the entire graduating class. Rivka Halevy has analyzed the Subj [Location] construction in Hebrew (both biblical and modern) from a cognitive and constructionist perspective. Highlighting the differences of her constructionist approach from a generative or lexical-projectionist approach, she says,

Dowty claims that the location-subject construction is a lexical derivation, analogous to rules of word formation on the one hand and to processes of lexical semantic extension and metaphor on the other. In my opinion, the difference in meaning between these constructions is constructionally determined, and it is not necessary to look for a basic and extended or derived construction. 377

The Subj [Location] in the intransitive construction, in this view, should be regarded as an emphatic structure. It increases the salience of the Setting which is characterized by a certain activity or action, in this case, the action of "dwelling" or "inhabiting." It also changes the perspective via an alternate image schema. Instead of the conventional use of Qal יָשָׂב in which a Figure is located within a Ground (or, [Contents] is located within a [Container]), the Ground [Container]/[Location] is construed as the Setting which is characterized by the action designated by the verb.

5.3.1.2 Niph יָשָׂב

Niph יָשָׂב occurs eight times, six of which are participles and two of which are finite forms in the perfect conjugation. The following are representative of the participial usage:

377. Halevy, "Understanding the Locative Alternation," 44 (emphasis mine). Though I will argue below that Halevy's thesis regarding what she calls the "swarm-drip alternation" is inadequate for explaining verbs of fullness (see chapter 6, 6.3.1.1, pattern 3 below), her general insight about the meaning of Subj [Location] constructions is sound and, I believe, applicable to BH dwelling verbs. Similarly, Langacker says, "There being no derivational element, the construction itself shifts primary focal prominence to the encompassing location. It thus portrays the location as hosting the activity, as well as exhibiting the associated perceptual properties." Cognitive Grammar: Basic Introduction, 388.
(108) a. Exod 16:35

Until they came to a *habitable* land.

b. Jer 6:8

Lest I make you a desolation, an *uninhabitable* land.

The Niph perf of שָׁבׁי appears in the following:

(109) a. Ezek 26:19

When I make you a city laid waste, like cities which are not *inhabited*.

b. Ezek 36:10

And the cities are *inhabited*, and those that are laid waste are rebuilt.

In contrast to intransitive Qal שָׁבָּה in the Subj [Location] construction, the Niphal construction construes the [Location] as a participant in the event. Specifically, Nip מִיתָה construes the [Location] as a Patient affected by the "dwelling" or "inhabiting" of agentive [Dwellers]. The passive construction backgrounds the Agent participants, but the notion of AGENCY is nevertheless present in a way that it is not in the Qal Subj [Location] construction. In Ezek 36:10, for example, "the cities" are construed as the Patient [Container]/[Location] affected by the action of agentive [Dwellers], though the [Dweller] participant is not overtly specified.

5.3.2

5.3.2.1 Qal מִיתָה

HALOT identifies three distinct homophonous verbs with the root מִיתָה. It is only the most commonly attested verbal root that pertains to this study. HALOT's root מִיתָה occurs 80 times in the HB. Its basic sense in the Qal is "to dwell as an alien or dependent." The focus of the verb,

378. HALOT, 184. BDB offers the glosses, "to sojourn," and "to abide," 158. מִיתָה appears in the Hithpolel stem twice, though Jer 30:23 should probably be emended to מִיתָה ("whirl," cf. Jer 23:19). The one clear example in 1 Kgs 17:20 appears to have the expected reflexive sense: מִיתָה ("the woman) whom I have
therefore, is the status of the Agent [Dweller], specifically, that the [Dweller] is a non-native resident. In Qal גור, the time (length of stay) and manner of sojourning are not lexicalized.

Pattern 1: [Dweller] גור «

Occurring only five times, the unmodified intransitive use of Qal גור with Subj [Dweller] is rare. Interestingly, it only appears in non-indicative moods with reference to the activity of sojourning (with inf abs, Gen 19:19) or the one who engages in the activity (with ptc used substantively). The participial usage in Num 15:15 (and possibly Job 28:4 and Isa 5:17) may have a semi-technical meaning referring to one who has the legal status of "resident alien." This accords with the unique focus of the verb being that of the "status of [Dweller]." It refers in each case to one who dwells with the status (whether legal or social) of a sojourner or non-native.


Combined, the Prep [Location] and adverbial שׁם constructions make up over half of all occurrences of Qal גור. These patterns represent the canonical action of "sojourning," that is, a Subj [Dweller] (typically human) resides as a sojourner in or at a [Location]. Like Qal ישיב sojourned myself with her"). Though caution needs to be exercised when only one data point is available, the use of Hithpolel גור in 1 Kgs 17:20 may be a creative exploitation in which Elijah is claiming to have imposed himself upon the widow of Zarephath. If this is the case, the verb has a causative-reflexive sense.

379. TDOT II, 443-449.
380. The parallelism of Jer. 49:18b (ר"א: ולך עִקְבָּה גִּבֵּרְךָ לָא גִּבֵּרְךָ הָעָמָדְךָ: ר"א: ולך עִקְבָּה גִּבֵּרְךָ לָא גִּבֵּרְךָ הָעָמָדְךָ) suggests a correspondence between the basic semantic function of the adverb שׁם and the preposition ב + suffix where both references are to a [Location]. The two constructions will be combined for purposes of analysis. Cf. Jer 50:40.
381. 44 occurrences, 55% of total usages.
above, the image schema is that of a Figure located within a boundary (Ground), the boundary being some sort of geographical or political entity. The following are representative:

(110) a. Gen 20:1

\[\text{And he sojourned in Gerar.}\]

b. Ps 15:1

\[\text{Who will sojourn in your tent?}\]

c. 2 Kgs 8:2

\[\text{And she and her household went and sojourned in the land of the Philistines seven years.}\]

Pattern 3: \[[\text{Human}\ Group\] \[\text{בתוך}\ [\text{Dweller}]\]

\[\text{גור}\ collocates with \text{בתוך} + \text{pl pron suf} 12\ times. It occurs mostly in texts traditionally ascribed to the Priestly source or written within the priestly tradition (e.g. Ezek 37:22).}^{382}\]

Pattern 3 offers an interesting contrast with pattern 2. While the [Location] Ground in pattern 2 is always an inanimate spatial entity with a more or less identifiable boundary (legal, geographical, etc.), the Ground in pattern 3 always refers to an animate entity, namely a group of people. The image schema here is not a point located within a boundary (pattern 2), but a point situated among a mass or collection of points. The single point functions as the Figure and the others the Ground against which the Figure is profiled. The following are representative:

(111) a. Lev 17:10

\[\text{Or from the sojourner who sojourns in your midst.}\]

b. Josh 20:9

\[\text{For every Israelite and for the sojourner who sojourns in your midst.}\]

---

382.Exod 12:49; Lev 16:29, 17:8, 10, 12, 13, 18:26; Num 15:26, 29, 19:10; Josh 20:9; Ezek 47:22.
Pattern 3 may be analyzed as eliciting a Gestalt shift from the conventional boundary focused construction of pattern 2 to the [Human\text{Group}] focused construction.

Pattern 4: [Companion] \text{גור} \ « / [Companion] \text{ש} [Dweller] \text{גור} \ «

Given the limited data (7x with \text{פי}; and 5x with \text{כש}) the semantic or pragmatic difference between the two comitative prepositions is difficult to discern. Generally, both indicate the notion of accompaniment and naturally the nominal governed by the Prep is always animate and typically [Human\text{Group}] (except Isa 11:6).

(112) Num 9:14

\text{וגר} את \text{סנהפ} \text{כש} \« \text{כש} \« חמה \« חמה

And when a sojourner \textit{sojourns} with you and would keep Passover to the Lord

(113) Gen 32:5

כֵּן \text{כשא} \text{נופל} \« \כשא \כשא \כשא

Thus says Jacob, your servant, "I have \textit{sojourned} with Laban."

There is no clear pattern to the distribution of these collocations. Both, for example, appear within the same book: \text{כש} occurs in Lev 19:34 and \text{כש} in Lev 25:6, 45.

Pattern 5: [Location] [Dweller] \text{גור} \ «

Qal \text{גור} appears four times (twice in Isa 33:14) in the Obj [Location] construction.\textsuperscript{383} The rational for the translations offered here will be discussed below.

(114) a. Isa 33:14

כַּמֶּךָ נִרְבֶּךָ אֲשֶׁר \text{נופל} \כַּמֶּךָ מִרְיָמָה \כַּמֶּךָ מִרְיָמָה

Such a consuming fire, who \textit{could stay in it} for us?

And such a devouring blaze, who \textit{could stay in it} for us?

\textsuperscript{383}I am omitting Ps 5:5 from this discussion since the pronominal suffix may be regarded as a substitute for a PP: פֶּלֶט אֲלֵיכֶּם אַלֵיכֶּם אֲלֵיכֶּם אַלֵיכֶּם ("For you are not a God who delights in wickedness, evil cannot abide with you").
b. Ps 120:5

Woe to me! For it is in Meshech that I sojourn,
I dwell with the tents of Kedar.

c. Judg 5:17

Gilead stayed beyond the Jordan,
and Dan, with ships why did you sojourn?

The Objs in the transitive constructions express [Locations] in, at, or with which one
could potentially "sojourn" or "reside as a non-native" (i.e. "a consuming fire," "an everlasting
the Objs notionally, filling in "in," "with," or "at" depending on the nature of the Obj [Location].
For example, NRSV renders Ps 120:5, "Woe to me that I am an alien in Meshech" (similarly
KJV, ESV, NIV, though JPS says, "with Meshech"). JPS translates Isa 33:14, "Who of us can
dwell with the devouring fire: Who of us can dwell with the never-dying blaze?" (similarly KJV,
NRSV, RSV, ESV, NIV). Judg 5:17 is rendered by NRSV, "Gilead stayed beyond the Jordan, and
Dan, why did he abide with the ships?" (similarly, NIV, ESV, JPS though KJV and NASB have
"in ships"). However, as demonstrated above, BH has a conventional way of expressing both the
locative and the comitative senses by means of Preps. This raises the question of the motivation
for the uses of Qal אֲנָה יִנָּה in the Obj [Location] construction.

I propose that rendering the [Location] participant in the canonical DO position increases
its salience and thereby emphasizes or foregrounds it. The [Location] element typically regarded
as a circumstance of the action is made a more focally prominent participant in the action. A
comparable phenomenon may be seen in English cleft constructions. For example, "It is
Brookland that we are looking for, not Brooklyn!" The above translations are rendered with

384. I am grateful to Edward Cook for suggesting this parallel.
English cleft constructions to capture the intended emphasis or participant prominence of the Obj [Location] in the Qal רָמַה transitive construction.

The motivation for increasing salience or prominence of the [Location] participant is varied. In Ps 120, the psalmist is lamenting the violence and deceit that characterize the society in which he resides far from his homeland. After crying out to God for deliverance (v 2) he calls out a self-malediction "Woe to me! For it is in Meshech I sojourn" (v 5). Many commentators agree that Meshech is functioning as a symbolic location of great distance from Jerusalem. The psalmist's complaint, therefore, is not so much regarding his status as a resident alien, but his location and what it symbolizes, namely that he is far from land and temple. The increase of salience of the location Meshech may be understood as a literary or poetic device foregrounding the root cause of the psalmist's plight. As the first psalm in the collection known as the "Songs of Ascents" (תְּנִיהוּתְנִיהוּתִּי), the psalm situates the pilgrim far from the Jerusalem temple to which he will sojourn as the collection progresses.386

Isa 33:14 comes in the context of what appears to be a liturgical cycle in which the speaker calls on God to redress wrongs which is followed by God's announcement that he will indeed do so not just against Israel's wicked neighbors, but also to the wicked within Israel.

385. The mention of Meshech (in the far north) and Kedar (associated with the eastern tribes of the Arabian desert) has caused no shortage of explanations, emendations, and creative harmonizations. For a summary of the proposals, see, Leslie Allen, Psalms 101-150 (WBC 21: Waco, TX: Word, 1983), 146. The most common interpretation is to take the locations Meshech and Kedar as figurative for "alien, mysterious, far-off peoples." John Goldingay notes, "They might then simply stand for typical places where Judeans might live as a scattered people as a result of 'the' exile." Psalms 90-150 (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008), 452. Similarly Erhard Gerstenberger says, "It is futile to speculate about the historicity and geographical location of such hostile tribes. Arguing from the very nature of the psalm texts that were used by many people in succeeding generations,... one must admit that any possible reference to a concrete situation must have acquired symbolic value in order to stay meaningful to the users of the text." Psalms: Part 2 and Lamentations (FOTL 15; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 319.

386. For a discussion of the pilgrimage motif in the Songs of Ascents, see Loren D. Crow, The Songs of Ascents (Psalms 120-134): Their Place in Israelite History and Religion (SBLDS 148; Atlanta: Scholars, 1996).
herself.\textsuperscript{387} In Isa 33:14, the question, "who can stand in the holy presence of God and not be consumed?" is rhetorical. The implied answer, of course, is that no one "among us" or perhaps better, "for us" is able to sojourn \textit{with} or \textit{within} the devouring fire. The effect of the Obj [Location] construction is that it construes the "consuming fire" and the "devouring blaze" as more prominent or involved in the event. In this way the author foregrounds the character of Zion, creating a sort of parody of the traditional temple entrance liturgies (cf. Ps 15:1: 'your tent/your holy mountain;' Ps 24:3: 'the mountain of YHWH/ his holy place'.)\textsuperscript{388} What is typically an announcement of divine hospitality (with its implied invitation) has become an announcement of divine judgment, as Zion is construed as a "consuming fire" and "devouring blaze." Beuken says,

Zion is rendered functionally here as the place in which YHWH effects his judgment. This is accomplished on the basis of two metaphors. The first stems from the topic of judgment: 'devouring fire' (with respect to God: Exod 24:7; Num 16:35; Deut 4:24; 9:3; 32:22; I Kgs 18:38; ....) The second metaphor employs a place name: 'the everlasting burning flames' (עֵרְבֵּי מַקְדִּים), which refers to the hearth of the altar of the burnt offerings (Lev 6:2). The term \textit{עולם} is never used otherwise to designate the fact that fire remains burning. As such, it supports the metaphorical function of the term 'hearth' as a reference to YHWH (cf. Isa 9:6; 24:5; 32:14, 17; 34:10...).\textsuperscript{389}

Indeed, such a location (especially if, as Beuken suggests, it is a metonym for YHWH himself) would be conceived as more involved than the typical setting as it "consumes" and "devours" those who do not meet the ethical qualification listed in v 15 (i.e. "He who walks righteously and speaks uprightly, who despises the gain of oppressions, who shakes his hands, lest they hold a bribe," etc.)

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{387}For Isa 33:14 as part of an "entrance liturgy" see Wellem A. M. Beuken, \textit{Isaiah II} (HCOT; Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 267.
\item \textsuperscript{388}Beuken, \textit{Isaiah II}, 267.
\item \textsuperscript{389}Beuken, \textit{Isaiah II}, 267.
\end{itemize}
The denunciation of Dan for "sojourning with ships" in Judg 5:17 has proved a difficult crux for the interpretation of the Song of Deborah. Barry Webb summarizes the historical difficulty, specifically that "Dan did not have direct access to the seacoast, either in its original allotment in the south (1:34) or its later location in the north (ch 18)." Among the more compelling is Lawrence Stager's suggestion that the Danites were serving as clients on Phoenician ships while they were still in the south. After surveying the major opinions regarding the meaning of Judg 5:17b, Jack Sasson concludes, "I simply do not know what the poet wants us to learn about Dan and its relationship with ships." To be sure, understanding the foregrounding function of the Obj [Location] construction sheds little light on the historical situation that may have given rise to the poetry. However, it may be said that the poet's astonishment seems to be more connected to the [Location] of the Danites with or in ships than with their status as resident aliens.

5.3.3
5.3.3.1 Qal חנה

Appearing only in the Qal stem, חנה occurs 140 times in the HB with at least three distinct but related meanings. HALOT offers the following glosses: 1) to decline (towards evening), 2) encamp, and 3) to lay siege to (with על). Qal חנה may be distinguished from Qal גור in that it lexicalizes MANNER and perhaps TIME, rather than the Dweller-status. The MANNER

393. HALOT, 332. Similarly BDB, "to decline, bend down, encamp," 333.
element regards the dwelling structures, namely tents or more generally camps. The TIME
element, perhaps through conceptual association (encyclopedic knowledge) with the nature of "camps" or the activity of "camping" regards the length of dwelling as a relatively brief period of time.

Pattern 1: [Dweller] חנה «
With one exception, the unmodified intransitive use of Qal חנה is found only in Numbers. The following are representative of its range of usage:

(115) a. Num 9:23

At the command of the Lord they would encamp, and at the command of the Lord they would set out.

b. Num 2:17

Just as they encamp, thus they shall set out, each in his position, by their standards.

As seen in these above examples, the intransitive use of Qal חנה may denote either the dynamic action of pitching camp ((115)a) or the stative scenario of camping for a period of time ((115)b). The MANNER of encamping may regard the type of accommodations (typically tents or other temporary structures), or the length of stay (a short period of time, e.g. 1 Kgs 16:16).

Pattern 2: [Location] -ב [Dweller] חנה «
By far the most common construction, Qal חנה + Prep ב [Location] situates the Figure [Dweller] almost always within the Ground [Location]. Of the 140 occurrences, Qal חנה is modified by Prep ב + [Location] 73 times. The following are representative:

394. The plural participle occurs in 1 Kgs 16:16. The unmodified usage of Qal חנה occurs seven times in Numbers.
a. Exod 17:1
And they encamped in Rephidim.

b. Josh 5:12
And the people of Israel encamped in Gilgal.

c. 2 Sam 23:13
And a band of the Philistines was encamped in the Valley of Rephaim.

On rare occasions Qal חנה + ב may express [Location] at which one encamps as in 1 Sam 29:1:
("And Israel was encamping at the spring which is in Jezreel").

Here there is significant semantic overlap with Qal חנה + Prep על (see pattern 3).

Pattern 3: [Location] על [Dweller] חנה «

There are clearly two distinct but related senses of the Qal חנה + על [Location] construction. The first image schema is of that of encamping at, rather than within, a [Location]. From the following examples it can be seen that the [Location] governed by על is an identifiable reference point (presumably of any shape or size) by which a group of any size may dwell as a camp.

(117) a. Num 33:10
And they camped at the Sea of Reeds.

b. 1 Kgs 16:15
The troops were camping at Gibbethon

c. 1 Sam 4:1
And they camped at Ebenezer

The second related sense of Qal חנה + על [Location] construction is that of camping against a [Human Group], usually an army or, metonymically, a city. For example:
So Israel arose in the morning and camped *against* Gibeah.

This sense "to camp against," however, comes from the polysemy of Prep **עַל** and not from a modulation of the sense of the verb Qal **חָנָה**.

**Pattern 4: [Location] [Dweller]**

Qal **חָנָה** occurs in a transitive construction twice, 2 Sam 17:26 and Gen 33:18.395

(119) 2 Sam 17:26

And it was in the land of Gilead that Israel and Absalom *encamped*.

As mentioned in chapter 3 (see (21) above), translations of 2 Sam 17:26 uniformly render the Figure/Ground relation in 2 Sam 17:26 with the same sense as the Prep **עַל** + [Location] construction: "The Israelites and Absalom encamped in the land of Gilead" (NRSV, same or similar, KJV, JPS, RSV, ASV, ESV, NIV, cf. 1 Sam 4:1). The context of 2 Sam 17:26 is Absalom's military coup and seizure of his father's throne in Jerusalem. Chapter 17 records Absalom's pursuing King David east of the Jordan "with all the men of Israel" (v 24).

The effect of the syntactic elevation of the [Location] to the DO is that it foregrounds the [Location] of Absalom's encampment. There may be two reasons for this, not mutually exclusive. The eventual clash between the armies of David and Absalom will take place in the "forest of Ephraim" (מִשְׁמַרְתָּא, 2 Sam 18:6). Increasing the salience of the [Location] participant may serve to clarify or emphasize that Absalom's encampment was in the land of

_________

395 I am excluding Isa 29:1 from this Obj [Location] pattern as its syntax is highly irregular. The syntax of **קִרְיָה** is unusual in that it places the noun **קִרְיָה** in construct with the 3ms finite verbal form **חָנָה** (in pause). While uncommon, this phenomenon is not unattested. GKC speaks about the construct state governing independent sentences which "virtually stand in the construct state (in *nomen regens*) in a sort of genitive relation." Other examples include, Exod 4:13 :הָרָבָּה **כִּי** **כִּי** **כִּי** ("by the hand of him you will send."), and Job 18:21, **כִּי** **כִּי** **כִּי** ("and this is the place of him who does not know God"). GKC §130d, 422. Cf. Num 23:3; Jer 48:36; Ps 16:3, 65:5, 81:6; Job 29:16; Lam 1:14.
Gilead though the battle will take place in the forest of Ephraim. It may also serve a particular narratival function of creating a sense of suspense. ❚“the land of Gilead”❚ almost certainly refers to the region immediately south (possibly, though less likely, immediately north) of Mahanaim, the place where in v 24 David and his army are said to have stopped to rest. The reader is given the notice (also in v 24) that Absalom and his army crossed the Jordan river and then in v 26 that "Israel and Absalom encamped in the land of GILEAD!" Many readers/hearers familiar with the geography of the Transjordan would have been aware of the proximity of Absalom's army to David's and thus the narrative's suspense would have been heightened.

The second occurrence of Qal נָחַת in a transitive construction is found in Gen 33:18.

(120) Gen 33:18

And Jacob arrived safely at the city of Shechem which is in the land of Canaan — having come from Padan-Aram — and it was was in front of the city that he encamped.

Jacob’s setting up camp in the region directly in front of Shechem is significant within the larger flow of the patriarchal narratives. Jacob imitates his grandfather Abraham by purchasing Canaanite territory for his family (Gen 33:19; cf. Gen 23:9). He erects an altar for the worship of El-Elohe-Israel (v 20). Also the presence of Jacob and his family before the city of Shechem provides the narrative backdrop for the subsequent drama of Dina’s rape and Simeon and Levi’s brutal revenge. Furthermore, this territory will later be the site in which the bones of Joseph would be buried in the land of Canaan (Josh 24:23). The foregrounding of the territory before the city of Shechem almost certainly has a narratival motivation of drawing the reader/hearer’s attention to the significance of the territory to which Jacob has just arrived.
5.3.4 Sha von

5.3.4.1 Qal שון

Qal occurs 111 times in the HB and exhibits significant semantic overlap with Qal ישב, as is evident from the parallelism in Job 29:25:

(121) Job 29:25

אֲשֵׁר לֶאָשֵׁר לֹא עָשִׂיתָם שָׁכַן עַל הַכוּרָה

I sat as a chief,

and I dwell like a king among troops.

BDB offers the glosses, "to settle down, abide, dwell."\(^{396}\) In contrast to Qal ישב which lexicalizes the MANNER "dwelling in tents/camps" (with the associated temporal notion "for a brief period of time"), Qal שון is also structure focused, but lexicalizes dwelling in more permanent structures (with the associated temporal notion, "for a longer period of time").\(^{397}\) Like Qal ישב which developed its "dwelling" sense from a more basic postural sense ("to sit"), so too Qal שון developed from the sense "dwelling in a permanent structure" to the more general sense of "to dwell" or "to reside in" a [Location].

Langacker calls this process semantic "bleaching." He says, "A verb like SIT or STAND profiles an imperfective process with two relational components: the notion of the trajector exhibiting a certain posture and spatial orientation; and the notion of the trajector remaining in a single spatial location. 'Bleaching out' of the posture specification leaves behind the notion of being in a certain place."\(^{398}\) The same process occurred with Qal שון resulting in the semantic overlap of the two verbs with the sense, "to dwell" or at times even more general, "to be/exist in [Location]."\(^{399}\)

---

396. BDB, 1015. Similarly HALOT, 1497.

397. See HALOT, 1497.


399. About semantic bleaching of posture verbs like sit and stand, Langacker maintains that an extreme form of
Pattern 1: [Dweller]

Occurring only four times, the unmodified intransitive usage of Qal שָׁכֵן is rare. God is
the Subj in one instance (Ps 68:19) and human beings in the other three (Nah 3:18; Pss 55:7;
102:29). More common is the occurrence of Qal שָׁכֵן with an adverbial modifier indicating the
MANNER of dwelling (e.g. לָבֶטַח, "securely," Jer 23:6; Jer 33:16; Ps 16:19; Num 23:9; Mic 7:14) or the period of dwelling (e.g. וָדוֹר עַד־דוֹר, "to all generations," Isa 13:20; Jer
50:39).

Pattern 2: [Location] Prep [Dweller]

Qal שָׁכֵן collocates with a number of different prepositions most of which serve to
establish a Figure/Ground relationship. The Figure [Dweller] is oriented spatially relative to a
Ground [Location]. The most frequent occurrence of Qal שָׁכֵן + Prep construction is with the
Prep -ב; it occurs 28 times (25% of all occurrences of Qal שָׁכֵן). The conventional usage of the
Qal שָׁכֵן construction is to situate an animate Figure relative to a Ground; typically an animate
being within or at a [Location] indicated by the Prep. The following are representative of the
conventional usage:

(122) Gen 26:2

Do not go down to Egypt; dwell in the land of which I tell you.

(123) Gen 14:13

and he was dwelling at the oaks of Mamre

The prototypical [Dweller] is animate, typically human (e.g.122-23 above) though the
Deity (e.g. Isa 8:18, Ps 74:2) and animals (e.g. Isa 34:17; Job 37:8) are also well attested.

bleaching may result in its functioning as an existential predicate: "Further attenuation, in the form of
abstracting away from the idea of a particular spatial location (and even physical space), results in an existential
Interestingly, whenever YHWH is said "to dwell" in or at a [Location] it is always expressed with Qal שכן and never Qal ישב.

While conceptually similar, there is a notable difference in the usage of Qal שכן + Prep and Qal ישב + Prep ב constructions. The Prep ב construction never takes a [Human Group] as the Obj of the Prep, but rather always takes a [Location]. In contrast, the Prep בתוכו construction shows a marked preference for a [Human Group] as the Obj of the preposition. Exod 29:45 is typical:

(124) Exod 29:45

שכן בתוכו, במבורא, אני ישות

And I will dwell in the midst of the people of Israel.

For the Qal שכן + Prep בתוכו construction, God is typically the Subj. In fact, there is only one instance in which a [Human Group] is said to dwell in the midst of a [Location].

(125) Zech 8:8

שכן בתוכו, יושב, הם יושבין

and they will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem.

This unusual collocation might be an allusion to God's promise in Zech 8:3 where God says: יושב בתוכו, יושב, יושבין יושבין ("and I will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem"). If this is correct, the author is making a creative parallel between God and Israel, depicting Israel as engaging in the same type of action as God, namely that of "dwelling in the midst of" Jerusalem.

Pattern 3: [Location] [Dweller] שכן «

The Obj [Location] construction occurs 17 times out of 111 instances of Qal שכן, making up 15% of total usages. It clusters mostly, though not exclusively in poetic texts including Isaiah, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Micah (Jer 17:6 and Deut 12:5 are prose). Interestingly, the

400 I am excluding inf Qal שכן in Deut 12:5 as the status of the Obj indicated by the pronominal suffix on לושב may be either the syntactic DO or Prep Obj.
conventional dates for most of the texts featuring the Obj [Location] construction are toward the middle or end of the compositional period of the biblical literature.\textsuperscript{401} This is evidence against the idea that the construction is a remnant of an older form that is slowly being replaced by the Prep [Location] construction.\textsuperscript{402}

While it could be argued that the authors are archaizing, the fact that few if any demonstrably early texts exhibit this form suggests that such archaic usages were unknown if they existed at all. Furthermore, the various usages of Qal שָׁכן by the same author or within the same books suggests that the Obj [Location] construction is not a dialectal variant. For example, the Obj [Location] construction is found in Isa 33:16 and Job 15:28, and the Prep [Location] construction in Isa 32:16 and Job 37:8. In fact, Jer 17:6 exhibits both the Obj [Location] and the Prep [Location] construction in the same verse. Jer 17:6 is striking in this regard and well summarizes the issue in question:

(126) Jer 17:6

\textit{And parched places he shall dwell in the wilderness.}

Semantically, both the Prep [Location] and the Obj [Location] construction evoke the same image schema and appear to construe the relationship of the event participants in an identical manner. The difference between the constructions, therefore, lies in the area of pragmatics, namely salience or emphasis. The Obj [Location] construction in Jer 17:6 increases the salience of the "parched places" (שָׁכן) that the ungodly will inhabit within the greater [Location] of the wilderness. The emphatic sense accounts for most if not all of the uses of Qal שָׁכן in the Obj [Location] transitive construction. The following are representative:

\textsuperscript{401} The sole exception is Deut 12:5 which, though conventionally dated to the Josianic period, may come from a much earlier source. Deut 12:5, however, is replete with textual difficulties.

\textsuperscript{402} Contra Kinberg, "Notes," 8, 10.
(127) a. Isa 33:16

As for him, it is in high places that he will dwell,
A stronghold of rocks will be his defense.

b. Ps 65:5

Blessed is the one whom you choose,
and bring near that in your courts he may dwell.

c. Ps 68:7

Nevertheless, as for the the rebellious, it is a parched land that they shall dwell in.

d. Ps 94:17

For in a little while, it is in silence that my soul shall dwell.

Like Qal שלך, when Qal שלך appears as a plural participle it is almost always in a construct relationship with [Location]. The one instance of an absolute form (Jer 25:24) is modified by Prep [Location]. Singular participles of Qal שלך are likewise best interpreted as construct relationships with the sense, "the one who dwells in/on/at [Location]." For example:

(128) a. Ps 135:21

Blessed be the Lord from Zion,
the dweller of Jerusalem.

Though the possessive sense of the construct relation is plausible for the following instances, some occurrences of nominals accompanying Qal שלך ptc's are better rendered adverbially. The adverbial reading is likely the sense of the following:

(129) a. Isa 33:5

The Lord is exalted, for he dwells on high (lit. highly).

b. Isa 57:15

For thus says the one who is high, the exalted one who dwells forever.¹⁰³

¹⁰³JPS translation adopts the adverbial sense. Cf. the ESV, "The one who is high, and lifted up, who inhabits eternity."
As noted earlier (see Intro (1)), the relation of the Subj and Obj in Prov 8:12 has presented difficulty for translation and interpretation. Ehrlich, Kuhn, and BHS suggest emending the MT to 'כְּנֶנְתִּי' ('prudence is my neighbor'). The MT, however, is supported by the LXX: ἐγὼ ἤ σοφία κατεσκήνωσα βουλήν. The following are representative of the [Dweller]/[Location] image schemas offered by translations:

(130) KJV: I, wisdom, dwell with prudence
NIV: I, wisdom, dwell together with prudence
RSV: I, wisdom, dwell in prudence
NRSV: I, wisdom, live with prudence
ESV: I, wisdom, dwell with prudence
JPS: I, Wisdom, live with Prudence
Luth1545: Ich, Weisheit, wohne bei der Klugheit

The translations can basically be divided into those that render the Obj as [Human] (personified like Wisdom) with the basic meaning "in the company of," and those that express the Obj as a [Location] within which Wisdom dwells. The JPS is unique in making the interpretive move of capitalizing both Wisdom and Prudence, indicating that the translators believe כְּנֶנְתִּי to be a personification of Prudence with whom Wisdom dwells as a companion or friend. In his commentary, Roland Murphy equivocates in his treatment of the expression. In his translation, Murphy renders Prov 8:12, "I, Wisdom dwell with prudence" (emphasis mine), though in his commentary he says, "Literally, Wisdom claims to 'inhabit,' or to live with, prudence". Needless to say, these two alternatives represent different conceptual structuring of the Figure and Ground.

The view adopted here, that the transitive construction of verbs of dwelling has a


405. The RSV, NRSV include a note indicating the uncertainty or obscurity of the Heb.

focusing or emphatic function does not solve the issue of participant orientation or image schema. What can be said, however, is that every other Obj accompanying Qal שַׁכָּן in a transitive construction expresses the participant role [Location]. [Company] is never expressed in this construction. This strongly suggests that הָנִּמָּנָה in Prov 8:12 should also be regarded as a [Location], especially since such a rendering is perfectly intelligible. Together with the theory adopted here regarding the emphatic function of the transitive construction, Prov 8:12 may be translated as follows:

(131) Prov 8:12: אֲנַיִּי הָאֵיֵיתָה יִתְנַשֵּׁא נַתְנָא לַכְּשָׁנָה אֲנַיִּי הָאֵיֵיתָה יִתְנַשֵּׁא הָאֵיֵיתָה שָׁנָה אֲנַיִּי הָאֵיֵיתָה יִתְנַשֵּׁא

I am wisdom, it is prudence that I inhabit,
and I find knowledge and discretion.

This focus on Wisdom's residence makes good sense within the larger context of the proverbial instructions that make up chapters 1-9. Personified wisdom's house will be the focus of Prov 9:1-6 as Wisdom is described as building her house of seven hewn pillars (9:1). The "simple" (יִתְרְפָּא) and "those lacking sense" (בְּשֵׁרְמֶש) are invited to "turn in here" (יְנָהֵמ רִיֵּמ) to Wisdom's abode to enjoy her hospitality (vv 4-5). On this reading, Prov 8:12 foregrounds the nature or character of Wisdom's abode, namely "prudence" (רִמֵּנָה).

There is one further aspect of Qal שַׁכָּן in the transitive construction that must be explored. Commenting on Prov 8:12, William Brown says,

Scholars have deemed this a difficult verse, given the verb שָׁנַן, "to abide," which seems inappropriate semantically and lacks a prepositional object. Elsewhere the term denotes an enduring, unassailable relationship, such as with the land (2:21, also without a preposition!). The wayward woman, on the other hand, does not abide at home (7:11). Such language vividly expresses the close correspondence between wisdom and prudence, a relationship in which wisdom's disciple must also share. 407

Similarly, Michael V. Fox, though not referring to the construction per se, suggests a

possible semantic nuance to the construction: "Wisdom does not say that she is cunning, but that she 'inhabits' cunning; in other words, she has an abiding connection to it but is not precisely equated with it." Both Brown and Fox express what they perceive to be at least a connotation (if not denotation) of Qal שֶׁכֶן in Prov 8:12, namely that the relationship expressed by the [Dweller] and [Location] is of a more permanent or abiding quality.

The sense of an "abiding connection" between [Dweller] and [Location] may also be the motivation for the following instances of Qal שֶׁכֶן in the Obj [Location] construction:

(132) a. Ps 37:3

חָיְתָה בְּשֵׁהָרָה לְשֵׁהָרָה שֶׁכֶּן שֶׁכֶּן לְשֵׁהָרָה שֶׁכֶּן

Trust in the Lord, do good,
\textit{dwell in the land}, and befriend faithfulness.

b. Prov 2:21

סֻפָּר שֶׁכֶּן שֶׁכֶּן שֶׁכֶּן שֶׁכֶּן שֶׁכֶּן שֶׁכֶּן שֶׁכֶּן שֶׁכֶּן

For the upright will \textit{dwell in the land},
and the blameless will remain in it.

c. Prov 10:30

חָיְתָה בְּשֵׁהָרָה לְשֵׁהָרָה שֶׁכֶּן שֶׁכֶּן שֶׁכֶּן שֶׁכֶּן שֶׁכֶּן שֶׁכֶּן שֶׁכֶּן שֶׁכֶּן

The righteous will never be shaken,
and the wicked will \textit{not dwell in the land}.

The connection between the concepts LOCATION and POSSESSION has long been recognized though a satisfactory linguistic explanation has often proved elusive. Cognitivists have explained the connection with reference to, among other things, image schemas and metaphorical extension. I would like to propose the latter as a possible explanation for the "abide permanently" sense of some uses of Qal שֶׁכֶּן in the transitive construction. POSSESSION trades on the locative image schema which locates one entity with or at another entity. Through


metaphorical extension, those who engage in the action of "being at" a [Location] for a long period of time may be conceived as possessing that [Location]. This sense would foreground both the **TIME** and **MANNER** aspect of the verb of Qal יָשָׁב, both of which express the notions of permanence. The expression of such a close and permanent relationship between [Dweller] and [Location] motivates the foregrounding of the [Location] in a transitive construction. In this view, the permanence of the relationship is thereby highlighted. The conception of a permanent or abiding connection between [Dweller] and [Location] is what motivates (though not requires or determines) the expression of the dwelling scenario with the transitive construction.

This explanation is not at odds with the emphatic sense of verbs of dwelling in the transitive construction. Rather, it may be regarded as supplementing it. The [Location] is still conceptually emphasized, but emphasized for the purpose of expressing a more symmetrical (though not perfectly symmetrical) relationship between the [Dweller] and [Location] participants.

5.4 Conclusions

For two of the four verbs classified as Verbs of Dwelling (Qal חָנה and Qal גָּרָה) the transitive construction is incredibly rare. For one, Qal ישָׁב, it is non-existent (though presumably possible). Qal ישָׁב rather exhibits the related phenomenon of participant role alternation in the Subj position. For Qal יָשָׁב, the transitive construction is much more frequent.

The prototypical action of dwelling is represented by the canonical Prep [Location] constructions, most typically with ב. The Prep [Location] construction should be regarded as the unmarked construction for verbs of dwelling. For most dwelling verbs, however, the transitive

---

410 So Prov 8:12 may express both the emphatic notion of foregrounding the [Location], but also expressing an abiding connection between the two participants.
construction should be considered a secondary norm based on its frequency and distribution.

When [Location] is expressed as the Obj of a dwelling, the [Location] participant is being construed as more patient-like in the sense that its status is made more salient, and its relation to the Figure Dweller more prominent.

In these cases, the coding of the [Location] participant as the DO increases the salience of the [Location]. This serves a variety of pragmatic purposes often associated with the general term, "emphasis." From a Cognitive Linguistic perspective, emphasis refers to the focusing of attention on an element of the event or scenario for a variety of communicative purposes including clarification, contrast, surprise, to name a few. On many occasions, it was argued, the purposes of emphasizing the [Location] participant are explainable with reference to poetic or narratival exigencies.
Chapter 6: Verbs of Fullness and Want

The largest verb class exhibiting the transitivity alternation is designated by GKC as Verba *copiae* and *inopiae* (also *abundandi* and *deficiendi*).\(^{411}\) Listing many, though not all, of the same verbs as GKC, Waltke-O'Connor speak of "verbs of fullness and want."\(^{412}\) Waltke-O'Connor's terminology will be used as a convenient short-hand for the verbs cited by the grammars under similar designations; however, its accuracy as a category label is one of the issues that will be evaluated in the course of this chapter.\(^{413}\)

BH verbs of Fullness and Want exhibit a remarkable diversity of syntactic-semantic patterning which only partially corresponds to the equally diverse patterning seen in English *to fill* or *to be full of*. In English, the semantic frame of the verb *fill* evokes the participants, \(<\text{Filler, Container, Contents}>\).\(^{414}\) As will be demonstrated below, the most basic BH Fill verb, Qal אֱלֹהָא, profiles only \(<\text{Container, Contents}>\), at least in its basic form and with its conventional meaning. At a higher level of abstraction, the concept *FILL* in both (and perhaps all) languages trades on locative image schemas which feature a [Locatum] oriented in a particular configuration relative to a [Location]. Specifically, the [Locatum] is conceived as internal to and co-extensional with the [Location]. It will be argued below that verbs which express the related concept *ABOUND* (GKC's *abundandi*), while similar in many respects to *FILL* must be distinguished on account of

---

411.GKC 117z, 369.


414.For a definition and description of semantic frames, see 3.1.2.3.
their profiling <Contents> exclusively. It is this difference in basic profile which accounts for the semantic difference in their various syntactic expressions.

Recent studies of the locative alternation have demonstrated that the compatibility of a verb with a particular syntactic construction is motivated by the perceived properties of the verbal action (e.g. load = change-of-state/cause motion; pour = caused motion; fill = change-of-state; see 3.3 above for fuller discussion) as well as by the particular semantics of the construction itself (e.g. intransitive, transitive, ditransitive, etc.). Verbs of Fullness and Want, therefore, will be classified according to the syntactic constructions they combine with in order to elucidate both the general event schemas they evoke as well as the unique sense of each expression. In addition to the issue of the combinatory potential of Fill and Want verbs with different syntactic constructions is the equally important issue of conventionality. That is, we must ask the question, "How are these verbs normally used?" Taking into account the issue of conventionality prevents the attribution of a discrete sense to a verb when it is being employed in a creative, extraordinary, or otherwise unusual fashion. This chapter will address both of these issues.

The goal of this chapter is three-fold: 1) to categorize the relevant constructions containing so-called verbs of Fullness and Want with a view toward establishing conventional and unconventional usage, that is, norms, secondary norms, and exploitations, 2) to establish the conceptual motivation for the various syntactic patterns of BH verbs of Fullness and Want as

415. The linguistic literature on the locative alternation is immense and the following is only representative. Within the CG tradition, the combinatory potential between verbs and locative constructions have been treated in a general way by Goldberg, *Constructions*; and in depth by Hans Boas, "A Lexical-Constructional Account of the Locative Alternation," in *Proceedings of the 2001 Western Conference in Linguistics*, ed. by L. Carmichael, et al. Vol 13 (2003), 27-42; and Seizi Iwata, *The Locative Alternation: A Lexical-Constructional Approach* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008). Though more projectionist than constructionist in their analyses, the following are notable for their treatments of the influence of verbal semantics on syntactic expression, especially as it regards locative verbs: Levin, *English Verb Classes*; Levin and Rappaport Hovav, "Wiping the Slate Clean: A Lexical Semantic Exploration;" Steven Pinker, *Learnability and Cognition: The Acquisition of Argument Structure*. 
well as their semantic or pragmatic significance, and 3) to determine the conceptual status of the non-Subj nominal in two- and three-argument constructions featuring verbs of Fullness and Want.

The issue of semantic or pragmatic significance is especially important as many of the constructions under consideration are often translated and/or interpreted as essentially synonymous. To be sure, the meaning of two constructions may sometimes be so close that the difference may safely be regarded as negligible for most purposes of interpretation. However, such an evaluation should be made only after a careful analysis of the semantic and pragmatic distinctiveness of the various constructions taking into account their larger contexts, at least as far as it is possible to do so given the limited amount of data and the inability to consult the intuition of a native speaker. To summarize the argument of this chapter in brief, what BH grammarians have designated "verbs of Fullness and Want" display a family resemblance only at the most general or abstract of level of conceptualization. There are at least four sub-categories of Verbs of Filling and Want that may be distinguished along certain conceptual parameters, namely the parameters of image schema, event structure, and force dynamics.

6.1 Verbs of Fullness, Type 1: Figure/Ground (Container-Focused)

6.1.1 מלא

6.1.1.1 Qal מלא

Pattern 1: [Container] מלא«

On a few occasions, intransitive Qal מלא profiles a more or less prototypical container with the sense, "to be full." For example,

(133) Joel 4:13

For the winepress is full
Other Subjs of Qal מלא in the intransitive construction include: כִּבְיָם (2 Kgs 4:6), כֹּל (Eccl 8:11), כֶּרֶם (Zech 9:15, Subj specified in 9:13), מַעֲשֵׂה (with the sense of warfare, Isa 40:2). The Subjs are either actual physical containers (e.g. "a winepress," or "vessels"), or through metaphoric extension construed as such (e.g. "heart" and "human beings.") These non-idiomatic uses of intransitive Qal מלא should be regarded as context-independent Obj Del (see 4.4.2.1.1, pattern 1 for discussion of context-dependent/independent Obj Del). In each case the Obj is indefinite, non-referential, and non-specific (with the possible exception of 2 Kgs 4:6, which may be a context-dependent Obj Del).

However, the vast majority of instances of intransitive Qal מלא feature יָמִים (pl) or שָׁנָה as the Subj with the sense of the completion of a definitive period of time, often the span of a life. 2 Sam 7:12 is representative.

(134) 2 Sam 7:12 יָמִים נַעֲלָמֶךָ אֶת אָבַתְךָ יָרָעֲשֶׁךָ

When your days are filled and you lie down with your fathers.

The sense "completion of a period of time," which accounts for 22 out of 29 occurrences of intransitive Qal מלא, is almost certainly an instance of the conceptual metaphor TIME-IS-SPACE.416 Conceptually, a period of time is mapped onto SPACE, specifically a CONTAINER which, as a volume, is able to hold a [Substance].417 According to Silke Höche, "The concept of

416. To be sure, Lakoff and Johnson do not use the designation TIME-IS-SPACE in either of their works on metaphor theory, Metaphors We Live By and Philosophy in the Flesh. As Bert Cappelle points out, the 'TIME-IS-SPACE metaphor' only "later came to be used as a cover term for a number of more specific conceptual metaphors by which the hard-to-grasp notion of time is treated as if it were a more tangible spatial phenomenon." "The TIME IS SPACE metaphor: Some Linguistic Evidence that its End is Near," Faits de Langues 34 (2009), 53-62, 53. Among the "more specific" conceptual metaphors discussed by Lakoff and Johnson that have come to be subsumed under the TIME-IS-SPACE metaphor include: TIMES ARE OBJECTS MOVING TOWARD YOU, TIMES ARE LOCATIONS IN A LANDSCAPE OVER WHICH YOU MOVE, EVENTS ARE MOVING OBJECTS.

417. It is interesting to note how the conceptual metaphor TIME-IS-SPACE operates in the opposite way in the English speaking world where it is the emptying of a [Container] that indicates the completion of a period of time as seen, for example, in an expression like "my time is running out."
containment is based on one of the most fundamental of our bodily experiences and as such is the source of many metaphorical mappings, e.g. TIME IS A CONTAINER (He finished the task in five minutes), ABSTRACT ENTITIES ARE CONTAINERS (He was in mortal danger), ACTIVITIES ARE CONTAINERS (I am not so much into skating), to name just a few.\textsuperscript{418} The Subj מַלֶּא in the intransitive use (represented above in (134)), therefore, is conceptually the [Container] which, once filled, indicates the completion or fulfillment of a definite period of time. It will be argued below that the transitive Qal מלא exhibits a conceptual indeterminacy with regard to Figure/Ground alignment. The reason that Qal מלא is classified as "Container Focused" is because of its exclusive profiling of the participant [Container] as Subj in intransitive constructions.

Pattern 2: [Contents] [Container] מלא

English locative verbs conventionally profile the participant [Filler] and exhibit at least one of the following locative constructions: change-of-state (e.g. Henry loaded the cart with hay) and/or caused motion (e.g. Henry loaded the hay onto the cart). Of course, other constructions are possible including one in which only the [Container] and [Contents] participants are profiled, a construction which mirrors the conventional BH usage:

(135) Water filled the pool.

Importantly, however, English does not allow the event participants to be reversed in the transitive construction ((136)a below), but requires the [Contents] participant to be marked as an Oblique.


b. The pool filled with water.

\textsuperscript{418}Silke Höche, \textit{Cognitive Object Constructions in English} (Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 2009), 59.
Unlike English, however, Qal מלא in the transitive construction does not typically profile the participant [Filler]. BH therefore exhibits what may be considered a simpler FILL scenario in that the concept of AGENT is absent from the conventional expression. If AGENCY (or CAUSALITY) is present conceptually and expressed in the transitive construction, it must be identified with either [Container] or [Contents]. Qal מלא, therefore, essentially orients two entities or THINGS in relation to each other. It establishes a spatial configuration of the [Locatum]/[Contents] and [Location]/[Container] in which the former is situated in and in some sense completely fills or covers the latter. The Subj [Container] construction occurs approximately 44 times. The following are representative of the conventional usage of the Subj [Container] construction:

(137) a. Isa 1:15

Your hands are full of blood.

b. Exod 8:17

And the houses of the Egyptians will be full of swarms of insects.

c. Isa 21:3

Therefore my loins are full of anguish.

d. Ps 10:7

His mouth is full of cursing, oppression, and violence.

Though some of the occurrences of the Subj [Container] construction may permit a dynamic processual interpretation in which the [Container] is construed as "becoming full" (e.g. Exod 8:17; Isa 21:3 above), most are restricted exclusively to a stative sense (e.g. Isa 1:15; Ps

419. However, [Filler] with the corresponding notion of AGENCY is introduced in the ditransitive; but this is a rare and unconventional usage as will be discussed below (see Pattern 4). I have chosen to use the designation "transitive" to describe the bivalent constructions throughout this section, a label which will be explained at length at the conclusion of Qal מלא.
10:7; Gen 6:13 below), "being full." However, those instances where Qal מלא may be understood as a dynamic event may also just as easily (and often preferably) be understood as describing a stative scenario. That is to say, there are no instances in which Qal מלא in the Subj [Container] construction requires a dynamic interpretation. Without clear evidence to the contrary, therefore, Qal מלא in the Subj [Container] construction should be understood as evoking a stative scenario in which the Subj [Container] exists in a steady state of "being full of" the [Contents] expressed by the Obj. For ease of comparison and analysis, Pattern 2 will be treated in more detail under Pattern 3 below.

Pattern 3: [Container] [Contents] מלא«

In BH either the [Container] or [Contents] participant may be selected as the grammatical Subj and the other participant is then coded as an Obj (zero marked or את marked). This may be contrasted with the English fill alternation in which the Subj [Container] construction requires that the [Contents] participant is coded as a peripheral Obj, usually with the Prep with (see example (136)b above). BH Qal מלא, however, exhibits the ability to reverse the clausal participants in a bivalent construction as in the following:

(138) a. Ezek 10:3

And the cloud [Contents] filled the inner court [Container].

b. Ezek 7:23

Forge the chain, for the land [Container] is full of bloody crimes [Contents], and the city [Container] is full of violence [Contents].

Though both constructions exhibit the identical two argument syntactic structure, many grammarians regard the semantic role alternation displayed by patterns 2 and 3 as a transitivity alternation. In this view, pattern 2 (Subj [Container]) is intransitive and pattern 3 (Subj
[Contents] is transitive. BDB, for example, offers the glosses: 1) be full with acc[usative] material, and 2) trans[itive] fill.⁴²⁰ The Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament (TDOT) states simply, "The qal of mālē’ can be either transitive or intransitive, 'to fill' or 'to be full.'⁴²¹ Similarly, Waltke-O'Connor say that, "Verbs of fullness and want can be transitive as well as intransitive, for example, בָּלֵא can mean 'to fill (transitive)' in the Qal as well as 'to be full (intransitive)' in both the Qal and Niphal."⁴²²

Though the transitive/intransitive division is commonly asserted, the linguistic principles and semantic parameters that underlie this distinction are never explained. Stated positively, there needs to be a principled linguistic explanation for why the [Container] argument is regarded as a DO and the [Contents] argument regarded as something else in the identical two-argument construction. The Obj for both alternations appears to be semantically required (presumably the parameter behind Waltke-O'Connor's designation "complement accusative"). And both may be marked by the Obj Prep את- (e.g. Subj [Contents], Gen 9:1; Subj [Container], Exod 8:17) which is typically associated with definiteness and transitivity.

It is worth considering why the Subj [Contents] construction is so commonly regarded as transitive and its Subj [Container] counterpart is not. Since the standard grammars and lexica offer no detailed explanation for this distinction, the following explanation is admittedly speculative. I believe the reason why the Subj [Contents] construction of Qal בָּלֵא creates a sense of transitivity that is notionally absent from the Subj [Container] construction may be attributed

---

⁴²⁰ Presumably the label "transitive" for meaning 2 indicates that meaning 1 is intransitive and that the accusatives accompanying meaning 1 are something other than DOs. BDB, 570. Gesenius' lexicon suggests a similar analysis: "(1) transit. TO FILL, TO MAKE FULL, (2) intrans. to be filled, to be full followed by an acc. of the thing with which any thing is full. Gesenius's Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon, trans. by S. P. Tregelles (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1857), 475.

⁴²¹ TDOT 8, 300.

⁴²² IBHS, 12.2.1h, 168.
to the following: 1) their Subjs more closely approximate prototypical agents, 2) their Objs more closely resemble a prototypical Patient undergoing (or having undergone) a change-of-state, 3) the event structure may, in some instances, be regarded as dynamic, and 4) the Obj [Container] participant is more often definite than the Obj [Contents]. This last point is of particular interest and its significance will be developed further below.

However, to whatever extent the above description adequately represents the thinking behind the distinction between transitive and intransitive uses of Qal מלא, two objections may be registered at this point and elaborated below: 1) it is not certain that the Subj [Contents] constructions do in fact construe dynamic events (and, if some do, it is certainly not characteristic of the conventional use of the construction), and 2) formally, the syntax of the two constructions is identical, a phenomenon that suggests at least a conceptual symmetry between the event structures denoted by both. This second objection, it seems to me, places the burden of proof on those who would argue for a transitivity alternation. The issue of transitivity will be addressed at the end of this section.

It is notable that the Subj [Contents] construction employs the qātēl vocalization typically associated with stativity. In the case of Qal מלא, the scenario or relation denoted is an indefinitely lasting state, that is, it expresses a "condition which lasts for an indefinite time but which may eventually cease."\(^{423}\) Moreover, the following examples of the Subj [Contents] construction are not easily interpreted as referring to a dynamic event or process of filling (especially when considered in their larger contexts):

\(^{423}\)Rene Dirven and Gunter Radden, *Cognitive English Grammar* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007), 191. Dirven and Radden list a host of subcategories of indefinite states including: psychological, emotional, mental, perceptual, behavioral, positional, relational, states of being, and states of possession. Remarkably, however, they say nothing about locational or situational states which are undoubtedly indefinite and which would certainly include notions of stative "filling."
(139) a. Isa 6:1

And his train filled the temple.

b. Exod 40:35

And Moses was not able to enter the tent of meeting for the cloud rested upon it and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle.

To these examples may be added Ezek 10:3 (already cited above (138)a). Ezek 10:3 is of particular note as Qal מלא is used for a description of the scene that is off-line from the main narrative action. The effect is to offer background (or better, backdrop) information on the various scene participants. It is in this context that the cloud is described as "filling" in the inner court.

Gen 1:22 and related passages present perhaps the most compelling case for a dynamic sense of the Subj [Contents] construction.424

(140) Gen 1:22

And God blessed them saying, "Be fruitful, multiply, and fill the waters in the seas."

However, imperative Qal מלא in Gen 1:22 does not necessarily refer to a dynamic action. It may express the resultant state brought about by the actions indicated by the two previous verbs, (i.e. "be fruitful, multiply, (and thereby) fill the waters in the seas."). Or, more likely, the particular form of speech, namely that of a "blessing," may cast a particular shade of meaning on all three imperatives. Gen 1:22 identifies the nature of the divine speech-act as a blessing (ברכה), a form of speech in which God bestows a state upon a person or persons (or, in this case, his animal creation).425 On this reading, God is declaring that a certain scenario of abundance be true of his animal (and later human) creation. Gen 1:22 aside, the stative sense of

424. The same blessing formula is repeated in Gen 1:28 and 9:1.

425. I know of no other blessing in the HB that includes an imperative. The use of an imperative in Gen 1 is clearly unusual.
the majority of Subj [Contents] constructions indicates that dynamicity is not the primary
property that distinguishes the semantics of the two bivalent constructions.

If, as I have argued, the [Container]/[Contents] alternation does not distinguish transitive/
intransitive senses, the motivation and semantics for the the alternation of participant roles in the
two argument construction of Qal מלא requires another explanation. Why would a speaker select
one participant to be the Subj over the other? What motivates the selection of Subj at a
conceptual level? And, if CG is correct that meaning is conceptualization, what is the semantic
significance of the alternation?

Of the many sub-disciplines that may be said to make up CL, one of the most vibrant is
the research area of Spatial Semantics. At the risk of oversimplifying a deep and diverse field of
inquiry, Spatial Semantics generally explores what spatial relations in language (defined largely
notionally) reveal about cognition and vice versa. Foundational for much of the discussion of
spatial semantics is Talmy's categories of Figure and Ground (see 3.1.2.2 above for fuller
treatment of Figure/Ground alignment). Briefly stated, the Figure is the entity that "has
unknown spatial... properties to be determined" and Ground is the entity that "acts as a reference
entity, having known properties that can characterize the Figure's unknowns." Though by no
means exhaustive, Talmy has compiled a list of features that motivate (though do not determine)
the construal of an entity as either Figure or Ground (see Table 6.1 below).

Ordinarily, the participants that conceptually approximate a prototypical Figure and
Ground are mapped onto the syntactic positions of Subj and Obj respectively, depicting as they
do the primary and secondary points of focal prominence or salience in a clause. According to

426. For a summary of Spatial Semantics as a sub-discipline of CL, see Jordan Zlatev, "Spatial Semantics," in The
CxG, the event participants evoked by a given verb typically fill the slots of a grammatical construction according to the conceptual correlation (or, semantic compatibility) of the perceived properties of the participants with the properties of the arguments of the grammatical construction. To use the English example of *fill*, the [Filler] participant would be mapped onto the Agent argument of a change-of-state construction: [Agent] *filled* [Patient] *with* [Contents].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitional Characteristics</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Ground</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Has unknown spatial (or temporal properties to be determined.</td>
<td>Acts as a reference entity, having known properties that can characterize the Figure's unknowns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Associated Characteristics</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Ground</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- more movable</td>
<td>- more permanently located</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- smaller</td>
<td>- larger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- geometrically simpler (often pointlike) in its treatment</td>
<td>- geometrically more complex in its treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- more recently on the scene/in awareness</td>
<td>- more familiar/ expected</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- of greater concern/relevance</td>
<td>- of lesser concern/ relevance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- less immediately perceivable</td>
<td>- more immediately perceivable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- more salient, once perceived</td>
<td>- more backgrounded, once Figure is perceived</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- more dependent</td>
<td>- more independent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Prototypical Properties of Figure and Ground

However, cross-linguistic studies of argument structures have revealed that some verbs exhibit an indeterminacy regarding Figure-Ground orientation. Sotaro Kita has argued that some Japanese verbs of the Pierce/Un-pierce verb class may alternate Figure and Ground in identical

syntactic constructions both of which are "semantically valid descriptions of the same event." Addressing the cognitive underpinnings of what she has termed Figure-Ground indeterminacy, Kita says, "the unification of verb semantics and the construction semantics is underspecified." Kita defines the features of central cases of Figure-Ground indeterminacy as follows: "(a) Figure and Ground are construed to be in a non-symmetrical relationship with respect to each other, and (b) when two versions of a sentence are created by exchanging the two NPs referring to Figure and Ground (keeping the verb and the construction constant), the two versions are both semantically valid descriptions of the same event." Notably, the syntax and semantics of BH Qal מלא exhibit both of Kita's parameters in the two argument constructions. I suggest, therefore, that the alternation of [Container] and [Contents] with Qal מלא is an instance of Figure-Ground indeterminacy.

Kita says, "in a pair of sentences involving a verb with Figure-Ground indeterminacy, one variant may be pragmatically preferred over the other because one participant in the event or the state may be seen as more suitable as Figure (or as Ground) than the other participant." In the case of Japanese Pierce/Un-Pierce verbs, she notes that the selection of Figure and Ground in an expression is pragmatically motivated and follows the general conceptual parameters outlined

429. Importantly, Sotaro Kita distinguishes Figure-Ground Indeterminacy from the oft-discussed locative alternation exemplified by the English swarm-alternation or load-alternation in that the latter alternations employ different syntactic constructions (e.g. The bees swarmed in the tree/ The tree swarmed with bees) which accounts for the difference in semantics (e.g. holism/partitive senses). The Japanese Figure-Ground Indeterminate constructions "share an identical construction and identical semantics (in the sense that they can refer to the same set of events)." "Figure-Ground Indeterminacy in Descriptions," in Crosslinguistic Perspectives on Argument Structure (New York: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2008), 91.

430. Kita, "Figure-Ground," 96.

431. Kita, "Figure-Ground," 93.

432. This suggestion was first made by Edward Cook in his presentation titled, "The Semantics of Biblical Hebrew מלא" presented at SBL Annual Meeting 2011. My thanks to Dr. Cook for making available to me the text of his presentation. Though different in some respects, the analysis offered here closely follows Cook's.

433. Kita, "Figure-Ground," 96.
by Talmy (Table 6.1 above). However, most of Talmy's parameters do not appear to inform the selection of Subj participant for the transitive alternations of Qal יָם.

For the most part the Subj [Contents] construction features Figures which are more moveable, smaller, and geometrically simpler (e.g. Isa 6:1; Exod 40:35 above). The same, however, cannot be said for the Subj [Container] constructions. To use Exod 8:17 (above (137)) as an example, the "houses of the Egyptians" are certainly not "more movable," "smaller," or "geometrically simpler." Of the qualities listed by Talmy, the Egyptian houses, in context, may be said to be "more recently on the scene/ in awareness" as they are mentioned earlier in the verse than the swarms of insects and, perhaps therefore, less "immediately perceptible." This may carry a degree of motivation for its selection. However, the most significant parameter that motivates the selection of [Container] or [Contents] as the Figure in bivalent Qal יָם constructions is Talmy's property salience. It is significant that "the houses of the Egyptians," (Exod 8:17), "your hands," (Isa 1:15), "my loins" (Isa 21:3) and "his mouth" (Ps 10:7) are all definite, a parameter which increases the salience of a participant (see Table 6.4 below for complete list of Subj [Contents] participants).

434. Regarding Japanese Pierce verbs, Kita highlights motion (more/less movable) and size (smaller/larger) as influencing selection of Figure and Ground. She also rightly points out that the prototypical characteristics interact with one another and may cancel each other out. They are also subject to construal operations.

435. I suspect this is the reason Cook proposes that the Subj [Container] retains its conceptual status as the Ground and the Obj [Contents] remains the Figure. Talmy argues that this takes place in some English constructions, such as: a) Smoke (F) slowly filled the room (G), and b) The room (G) slowly filled with smoke (F). Cognitive Semantics I, 333. While this is a plausible explanation of the Qal יָם transitivity alternation, I believe that the more common construal operation of Focusing in which either [Container] or [Contents] may be profiled as the Figure better accounts for the data. The main difference with the analysis adopted here and Cook's, therefore, is that individuation — considered as a scalar phenomenon — remains a feature of the Subj Figure in both constructions. As the [Contents] are perceived (or construed) as less individuated, they are more likely to be selected as the Obj. And as the [Contents] is perceived as less individuated, the [Container] is then conceptually more salient and more likely to be profiled as the Subj. Both analyses, it should be noted, are compatible with Kita's Figure-Ground indeterminacy proposal adopted here.
As a conceptual phenomenon, Talmy's *salience* parameter is very close to Hopper and Thompson's transitivity parameter *individuation*. Individuation, for Hopper and Thompson, "refers both to the distinctness of the patient from the A[gent] and to its distinctness from its own background."\(^{436}\) The prototypical features of *individuation* are summarized in Table 6.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individuated</th>
<th>Non-Individuated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proper Noun</td>
<td>Common Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human, Animate</td>
<td>Inanimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referential, Definite</td>
<td>Non-referential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Properties of Individuation\(^{437}\)

Cook has argued convincingly that *individuation* is the primary parameter informing the selection of [Container] or [Contents] as the Subj of Qal מַלּ. Specifically, he suggests that the selection of Subj is motivated by the perceived *individuation* of the [Contents] participant exclusively. In CG terms, *individuation* is a feature pertaining to the structural schematization of an entity. Langacker says, "the converse of specificity is schematicity.... A schematic characterization is instantiated by any number of more specific ones, each serving to elaborate its coarse-grained specifications."\(^{438}\) Non-individuated entities are more schematic, and

---

438. Schematization, according to Langacker, is operative at all levels of cognition and therefore present at every point of the continuum of linguistic analysis from lexicon to grammar. He says, "Schematization is fundamental to cognition, constantly occurring in every realm of experience. Extraction of a schema is simply the reinforcing of something inherent in multiple experiences, at whatever level of granularity their commonality emerges. A schema should therefore be seen as immanent in its varied instantiations, not as separate and distinct (even if shown individually for analytic purposes). By its very nature, a schema serves a categorizing function: capturing what is common to certain previous experiences, it can be applied to any new
individuated entities are less schematic. The more individuated (specific) the [Contents] participant is perceived to be, the more likely it is to be represented as the primary focus (Subj) in a Qal מלא expression. The following chart (Table 6.3) summarizes the participants in Qal מלא constructions where the [Container] is featured as the Subj.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj [Container]</th>
<th>Obj [Contents]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen 6:13  הָאָרֶץ (the land)</td>
<td>חָמָס (violence)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 8:17  יָרֵא (houses of the Egyptians)</td>
<td>כְּשָׁנֵים (the swarms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 15:9 שָׁמָּה (soul/ desire)</td>
<td>Pron Suffix - &quot;them&quot; (Israel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev 19:29  הָאָרֶץ (the land)</td>
<td>חָטָא (depravity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut 34:9  יְהוָה (Joshua)</td>
<td>רַחֵל (spirit of wisdom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judg 16:27  הָבָטָה (the house)</td>
<td>נְאָשָׁתָם (men and women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kgs 6:17  הָרָה (the mountain)</td>
<td>סֵפֶר אִבָּא (horses and chariots of fire)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 1:5 רֹגִים, (your hands)</td>
<td>דָּמִים (blood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 11:9  הָאָרֶץ (the land)</td>
<td>יָזָה אֲשֶׁר-וַיָּדָה (knowledge of the Lord)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 13:21 בָּשָׂל (their houses)</td>
<td>צָעָר (owls)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 15:9  מִי רְבִיצָה (waters of Dibon)</td>
<td>דָּם (blood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 21:3  יָרְנִים (my loins)</td>
<td>חָלְלָה (anguish)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 22:7 שִׁפְחָה-שִׁפְחָה (choicest of valleys)</td>
<td>לֶחֶם (chariots)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 28:8 בְּשָׂל (all the tables)</td>
<td>יְרֵמָה (filthy vomit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 30:27 שֶׁפֶךְ (his lips)</td>
<td>יָפֵן (fury)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 34:6  בַּיַּמִּים (sword)</td>
<td>דָּם (blood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer 6:11 &quot;I&quot; (Jeremiah)</td>
<td>יָרָבְרָא (the wrath of the Lord)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

experience exhibiting the same configuration." Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction, 56 (emphasis original). Langacker's notion of schematicity is important for assessing the transitivity of Qal מלא constructions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Hebrew Text</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jer 23:10</td>
<td>הָאָרֶץ (the land)</td>
<td>adulterers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer 46:12</td>
<td>הָאָרֶץ (the land)</td>
<td>your cry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer 51:5</td>
<td>אָרֶץ (their land)</td>
<td>guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:23a</td>
<td>הָאָרֶץ (the land)</td>
<td>judgments of blood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 7:23b</td>
<td>הָאָרֶץ (the city)</td>
<td>violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 9:9</td>
<td>הָאָרֶץ (the land)</td>
<td>blood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 10:4</td>
<td>הָאָרֶץ (the courtyard)</td>
<td>the brightness of the glory of the Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel 2:24</td>
<td>הָאָרֶץ (the threshing floors)</td>
<td>grain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic 3:8</td>
<td>עָנֹי (strength)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic 6:12</td>
<td>שָׁפָה (her rich men)</td>
<td>violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hab 3:3</td>
<td>הָאָרֶץ (the land)</td>
<td>his praise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 10:7</td>
<td>דְרָע (his mouth)</td>
<td>cursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 26:10</td>
<td>יָנָה (their hands)</td>
<td>bribes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 33:5</td>
<td>הָאָרֶץ (the land)</td>
<td>faithfulness of the Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 38:8</td>
<td>יִפְלָה (my loins)</td>
<td>burning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 48:11</td>
<td>יַעַיֶּה (your right hand)</td>
<td>righteousness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 74:20</td>
<td>הָאָרֶץ (dark places of the land)</td>
<td>habitations of violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 104:24</td>
<td>הָאָרֶץ (the land)</td>
<td>your creatures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps 119:64</td>
<td>הָאָרֶץ (the land)</td>
<td>your faithfulness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 20:11</td>
<td>בְּנֵיהוּ bringen (bones)</td>
<td>vigor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 21:24</td>
<td>בָּנָי (his pails)</td>
<td>milk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 32:18</td>
<td>&quot;I&quot; (Job)</td>
<td>words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 36:16</td>
<td>יִשְׁבַּנ (your table)</td>
<td>fat or rich food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job 36:17</td>
<td>&quot;you&quot; (Job)</td>
<td>case of the wicked man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov 12:21</td>
<td>זָדֵי (wicked)</td>
<td>trouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccl 9:3</td>
<td>חֵיל (heart of the children of man)</td>
<td>trouble</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3: Participants in the Subj [Container] Transitive Construction of Qal מָלַא

Table 6.3 shows that the vast majority of Obj [Contents] featured in Subj [Container] constructions are indefinite, abstract, and mass or plural, and non-referential. Abstract entities (e.g. violence, depravity, anguish, cursing, burning, faithfulness, knowledge of the Lord, praise, righteousness, strength) would represent the most schematic (non-individuated) entities. Though concrete and (mostly) animate, Objs like "swarms," "owls," "adulterers," "bribes," "men and women" exhibit the non-individuated qualities: common, plural or mass, and non-referential. Profiling the [Contents] as the Obj increases the salience of the [Container] which might inherently manifest more Ground-like qualities. As the more salient of the two, the [Container] becomes the logical focal point and is thus profiled as the Subj Figure.

The participants featured in the Qal מָלַא in the Subj [Container] construction may be helpfully contrasted with the same in the Subj [Contents] construction. The transitive Subj [Contents] construction occurs 16 times and the participants are outlined in Table 6.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj [Contents]</th>
<th>Obj [Container]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen 1:22</td>
<td>בָּנָי (referring to sea creatures in preceding verse)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 1:28</td>
<td>בָּנָי &quot;man and woman&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen 9:1</td>
<td>&quot;you&quot; (Noah and sons)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 10:6</td>
<td>רָעָב (locusts v 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 40:34</td>
<td>מַשָּׁה (glory of the Lord)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 40:35</td>
<td>מַשָּׁה (glory of the Lord)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

439. Cook notes that even those Objs marked as definite are used generically. The "swarm of insects" in Exod 8:17 does not refer to a particular swarm and the "men and women" in Judg 16:27 "refer to types of people, not particular groups." (manuscript of presentation).
Table 6.4 : Participants in the Subj [Contents] Transitive Construction of Qal סמל

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>[Contents]</th>
<th>[Container]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings 8:10</td>
<td>(the cloud)</td>
<td>(the temple of the Lord)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings 8:11</td>
<td>(glory of the Lord)</td>
<td>(the temple of the Lord)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isa 6:1</td>
<td>(his train)</td>
<td>(the temple)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer 23:24</td>
<td>(the Lord)</td>
<td>(the heavens and the earth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 10:3</td>
<td>(the cloud)</td>
<td>(the inner court)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 43:5</td>
<td>(glory of the Lord)</td>
<td>(the temple)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek 44:4</td>
<td>(glory of the Lord)</td>
<td>(the temple of the Lord)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chr 5:14</td>
<td>(glory of the Lord)</td>
<td>(house of God)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chr 7:1</td>
<td>(glory of the Lord)</td>
<td>(the temple)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chr 7:2</td>
<td>(glory of the Lord)</td>
<td>(the temple of the Lord)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Obj [Container] participant in the Subj [Contents] construction shows just as much variation in individuation as it does in the Subj [Container] construction. Very often it refers to highly individuated realities (e.g. "the tabernacle," "the temple," "the inner court") and is often marked by the Obj Prep אתה. For this reason, Cook has rightly argued that it is the properties of the [Contents] participant alone which motivate syntactic organization. The [Contents] in the Subj [Contents] construction are often proper nouns (e.g. the Lord), animate (locusts, sea creatures), and definite/ referential (e.g. his train, the cloud, the glory of the Lord). For this reason, Cook has rightly argued that it is the properties of the [Contents] participant alone which motivate syntactic organization. The [Contents] in the Subj [Contents] construction are often proper nouns (e.g. the Lord), animate (locusts, sea creatures), and definite/ referential (e.g. his train, the cloud, the glory of the Lord). Simply put, [Contents] which exhibit more properties of individuation (specificity and animacy) are more likely to be construed as the Subj Figure in the transitive construction of Qal סמל.

440. It is significant that all of the NPs are either animate or conceptually associated with an animate entity.
The Figure-Ground indeterminacy of Qal וּלְכָה raises the question of transitivity. In what way, if any, may the two argument construction of Qal וּלְכָה be regarded as transitive? In his discussion of the characteristics of Subjs and Objs Langacker highlights an important theoretical distinction between *prototypes* to *schemas*. A "prototype" in CL is the best-example-of a given category from which many other category members depart to a greater or lesser degree. A "schema," by contrast, applies to every member of a category regardless of where a member falls in relation to the prototype. Though [Agent] is the prototypical Subj in a transitive construction, Langacker rightly notes that not all Subjs are properly regarded as [Agents] (even metaphorically). While prototypical of a Subj in a transitive clause, AGENCY may not be regarded as schematic.

Langacker incrementally increases the level of abstraction of the transitive Subj in order to arrive at the schematic Subj. He moves from [Agent] to "head of action chain," in which the source of energy moves from Subj to Obj. Next, Langacker proposes Subj [Experiencer] ---> ZERO in which the Subj "merely establishes mental contact with the object." This model, however, fails to account for stative situations as in the following:

(141) a. A fence surrounds his property.
   b. Sharon's apartment faces the courtyard.
   c. This nicely-wrapped package contains nothing but crumpled newspapers.

These he analyzes as asymmetrical stative scenarios (which Langacker indicates with ZERO----->ZERO) and notes that even these preclude what may be considered the most abstract

442. E.g. *I remember my childhood very well*. Langacker labels the Obj in Subj [Experiencer] transitive constructions as "Zero" to indicate its lack of any meaningful (or conceptual) participation in the event (in contrast, for example, to a Patient). *FOCG II*, 310.
443. Examples taken from Langacker, *FOCG II*, 311.
and therefore the limiting cases, namely symmetrical relationships (ZERO ---- ZERO).

Symmetrical relationships are seen in the following expressions:444

(142) a. Line A intersects line B.
   b. The railroad tracks parallel the highway.
   c. Joshua resembles Jonathan.

The schema of the transitive clause, Langacker concludes, is a primary and secondary clausal participant in a Figure/Ground relationship.445 Once the penultimate asymmetrical relationship is passed (i.e. ZERO---->ZERO), the Figure/Ground relationship resorts to a purely subjective imposition of organization on a relation (as in (142) a above). According to Langacker's schema, Qal כָּלַל exhibits the penultimate ZERO---->ZERO transitivity structure.

The scenario is stative, and neither [Container] nor [Contents] is an "event participant" by which Langacker means, an entity involved in the action denoted by the verb (e.g. Agent, Patient, Experiencer). Clauses featuring bivalent Qal כָּלַל, therefore, are extremely low on the transitivity spectrum and distant from the transitive prototype. Nevertheless, a Figure is related to Ground in an asymmetric relationship, a relation which is motivated primarily according to the parameter of individuation.

444. Examples taken from Langacker, FOCG II, 311. Commenting on ZERO----ZERO transitive constructions, Langacker says, "Here we observe the limiting case [of transitivity], in which subject/object alignment — normally motivated by objective factors — is solely due to the speaker imposing a particular choice of figure/ground organization. A schematic and fully general characterization of subject vs object can only be provided by a subjective distinction such as primary vs secondary clausal figure." FOCG II, 324 (emphasis original).

445. Langacker notes that though symmetrical, alternating Subj and Obj in these expressions does not say exactly the same thing. The difference, of course, is that one is profiled as the Figure, the other the Ground. In symmetrical relationships, the motivating factors are purely subjective. FOCG II, 311-12.
Pattern 4: [Contents] [Container] [Filler] מלא «

Qal מלא in the ditransitive construction is rare. Out of the approximately 100 uses of Qal מלא, it appears in the ditransitive construction seven or eight times. The following are representative:

(143) a. 1 Kgs 18:34

 McIntyre אָמַל אֶרֶץ הָרְשֵׁבָה כֹּרֵי פִּים

 And he said, "Fill the vessels with water."

 b. Ezek 8:17

 עָמַל אֶת־אֶרֶץ הָרְשֵׁבָה כֹּרֵי פִּים

 For they fill the land with violence.

Rather than multiplying senses of Qal מלא to include a discrete sense involving external agency, it is better to locate the notion of AGENCY at the level of the ditransitive construction, the meaning of which in BH we have already established is: x changes state of y by means of z (see 4.2.3.1 pattern 5 for discussion). In the ditransitive construction, the [Container] participant is always the more direct of the two Objs. This is indicated either by its being marked with Obj Prep את, or, less often, by word order in which the [Container] occurs in the canonical DO position (after the Subj and before the [Contents]). The [Container] in the DO position indicates that the change-of-state of the [Container] is the ultimate goal of the action. The [Contents] in this event schema, then serve as a quasi-instrument identifying the means by which the [Filler] accomplishes his or her task.

6.1.1.2 Niph מלא

With two exceptions, Niph מלא occurs with the participant [Container] expressed as Subj. Semantically, therefore, Niph מלא exhibits striking similarities to the Subj [Container] structure.

446. Niph מלא in the Subj [Container] construction occurs 25x. Num 14:21 and Ps 72:19 are the only exceptions to the Subj [Container] participant structure.
constructions of Qal מלא, so much so that many lexicons and grammars regard them as basically synonymous. Broadly considered, both describe a scenario in which Subj [Container] is full of Obj [Contents]. Furthermore, there are no clear selectional restrictions regarding the types of nouns the constructions prefer in either Subj or Obj position. This is evident from the passages where the same scenario is described with both Qal מלא and Niph מלא as in Gen 6:11,13.

(144.1) a. Gen 6:11

For the land is filled with violence. (Niph)

b. Gen 6:13

For the land is full of violence on account of them. (Qal)

Though similar, the semantics of the two constructions are not identical. The difference is one of conceptualization and construal. In contrast to the pure stative of Qal מלא, Niph מלא is used to describe the resulting state of a dynamic event of "filling." Its usage is motivated by conceptual realities associated with an EVENT, namely AGENCY and DYNAMICITY. Niph המלא construes the Subj as a Patient, or at least more patient-like than its Qal counterpart. In this way the Niphal may be said to introduce the notion of AGENCY, though the [Agent] is not profiled as a core participant. As the Patient, the Subj [Container] undergoes (or has undergone) a change-of-state as a result of an action (filling) performed by an AGENT.

That Niph מלא describes a state resulting from a dynamic event is supported by its exclusive use in imperfect or waw-consecutive constructions. In contrast, Qal מלא is primarily found in the perfect tense. To be sure, the correlation of Niph מלא with imperfect/waw-consecutive constructions and Qal מלא with the perfect may be the result of suppletion. However, the diachronic development of suppletive forms is not immune from conceptual

---

447. EVENT is used here in contrast to STATE.
motivation. According to CG, the cognitive processes that motivate "synchronic" variation are the same types of processes that motivate "diachronic" change (e.g. polysemy, metaphor, metonymy, grammaticalization).\footnote{Geeraerts, "History of Lexical Semantics," 661. See above 1.2.} On occasion, however, Qal מלא does appear in an imperfect construction (e.g. Gen 50:3; Exod 15:9; 2 Sam 7:12 Esth 2:12) indicating that we do not have a true (or uniform) suppletive paradigm.

Conceptual notions of AGENCY and DYNAMICITY are not always significant for expressions featuring Niph马拉. Qal and Niph马拉 constructions do show significant semantic overlap in usage and on some occasion may be said to "mean" the same thing. However, significant semantic overlap is not the same as complete synonymy. Niph马拉, according to the view propounded here, may be used to evoke notions of AGENCY and DYNAMICITY that are not present in the Qal forms. For example, the use of the Niph马拉 in 2 Kgs 3:20 is likely motivated by the desire to construe the FILLING event as the result of a dynamic process and its use in Jer 13:12 to incorporate the notion of AGENCY.

\begin{verbatim}
(144.2) 2 Kgs 3:20
And water was coming from the direction of Edom, and the land was filled with water.
\end{verbatim}

\begin{verbatim}
(144.3) Jer 13:12
Thus says the Lord God of Israel, "Every jar will be filled with wine." And they will say to you, "Do we not know that every jar should be filled with wine?"
In both cases, the Subj [Container] is depicted as undergoing a change-of-state. Though the [Agent] is left unspecified, from the context it is clear that an [Agent] is the causer (in both of the above instances the [Agent] is YHWH.) AGENCY and dynamic action should be regarded as
\end{verbatim}
part of the base or frame conventionally evoked by Niph מלא.  Since it features מלא in both stems in close proximity, Ezek 10:4 is useful in illustrating the different senses.

(145) Ezek 10:4

And the glory of the Lord went up from the cherubs to the threshold of the temple, and the temple was filled (Niphal) with the cloud. And the courtyard was full of the brightness of the glory of the Lord.

The temple is construed as a Patient that is filled with a cloud by an unspecified Agent (though contextually we known that it is the "glory of the Lord"). The resultant state of this filling is that the courtyard is full of the "brightness" of the "glory of the Lord." Niph מלא construes the [Container] as a Patient, Qal מלא, more schematically, construes it as a Figure relative to a Ground.

6.1.1.3 Piel מלא

The distinguishing feature of Piel מלא is its consistent profiling of the participant role [Filler] with the entailed notion of AGENCY. Syntactically, Piel מלא appears in monovalent, bivalent, and trivalent constructions which correspond to the semantics of the intransitive, transitive, and ditransitive constructions.

449. Some have seen this same distinction in English: be filled vs be full. In the example, "The nursery was full of/ filled with children," the latter is thought to construe the nursery as [Patient] which was acted upon by unexpressed [Agents] (e.g. tired parents). I use the word "conventional" here to allow for overlap in usage with the Qal perfect. Interestingly, the same overlap may be true in English usage of fill/be full distinction. While both could be used to simply denote the state of a packed nursery in the above example, only the former could be modified with the agentive PP, by parents. For example, The nursery was filled with children by parents tired of trying to shop with little ones.
With a few exceptions, intransitive Piel מלא appears in two specialized usages of which the following are representative:

(146) Josh 14:8:

But I wholly followed the Lord my God.

(147) 2 Chr 6:15:

You spoke with your mouth, and with your hand you fulfilled (it) this day.

The use of Piel מלא with the sense "to fulfill" or "accomplish" should probably be analyzed as a type of context-dependent Obj Drop. In each of its four occurrences, the thing that is "fulfilled" is easily inferred (if not stated) in the immediate context.450 That Piel המלא with the sense "to fulfill" may take an Obj is seen, for example, in Ps 20:5:

(148) Ps 20:5:

May he give to you your heart's desire, and may he fulfill your plans.

The use of Piel המלא with the sense "to follow after" as seen in (146) above is clearly idiomatic. To be sure, idiomaticity does not preclude it from a linguistically principled grammatical analysis. However, for the purposes of this study it is sufficient to identify it as an idiom and to note that the Subj of the idiom exhibits the agentive properties [+Vol], [+Inst].

Pattern 2: [Container] [Filler] מלא«

The Subj of the transitive construction always profiles the participant [Filler] and the DO always the [Container] participant as in the following:

450. In addition to 2 Chr 6:15, see Jer 44:25; Ps 20:6; 2 Chr 36:21.

Exod 2:16

And they filled the troughs to water their father's flock.

That only the [Container] is profiled as the DO indicates that Piel מלא is only used to express the change-of-state of an Obj [Location] and does not enter into a caused motion construction.\(^{452}\)

Pattern 3: [Contents] [Container] [Filler] מלא«

The ditransitive construction of Piel מלא patterns exactly like the Qal ditransitive. The Subj always profiles the [Filler] participant and Obj the [Container]. The second Obj specifies the [Contents] and functions as a sort of quasi-instrument. Piel מלא is certainly the more frequent of the two; Piel occurring 36 times and Qal seven or eight. Dialectal factors may be ruled out as an explanation for the variation since both Qal and Piel ditransitive constructions occur in the same books.\(^{453}\) Given the limited amount of data, the semantic or pragmatic distinction between ditransitive Qal מלא and Piel מלא is difficult to determine.

\(^{452}\) There are three verses where Piel מלא appears to collocate with DO [Contents], Exod 39:10; 1 Sam 18:27; and Ezek 24:4. I would argue, however, that these are not actual instances of this construction. 1 Sam 18:27 is an instance of the secondary sense "to fulfill" or "to accomplish": יָֽרֵאָּה מָלֵא ("and David brought their foreskins and fulfilled/accomplished them for the king.") In Ezek 24:4, the [Container] participant ("the pot") is easily inferred from the immediate context. The only verse, it seems to me, that has a plausible claim to a DO [Contents] construction is Exod 39:10: מָלֵא אִשָּׁה בְּעִנְבֵּרָה אָרֶץ אָסלִּים ("and they filled (set?) in it four rows of stones." While this may be an instance of the DO [Contents] construction, it appears to be using a secondary sense of the verb that is associated with stonework.

\(^{453}\) In fact, every usage of the ditransitive Qal מלא has its Piel counterpart in the same book. The same, however, can not be said for the Piel which has a much wider attestation.
6.1.2.1 Qal שָׂבַע

Qal שָׂבַע occurs 78 times and generally denotes the state of "being sated" or "satisfied" (BDB). It appears most frequently in contexts of eating and, less frequently, drinking; and it often collocates with Qal אֲכַל denoting the resultant state of the "eating" activity. Semantically, Qal שָׂבַע is often associated with מָלַא (often in Piel or Niph, though sometimes Qal) with which it frequently appears in parallel (e.g. Ps 17:14 "As for your treasured ones, may you fill their bellies/ and may they be satisfied with children").454 This association, I believe, is correct, though it needs to be qualified. Qal שָׂבַע is similar to Qal מָלַא in that both denote stative scenarios which involve, at the most schematic level, the participants [Locatum] and [Location] in which the former is in some way "filling" the latter.

A critical difference, however, is that Qal מָלַא evokes more or less conventional [Containers] and [Contents] (or metaphorical extensions thereof) where Qal שָׂבַע conventionally profiles animate Subjs, most typically [Human]. To be sure, there is the obvious metaphorical connection for English speakers between a [Container] being full and a [Human] being full, as in, *I'm full, and couldn't eat another bite*. Whether or not ancient Israel also employed the BODY-IS-CONTAINER metaphor in this regard is unknown; however, it is clear that the Subj of Qal שָׂבַע is consistently perceived to have the quality ANIMATE, either really or metaphorically.455

Needless to say, ANIMACY is not a property of a prototypical [Container].

Notably, Qal שָׂבַע does not exhibit the Figure-Ground indeterminacy that is displayed by Qal מָלַא. This may be explained with reference to the participant [Sated] as more specific than

454. Reading Qere: דַּעְמִן. See also, Deut 6:11; Ezek 7:19 (Piel שָׂבַע), Eccl 1:8.

455. Even non-animate Subjs are clearly construed as animate: e.g. Prov 30:15-16 construes Sheol, a barren womb, land, and fire as entities that never "say enough."
[Container] in that the [Satisfied] is conceived as an [Experiencer]. Note that the Experiencer ---- ZERO schematization is more specific than the ZERO ---- ZERO character of Qal מלא.

According to Talmy's parameters of Figure-Ground orientation (Table 6.1 above), the [Experiencer] participant (what we will call [Sated]) is conceptually much more strongly motivated to be profiled as the Subj Figure than the [Stimulus] participant. In comparison to the Ground [Stimulus], the Figure [Sated] participant is "of greater concern/relevance," "more salient once perceived," and "more dependent." It is also the more individuated participant in its exhibiting the property ANIMACY.

Pattern 1: [Sated] מלא«

Qal מלא occurs in the intransitive construction 35 times, and the Subj in each instance profiles the [Sated] participant. Semantically, the concept denoted by Qal מלא is closely related to the more general term for eating, Qal אכל. The former is essentially the resultant state of the latter as is indicated by their frequent collocation.

(150) a. Deut 6:11

And you shall eat, and you shall be/become satisfied.

b. Hos 4:10

They shall eat and not be/become satisfied.

Qal מלא, however, may be used without אכל and still evoke the EATING frame.

(151) Ps 37:19

And in days of famine, they shall be satisfied.

The state of "satiety" or "satisfaction" denoted by Qal מלא may, through metaphorical extension, express other experiences of satisfaction such as sexual satisfaction (Ezek 16:28, 29).
or judgment and retribution (Jer 46:10). These uses, however, are less conventional than the much more frequently attested sense of "satisfied with food." 456

Unlike Qal מלא, the intransitive usage of Qal שבע is not an example of IOD. As noted above, the expression "the winepress is full" (Joel 4:13, (133)) permits the omission of the [Contents] participant when it is indefinite, non-referential, and non-specific. Nevertheless, the "winepress" is understood to be full of "something," presumably wine. Notice, however, that the same is not necessarily true of Qal שבע as is clear from the following expressions:

(152) a. Isa 53:11

Out of the anguish of his soul, he shall see and he will be satisfied.

b. Jer 50:10

All who plunder her will be satisfied (or sated).

c. Ps 104:16

The trees of the Lord are sated.

d. Prov 27:20

And the eyes of man are never satisfied.

To be sure, most intransitive uses of Qal שבע are rightly analyzed as IOD, with conventional Obj being "food," "drink" or some other contextually understood [Contents] participant. The handful of occasions like those cited above which resist such an interpretation are the result of fine-grained focusing on only the resultant state of the [Experiencer] participant. The focus may be thought of as "so close" or "fine-grained" that the [Stimulus]/[Contents] participant becomes so peripheral that it no longer features as something "understood."

456. Even the use of Qal שבע in the context of violence in Jer 46:10 is used through metaphorical extension of the concept EATING applied (via personification) to the "sword." Conceptually, a "sword" that may be said "to eat" or "devour," may be extended to a "sword" being "sated." (הסכית ולך, ולך אכלה, "and the sword shall devour and be sated.")
Pattern 2: [Stimulus] [Sated] שָׁבַע «

When an Obj is present it always designates the participant [Stimulus] (or [Contents]).

The conventional THING with which one is "satisfied," is, of course, food or drink. For example:

(153) Exod 16:12

At twilight, you shall eat meat, and in the morning you shall be satisfied with bread.

Less conventional and more abstract [Stimulus]/[Contents] participants include: "good things," (Ps 104:28), "contempt" (Ps 123:3), "produce of his lips" (Prov 18:20), "riches" (Eccl 4:8). Though conceptually similar to Qal מלא, the fact that Qal שָׁבַע profiles an animate participant [Experiencer] instead of the more general and inanimate [Container] accounts for the absence of Figure-Ground indeterminacy in the latter.

6.1.2.2 Niph שָׁבַע 457

While the sense of the verse in which it occurs is a bit obscure, Niph שָׁבַע nevertheless appears to exhibit a similar semantic profile to Niph מלא.

(154) Job 31:31

Whom did he give of his meat who is not satisfied?

Though caution needs to be taken when making generalizations based on a single data point, it can be noted that the sense of the sole instance of Niph שָׁבַע appears to parallel the event 457. For the sake of space and because the semantics of both are reasonably predictable, I will not offer a full treatment of Piel and Hiph שָׁבַע. A couple points, however, are worth stating. First, the Hiph is much more frequently attested than the Piel (16x/2x). Both stems introduce the concept of AGENT in the familiar event schema: [Agent] causes [Patient] to be satisfied (with z). The second Obj (z) expressing [Contents]/[Stimulus] is optional for both stems (cf. Piel Ezek 7:19; Hiph Ps 107:9). Judging from the two data points available for the Piel, the motivation for the use of the Piel over the Hiph is the concept of multiple or plural iterations of the action (pluractional). Interestingly, Qal שָׁבַע should probably not be regarded as reflexive like Qal אכָל or Qal לְבַשׁ. One cannot "satisfy" oneself the same way one can "feed" oneself. This seems to be implied in the frequent occurrences of expressions like that found in Hos 4:10: "And they shall eat, but they shall not be satisfied"). The Subj of Qal שָׁבַע does not exhibit the property CONTROL.
structure of Niphָלָה. The [Agent], Job, is absent from the expression and the Subj ("the men of his tent/clan") are construed as Patients who are recipients of Job's largess.

6.1.3 Summary

Verbs of Fullness, type 1 (Container focused) profile two participants in an asymmetric relationship. Qal מלא is more schematic than Qal שעון; however, they both evoke a stative scenario in which two participants are oriented with respect to each other. The rare occurrence of Qal מלא in an intransitive construction is best analyzed as an IOD. The same, however, can not necessarily be said of Qal שעון. Since Qal שעון profiles an [Experiencer] participant (with the property [+Animacy]) it is more compatible with the intransitive construction which simply expresses the state of being "satisfied" or "sated" without necessarily evoking an indefinite Obj.

The classification "Container-focused" is based on the intransitive usage of both verbs. In intransitive constructions, both Qal מלא and Qal שעון exclusively profile what may be considered the [Container]/[Experiencer] participant, that is, the entity that exhibits the state of being "full" or "satisfied."

6.2 Verbs of Filling, Type 2: Figure/Ground (Contents Focused)

Admittedly, "Contents" is not the most precise designation for the primary focused participant in Type 2 verbs. It will be used only for comparison purposes, specifically to facilitate comparison with Type 1 verbs which profile a more prototypical [Contents] participant. The [Contents] in Type 1 verbs refers to the [Locatum] which is oriented to and coextensive with a [Container] or [Location]. The semantic similarities of Type 2 verbs to Type 1 verbs resides largely in the conceptual connection of Type 2 participants [Substance]/[Humans] (e.g. "armies" "waters," "rivers," and "floods") with the Type 1 participants [Contents] or [Locatum].
6.2.1 גבר

6.2.1.1 Qal גבר

Qal גבר denotes the concept STRENGTHEN, and it is used to describe the scenario/event of "being" or "becoming strong." BDB offers the glosses, "be strong, mighty" and "prevail." In CG terms, the common cross-linguistic connection of "being" and "becoming" is the result of the ambiguity of the concept END. The concept END may be perceived as a geometric point at the end of a THING or EVENT (e.g. There is a door at the end of the hallway, and When the movie ended, the crowd clapped.) Or, it might be perceived to be the last portion of a THING or EVENT. For example, the statement, Cut the end of the string typically means to cut off the last bit or portion of the string. Similarly, This is the end of the speech refers not to the silence after the speech, but to the concluding section.

Qal גבר refers to the change-of-state of an entity relative to a Ground. The verb may refer to the resultant state ("being") or the last portion of the change-of-state immediately leading up to and including the resulting state ("becoming"). The sense of Qal גבר often rendered "prevail," trades on this latter sense of "becoming strong/ mighty" relative to a Ground. STRENGTH, after all is a relative concept. Both the stative and dynamic senses of Qal גבר typically profile a Ground element which is either overtly expressed or recoverable from the context. The central feature of Qal גבר which allows for the intransitive/Prep modified alternation is the perceived salience of the Ground which, when specified, always expresses the [Prevailed over] participant. More abstractly, the Ground element in a clause featuring Qal גבר may be regarded as the "measuring argument" which establishes the metric that the Figure surpasses, overcomes, or is stronger than. Conceptually, the Ground may be more or less salient in the mind of the speaker.

458. BDB, 149. HALOT offers the more explanatory glosses "to be superior," "to achieve something," and "to increase," 175. The concept STRENGTH is not as obviously present in these senses.
(and this may be due to its perceived relevance) and therefore is more or less likely to be overtly expressed.

Pattern 1: [Humans/Substances] 

The intransitive pattern profiles the semantic role [Human(s)/Substance]. Conceptually, the idea of prevailing always entails an entity prevailed over, though the intransitive construction leaves this entity unspecified. Participants profiled in the Subj position include: [Humans] (individual non-specific, 1 Sam 2:9; Lam 1:16; groups, Exod 17:11) and [Substances] (possibly, "waters," Gen 7:18). It should be noted that the entity [Prevailed over] is typically clear from the discourse context. The [Prevailed over] participant serves as the Ground against which the Figure [Prevailer] is profiled. In Exod 17:11, for example, the [Prevailed over] is understood to be the opposing army.

(155) Exod 17:11

וַחֲצָתָה הָאָרֶץ וַיִּצְבָּא עַל נַחַל אֲבִירָה וַיִּזְדֹּחַ עָלָיו אֲמָלֵק וַיִּצְבָּא עָלָיו קִרְיָת אֲבָרָם.

And it happened that whenever Moses raised his hand, Israel prevailed, and whenever he lowered his hand, Amalek prevailed.

Gen 7:18 is probably not an unmodified intransitive, rather the Ground (עָלָיו אֲמָלֵק) is gapped in the first clause but expressed in the second (cf. Gen 7:19, 24). Qal נָבַר in the intransitive construction demonstrates both context-dependent (e.g. Exod 17:11) and context-independent Obj Del (e.g. 1 Sam 2:9). When the IOD is context-independent, the Obj is non-specific, non-referential, and indefinite.

A characteristic of Type 2 verbs of Fullness that distinguishes them from Type 1 verbs regards the nature of the force dynamics involved in the event structure. The force, or energy source effecting the change-of-state of the [Substance] is perceived as being internal to the [Substance] itself. The force is internal and pushing outwards, a notion compatible with growing or increasing in power.
Pattern 2: [Ground] Prep [Human/Substances]-gapר «

When the Ground is overtly expressed, it is always governed by a Prep, usually על - ב, though once with Prep מ.

(156) a. 2 Sam 11:23

And the messenger said to David, "The men prevailed over us"

b. Ps 65:4

The words of iniquity are stronger than I.

The semantic distinction between - ב-gapר and מ--gapר is difficult to establish with the present data.459 As is indicated in the translation of Ps 65:4 (above), the מ-_gapר construction may express a stative scenario.460 In both prepositional constructions, however, the [Human] or [Substance] (literal or metaphorical, cf. Ps 103:11) is the Figure situated relative to the Ground which is either [Human - Group] or [Location]. If any entity may be correlated with the [Container] participant profiled in Type 1 verbs, it would be the Ground [Prevailed over] element. However, the event schema is not that of a [Contents] filling a [Container] (or vice versa). Rather, the event schema is that of a [Substance] overwhelming, or completely and powerfully covering over a [Thing] or [Location].

Importantly, the Ground element is conceptually more peripheral to the verbal scenario/action designated by Qal טבר than the [Container] is for Qal עָלֶה. The Ground is always governed by a Prep which orients the Figure [Substance] relative to a Ground [Location].

459. Interestingly, both - ב and מ may also be used to indicate comparison (e.g. 1 Chr 5:2; 2 Sam 1:23).

460. Though one wants to be careful about drawing conclusions based on two data points, it is interesting to note that the only other instance of מ-_gapר (i.e. 2 Sam 1:23) also appears to express a stative scenario.
Job 21:7 is the sole instance of Qal גָּבָר in what appears to be a transitive construction.

The sense of the second nominal, lְיִדְיִד ("strength" or "might," or possibly, "wealth") has presented translational and interpretive difficulties. Representative English translations include the following:

(158) a. KJV: Wherefore do the wicked live, become old, yea, are mighty in power?
   b. NASB: Why do the wicked still live, continue on, and become very powerful?
   c. NRSV: Why do the wicked live on, reach old age and grow mighty in power?
   d. NIV: Why do the wicked live on, growing old and increasing in power?
   e. JPS: Why do the wicked live on, prosper and grow wealthy?

It is clear that חָיִל is not filling the conventional Ground roles [Human-Group] or [Location]. It is specifying an attribute or quality which characterizes the רְשָׁעִים ("the wicked"). This usage is clearly exceptional and should probably be taken as a creative exploitation of the language. The author of Job may, in fact, be making a pun on the technical term for the landed aristocracy, חַיִל גִּבּוֹר, a designation that occurs at least 32 times in the HB. Job 21:7 comes in the middle of Job's response to Zophar; and he is asking, in effect, "Why do the wicked prosper?" The unconventional expression lְיִדְיִד may be intimating (albeit subtly) that the wicked's increase in strength or wealth enables them to assume the semi-technical social status of חַיִל גִּבּוֹר.
Nevertheless, even creative exploitations achieve their meaning through the use of conventionalized constructions and image schemas. I suggest that the cognitive operation at work in Qal גבר pattern 3 is a variation of what is known as a Cognate Object Construction. Cognate Objects (COs) have been fertile ground for discussions of transitivity. In his recent study of Cognate Object Constructions (COCs) Silke Höche has argued convincingly that COs should be regarded as Objs in transitive constructions. He argues that the forms of COCs are conceptually motivated, saying that they mirror "a particular load of conceptual content and/or a particular relation or constellation of the conceptualized entities (objects/ events)." Höche draws on Langacker's notion of "conceptual reification" to describe the construal operation in which the "temporal succession of component states" characteristic of verbs is reified through summary scanning and the resultant nominalization evokes the verbal event without the temporal element. Conceptual reification may be illustrated with the following examples:

(159) a. To the disappointment of the Danes, London Bridge fell in 1014.

   b. The falling of London Bridge in 1014 disappointed the Danes.

   In (159)a, the "falling" of London Bridge is conceived as a temporal sequence (through sequential scanning) and thus expressed with a verb; in (159)b the entire event is construed in its

---

463. Höche, *Cognate Object Constructions*, 76; 272-77. The syntactic status of COs has been a matter of vigorous debate in modern linguistics. Approaching the question from a rigorously cognitivist perspective, Höche rejects the notion that COs should be analyzed as adjuncts or adverbials.


465. Höche says, "A combination of summary scanning and shift in profile is at work in nominalization (i.e. the conceptual reification of the verbal process), giving rise to a particular type of noun — the episodic noun, which designates one episode of the process expressed by the verb. Thus, a smile, for example, is the result reifying the complex temporal relation designated by the verb smile. As a consequence, the verb and its corresponding episodic noun evoke the same conceptual base; yet the profiles which are imposed on this base by verbal and nominal form in each case differ. While for verbs, the temporal succession of the component states is prominent... for nominalizations we find the characteristic shift of the profile to a thing... the focus now being on the bounded entity, containing the abstract region which is occupied by a set of component states." *Cognate Object Constructions*, 78 (emphasis original). In addition to conceptual reification, Langacker designates the second factor of COCs, namely the "tolerance of redundancy, up to an including full overlap between the components of a complex expression." *FOCG* II, 364.
entirely (though summary scanning) and thus expressed with a NP. The cognitive operation of reification renders the referent as an Obj or a mass. Höche concludes, therefore, that as such it "can be construed as the participant in the event."^466 Obviously, the Obj מָלֶל in Job 21:7 is not cognate to Qal גָּבֵר. However, many COCs may feature nominals which are associated with the same semantic domain. Consider, for example, the following pairs:

(160) a. Miranda sang a song.
    b. Miranda sang an aria.

(161) a. Stan dreamed a dream.
    b. Stan dreamed a nightmare.

(162) a. The villain smiled a crooked smile.
    b. The villain smiled a crooked grin.

To be sure, the b sentences are not properly COCs in the formal sense. Nevertheless, the event schemas evoked by the a and b sentences are conceptually near equivalents. The Obj מָלֶל in Job 21:7 shares a similar semantic domain as Qal גָּבֵר and should be regarded as designating the resultant state (reified Obj) of the strengthening event. The sense of the COC (near equivalent) construction is best captured in the NRSV (and similar translations) that render Job 21:7b "...and grow mighty in strength."

6.2.2

6.2.2.1 Qal שָׁטִיף

Qal שָׁטִיף typically profiles two participant roles which I will designate using the terms: <Flood, Flooded>.

---

^466 Höche, *Cognate Object Constructions*, 78. Höche's analysis of COCs is more nuanced and developed than is able to be presented here. Importantly, however, Höche makes a distinction between COs which relate Events and those that relate Results. The former is a reification of the entire Event described by the verb, the latter is the "endpoint" of the event, the result and in some cases the product of the action. The suggestion here is that מָלֶל is of the resultive type.
Pattern 1: [Flood] שׁטף «

The intransitive usage only profiles the participant [Flood], which is the [Thing] or [Substance] which undergoes a change of state of increasing, swelling, and expanding. The basic image schema is of water flooding. The Subjs of Qal שׁטף are basically of two sorts: bodies of water and armies. It is quite likely that the latter is a conventionalized usage based on the metaphorical extension of the former. That is to say, conceptually the metaphor is ARMIES ARE BODIES OF MOVING/SWELLING WATER. The use of Qal שׁטף to describe the action of armies appears dependent on the image schema of its use with water and therefore should be regarded as a metaphorical use of the more basic sense of "to flood."

(163) a. Ps 78:20

Here he struck the rock,
    Water flowed out,
    Streams overflowed.

b. Isa 8:8

And he will sweep into Judah, overflow, and pass through, he will reach up to the neck.

The Subj of the verbs in Isa 8:8 is the king of Assyria who is figured as a mighty rushing river in an extended metaphor running throughout vv 7-8. This metaphor of a mighty army figured as an overwhelming or rising flood is fairly conventional (e.g. Jer 47:2; Dan 11:10, 40)

On one occasion, Qal שׁטף profiles the [Flooded].

(164) Dan 11:26

Even those who eat his food will break him, his army will be washed away and many slain will fall.

The figure ARMIES ARE A FLOOD serves as a sustained metaphor throughout the apocalyptic vision (e.g. Dan 11:22). The armies of the King of the North destroyed and conquered like flooding waters (Dan 11:10). Armies are "swept away" or "flooded away" (Dan
11:22, Niph (שׁטף) before the "exactor of tribute." But eventually his own armies will themselves be "swept/flooded away" (Dan 11:26 Qal (שׁטף)).

The use of Qal (שׁטף) in Dan 11:26 should not be regarded as a distinct sense or even a different participant structure. Rather, the notion that the army will "be washed away" is a modulation of the conventional sense which undergoes polysemic extension. On this reading, the "army" is still filling the [Substance] role. The focus simply shifts from the destructive growth or swelling of the "waters/armies," to the movement of the "waters/armies." Though flood waters are typically perceived as moving "into" and "through" a [Location], they may also be construed as moving "away" from a [Location].

Pattern 2: [Flooded] [Flood] (שׁטף)

The transitive construction occurs 12 times. The Obj in the transitive construction always profiles the [Flooded] participant which specifies the Patient which is overwhelmed by the [Substance] designated by the Subj [Flood]. Isa 28:17 is representative:

(165) a. Isa 28:17

Waters will flood the shelter.

b. Jer 47:2

And they [the waters] will flood the land and all that fills it, the city and those who dwell in it.

Unlike Qal (גבר), the Obj in the transitive construction is not an Obj of result, but rather specifies the Patient. The transitive usage brings into view the Ground element which is "overwhelmed" or "flooded" by the Subj. Like Qal (גבר), however, the introduction of the Ground

467. To be sure, it is also possible that חילו is the Obj with the sense of the clause being, "And one shall overwhelm his army."
changes the measuring argument. In the intransitive construction, the "growth," "swelling," or perhaps, "movement" of the [Substance] itself serves as the metric which measures out the event (e.g. Isa 8:8, above). The use of the Ground as the Patient changes the event structure in that the event now approximates much more closely the prototypical transitive scenario.

Pattern 3: [Flooded] [Flooder] יבש "

A single instance of Qal יבש in 1 Kgs 22:38 profiles an unconventional participant as the Subj, namely the agentive [Flooder].

(166) 1 Kgs 22:38 נָשַׁף אָרָם-יָבוֹם וְתֹּם | הָאֲשֶׁר-שָׁפָה לִבָּהוּ

And they inundated the chariot by the pool of Samaria.

The sense of the expression is clearly that of an Agent "washing" or "inundating" the chariot. Broadly conceived, the Obj in pattern 3 profiles the same participant in pattern 2, the [Flooded]. The alternation, therefore, is of the Subj profile. While the [Flooder] participant is similar to the [Flood] participant in pattern 2 as being the CAUSER of the effect on the Obj, it is nevertheless conceptually distinct as it profiles AGENCY. There is also a greater distinguishability of participant in pattern 3 than pattern 2, making the former closer to the prototypical transitive scenario. The alternation of the Subj participant is likely motivated by the conceptual contiguity between [Flood] and [Flooder]. (For a fuller discussion of what may be termed Metonymic Subject Change, see under Qal חסר below, 6.5.1 pattern 2)

468 This sense is confirmed by two of the three passive uses of יבש (Niph and Pual) both conveying the sense of "being washed" (Lev 6:21, 15:12). Both are modified by the instrumental בַּמָּיִם.
6.2.3 Summary

The similarity between Qal בָּרֺד and Qal שָׁטַך resides in the conventional Subj profiled in intransitive constructions. [Substance] or, by metaphoric extension, a [Human-Group] is conceived as overwhelming or inundating a Ground. The major difference, however, is that Qal שָׁטַך profiles the Ground element as more of a Patient than Qal בָּרֺד. The only bivalent instance of Qal בָּרֺד does not profile an affected Patient, but a CO near equivalent. Nevertheless, in light of Höche's cognitive analysis of COCs, the CO is rightly analyzed as a DO and the clause best regarded as transitive. In contrast to Type 1 verbs, Type 2 verbs of Fullness evoke an event structure in which internal force dynamics push outward causing a growing, swelling, or strengthening of the Subj. That motion may be viewed with reference to the previous state of the Subj [Substance]/[Human] or with reference to an external Ground which is "overpowered," "overwhelmed," or in some general sense "covered" by the [Substance] itself.

6.3 Verbs of Fullness, Type 3: Effected Object

Verbs of Fullness, Type 3 verbs are characterized by transitive constructions profiling an Effected Obj, that is, an Obj that is created or comes into existence by means of the action denoted by the verb.

6.3.1 שָׁרֵץ

6.3.1.1 Qal שָׁרֵץ

Occurring only 14 times in the HB and only in the Qal stem, Qal שָׁרֵץ appears in three basic syntactic patterns: unmodified intransitive, intransitive modified by Prep governing [Location], and transitive. HALOT's translation"to creep, move, swarm" suggests that the
authors regard manner of motion as the salient feature of the verb. Other suggestions that have been offered for the basic sense of the root in its nominal or verbal uses include: animals characterized by "low carriage" (Whitekettle), "a wiggling or scampering tribe" (Joüon-Muraoka), "swarmers, the wriggling kind" (Waltke-O'Connor), creatures that do not swim or fly through the usual means (fins or wings), but instead crawl (Levine), "small creatures that go about in shoals and swarms" (Snaith), and creatures with an "indeterminate form of movement" (Douglas). The common quality uniting these proposals (including HALOT's) is the "manner of motion" of the various animals described as רוּץ or by the verb Qal רוּץ. However, Cook argues convincingly that "manner of motion" (whether it be low carriage, etc.) is not at the heart of the lexical meaning. Rather, based on its use in Exod 1:7 (see (167) below), it core sense is better understood to be the collection of animate beings into groups. That is, it is the resulting state of "grouping" or "collecting into swarms" that is the core feature of the motion denoted by the verbal and nominal forms.

Pattern 1: [Swarmer]שׁרץ

The unmodified intransitive usage occurs only twice, Lev 11:43 and Exod 1:7.

(167) a. Exod 1:7

ודָנִים יְשָׁרְתֵּן יִשְׂרָאֵל יָרְאוּ גָּאוֹנָה נֻאָרָו מִשְׁתָּרָה בְּמֵאָר פָּנִים

And the Israelites were fruitful and they swarmed and they multiplied and became

469. So HALOT and BDB adds "teem."


exceedingly mighty.

b. Lev 11:43  

And you shall not contaminate your throats with any creature that swarms.473

Its use in Exod 1:7 is particularly interesting as it sheds light on the sense of Qal שׁרץ.

The image of Israel "creeping" or "moving with a low carriage" seems peculiar even allowing for metaphorical extension. The sense, as Cook argues, is more likely the movement of a large number of animate creatures into groups or swarms. I would point out that from a cognitive perspective, this final state of "grouping" or "swarming together" may easily be perceived as the GOAL of the action. This is the point of connection between Qal שׁרץ and the other verbs of motion discussed below. The intransitive use of Qal שׁרץ ptc in Lev 11:43, therefore, simply focuses on the type of creatures who gather in such a manner.

Pattern 2: [Location] -ב/ על־ [Swarmer]שׁרץ«

Half of the occurrences of Qal שׁרץ appear with a Prep governing [Location]. For our purposes the two prepositional usages of Qal שׁרץ may be treated together as the difference between them pertains mainly to the construal of the Obj [Location] which, interestingly, is always הַאֶרֶץ.

(168) a. Gen 8:17  

And they [swarming creatures] shall swarm in the earth, and be fruitful and multiply on the earth.

b. Gen 7:21  

And every swarming creature that swarmed upon the earth.

473. Translation by Jacob Milgrom, Leviticus 1-16 (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1991), 683. Both the LXX and Syr add 'al-hā‘āres which may be preferable as it creates an inclusio with v 44. Milgrom points to the previous context in support of this view noting that "not all swarming creatures (which would include the fish and the flying insects, some of which are pure, vv 9, 21-22) but only those which swarm on the land (none of which are pure)." Leviticus 1-16, 685.
Prep על construes הַאֶרֶץ as a planar surface upon which [Swarmers] gather into groups in a manner indicated by the verb. Prep ב construes הַאֶרֶץ more as a container in which [Swarmers] move and therefore evokes an image schema that is conceptually closer to the Container-Contents schema than the schema evoked by the Prep על. The action denoted by the verb Qal שׁרץ is clearly an Activity indicating motion and its collocation with Prep + [Location] which serves to contextualize or ground the activity is fairly unremarkable.

Pattern 3: [Swarmers] [Location] שׁרץ «

On four occasions, Qal שׁרץ appears with the [Location] as the Subj and [Swarmers] in the canonically DO position. These instances are as follows:

(169) a. Gen 1:20

b. Gen 1:21

c. Exod 7:28

d. Ps 105:30

This construction, which I will call the Subj [Location] construction, has long been recognized as a grammatical peculiarity. Luzzatto, for example, maintained that Qal שׁרץ is always intransitive.474 Commenting on its use in Gen 1:20 he says, "It does not mean that the waters will bring forth [the creatures] or beget them, but that the waters will seem to be agitated by them."475 Citing the treatments of GK, Brockelmann, and Meyer, HALOT simply notes that this construction is "of grammatical interest."476 No translation or paraphrase is provided.

476. HALOT, 1656.
Many modern English translations make sense of the construction by inserting the Prep \textit{with}. For example, the NIV translates Gen 1:20 as, "And God said, 'Let the water teem with living creatures.'"\textsuperscript{477} Other translations, however, render the sense of the construction as essentially productive or creative in meaning. Thus the NRSV reads, "And God said, 'Let the waters bring forth swarms of living creatures.'"\textsuperscript{478}

The issue of the semantics of Qal קָרַץ in the Subj [Location] construction has recently been revisited by Rivka Halevy and Edward Cook, both of whom offer a more theoretically rigorous analysis. Halevy's treatment of what she calls the "swarm-drip" verbs includes evidence from both biblical and modern Hebrew, though most of her examples come from the latter.\textsuperscript{479} She identifies five semantic classes which evidence the alternation: 1) activities occurring over a long period constantly or repetitively, 2) predicates indicating animal sounds heard constantly, 3) predicates indicating a process of light emission, 4) predicates indicating smell transmission, and 5) predicates indicating degree of occupancy or abundance.\textsuperscript{480} It is questionable whether Halevy's Class 1 is an identifiable "semantic class" in the same sense as Classes 2-5. Nevertheless, Class 1 is the only class for which Halevy offers BH examples, including Qal קָרַץ.

Halevy explains the Subj [Location] construction with reference to a number of cognitive operations. She asserts that the construction exhibits the "holism effect," that is, in the Subj [Location] construction the [Location] is construed as wholly or entirely affected. Halevy notes

\textsuperscript{477}So too ASV, NASB, ESV, NLT, NKJV.

\textsuperscript{478}Among English translations, this meaning appears to have the older pedigree as it is found in the 1599 Geneva Bible. It is found also in the KJV, RSV, OJB, JPS.

\textsuperscript{479}The review and critique of Halevy's argument found here, though, only pertains to the biblical evidence. The phenomenon as it is found in Modern Hebrew (MH) is outside the scope of this study.

\textsuperscript{480}Halevy, "Understanding," 40-42.
that this conceptualization "motivates an accusative analysis for the verb." The substance of Halevy's argument, however, is that the Obj of the Subj [Location] constructions is an "accusative of specification," or Tamyiz. She summarizes her view as follows:

I believe that the location-subject construction represents a different structuring of the event, which [sic] it is viewed by the observer/speaker from a distinct perspective. More specifically, while the unmarked construction of the actor-subject subsumes an event of filling a space, the location subject construction classifies the location according to the activity that takes place within it. This kind of classification is performed in a descriptive, vivid, and sense-oriented way. That is, behind the two alternate codings of the same "objective" piece of reality lie two different functions.... According to this approach, the argument alternation in the locative-subject construction portrays an event construal conceived from the perspective of the location-subject as a whole, that is, as a "container" characterized by the entities located within it.

Halevy's analysis offers a number of significant and helpful insights into the behavior of Qal ורץ, notable among them is the notion that the transitivity alternation entails a shift in event structure. She is certainly correct that this shift is motivated at a cognitive and conceptual level and is represented in the syntax of the constructions. Though not responding to Halevy's argument specifically, Cook's treatment of Qal ורץ highlights some of the weaknesses of Halevy's thesis. Cook's also considers Qal ורץ in light of the cross-linguistic literature on the swarm-alternation. However, in contrast to Halevy, Cook notes some striking dissimilarities between

482. Halevy, "Understanding," 43-44. To my mind, this is the heart of Halevy's argument. To this she appends the pragmatic argument that the Subj [Location] construction is functionally "presentational," and therefore similar to existential expressions like, (There is the book in the library). "Understanding," 45. Halevy's argument in this regard resembles the argument made in chapter 5 regarding dwelling verbs in setting-subject constructions (see 5.3.1.1, pattern 3). In the setting-subject construction, a Subj [Location] is expressed to describe an event that takes place within it. Langacker has made a compelling argument that the setting-subject image schema is the conceptual basis for certain expressions that have proved tremendously difficult for formal linguistic analyses, namely existential expressions (e.g. it-constructions as in It's raining big drops, and It seems that he lied to us). Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction, 389-90. While I believe the setting-subject construction makes good sense of BH dwelling verbs, as will be argued below, the Substance-Source image schema makes better sense of the BH data for Filling Verbs.
BH Qal שרץ and what is typically regarded as the swarm-alternations. Cook rightly notes that the "holism effect" does not fit the sense of at least three of the four uses of the verb.

Cook's thesis begins with the semantics of the verb itself, particularly highlighting the image schema it evokes. Contrary to many who regard Qal שרץ as indicating a particular manner of motion, Cook notes that its collocation with the verbs פרה and רבה in Gen 8:17, 9:7, and Exod 1:7 "shows clearly that the verb belongs with the verba copiae, not the verbs of motion," specifically that of "clustering in large space-occupying numbers (swarms)."

In contrast to the holism effect or the location-characterized-by-activity theory of Halevy, Cook proposes that the Obj complement is a DO and that the sentences should be interpreted as transitive constructions with the verb meaning "cause to swarm," or "cause to abound." As discussed in chapter 2 (see 2.3.1 above), this interpretation is widely attested in the ancient literature and it persisted well into the modern period as evidenced by the KJV and translations that follow in the tradition of the so-called Authorized Version. Cook finds an analogue to the transitivity alternation of Qal שרץ in the Substance/Source alternation of English verbs identified by Levin. Though Levin notes that this alternation appears restricted to verbs of substance emission in English, there is no reason that this must be the case. She describes the Substance/Source alternation as follows: "Like the middle alternation and the causative alternations, this transitivity alternation is characterized by the subject of the intransitive form of the verb bearing the same semantic relation to the verb as the object of the transitive form: in this instance, the substance emitted." For example:

(170) a. Heat radiates from the sun.

b. The sun radiates heat.

484. Levin, English Verb Classes, 32-33.
Cook admits that the parallel is inexact in that the BH constructions do not indicate source in the intransitive construction with the equivalent (and expected) Prep מִן. He proposes that BH exhibits a type of hybrid alternation in which the [Location] of the intransitive (locative) construction is converted into a Substance/Source alternation.²⁸⁵ Cook cites Salkoff’s examples (171) and offers his own (172) - (176) as conceptually analogous to the BH evidence:

(171) a. Sweat dripped down John's face.  
    b. John's face dripped with sweat.  
    c. John's face dripped sweat.

(172) a. Water collected in the sink.  
    b. The sink collected water.

(173) a. Weeds sprouted in the garden.  
    b. The garden sprouted weeds.

(174) a. Water gushed through the ravine.  
    b. The ravine gushed water.

(175) a. Love sparkled in his eyes.  
    b. His eyes sparkled love.

(176) a. Trophies accumulated on his shelf.  
    b. His shelf accumulated trophies.

The transitive "productive" interpretation in which the [Location] is construed as the [Source] which "produces" or "causes to go forth" a [Substance] better explains the sense of Qal שׁרץ in its contexts. This is most clearly seen in Exod 7:28: "And the Nile caused frogs to swarm forth"). The context is the Exodus plague narrative in which YHWH threatens the Pharaoh with the inundation of Egypt with frogs. Immediately prior, YHWH says, "if you refuse to send them forth, I will strike all of your territory with frogs," Exod 7:27). And after, YHWH says, "and they will go up and enter your palace and your bedchamber,"

Exod 7:28b). If the "swarming" denoted by Qal שׁרץ in the Subj [Location] construction only denotes movement which takes place within a location — as is suggested by the translation, "the Nile will swarm with frogs" — then there is not much of a threat to the royal palace or the homes of his courtiers. If, as is suggested here, the Subj [Location] construction entails the concept CAUSATION and carries the sense "to produce" or "cause to swarm forth," then there is a clear threat to Egypt. The Nile is going to produce and issue forth a swarm of frogs. It is more satisfactory to understand the function of the Nile on a conceptual level as the [Source] which is construed as "producing" the frogs [Substance].

Similarly, the causative-productive sense "bring forth swarms of living creatures" (as e.g. JPS) in Gen 1:20 makes better sense in the context than the location-characterized-by-activity sense, "swarm with living creatures" (as e.g. ESV). Throughout the creation account of Gen 1:1-2:4, God is depicted as bringing the creation into existence through the mediation of its environment which is construed as producing or issuing forth its "inhabitants" (broadly considered). This may be seen, for example, in Gen 1:11 and 24:

(177) a. Gen 1:11

And God said, "Let the earth sprout vegetation, plants bearing seed, and fruit trees bearing fruit in which is their seed according to its kind."

b. Gen 1:24

And God said, "Let the earth bring forth living creatures according to their kind."

Gen 1:20 (and the notice of fulfillment in v 21) parallels this event structure in which the waters "bring forth in swarms" the living creatures which are to find their habitation in them. Cook's Substance/Source alternation developed primarily (though not exclusively) with reference to Qal שׁרץ has significant explanatory value for other BH verbs as will be demonstrated below.
6.3.2 וַלֹּא

6.3.2.1 וַלֹּא

Even a cursory survey of the varied uses and senses of וַלֹּא is beyond the scope of this study, and nevertheless would probably risk distracting from the salient features of the rare transitive constructions. It is sufficient for our purposes to note that וַלֹּא is perhaps the most basic or general verb of motion. Typically intransitive in the vast majority of its usages, וַלֹּא denotes the action of going, coming, walking (often along a path). It is commonly used to express motion toward a [Goal], or away from a [Source] or point of origin, both typically governed by a Prep. וַלֹּא also exhibits a wide range of metaphorical uses and, in some constructions, may function as a light verb with the general sense of "increasing," or, "continue to do something."

Pattern 1: [Substance] [Source] וַלֹּא«

וַלֹּא is one of a handful of motion verbs that GKC associates with the category Verba copiae and inopiae. GKC cites Joel 4:18, a verse in which the verb occurs twice, as an instance of the transitive alternation.

(178) Joel 4:18

The hills will flow forth milk,
and all the stream beds of Judah will flow forth water.

The Subjs in both the A colon and the B colon are not conventional [Substances] which may be conceived as "moving" or "flowing." Both, rather, are conventional [Locations] to which, from which, or in which an activity may take place. To be sure, both Halevy's and Cook's proposals are plausible interpretations of Joel 4:18. According to Halevy's model, "the hills" may be the [Location] which is characterized by the activity of "flowing with milk, and "the stream beds," the activity of "flowing with water." Cook, on the other hand, argues for a version
of the Substance/Source alternation (the interpretation adopted in the translation above) in which "the hills" and "the stream beds" are construed as the [Source] which issues forth or produces their respective [Substances]. Though both are plausible interpretations of Joel 4:18, other uses of Qal הָלַךְ suggest that Cook's Substance/Source alternation better captures the event structure of this exceptional usage in other instances. The use of Qal הָלַךְ in Mic 2:11 is most satisfactorily explained with reference to the Substance/Source alternation.

(179) Mic 2:11

לֹא־אִשָּׁה־תַּחֲפֹת רְוֵי־חֵם הָלַךְ נַפְשׁוֹּ

As is evident from the sampling of English translations below, the Qal act ptc of הָלַךְ is typically interpreted as referring to the movement of the false prophet ("going/walking about") and רְוֵי־חֵם is taken as adverbial or as the fronted Obj of בַּעַל.

(180) a. If a man walking in the spirit and falsehood do lie (KJV)
   b. If a man should go about and utter wind and lies (RSV, similar ESV)
   c. If a man should go about uttering empty falsehoods (NRSV)
   d. If a liar and deceiver comes and says (NIV)
   e. If a man walking after wind and falsehood (NASB)

It is not obvious, however, that רְוֵי־חֵם is meant to be taken as an adverb. Mic 2:11 is the only instance in which Qal הָלַךְ is modified by רְוֵי־חֵם and it may just as easily (if not preferably) be regarded as a DO. The false prophet, in this interpretation, is construed as the [Source] and the רְוֵי־חֵם ("wind") the [Substance] which issues forth from him. Thus the sense of Mic 2:11 would be, "If a man produces wind and utters falsehood." A similar (though not exact) event structure is suggested by HALOT which regards Qal הָלַךְ in Mic 2:11 as metaphorical and offers the gloss, "overflowing with." A similar Subj [Source] event structure is manifest in Ezek 31:4:

486. HALOT, 247.
In Ezek 31:4, "her rivers" (דַּיְלֵיהּ בְּרֶשֶׁת) is the Obj of the action denoted by Qal הָלַךְ. There is a difficulty, however, in determining the Subj of the verbal action. A possible Subj is "the surrounding place of its planting" (םְפָשִׁית הָאַלַּיְלֵיהּ) construed as a singular via attraction to the nomen rectum. There is, on this reading, however, the difficulty of the lack of gender concord between the Subj and verb. A better reading, therefore would be to re-point Qal הָלַךְ as an infinitive absolute, allowing "the deep" from the previous clause to be the Subj ("[the deep] flowed forth rivers around the place of its planting").487 "The deep," in this case, probably refers to a primordial body of water understood as existing underneath the earth's surface is the [Source] (with its implied energy and action) which "produces" or "issues forth" the rivers which water Assyria figured as a tree (v 3).

Though arguably less clear examples of the Substance/Source alternation than Mic 2:11 and Ezek 31:4, two other occurrences of Qal הָלַךְ in a transitive construction may also evoke the same (or similar) event structure.

(182) Ps 105:41

487. Following the Gk ἠγαγεν ("carried," lit. "made to go"), G. A. Cooke makes what he calls a "necessary change" of the MT's "it was going." Cooke's rendering is very close to that suggested here: Waters nourished it, Tehom reared it, 'carried' her streams around its' plot. Ezekiel (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1936), 339.
Though typically regarded as an adverb ("and they flowed in the desert as a river") it is possible that "the waters" themselves are being construed as the [Source] of the river [Substance] which is produced.

(183) Ezek 7:17

כֶּלֶ֥לָה רַגְעָה יָלְדוּתָה יָלִ֖דוּת יָלְדוּת יָלִ֖דוּת.

All hands grow weak, and all thighs flow forth water.

Ezek 7:17, though probably both a euphemism and an idiom, nevertheless makes better sense as a Subj [Source] event structure (Cook) than with a [Location] = Place-of-Activity (Halevy) event structure. "The thighs" are not the [Location] in which the "flowing activity" (presumably urination) is taking place, but rather the [Source] (expressed as a circumlocution) which produces the [Substance].

6.3.3

6.3.3.1 Qal ירד

Like Qal הולך, Qal ירד is a motion verb which typically appears in an intransitive construction with the sense, "to go down" (HALOT), "to come, go down, descend" (BDB). In active constructions, the Subj is typically the [Mover] and the [Location] from which, or to which the [Mover] descends is typically, though not always, governed by a Prep.

Pattern 1: [Substance] [Source] ירד«

Like Qal הולך, Qal ירד in the transitive construction is relatively rare, though unlike Qal הולך it appears to exhibit selectional restrictions that suggests a degree of idiomicity. GKC cites

488. The same idiom may be found in Ezek 21:12.

489. HALOT, 334-45.
Lam 1:16; 3:48; Jer 9:17; 13:17; and Ps 119:136 as examples of the transitive alternation and offers the glosses, "to pour down," and "to overflow with." Lam 3:48 is representative of the basic event structure:

(184) Lam 3:48

My eyes pour forth streams of water.

HALOT suggests an alternate rendering in which the Obj is adverbial and the action indicated by the verb depicts a change-of-state of the Subj, "eyes." For example, they translate Jer 13:17 as "my eye melts in tears" (יוֹרַע נְפִיָּה דָּאָר נֵי). "Eyes," in this view, "go down" in the metaphorical sense of being dissolved, or "melting." This view may appeal to other usages in which the Subj is in some sense the [Substance] (very broadly considered) which itself "goes down" through the event of physical transformation or dissolution. For example, Deut 28:52, וְהוֹרַע מִנֵי דָּאָר נֵי ("until your high walls fall down"). The obvious difference between the event structure represented by Deut 28:52 and the event structure represented by Lam 3:48 is the presence of a second nominal in the latter. By and large, modern translations analyze the second nominal (ְנֵי, "tears" or נְפִי, "water") as an adverb. Fairly standard among English translation is, "My eyes flow with rivers of tears." The JPS translation construes the Subj "my eyes" as more actively involved in the event: "My eyes shed streams of water."

GKC's rendering (especially "pour forth" evoking as it does a transitive event schema) comes very close to the interpretation offered here in which the Subj is the [Source] producing the [Substance]. The simple transitive rendering in the Substance/Source image schema

490. GKC, §117z, 369.

491. Similarly, Deut 20:20. Conceptual parallels may include the falling of soldiers (e.g. 1 Sam 26:10; Hag 2:22; Ezek 30:6); forests going down to the ground (Isa 32:19; Zech 11:2).

492. So RSV, NRSV, ESV. Similar, KJV. NIV switches the event schema: "Streams of tears flow from my eyes."
construes the event as it was most likely conceived, that is, an event in which the eyes produce tears or "water" as a [Substance] issuing forth from a [Source]. The LXX renders the above examples with the verb κατάγω in active constructions with the Obj in the accusative case. For example, Jer 9:17 is rendered as follows: καὶ καταγαγέτωσαν οἱ ὄφθαλμοι ὦμόν δάκρυα ("and let our eyes flow down tears").

Lam 3:48 taken as the Substance/Source alternation construes the Obj בֵּית אָב as a DO. "My eyes" (יָנָי) are the [Source] which produces the [Substance], "streams of water" (בֵּית אָב). The [Substance] in this event is the Eff Obj; however, since the clause is low on the distinguishability of participants it resides on transitivity scale in a lower position than the Aff Obj prototype.

6.3.4 יָנָי

6.3.4.1 Qal יָנָי

Occurring approximately 750 times, Qal יָנָי is one of the most common BH verbs of motion. Typically, Qal יָנָי denotes motion away from a location, hence its conventional gloss "to go or come out," (BDB) and "come forth, set out, move away" (HALOT). GKC cites Amos 5:3 as an instance (arguably the sole instance) of the transitive use of Qal יָנָי where the Obj specifies the event participant [Human] as opposed to [Location].

493. My translation. The NETS translation, "and let our eyes bring down tears," does not capture the correct image schema of κατάγω when it collocates with Obj [Substance] (cf. Sir 22:19; Ps 77:16).

494. BDB, 422; HALOT, 425. The root יָנָי also appears in the Hiphil and Hophal stems with fairly predictable senses ("cause to go out" and "be led out," respectively).

495. I am excluding from this discussion the transitive constructions with the sense "away from" and "toward" + DO [Location]. While the alternation יָנָי + DO [Location]/ מִן [Location] is interesting in its own right, it does not directly bear on the semantics of the construction in Amos 5:3.
The city that *sends forth* a thousand,
will leave over a hundred,
and the one which *sends forth* a hundred,
will leave over ten for the house of Israel.

When Qal נָעַר occurs with an Obj, the Obj is typically governed by a Prep (most often מִן) and specifies a place or location from which the Subj departs. It is not uncommon, however, for Qal נָעַר to occur in an intransitive construction either with the general sense of leaving or departing (e.g. Exod 17:9), or where the [Location] is inferred from the context (e.g. Gen 8:18). The general consensus of translators and commentators is that Qal נָעַר in Amos 5:3a is an intransitive construction and that the nominal modifiers (אֶלֶף "thousand," and מֵאָה, "hundred" — both clearly referring to an army or military units) function adverbially specifying the MANNER of motion. For example:

(186) a. The city that went out a thousand shall leave an hundred (KJV)
   b. The city that went forth a thousand shall have a hundred left (RSV, similar NRSV, ESV)
   c. Your city that marches out a thousand strong will have only hundred left. (NIV, similar JPS)

Clearly, עִיר is a figure (i.e. metaphor, meronym, metonym, etc.). The question is, however, what entity does עִיר figure? Duane Garrett suggests that, "the 'city' here by synecdoche represents the military men of that city."496 "The city" stands for the city's army and it is this army that is marching out for battle. This understanding appears to be what is in view in the translations above (186) a-c and, to be sure, it is grammatically plausible and semantically coherent when considered on its own. I suggest, however, that this analysis of the A colon results in an awkward (if not non-sensical) use of Hiph שָאר in the B colons. Hiph שָאר is almost

always (perhaps always) causative in meaning with the sense "cause to remain or be left over," or, more simply, "to leave over." The fairly consistent event schema evoked by Hiph אָשָׁר is one in which the Subj-Agent causes an Obj-Patient distinct from the Subj "to remain" or "be left over," as can be seen in the following examples:

(187) a. Deut 2:34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>נָלַיָה</th>
<th>הָיָה</th>
<th>נָלַיָה</th>
<th>הָיָה</th>
<th>נָלַיָה</th>
<th>הָיָה</th>
<th>נָלַיָה</th>
<th>הָיָה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deut 2:34:</td>
<td>And we left (caused to remain) no survivor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. 1 Kgs 19:18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>נָלַיָה</th>
<th>הָיָה</th>
<th>נָלַיָה</th>
<th>הָיָה</th>
<th>נָלַיָה</th>
<th>הָיָה</th>
<th>נָלַיָה</th>
<th>הָיָה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Kgs 19:18:</td>
<td>And I will leave (cause to remain) seven thousand in Israel.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Zeph 3:12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>נָלַיָה</th>
<th>הָיָה</th>
<th>נָלַיָה</th>
<th>הָיָה</th>
<th>נָלַיָה</th>
<th>הָיָה</th>
<th>נָלַיָה</th>
<th>הָיָה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zeph 3:12:</td>
<td>And I will leave in your midst a people humble and lowly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To take, as Garrett does, הָעִיר as a synecdoche for the army itself requires an otherwise unattested usage of Hiph אָשָׁר. In this case, the same entity that "goes out" is the entity who is "causing to remain." The senses suggested by the translations above require an unattested reflexive meaning along the lines of "cause themselves (some of themselves?) to remain." For this reason, Arnold Ehrlich (among others) suggests re-vocalizing אָשָׁר as a Niphal in order to identify the city as the entity experiencing (instead of causing) the devastation of being left with a meager remnant.

If, however, Qal אָשָׁר is understood as evoking the Substance/Source alternation then אָשָׁר ("the city") may be construed as the [Source] which issues forth or sends out a [Substance], namely a thousand man army. In this interpretation, אָשָׁר does not refer to the army itself but to the city of Samaria conceived as a collective corporate entity. Or, perhaps better, אָשָׁר may

---

497."To leave over," HALOT, 1377; "leave over, spare; leave or keep over," BDB, 984.

metonymically refer to Samaria's leaders — wealthy elite, religious leaders, and political officers — who throughout Amos are particularly singled out as the cause of Israel's defeat (e.g. 3:9-10; 4:1; 6:4-7; 8:4-7). HALOT's brief entry for Hiph רָשַׁשׁ is suggestive. HALOT cites Amos 5:3 as an example of the meaning, "to preserve alive, keep surviving troops after an expedition."

Presumably, הַעִיר is the Subj of both Qal יצא and Hiph רָשַׁשׁ. Therefore, the הַעִיר that is "preserving alive" a hundred soldiers is the same entity who previously "sent forth" the same soldiers.

Though not in full agreement with the event structure proposed here, it is of interest that both the LXX and Tg. Jon. renders an event schema that is strikingly different than the modern interpretations.

(188) LXX: Ἡ πόλις, ἓς ἔξεπορεύοντο χίλιοι, ὑπολειφθήσονται ἐκατόν, καὶ ἓς ἔξεπορεύοντο ἐκατόν, ὑπολειφθήσονται δέκα τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραήλ.

The city out of which a thousand were going forth, there shall be left a hundred, and out of which a hundred were going forth, there shall be left ten to the house of Israel.

(189) Tg. Jon.: נַכְתָּה דִּפְסֵק נַפֶּה אַלְפֵּים יִשְׂרָאֵל בַּעֲדֵה רֹאֶה נַכְתָּה

The city from which a thousand left, there will remain in her only a hundred, and (from which) a hundred left, only ten will remain for the house of Israel.

"The city" according to the LXX and Tg. Jon. is not a figure standing for the army. The city is depicted as the [Location] out of which the army marches. The main difference between the versions' rendering and the one proposed here is the notion of CAUSALITY. CAUSALITY is absent from the versions but present in the Subj [Location] construction of the Substance/Source alternation.

499. HALOT, 1377.

500. NETS translation.
It cannot be said for certain that Amos 5:3 is, in fact, an example of the Substance/Source alternation. However, as argued above, this reading has much to commend it. Understanding הַעִיר as the conceptual [Source] which sends forth the army [Substance] preserves the semantic coherence of the larger textual unit. If it is an example of the Substance/Source alternation then it is best regarded as an exploitation of the conventional usage of the verb. The exploitation is based on analogy with the Substance/Source alternations of other motion verbs (see in this chapter הָל, יָרַד, עָבַר), and is perhaps motivated by the use of Qal יצא in connection with military marches into battle (e.g. Deut 20:1; 1 Sam 8:20; 1 Chron 20:1).

6.3.5

6.3.5.1 Qal עָבַר

Qal עָבַר is commonly used to express the movement of a Figure [Mover] most often relative to a Ground either expressed as the DO or oriented spatially by means of a Prep. The concept denoted by Qal עָבַר most directly relevant to the present study is that of **TRANSGRESSION** or the contravening of a law or rule. This abstract sense is almost certainly related to the more concrete or bodily sense of "go over, pass over" seen, for example in Gen 31:21:

ןֶגֶף וַעֲבֹר אֵלָה יָדֵי

("and he arose and he crossed the river.") The sense, therefore, of overstepping, contravening, or transgressing a boundary is a metaphorical extension of this embodied motion in which the laws or statutes are figured as a Ground (or reference point) which may be "passed over," or "transgressed" by a moral agent. The following verses are representative of Qal עָבַר with the sense, "to transgress." 501

501. To these examples can be added Job 14:5; Josh 7:15, 23:16; Num 22:18 all of which follow the same participant structure.
(190.1) a. Dan 9:11

All Israel transgressed your law.

b. 2 Chr 24:20

Why do you transgress the commandments of the Lord?

c. Josh 7:11

Israel has sinned; they transgressed my covenant.

The above examples all exhibit the same argument structure of the overtly expressed participants, <Transgressor, Transgressed>. The [Transgressor] is coded as the Subj and the [Transgressed] as the Obj. Jer 5:28, however, offers a notable exception to this pattern.

(190.2) Jer 5:28

The Subj of the verb in Jer 5:28 is Israel whom the prophet Jeremiah is denouncing with a catalogue of their wicked deeds. The sense of Jer 5:28 is, admittedly, obscure. Taking the sense of the conventional construction, the sense would be something like: "Also they transgress words/deeds of evil." Many translations interpret the meaning of the verb with the sense of "passing beyond," that is, exceeding, outdoing, or going further than the "deeds of wickedness."

So for example, the RSV renders the Hebrew: "They know no bounds in deeds of wickedness." Other translations render the meaning as "passing over" in the sense of "to not take notice of" or "to overlook." So the NAB translates Jer 5:28: "They pass over wicked deeds."

GKC suggests that the use of Qal עבֹר in Jer 5:28 is an instance of the transitive usage and they offer the gloss, "to pass over, to overflow with."

GKC's interpretation of Jer 5:28 is not

---

502. The NIV renders the Hebrew with an otherwise unattested intransitive sense, "their evil deeds have no limit."

503. GKC §117z, 370.
perfectly clear from their glosses, nor how this sense is transitive in a way other senses are not. Nevertheless, GKC's implication that we are dealing with an exceptional argument structure is compelling and it fits with the overall schema of motion verbs which take on the Subj [Source] meaning in certain transitive constructions. However, it should be noted that unlike the others that fit this category, the Subj [Source] sense of Jer 5:28 does not necessarily make better sense of the clause, but rather offers yet another image schema that is just as metaphorical as those proposed in the standard translations.

6.3.6 עלה

6.3.6.1 Qal עלי

Occurring approximately 612 times, Qal עלי is another common motion verb. Its general sense is "to ascend," or "to go up." One of the many conventional image schemas with which Qal עלי is associated is that of a [Mover] ascending a [Location], or going up to/from a [Location]. GKC cites Isa 5:6 as a transitive construction:

(191) Isa 5:6

I will make it a desolation,
   it will not be pruned, and it will not be hoed,
   but will grow up briers and thistles.

504. Though not proposed by any translation or commentary that I could find, a further possibility that deserves consideration is taking deeds of wickedness as adverbial: "They transgress with deeds of wickedness." I am grateful to Andrew Gross for this suggestion.

505. So HALOT, 828; BDB, 748.

506. Of the three verses cited by GKC, only two are treated here as the third is a highly questionable example of the transitivity alternation. Isa 34:13 says, It is unclear if it is the "fortress" or the "thorns" which are profiled as the Subj. It should be noted, however, that a number of older commentators share GKC's understanding of the event structure, namely, that the "fortress causes to grow up thorns."
To be sure, the status of the two nominals רָעָמִים ("briars and thistles") is not certain. Are they the grammatical Subjs or Objs? Many, if not most, translations render them as Subjs: "and briars and thorns will grow up" (RSV; similarly ESV, NASB, NIV). This is undoubtedly the more conventional of the available options as "briars and thorns" are, conceptually, the more obvious choice of Figure. Moreover, Qal עָלָה is often used to express the growth of vegetation (e.g. Isa 55:13; Ezek 47:12; Jon 4:6; Deut 29:22; Amos 7:1; Gen 41:5, 22). Against rendering the two nominals as Subjs, however, is the unnatural shift of parallelism from the previous two clauses, both of which feature "the vineyard" (כֶּרֶם) as the implied Subj. Though less decisive, another argument regards the lack of agreement between the verb (singular) and what would be the two Subjs ("briars and thorns"). Recent studies on compound Subjs by E. J. Revell and Michael Shepherd have concluded that the common use of singular verbs with compound Subjs "draws attention to the first member of the compound subject as the principal actor."\(^{507}\) If they are correct, it is hard to see how "briars" are in any way more prominent than "thorns" in Isa 5:6. A plural verbal form, therefore, may be expected for such a compound Subj.

Other translations, perhaps because of one (or both) of these difficulties, retains "the vineyard" as the implied Subj and renders the two nominals as Oblique Objs as seen, for example, in the JPS translation: "And it shall be overgrown with briars and thistles" (similarly, NRSV). The second verse cited by GKC as a transitive construction of Qal עָלָה is Prov 24:31.

(192) Prov 24:31

And I saw all of it was growing up thorns, and nettles had covered its surface.

---

The antecedent of רָעָשׁ is the "field of the lazy man," and the "vineyard of a senseless person" (v 30). Given its agreement with the verb, רָעָשׁ is the Subj which is governing the verb Qal עָלָה. The general consensus among commentators and translators is that the speaker is describing a field overgrown with thorns, nettles, weeds, and the like, that inevitable outcome of laziness according to the sages. Very few commentators mention the unconventional usage of Qal עָלָה in this verse, and none that I found offered a linguistic analysis. While certainty is difficult with the above examples, it can be said that they fit the semantic pattern of the Source-Substance alternation and in Isa 5:6, the sense of the Subj [Location] construction seems preferable.

6.3.7

6.3.7.1 נָבָה

Nabah only occurs four times in the HB, three times in the Qal and once in the Polel. BDB offers the gloss "to bear fruit" and HALOT suggests a more general sense, "to prosper." The evidence that the verb has a floral (or agricultural) imagery as its conceptual background, as suggested by BDB, is minimal. BDB offers Aramaic נֹבַה (fruit) though admits it is rare. HALOT cites a use of the Polel form of the root in 1QHod 8:13 with the sense, "to sprout," JArm נָבָה meaning 'fruit,' a possible cognate in Punic meaning, "to grow," and Arabic, nūb meaning,

508."And see, it was all overgrown with thorns" (NRSV, similar RSV, ESV, JPS, NASB, KJV). M. Fox offers a similar translation without comment: "and I saw that it was overgrown with weeds." Proverbs 10-31 (AB; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 773. The lack of agreement between plural "thorns," (רְעָשִׁים) and Qal עָלָה in the singular strongly argues against the reading proposed by Tremper Longman: "Thorns grew up all over it." Proverbs (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2006), 442.

509.BDB, 677; HALOT, 626. Waltke suggests the meaning of the intransitive is, "to thrive," "to prosper," and the transitive, "to thrive unto the production of." This makes good sense of data, but no linguistic basis for the shift in meaning is offered. The Book of Proverbs: Chapters 1-15 (NICOT; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 468.

510.BDB, 677. Similarly, NIDOTTE III, (52) relates Qal נָבָה to Aramaic נָבַה ("fruit") as well as BH נָבַה in Isa 57:19.
"abundant rain."

To be sure, most of this evidence is too late or tenuous to provide certainty with regard to the conceptual background of BH נוב. It may be said, however, that the general sense of "prosper" or "flourish" is a natural polysemic extension of such floral imagery (cf. פרח below). Moreover, the floral imagery would be consistent with the larger context of Ps 92:15 ((193)b below).

Its three occurrences in the Qal stem are as follows:

(193) a. Ps 62:11

As for wealth/strength, if it prospers, do not set your heart on it.

b. Ps 92:15

Yet they prosper in old age,
they are full of sap and green.

c. Prov 10:31

For the mouth of the righteous brings forth wisdom,
but the tongue of perversity will be cut out.

Without leaning too heavily on supposed floral imagery, the general image schema Qal נוב is of an internal force or energy source enlivening the Subj and/or causing some sort of expansion or growth (as is indicated in Ps 62:11). Given the paucity of data points, it is impossible to determine the conventionality of the transitive construction seen only in Prov 10:31. What can be said, however, is that the syntactic and semantic patterns are consistent with verbs of similar meanings, for example, Qal פרח. The Obj in the transitive construction expresses the Effected Object brought into existence through the activity of the Subj [Causer].

The "mouth of the righteous" is the [Source] that issues forth wisdom, the [Substance].

511. HALOT, 626. Zorell also suggests a floral background, "prospere crevit planta, mataphor. iustus Ps 92:15," Lexicon Hebraicum, 503. A less convincing proposal has been made by Dahood who connects BH nōpet and Ug nbt. He suggests Qal נוב means, "to flow." The Gk translates נוב as ἀποστάζει ("drips").
6.3.7.2 Polel

The sole instance of Polel נוב offers a significant data point for understanding the force dynamics of Qal נוב.

(195) Zech 9:17

Grain will cause to prosper young men, and new wine, young women. 512

In contrast to Qal נוב, the causal force effecting the "flourishing" in Polel נוב is externally transmitted. The [Causer] is identified as grain for the young men and new wine for the young women. Importantly, the event participant [Causer] is depicted as bringing about the change-of-state through the transmission of force or energy from without. The Objs in Zech 9:17 are both DOs and the event more closely approximates the prototypical transitive scenario than those designated by Qal נוב.

6.3.8 Qal נחל

6.3.8.1 Qal נחל

Pattern 1: [Substance] נחל«

In the intransitive construction, Qal נחל always profiles the participant [Substance] as the grammatical Subj.

(196) Song 4:16

Blow upon my garden, let its spices flow.

When specified, the [Location] or [Source] of the [Substance] is governed by the Prep מן as seen in Num 24:7.

512 The syntax of the Hebrew gaps the verb in the first clause which is as highly unnatural in English as it is in Hebrew. I have preserved the more natural order in my English translation.
(197) Num 24:7

Water will flow from his bucket.

Pattern 2: [Substance] [Source]

Qal וָּלָּל appears in the transitive construction three times.

(198) a. Jer 9:17

My eyes pour down tears,
and my eyelids flow forth water.

b. Job 36:27b-28a

they cluster into rain for his mist
which the clouds flow forth.

c. Isa 45:8

Shower, O heavens, from above,
and let the clouds flow forth righteousness.

Subj [Source] constructions patterns similarly to Qal דָּל, though its participants go beyond "tear" and "eyes." When the [Location] is in the Subj position, it indicates a point of origin which produces the [Substance] specified by the DO. Again, the Obj is best analyzed as an Effected Obj.

6.3.8.2 Hiph וְלָל

(198.2) Isa 48:21

He caused to flow for them water from the rock.

The salient feature of Hiph וְלָל is its profiling the [Agent] participant. The [Agent], in this case God, is external to the [Source]/[Substance] complex. "The water" (וָּלָל) is the DO Patient, and the [Location/Source] participant is given a more peripheral status as the Obj of the Prep מָן.
In contrast to the Qal transitive construction in which the [Source] participant may be understood conceptually as [-Vol], [-Inst], the Subj of the Hiph נָטַף includes both of these agentive properties.

6.3.9 נָטַף

6.3.9.1 Qal נָטַף

Out of 18 occurrences in the HB, נָטַף appears nine times in the Qal and nine in the Hiphil. The general event denoted by Qal נָטַף is "dripping" or "secreting" where a substance is produced or discharged from a [Source]. The intransitive usage of Qal נָטַף occurs three times and displays an alternation between Subj [Source] and Subj [Substance].

Pattern 1: [Source]

(199) a. Judge 5:4:

The earth trembled,
the heavens dripped,
yes, the clouds dripped water.

b. Ps 68:9:

The earth trembled,
the heavens dripped,
before God, the one of Sinai.

It is possible that the intransitive use of Qal נָטַף in Judg 5:4 is an instance of Obj gapping or context-dependent Obj dropping where the Obj (in this case מָיְמִים) is not specified until the following clause. However, the use of Qal נָטַף in the nearly identical passage in Ps 68:9 suggests that the verb is compatible with the semantics of intransitive construction.

513. HALOT translates Qal נָטַף "to drip, secrete," (694), and BDB "to drop, drip."
Pattern 2: [Substance] נטף

Though figurative, there is one instance in which Qal נטף profiles what is clearly the [Substance] participant as the Subj.

(200) Job 29:22

And my words, they did not speak again, and my words *dripped* upon them.

Given that we are dealing with a single data point (not to mention the poetic creativity of Job) it is difficult to draw firm conclusions regarding the conventionality of the Subj [Substance] usage of Qal נטף. Nevertheless, I believe this alternation between the [Source] and the [Substance] in the Subj position may be explained as an Metonymic Subject Change (see 6.5.1.1 below for full discussion of this phenomenon). Either the [Drip] or the [Dripper] may be selected as the primary focal participant creating a Gestalt shift in the event structure.

Pattern 3: [Substance] [Source] נטף

Qal נטף occurs six times in the transitive construction. In each occurrence the [Source] is the Subj and the [Substance] is the Obj. Conventional usages are seen in the following (as well as in Judg 5:4, third colon, cited above as (199)a):

(201) a. Prov 5:3

For the lips of the strange woman *drip* honey.

b. Song 5:5

And my hands *dripped* myrrh.

6.3.9.2 Hiph נטף

Hiph נטף occurs nine times and is almost exclusively used to denote prophetic proclamation. It collocates with Preps LET and UP with the senses of proclaiming to a people or
region and against a people or region respectively. The sense of preaching as dripping or dropping is most likely a metaphorical extension of the basic sense of "dripping." Important, however, for this study is the fact that the Hiphil stem introduces the concept of AGENT inasmuch as the prophet is conceived as [+Vol], [+Inst], and [-Aff] in the action. The single exception to the sense of "proclaim" is Amos 7:16.

(202) Amos 7:16

וְהָרִים יִדְרֵפֵּן מַיָּהָהּ יִדְרְפוּ

And the mountains will drip sweet wine.

It is unclear from the context how Amos 7:16 is different from the identical expression in Joel 4:18 which employs Qal נֶטֶף. The most obvious possibilities, however, are: 1) Amos 7:16 and Joel 4:18 represent dialectical variation, 2) the metaphorical construal of the natural phenomenon in Amos 7:16 depicts the mountains as [Agent] instead of [Causer], perhaps as an exploitation of a conventional image or as a new, different metaphor, 3) the event structure is, in some other way, conceived differently so as to elicit alternate linguistic expression. However, without more occurrences, the above remarks are necessarily speculative.

6.3.10 פרח

The basic concept evoked by Qal and Hiph פרח is the verbal action of "budding," "sprouting," or, through polysemy, "flourishing." The event participants profiled are <Sprouter, Sprout> and in (some) uses of the Hiphil <Causer, Sprouter, Sprout>. At a more general or abstract level, the event structure and force dynamics are schematic of the <Sprouter, Sprout> scenario in which the Sprout denotes an Effected Object. Interestingly, פרח in its various verbal forms, never occurs in a Cognate Object Construction with פרח ("bud," "blossom") in the

514 פרח occurs in the Qal 30 times (excluding Ezek 13:30 which uses a homonym, HALOT, 966) and in the Hiph 5 times.
DO position. Nevertheless, its use in the transitive construction with Obj [Sprout] (pattern 3 below) suggests that the Cognate Object Construction would have been felicitous.

6.3.10.1 Qal פרח

Pattern 1: [Sprouter] פרח

Qal פרח in the intransitive construction uniformly profiles [Sprouter] as the Subj which undergoes the action of "budding," "blossoming," or "sprouting." The following are representative:

(203) a. Num 17:20

וַתִּגַּעַת הַרְפֹּחַ אַל-אָבָרֶה, וְעָלָה הַפֶּקֶד לְפָרָח

And the man whom I will choose, his staff will sprout.

b. Hab 3:17

כִּרְבְּעַהֲהָה לֶא-רַמְמִית

Though the fig tree should not blossom.

The intransitive (as opposed to the transitive) construction focuses attention exclusively on the [Sprouter] and backgrounds the [Sprout] thereby evoking a more prototypical change-of-state scenario. The semantic effect of the intransitive construction is that it denotes change-of-state of the Subj by means of the sprouting of a substance. Though left unspecified, the [Sprout] participant is understood to be conceptually associated with the [Sprouter] participant. Associated as it is with the fructification of the floral world, the [Sprout] participant of Qal פרח in the intransitive construction is some sort of "bud" or "blossom."


Leaving aside the sense "to flourish" for the moment, the Subj of Qal does not feature the agentive properties [+Vol] [+Inst]. The CAUSATION however is conceived as being internal to the
Subj. It is through some sort of internal force that the [Sprout] is produced. The sense of "flourishing," however, focuses on the resultant state of the activity.

Pattern 2: [Sprout?] פרח «

Pattern 2 only occurs in the Priestly codes of Leviticus and exclusively in contexts of bodily disease or mildew in the home. There is an ambiguity regarding the Subj participant status. Does the Subj denote the [Sprouter] or the [Sprout]? The event schema denoted in Lev 13:12 and 13:57 suggest that the construction profiles the latter as the Subj.

(204) a. Lev 13:12

אָסַרְתֵּךְ הָעֵヶ月ָה הַצָּלֵךְ בֵּיתָהּ מִשָּׁלְכָהּ מִשָּׁלְכָהּ אַחַ מַלְפָּה מִלְפָּה מָרַעְשׁה יְדֵי-רֵעֶשׁ

If the scale disease sprouts on the skin and the scale disease covers all the skin of the diseased person from his head to his feet.

b. Lev 13:57

אַמְרֹתְךָ הָעֵ nues הָאָסַרְתֵּךְ מִלְפָּה מִלְפָּה מָרַעְשׁה אַחַ מַלְפָּה מִלְפָּה מָרַעְשׁה גֶּפֶן

If [the diseased area] appears again in the garment — whether in warp or woof — or in any garment of skin, it is spreading.

The verbal action denoted by Qal פרח results in the Subj "covering" the diseased person entirely (Lev 13:12). In Lev 13:57, it is the appearance of the diseased area that indicates its sprouting or, better, spreading. The visible disease is not what is "being sprouted" by an unexpressed [Sprouter] but is the [Sprout] itself. These uses would seem to correlate the Subj more with the [Sprout] which grows or moves out from the [Sprouter]. I believe we see a similar phenomenon in the following English alternations:

(205) a. The branch bloomed.

   b. The branch bloomed flowers.

   c. The flowers bloomed.

   d. The flowers bloomed on the branch.
Pattern 3: [Sprout] [Sprouter] הפרח«

Qal הפרח only occurs twice in the transitive construction and both times in the same context.

(206) a. Exod 9:9
וַהֲלֹ֣ה עַל מֵרָאֶ֑ם וַהֲלֹ֣ה עַל מֵרָאֶ֑ם לְשִׁמְר֣וֹן פָּ֔תַחְתָּהּ לְשִׁמְר֣וֹן פָ֔תַחְתָּהּ כַּעֲדֵי עַ֖רֶם מִשְׁמַרְתָּֽם׃

And it will be upon man and beast as boils producing sores in all the land of Egypt.

b. Exod 9:10
וַהֲלֹ֣ה בַּמּוֹרָאֵ֑ים וְהֲלֹ֣ה בַּמּוֹרָאֵ֑ים לְשִׁמְר֣וֹן פָ֔תַחְתָּהּ לְשִׁמְר֣וֹן פָ֔תַחְתָּהּ כַּעֲדֵי עַ֖רֶם מִשְׁמַרְתָּֽם׃

And it became boil producing sores on man and beast.

Qal הפרח in the transitive construction evokes the Substance/Source image schema outlined above (6.3.1.1). The "boils" (שמרן) are the [Source] producing the "sores" (סickness) [Substance]. Conceptually, the action denoted by the verb entails the production or creation of a [Substance]; therefore, the Obj should be understood as an Effected Object. The סickness come into existence through the internal force or causation of the שמירן. The construction, therefore, is transitive. However, it deviates from the prototypical transitive scenario in that the Obj comes into existence through the action specified by the verb and therefore lacks the property of individuation and participant distinguishability that is characteristic of the Affected Object in the prototypical Agent-Patient scenario.

6.3.9.2 Hiph הפרח

Hiph הפרח occurs five times in the HB. However, the expected event participant [Causer] is only present in two of the five occurrences:

(207) a. Ezek 17:24
וַהֲלַ֜ק הַמֶּחֱרַ֣ךְ הָ֔אן בֵּעָ֖שׁ And I have made the withered tree flourish.

b. Isa 17:11
וַהֲלַ֜ק הַמֶּחֱרַ֣ךְ הָ֔אן בֵּעָ֖שׁ In a day you grow your plant, and in the morning you cause your seed to bud.
The other three uses of Hiph פרח resemble the intransitive use of Qal פרח with the sense, "to flourish."

(208) Ps 92:14

Planted in the temple of the LORD, in the courts of our God, *they flourish.*

515

The behavior of Hiph פרח meets the twin criteria for lability proposed by Letuchiy, specifically, distinct transitive and intransitive uses and different semantic roles for the privileged (Subj) participant. In terms of the taxonomy of labile verbs, Hiph פרח exhibits the causative/inchoative alternation.

6.4 Verbs of Filling, Type 4: Affected Object

Affected Objs are the most prototypical Objs in transitive constructions. They exhibit the conceptual parameters associated with the prototypical Patient, specifically [-Vol], [-Inst], [+Aff].

517

6.4.1 זרע

6.4.1.1 Qal זרע

Pattern 1: [Filler] זרע«

The intransitive use of Qal זרע always expresses the [Filler] — that is, the sower — as the Subj Agent as, for example, in Mic 6:15.

518

515. Note also the chiastic parallelism expressed with stem variation.


517. For a discussion of the prototypical patient, see 3.2 above.

518. Some apparent instances of intransitive Qal זרע may simply have the DO gapped. For example, Lev 25:11: 'לא תפרע ולא תלקם את הזרעים' ("You shall neither sow nor reap the aftergrowth." Cf. Lev 25:20). There are, however, sufficient number of intransitive usages to regard it as a conventional pattern (i.e. Judg 6:3; 2 Kgs...
You sow, but you do not reap.

The [Filler] performs the actions of spreading seed with the natural expectation that his or her work will bear fruit. In the intransitive construction, neither the [Container] (i.e. land or field of some sort), nor the [Contents] (i.e. seed in general or a specific variety thereof) are mentioned. In each case, both are indefinite, non-referential, and non-specific in accordance with he parameters of Obj Del. Since both are evoked by the semantic frame SOW, the absence of either should be regarded as a focusing or windowing of attention on the action or process specified by the verb itself.

Pattern 2: [Container] [Filler] זרע

Pattern 2 is treated together with pattern 3 below.

Pattern 3: [Contents] [Filler] זרע

Patterns 2 and 3 are both transitive constructions. They differ only with respect to the profiled participant expressed as the DO, the [Container] or the [Contents].

(210) a. Exod 23:10 לָשׁוֹן שָׁנִים חָוָה אֲשֶׁר אֲקָרָתָה

And six years you shall sow your land.

b. Jer 12:13 לְשׁוֹן הָעֵשֶׁה [קָרָתָה] זְרַע

They have sown wheat, but they have reaped thorns.

Out of 20 occurrences, Qal זֶרַע appears with DO [Container] five times and DO [Contents] 15 times. Both may appear with or with or without Obj Prep את (e.g. Exod 23:10

19:29 || Isa 37:30; Job 31:8; Eccl 11:4).
and Deut 11:10 with אָתַּרְלָא, Ps 107:37 and Jer 12:13 without אָתַּרְלָא). The alternating semantic role of the participant expressed as the DO is another instance of Metonymic Object Change (MOC) discussed above (see 4.2.2.1, pattern 2 for full discussion). In fact, Qal רָעַץ is quite similar to Sweep's parade example of MOC, English plant (cited above and repeated here for convenience):

(211) a. Mary \textit{planted} roses (in the garden).

b. Mary \textit{planted} the garden (with roses).

Both [Container] and [Contents] — that is, land and seed of some sort — are core elements of the SOW frame and therefore are activated by Qal רָעַץ. The association of LOCATION-LOCATUM provides the conceptual contiguity that motivates the alternating Objs. Either may be profiled as the Obj. Importantly, the event structure evoked by Qal רָעַץ in the transitive construction more closely approximates the prototypical transitive scenario than either Verbs of Fullness, Type 1 or 2. The image schema entails an Agent [Filler] acting on a Patient [Contents] or [Container].

Mention should also be made of intransitive uses modified by a Prep (usually -ב with variety of senses, but once לָא, Jer 4:3; once כָּל, Jer 50:16; once עַל, Isa 32:20). When intransitive Qal רָעַץ collocates with locative Prep -ב, the image schema changes from action performed upon a Patient, to action performed within location.

(212) Gen 26:12 אַיְּשֵׁי הָאָרֶץ -ב לָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָא אֶלָา אֶלָא אֶלָa אֶלָa אֶלָa אֶלָa אֶלָa אֶלָa אֶלָa אֶלָa אֶלָa אֶלָa אֶלָa אֶלָa אֶלָa אֶלָa אֶלָa אֶלָa אֶl
schema evoked by Qal וַיָּרָא modified by the Prep -ב + [Location] is more consistent with the characterization of Isaac as a sojourner.

Pattern 4: [Contents] [Location] [Filler] וַיָּרָא

Qal וַיָּרָא in the ditransitive construction is fairly rare, occurring only five times. Each instance profiles the [Filler] as Subj Agent and the [Location] as the more salient of the two Objs (Lev 19:19, fronted before the verb; Deut 22:9; Judg 9:45, in canonical DO position preceding Obj [Contents]; Isa 30:23; Jer 31:27, Obj Prep יָרָא marked).

(213) Jer 31:27:וַיָּרָא הַבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַֽיָּרָא הַבְּנֵי יְهوֹWestern:וַיָּרָא הַבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַֽיָּרָא הַבְּנֵי יְהוֹעֵז

And I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of men and the seed of cattle.

Its usage exhibits the semantics of the ditransitive construction: *x changes state of y by means of z*. Subj [Filler] changes the state of [Location] by means of [Contents] (for discussion of the semantics of the ditransitive construction in BH, see 4.2.3.1 above).

6.4.1.2 Niph וַיָּרָא

Niph וַיָּרָא occurs six times and either the [Location] or the [Contents] may be profiled as the Subj. \(^{519}\) Subj [Location] is the more frequent.

(214) a. Lev 11:37:וַיֶּאֱלַי הַבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַֽיַּרְא הַבְּנֵי יְהוֹWestern:וַיֶּאֱלַי הַבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַֽיַּרְא הַבְּנֵי יְהוֹעֵז

If any part of their carcass falls upon seed grain that will be sown, it is clean.

b. Deut 21:4:וַיְרָא הַבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַֽיְרָא הַבְּנֵי יְהוֹWestern:וַיְרָא הַבְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַֽיְרָא הַבְּנֵי יְהוֹעֵז

\(^{519}\)The single use of Pual וַיָּרָא occurs in Isa 40:24:וַיָּרָא ("Hardly are they planted, hardly are they sown.") The motivation for the Pual as opposed to the more frequently attested Niphal construction is almost certainly the pluractional sense of the Pual. The Subjs are the "princes and rulers of the earth" from v 23 each of which is "planted and sown" individually and through presumably discrete actions.
And the elders of that city shall bring the heifer down to a valley running with water which is neither plowed nor sown.

The alternation of the participant roles as the Subj is further evidence that the Patient of the verbal action may be variously conceived and therefore variously construed. Obviously, one is a more ultimate goal and the other a more proximate goal of the verbal action. One sows seed in order to do something to the ground [Location] (not, typically to get rid of seed).

Nevertheless, as in the case of Qal זֶרַע the purposes of the speaker allow for the windowing of attention on either GOAL which results in syntactically in alternate construals.

Of particular interest is the use of Niph זֶרַע with an Obj in Num 5:28.

(215) Num 5:28

Then she shall be free of guilt and she shall be able to conceive (lit. be sown with seed).

The difficulty presented by Num 5:28 concerns the status of the second nominal זֶרַע (pausal form of זֶרַע). זֶרַע denotes the [Contents] participant (broadly considered) and in the passive construction is optionally profiled as the Subj. In Num 5:28, the woman who has sustained the Sotah ordeal (i.e. a judicial procedure in which a potion is consumed by the accused and her physiological response to the potion indicates the deity's verdict) is declared innocent and she retains the ability to bear children. The woman is clearly the [Location] participant (again, broadly or conceptually considered) which, as was argued above, is optionally expressed as the Subj of the Niphal construction (Deut 21:4). This phenomenon is analogous to the passive constructions of לָבַשׁ (for discussion see 4.2.1.2 above). The effect of the passive construction is to background the concept (and therefore the participant role) [Agent]. Unlike לָבַשׁ, זֶרַע is not lexically reflexive which is why the alternate conceptual patient [Location] is profiled as the Subj. Nevertheless, the general principle of the passive foregrounding the Subj's role as Patient and backgrounding the notion of AGENCY still holds. Like the second nominal in
passive, the Obj in Niph זרע takes on a quasi-patient status (or perhaps quasi-instrument) and it creates a scenario low in the distinguishability of participants and therefore low on the transitivity spectrum.

6.4.1.3 Hiph זרע

Hiph זרע occurs only three times in the HB and it evokes a scenario the structure of which closely parallels that of the Verbs of Filling, Type 3 in the Location=Source alternation.

(216) a. Gen 1:12

הָעָרָבָה מָאָר רַעְשָׁה ַ אָוֹדָה עָרָבָה יִרְדְּשׁ בֵּין לְיִדָּוֶה

And the earth brought forth vegetation, plants producing seed after its kind.

b. Lev 12:2

אָשֶׁר וְחוֹלֵית יִזְדְּבַת גֵּפֶר

A woman, if she bears offspring, and gives birth to a male child.

Given the paucity of data, it is unclear if Hiph זרע exhibits the transitivity alternation. What appears to be an intransitive construction in Lev 12:2 may be an instance of a gapped Obj expressed overtly by זכר in the following clause. The other two occurrences (Gen 1:11, 12) exhibit a Cognate Object Construction in a transitive clause. The Obj of the Hiph זרע in a COC construction expresses the Effected Object (sometimes called, Object of Result). The Obj comes into existence through the activity denoted by the verb. This may be contrasted with the Agent-Patient image schema evoked by the Qal and Niphal.

6.5 Verbs of Want

Though syntactically simpler than Verbs of Fullness, Verbs of Want present a conceptually more complex scenario. This is largely due to the lexicalization of Negation (NEG)
which is inherent in both verbs which GKC classifies as *Verba inopiae*. Talmy Givón has argued that in the positive/negative opposition, the latter is the marked construction. According to Langacker, "we are primarily concerned with what *is*, and we say that something *is not* only in response to some evocation (perhaps implicit) of the positive situation... In the terminology of cognitive grammar, NEG is conceptually dependent, for it makes salient (though schematic) internal reference to the situation whose existence it denies." Langacker offers the following schematic characterization of NEG: "[NEG] profiles some entity and specifies its absence from a mental space." Langacker's schematic description provides useful categories for speaking about the participants "involved" in the scenario of absence, namely the THING that is absent, and the "mental space" from which it is absent. With BH verbs of Want, that mental space is typically filled with a more or less concrete entity which allows the participant labels <Container, Contents> to be serviceable for descriptive analysis as long as they are understood broadly.

6.5.1

6.5.1.1 Qal

BDB offers the general glosses, "lack, need, be lacking, decrease," and then divides its entry along the conceptual parameters of Subj [Container] (with accusative and absolute) and Subj [Contents] (absolute). HALOT offers two entries without reference to syntactic patterns:

520. As an example of verbs of Want, Waltke-O'Connor only cite חסר. Joüon-Muraoka cite both חסר and ישן.
524. BDB, 341.
"to decrease," and "to be devoid." Of the 18 occurrences of Qal חסר, the distribution between transitive and intransitive constructions is exactly even. The intransitive construction, however, exhibits an interesting alternation between the [Container] and [Contents] participants profiled as the Subj.

Pattern 1: [Container] חסר «

Qal חסר in Subj [Container] constructions expresses the state of the [Container] as being in a state of want.

(217) a. 1 Kgs 17:14

אֶרֶבֶת הַשֶּׁמֶן לֹא חָסַר

And the jar of oil shall not want (i.e. lack).

b. Prov 13:25

רֵעֵס רֵעֵס חָסַר

But the belly of the wicked wants (i.e. suffers want)

In each instance THING that is "wanted" is easily inferable from the participant involved or is an expression of a generality (Neh 9:21). The entity which may be overtly expressed by an Obj (see pattern 3), in each case is non-specific, non-referential, and indefinite. The Subj [Container] construction is perhaps best analyzed as IOD. In contrast to Qal לבש, however, the focus is not on an action, but on a state.

Pattern 2: [Contents] חסר «

The Subj [Contents] construction occurs four times.

(218) a. Eccl 9:8

אֶרֶבֶת שִׁלְחָן הַדַּנֵּר לֹא חָסַר

And let oil not be lacking on your head.

525. HALOT, 338.
b. Deut 15:8

And you shall certainly lend him what is sufficient for his need which is lacking for him.  

Interestingly, in the Subj [Contents] construction the participant [Container] is often overtly expressed with a PP (i.e. "your head," Eccl 9:8, and "the needy man" Deut 15:8). That the profiling of the Ground element is not obligatory is evident from its usage in Gen 8:3 (and similarly 8:5):

(219) Gen 8:3

And at the end of 150 days, the waters abated.

From the above examples, it appears that Qal חסר exhibits an ambiguity of "being" and "becoming" (see 6.2.1.1 above). Gen 8:3 expresses the notion of "becoming" or entering into a state. The [Contents] or [Substance] undergoes a change-of-state of decreasing. Interestingly, the stative usages of the Subj [Contents] construction all express the [Container] participant by means of the PP. I suggest that the motivating factor for this is the perceived need for a measuring argument. In a dynamic event, the [Contents] itself may serve as the measuring argument inasmuch as it "decreases" or "abates" from its earlier, fuller state. The earlier state is conceptually the Ground and does not need to be expressed. The stative usage of Qal חסר in the Subj [Contents] construction motivates the overt expression of the Ground as an Oblique complement. The Ground provides the measuring argument which allows for the conceptualization of an absence. Without the Ground specified, it is difficult to imagine or conceive of the absence of an entity.

Regarding the Subj participant role alternation exhibited in patterns 1 and 2, earlier I argued that the Obj alternations of Qal זרע and Qal זר או exhibit a conceptual phenomenon known

526. Though less likely, another interpretation would be: "which he lacks for himself." BDB, 341.
as Metonymic Object Change in which two conceptually contiguous realities (elements of the same frame or domain) alternate in the Obj position thus shifting or modulating the event structure that is profiled. The linguistic ability to shift the profiled relationship of the domain elements (which is the essence of MOC) is essentially an expression of the basic cognitive ability of Gestalt shifting. There is no principled reason why the profile shifting of frame participants must be limited to Objs, and here, I believe, we see the same thing happening with Subjs. Qal מַסֵּר exhibits what we might call Metonymic Subject Change. Both the [Container] and the [Contents] participants are evoked by the verb and either may be selected as the primary focus Figure in the Subj position.

Pattern 3: [Contents] [Container] מַסֵּר «

Qal מַסֵּר appears in the two-argument construction nine times. In each instance the participant [Container] is profiled as the grammatical Subj. The following are representative of the scenario:

(220) a. Gen 18:28

Suppose the fifty righteous men are wanting five

b. Deut 2:7

And you have not lacked a thing.

c. Ezek 4:17

In order that they will lack bread and water.

Broadly speaking, Qal מַסֵּר expresses the non-existence or absence of [Contents] within the space indicated by the [Container]. The scenario is uniformly stative; and the event structure may be helpfully compared to Qal מלא and Qalഷׂוע. Where Qal מלא and Qalषׂוע orient two
entities in a Figure/Ground relationship expressing the presence of the one relative to the other, Qal חסר essentially expresses the opposite.

The main issue driving this study regards the status of the second nominal, in this case the [Contents] participant. Like Qal מלא (see 6.1.1 above), I suggest that the image schema of transitive Qal חסר is of the penultimate ZERO---->ZERO scenario. The scenario evoked is one of an asymmetric relation between Subj and Obj. Unlike Qal מלא (but similar to Qal שבע) participants [Container] and [Contents] do not appear to be interchangeable, likely because the Subj [Container] participant is usually HUMAN-Group and thus perceived as an [Experiencer]. The verb describes an indefinitely lasting state which exists between the [Container] and the [Contents]. The [Container] exists in a continued state "absent of" or "lacking" the [Contents]. By overtly expressing the participant role [Contents] in the Obj position of a transitive construction, the speaker is imposing an image schema of a relationship between two entities. As mentioned above, by invoking the NEG concept of absence, the entailed concept of presence is invoked only to say that something is not so. By profiling a relationship between two entities, therefore, the speaker is able to specify (to a greater or lesser degree) the THING that is lacking.

In sum, the two-argument construction is a transitive construction in which the second noun is an Obj. The scenario expressed by Qal חסר in the transitive construction is only one, or possibly two, steps removed from the most schematic transitive scenario, the symmetrical orientation (literally or figuratively) of two entities.
6.5.2 שׁכל

6.5.2.1 Qal שׁכל

The notion of "want" or "lack" designated by Qal שׁכל is always the "want" or "lack" of children, hence the gloss "be bereaved" (BDB) and "to become childless" (HALOT).\(^{527}\)

Occurring only four times in the Qal stem (and twice in the same verse, Gen 43:14), Qal שׁכל exhibits the following transitivity alternation.

**Pattern 1: [Bereaved] שׁכל»

(221) Gen 43:14

As for me, if I am bereaved, I am bereaved. (intransitive)

Clearly, "children" is the understood Obj which is perceived as potentially "lacking."\(^{528}\)

Furthermore, in the context of Gen 43:14 the particular children, namely Israel's 11 sons, are specifically in view. Though this may be evidence of a context-independent Obj Del, 1 Sam 15:33 (see (224) below) makes such a conclusion tenuous. Qal שׁכל may allow for both types (context (in)dependent) of Obj Del. Regardless, the semantic function of the intransitive construction is its focusing attention on the resultant state of the [Bereaved] participant. The [Lost] participant is not perceived as relevant and therefore not overtly expressed.

**Pattern 2: [Children] [Bereaved] שׁכל»

(222) Gen 27:45

Why should I be bereaved of you both in one day. (transitive)

Gen 27:45 is the sole instance of Qal שׁכל used in a transitive construction. The transitive construction specifies the [Children] participant which are, in this case, potentially absent.

---

527. BDB, 1013; HALOT 1492. Joüon-Muraoka suggest, "to lack, or be short of," §125d; similarly GKC §117aa.

528. Interestingly, many English translations supply "children" as the Obj (KJV, ESV, RSV, NRSV).
Pattern 2 should be analyzed as Qal אֶתְרָה above but with the selectional restriction pertaining to the absence of children from parents. The construction relates two entities with the element [Neg].

6.5.2.2 Piel שָׁכַל

Piel שׁכל occurs over four times as much as Qal שׁכל. Appearing in both transitive and intransitive constructions, the Piel construction shows the same syntactic variation as Qal שׁכל, however, it includes the concept AGENCY.

(223) a. Gen 42:36

אָנַּי שָׁכַלְךָ

You have bereaved me.

b. Deut 32:25

וַיהוָה שָׁכַל הַחַלְפֵּךְ

Outdoors, the sword will bereave (intransitive)

The semantic distinction between Qal שׁכל (Subj Experiencer) and Piel שׁכל (Subj Agent) are clearly manifest in 1 Sam 15:33 where both stems are used.

(224) 1 Sam 15:33

וַיַּקְרָא שָׁמַע אֲשֶׁר שָׁכֵל נַשָּׁה תַּחַלֵּךְ וְלֶחֱטָא שָׁכֵל נְשֵׁי אָשֶׁר נָחָלָה שָׁלֹא וּרְעָה שָׁלֹא וּמָשָּׁל יִשְׂרָאֵל וּרְעָה שׁכַל

And Samuel said, "Just as your sword bereaved women, thus shall your mother be bereaved among women."

Notably, the intransitive usage seen, for example, in Deut 32:25 above typically construes habitual, iterative, or generic statements. This is consistent with Goldberg's parameters for Patient argument omission in causative constructions. The exception to this may be seen in the usage of Piel שָׁכַל with the sense, "to miscarry."

(225) Gen 31:38

רָדַלְתִּי וְתַעֲץ לֵא שָׁכַלָּה

Your ewes and your goats did not miscarry. (intransitive)

Piel שׁכל with the sense of "miscarry," should be regarded as a secondary sense of the verb. It should not be regarded as evidence that ancient Israel conceived of the mother as

somehow agentive in the event of a miscarriage. The Subj in Mal 3:11, for instance, profiles the "miscarriage" of (the vines in the field).

6.6 Conclusions

The concepts FULLNESS/ABUNDANCE and WANT/LACK are highly abstract. It is not surprising, therefore, that linguistic expressions of these concepts exhibit a variety of concrete image schemas and event structures. The variety of expression, however, is both patterned and motivated. The factors licensing and limiting the use of verbs of Fullness and Want are conceptual in nature. The purpose of this chapter has been to delineate the conceptual processes which motivate the various BH expressions of Fullness and Want. Even a cursory survey of the various verbs designated by BH grammarians as verbs of Fullness and Want reveals that the Objs which may accompany the verbs do not express the same type of entity. That is to say, the Objs do not consistently express the same relationship to the verbal action (or state).

In previous grammatical analysis, the status of the Objs accompanying verbs of Fullness and Want have been vaguely labeled and even more vaguely described. I have attempted to categorize these verbs along certain conceptual parameters, namely the relation of the event or scene participants to one another as well as to the forces involved in their orientation or interaction. In terms of force dynamics, Type 1 verbs express simple containment, Type 2 change-of-state, Type 3 Effected Obj, and Type 4 Affected Obj. From the perspective of CG, each of these nominals are rightly characterized as Objs, and their "directness" (whether or not they are DOs) is really a matter of definition. What makes an Obj (defined as the secondary clausal figure) direct? As Langacker says, there is a degree of arbitrariness wherever one draws
the line. According to CG, the secondary clausal figure (in most cases) sets up a relation between Figure and Ground (Trajector/Landmark) which approximates to a greater or lesser degree the prototypical transitive scenario.

With the exception of Qal זרע, BH verbs of Fullness and Want all significantly depart from the prototypical transitive scenario. Type 1 verbs depart the furthest from the prototype, one or two steps removed from the most schematic transitive construction (i.e. a symmetrical one in which Figure/Ground status is purely subjective). Type 4 verbs, profiling both an Agent [Filler] and Patient [Container] or [Contents] (or both) most closely approximates the prototype. Types 2 and 3 fall in between these two poles in proximity to the prototypical transitive scenario.

530. Personal communication.
Chapter 7: Miscellaneous Verbs

This study of the transitivity alternation in BH is by no means exhaustive. The goal has been to offer an analysis of the phenomenon primarily as it is exhibited in BH verb classes. The hope is, however, that the theory and methods applied to verb classes and the conclusions derived from their analysis would be applicable to other BH verbs which may not belong to a clearly identifiable "verb class," but which nevertheless exhibit the transitivity alternation. This chapter, therefore, is envisioned as a series of probes in which three miscellaneous verbs — that is, verbs which do not belong to the verb classes listed above — are analyzed with a view toward understanding the semantic or pragmatic significance of their transitivity alternations.

7.1 פרץ

The BH root פָרַץ occurs 50 times in the HB, 46 in the Qal, twice in the Niphal and once each in the Niphal and Hithpael. 531

7.1.1 Qal פרץ

GKC categorizes פָרַץ as a verba copiae on the basis of Prov 3:10:

(226) Prov 3:10: יִשָּׂאוּ שָׁלְחוּ יְבִיאוּ וּקְרָאַו וּזְבַעְתוֹ׃

Then your barns will be filled with plenty,
and your vats will overflow with wine. (GKC's translation).

531 The derived stems will not be treated at length as their syntactic patterning does not bear directly on the issue in question, namely the status of the Obj in transitive constructions. It is sufficient to note that the passive constructions (Pual, and Qal Pass occurring 2x and 1x respectively) both profile the participant role [Breached] as the Subj indicating its status as DO in active constructions. The sense of the sole occurrence of Niph פרץ in 1 Sam 3:1 is obscure. For a discussion of possible emendations, see P. Kyle McCarter, Jr., I Samuel (AB 8; New York: Doubleday, 1980), 95. McCarter also offers the tentative suggestion that פָרַץ may be a "technical designation of some kind, perhaps referring to a cultic practice whereby visions were regularly obtained." I Samuel, 97.
However, apart from Prov 3:10 (the meaning of which is precisely the point in question), Qal פרץ does not exhibit much, if any, significant semantic overlap with the other verbs categorized as *verba copiae*.\(^{532}\) Though at first glance the semantics of Prov 3:10 seems consistent with the Substance-Source alternation proposed for verbs of fullness, a closer examination reveals that the participants involved do not correspond to the canonical Substance-Source event schema. For Qal פרץ, the [Breached] participant is not conventionally understood as a [Location] but rather, as will be demonstrated below, a Patient undergoing a fairly typical change-of-state. The meaning of Prov 3:10 will be discussed below.

Pattern 1: [Breacher] פרץ

Qal פרץ occurs in the intransitive construction 10 times. The Subj of Qal פרץ in the majority of occurrences of the intransitive construction is almost always a collective noun, usually [HUMAN\(_{\text{Group}}\)], and the event schema denoted by the verb is the growth, proliferation, or spreading out spatially (usually geographically) of the collective plural entity.\(^{533}\) Exod 1:12 is representative of the conventional usage:

(227) Exod 1:12

\[
כָּאָמְרוּ תַּחַת עֵתָה מִן רָדָה אֲלֵה הַדָּבָר בַּעֲרָבָה מִן סְפַּר
\]

And the more they oppressed them, the more they multiplied and the more they spread.

Twice, the action indicated by Qal פרץ is modified by directional adverbs as seen, for example, in Gen 28:14:\(^{534}\)

\(^{532}\) It could be argued that Qal פרץ is a motion verb along the lines of ירדו, הלכו, etc. This sense, as will be argued below (pattern 1), is not its core sense and, contra GKC, neither is it the central concept motivating its unconventional usage in Prov 3:10.

\(^{533}\) An exception is found in 2 Chr 31:5 which has הַדָּבָר as the Subj ("And when the word spread...").

\(^{534}\) See also Isa 54:3.
And your descendants will be as the dust of the land, and they shall spread to the west and the east and the north and the south.

This intransitive usage of Qal פרץ denotes a change-of-state of the Subj [Breacher] as there is envisioned both movement and, often, multiplication. Importantly, however, there is not a concrete entity (even unexpressed) that is conceived as being "breached" and therefore issuing forth of the [Breachers]. In contrast to Qal שׁרץ which indicates motion into groups or swarms of animate creatures, Qal פרץ expresses the spreading out, dispersion, or proliferation of them. Despite its frequency of usage, however, I suggest that the "spread out" sense of Qal פרץ in the intransitive construction is derivative from the more basic sense of "to breach."

Conceptually, the action of "spreading out" expressed by intransitive Qal פרץ involves a force dynamic in which the [Breacher] (or, in this case, [Mover]) spreads out on account of an internal force which is [-Inst] and perhaps [-Vol]. In Exod 1:12, it is clearly on account of Israel's multiplication that the people are "forced" or "compelled" to spread out. Though not applied explicitly to the intransitive construction, HALOT offers the following definition of Qal פרץ: "to break out because of an excess, spread out." It is the conception of something being "in excess" that introduces the notion of an internal pressure or force which compels the [Breacher] outward. This sense would have derived through polysemic extension from the more basic sense, "to breach," which does involve a more conventional [Breached] participant. Needless to say, the canonical concept BREACH entails both a [Breacher] and a [Breached] participant as well as a force dynamic that on account of sustained pressure causes the [Breached] to give way.

535. HALOT, 972.
The two exceptions to the "spread out" sense of Qal פרץ in the intransitive construction are found in Mic 2:13 and Eccl 3:3, and, in the view presented here, represent the more basic sense of the verb:

(229) a. Mic 2:13

אַתָּהُ הַפּוֹרְשֵׁי הָסָרִים פָּרְשֵׁי הַשִּׁקָּה הָשִּׁקָּהוֹת

And the one who breaches goes up before them, they breach and pass through the gate.

b. Eccl 3:3

אָכַף לֹא פְּרִית לֹא לָבָתָה

A time to break down, and a time to build.

In Mic 2:13, the use of Qal פרץ in the B colon is most likely transitive with the Obj of עבר, namely שער, doing double duty as Obj of both verbs. The intransitive uses of the Qal פרץ ptc in the A colon of Mic 2:13 and the infinitive construct in Eccl 3:3 trades on a second (transitive) sense of the verb, "to breach" or "to break through" discussed under pattern 2 below. These should be regarded as IOD. Importantly, both Objs are non-specific and non-referential. The use of the conventionally transitive Qal פרץ in an intransitive construction with the sense "to breach," focuses on the action (Eccl 3:3) or the actor as one who performs the action (habitually, iteratively, or characteristically, Mic 2:13).

Pattern 2: [Breached] [Breacher] פרץ

The basic event denoted by Qal פרץ in the transitive construction is significantly different from that denoted by the conventional intransitive usage (though with two exceptions noted above). The basic sense is "to breach" or "break through" a structure, often a wall or fortification.
Conventional Subjs are animate, typically [HumanIndividual], [HumanGroup], and [Deity] as seen in the following:

(230) 2 Chr 26:6

And he breached the wall of Gath, the wall of Jabneh, and the wall of Ashdod.

(231) Isa 5:5

And I [God] will breach its wall and it will be for trampling.

Qal פרץ may be used with the more general notion of "destruction." This sense is probably the result of semantic bleaching of the more narrow "breach" sense. Conceptually, to breach a wall is to render it ineffective and therefore functionally to destroy it. It is likely this more general sense that is in view in, for example, 2 Chr 20:27 ("the Lord will destroy what you made") and also when Qal פרץ takes the Obj [Human] (e.g. Ps 60:3, "You have destroyed us.") The Objs in both the specific sense of "to break through" and the more general sense of "to destroy" are clearly DOs. Importantly, the event schema closely approximates the prototypical transitive scenario in which a discrete Agent acts upon a Patient effecting a change-of-state.

Pattern 3: [Breached] Prep [Breacher] פרץ

Qal פרץ in the Prep [Breached] construction exhibits a variety of polysemous senses. It collocates most often with Prep -ב and the participant we are calling [Breached] which most often profiles a HumanGroup entity. The usage that profiles the HumanGroup as the "breached" or

537. HALOT does not clearly distinguish transitive, intransitive, and Prep modified constructions in their glosses. In addition to the gloss offered above (to break out because of excess) HALOT offers the following: 1) to make a split, to make a breach, 2) to break down, 3) sink a shaft, 4) to break through, 5) to break out in judgment. HALOT, 972.

538. It should be noted that there is one instance of Prep -ב + [Location] in Job 1:10 which is simply situating the action Figures' "spreading out" relative to the Ground [Location], in this case הארץ ("in the land"). Also, the sense, "to urge" features Qal פרץ + Prep -ב [Human]. This sense will not be treated here as it is most likely a
"destroyed" entity, however, is best understood as an extension of the more basic "breached structure" sense. 2 Chr 25:23 is particularly helpful for understanding the Prep [Breached] construction.

(232) 2 Chr 25:23  

And he (Joash) breached the wall of Jerusalem four hundred cubits from the Gate of Ephraim to the Corner Gate.

In 2 Chr 25:23, the specification of the extent of the breach implies that the wall of Jerusalem was not destroyed in its entirety. It was only partially, rather than wholly, affected by Joash's action. Qal מצור + Prep -ב evokes an image schema in which the Obj is only partially affected. The difference between a partial and a complete "breach" in a structure is often more a matter of perception and construal than a matter of the "real world" situation. A wall that is "breached" may legitimately be regarded and construed as destroyed as one hole renders an entire fortification more or less ineffectual. In 2 Chr 25:23, Joash breaches a significant portion of the wall; however, the author's construal of the breached wall emphasizes that a portion of the wall was still left standing. The partial destruction of the wall is expressed with the Prep -ב + [Breached] construction. This is the salient difference between pattern 2 and pattern 3; the former construes the Obj as wholly affected, the latter construes the Obj as only partially affected.

Similarly, when the breached entity profiles a [HumanGroup], the envisioned destruction is partial. This is perhaps most clearly seen in Ps 106:29 and 1 Chr 15:13 (// 2 Kgs 14:13):

(233) a. Ps 106:29  

They provoked anger by their deeds,  
and a plague broke out among them.

byform of פצר and therefore a different root.
b. 1 Chr 15:13

The Lord our God brooked out among us for we did not seek him according to the statute.

This sense of partial "breaching" or "destruction" also seems to be the most natural reading of Exod 19:24:

(234) Exod 19:24

And let not the priests or the people break through to come up to the Lord lest he break out among them.\(^{539}\)

As noted above (see 2.3.3.3.3) Garr observes the same conceptual phenomenon at work in alternations featuring various BH verbs of motion and hitting or striking.\(^{540}\) The destruction depicted by the Qal פרץ + Prep -ב is significant yet partial in its extent and effects.

Pattern 4: [Breach] [Breacher] פרץ «

On two occasions (not including the parallel in 1 Chr 13:11) the Obj profiled in the transitive construction shifts from the [Breached] (i.e. the structure or the group of people) to the [Breach] itself, that is the hole or the space created through the action denoted by Qal פרץ. The Obj [Breach] is often indicated with the Cognate Object (CO) פרץ.

(235) 2 Sam 6:8

And David was angry because the Lord breached a breach in Uzzah.

(236) Job 28:4

He breaches a shaft far away from the sojourners.

Though technically not a CO, Job 28:4 should be regarded as a variation of the Cognate Object Construction (COC) exhibited in 2 Sam 6:8. This would be analogous to the way that the

---

539. Similarly Exod 19:22.

Obj in *I sang an aria* may be seen as a variation of the COC, *I sang a song*. The CO כָּרַע is undoubtedly an Object of Result, that is, the THING that comes into existence as a result of the action denoted by the verb.541

This shift in profiled participants does not necessitate the positing of a new and distinct sense of Qal כָּרַע from that of patterns 1-3. Rather, the sense, "to breach a breach" should be regarded as a modulation of the profiled participants evoked by the base. As such, the COC is an instance of Metonymic Object Change (MOC, see 4.2.2.1, pattern 2 for full description of MOC).

Pattern 5: [Breacher/Breachee] [Breached] כָּרַע «

The participant structure of Qal כָּרַע in Prov 3:10 does not easily fit any of the patterns outlined above. Prov 3:10 profiles the [Breached] entity in the Subj position making it the primary focal participant, and what may be regarded as the [Breacher] or perhaps the [Breachee] participant ( MASS, "new wine") is encoded in the canonical DO position making it the secondary focal participant. I propose that the use of Qal כָּרַע in Prov 3:10 is an exploitation of the verb trading on a version of the labile (or quasi-labile) alternation of the causative/inchoative. The conventional usage discussed in patterns 2 and 3 clearly express a more or less prototypical causative event in which an Agent acts on a Patient effecting a change-of-state. The Subj [Breached] construction depicts the [Breached] undergoing the same change-of-state (i.e. the walls of the vats are bursting open), though without the involvement of an Agent.

A similar alternation was observed in the shift of participant roles with Qal לְבוֹשׁ which on a few occasions profiles the [Dress/Dresser] in the Subj position and the [Dressee] in the Obj

541 Höche distinguishes the Object of Result from what he calls the Event-Result Object (e.g. *smile a smile*). The Object of Result refers to a more concrete entity which is the result of the action (e.g. *weave a web, paint a painting*), instead of a reified focus on the final resultant state of the action. *Cognate Object Constructions*, 89
position (see 4.2.1.1, pattern 3 above). Such usage, it was argued, is unconventional, though accords with known cognitive and linguistic operations (specifically metaphorical personification) and should be regarded as a secondary norm. Similarly, the unconventional argument structure of Qal יָפַץ in Prov 3:10 resembles a sort of causative/inchoative alternation well-known in cross-linguistic analysis of lability. According to Letuchiy's taxonomy of labile verbs, the alternation exhibited by Qal יָפַץ would be a quasi-labile verb as it exhibits a participant role alternation though preserves the two-argument transitive structure.\footnote{Alexander Letuchiy, "Towards a Typology of Labile Verbs," 223-27.}

The semantics of the inchoative alternation, often associated with the middle voice, is the notion of spontaneity. According to Kemmer,\footnote{Kemmer, "The Middle Voice," 198-99. Cf. Langacker, $FOCG$ II, 371.}

> The term "spontaneous event" will therefore be used as a cover term to refer to events in which the conceptual alternative of focussing on a non-volitional, affected participant is chosen, in abstraction from the degree of likelihood for that choice. Spontaneous events are semantically middle in that the affected entity is not only an Endpoint, but is also conceived as an Initiator... Spontaneous events are different from other middle situation types in the complete lack of volitional initiation by the Patient or Undergoer of the event. If there is an actual (albeit uncoded) Agent Initiator involved in the situation at all, it is an entity distinct from the Endpoint. In this respect the spontaneous action verbs are similar to the passive-like situation types.

In middle construction, qualities associated with AGENCY are notably absent. In the parade example, *The glass broke*, there is no Agent, nor are there concepts associated with AGENCY, specifically intentionality and volitionality. Though unexpressed, both are even present in the passive construction, *The glass was broken*, which presumes the action of an Agent. This is not the case with a middle inchoative construction.

In Prov 3:10, the canonical Patient participant [Breached] which in the conventional construction undergoes the change-of-state due to action of the Agent [Breacher], is encoded as
Subj. Though the central concept expressed by the verb, namely the event of "breaching" or "breaking through" is preserved, the profile of the event structure is shifted. By profiling the [Breached] participant as the Subj, the expression takes on an unconventional middle sense along the lines of the English, *The glass broke*.

To be sure, DOs are not typically found in inchoative alternations. However, they are certainly not impossible as in the English verbs, *shatter* and *explode* in the following examples:

(237) a. Floyd *shattered* the glass.

b. The glass *shattered* shards.

(238) a. Dan *exploded* the device.

b. The device *exploded* shrapnel.

On this reading, the "vats" in Prov 3:10 are construed as spontaneously bursting forth with the resultant [Breacher/Breachee] or [Substance] expressed as the DO envisioned as "bursting forth." The following translation expresses the proposed participant structure and force dynamics of the event schema:

(239) Prov 3:10

 hargaי יָדֵךְ שָׁפָר שָׁפָר הַחֲנִיאָת שֵׁיַר

And your barns will be filled with abundance, and your vats *burst forth* new wine. 544

7.2

7.2.1 Qal שָׁבַך

Occurring 198 times in the HB, Qal שָׁבַך is the canonical postural verb denoting the action or state of "lying down."

---

544. The majority of translations and commentaries express the Obj יָדֵךְ with the Obl Prep "with." For example, the NRSV renders it, "and your vats will be bursting with wine."
Pattern 1: [Lier] שׁכב

The unmodified intransitive usage of Qal שׁכב denotes the postural sense of "lying down." It may refer either to the dynamic action of assuming the posture of "lying down," or the stative event of "being in the state of lying." The following are representative of the dynamic and stative senses:

(240) Gen 19:33

And he did not know when she laid down and when she arose.

(241) 2 Sam 13:8

And Tamar entered the house of Amon her brother, and he was lying down.

In the intransitive construction, neither the place in which nor the thing upon which one lies is significant. It is the action or state itself that is in focus. The dynamic inchoative usage shows a strong correlation with finite verbal forms and the stative usage with non-finite forms.

Pattern 2: [Companion] אֶת־ Prep [Lier] שׁכב

I have chosen the designation [Companion] for the participant role that specifies the "companion" or, often, "lover" with whom the Subj [Lier] lies. Both Preps express a comitative relationship between Subj [Lier] and Prep Obj [Companion]. The following are representative:

(242) a. 2 Sam 7:12

For when your days are full, and you lie down with (אֵלָי) your fathers

545. In this sense, Qal שׁכב closely resembles the posture verb Qal ישב discussed in chapter 5 above (see 5.3.1.1), especially in its ability to shift focus from final state to the action/events leading up to the final state.

546. The collocation of Qal שׁכב with locative Preps -ב and על will not be examined in depth. For our purposes, it is sufficient to note that Qal שׁכב takes both Preps often (21x with -ב and 15x with על). With few exceptions the Preps specify the orientation of the Figure [Lier] relative to the Ground [Location]. Prep -ב construes the Obj [Location] as the place in which (e.g. 1 Sam 3:3) or at which (e.g. Isa 51:20) the Subj [Lier] is situated. Prep על predictably construes the [Location] as a planar entity (e.g. 2 Sam 13:5). The examples cited are prototypical and the usages of both Preps with Qal שׁכב are susceptible to fairly typical polysemic extensions.
b. 1 Kings 1:21

And when my lord the king *lies down* with (עִם) his fathers.

The semantic difference between the two comitative Preps, however, is elusive. In his extensive treatment of the use of "to have sexual intercourse with", Harry Orlinsky notes, "The distinction between the two prepositions has puzzled critics since ancient times." After surveying and critiquing the various proposals for a semantic distinction between the two Prep constructions, Orlinsky proposes a documentary explanation in which the Priestly sources consistently employ אֶת־(with one exception, Lev 15:32) and Deuteronomy exclusively employs עִם. Regarding the mixture of forms in Genesis, Orlinsky cites S. R. Driver's view approvingly, specifically that such careful editorial work was done in weaving J and E together that to "attempt to isolate J from E throughout in minute detail is precarious." Orlinsky's documentary explanation is compelling as far as it goes; however, a clear difficulty remains in texts like Samuel in which both forms are used without any noticeable semantic difference. At this point the application of the principles of CG, especially as regards the form-meaning pairing, may have reached the end of what it is able to do with a dead language. Barring more data — and without the benefit of introspection — a distinction based on distribution or semantics/pragmatics is not likely to be discovered.


Pattern 3: [Companion] Obj Prep [Lier]

It is difficult to establish how often Qal שׁכב occurs with a DO on account of the homophony of comitative Prep (hereafter Com Prep) and Obj Prep את. Based on formal distinction of the suffixed forms of the Obj Prep, there are seven clear uses of Qal שׁכב + Obj Prep construction. Orlinsky argues adamantly that Qal שׁכב never takes the Obj Prep, and that what appear to be suffixed forms of Obj Prep את are in fact by-forms of the Com Prep. The difficulty with Orlinsky's proposal, however, is that arguably every appearance of the by-form Com Prep (which formally looks like the Obj Prep) is used to express some kind of illicit, often violent, sexual encounter.

(243) a. 2 Sam 13:14

And being stronger than her, he violated her, and he laid with her.

b. Ezek 23:8

For in her youth, they lay with her.

c. 1 Sam 2:22

And how they laid with the women who served at the gate of the tent of meeting.

d. Gen 34:2

And he seized her, and he laid with her, and he humiliated her.

e. Num 5:13

If a man lies with her sexually.

f. Num 5:19

If no man has laid with you

551. Orlinsky thoroughly critiques the various proposals to emend את to את. His own solution appeals to the use of את as Prep "with" in Josh 10:25; 14:12; 2 Sam 24:24 and occasionnally throughout Kings, Jer, and Ezek. Orlinsky proposes keeping the את form as a by-form with the meaning, "with." Orlinsky, "The Hebrew Root," 26.
Orlinsky would have to suppose that this correlation is simply a coincidence. Such a conclusion, however, strains credulity and one is left looking for another explanation. It should be noted that every clear occurrence of Qal יָעַבָּר in the Obj [Companion] construction expresses the act of sexual intercourse. That is, it is never used with the sense, "in the company of" as in examples (243)a-b above.

The salient difference between the Com Prep [Companion] and the Obj [Companion] constructions is the concept of RECIPROCITY present in the former. A reciprocal action is one that involves a more or less equal participation of the participants in the event. The event denoted by the expression *John kissed Susan*, could also be expressed with the reciprocal pronoun, *John and Susan kissed each other*. Note, however, that the reciprocal sense of *John kissed Susan* is not the only possible sense. It could be that Susan was uninterested and John "stole a kiss." English *kiss* in the transitive construction, therefore, contains a degree of ambiguity. I suggest that Qal יָעַבָּר in the Com Prep [Companion] construction is the unmarked construction which often, though not always, indicates reciprocal action.

(244) a. Gen 30:15

And Rachel said, "Therefore, let him **lie with you** tonight.

b. 2 Sam 12:24

And he went in to her, and **he laid with her**.

To be sure, illicit sexual encounters are expressed with the Prep [Companion] construction (e.g. הִשְׂכַּבָּה, "and he seizes her, and he lies with her (by force," Deut 22:25). In this regard, like English *kiss* discussed above, there is a degree of ambiguity to the Prep [Company] construction. Reciprocity should not be taken as semantically consensual.

The Obj [Companion] construction, however, removes the bi-directional element of reciprocal action, and focuses only on unidirectional action of an individual. In this way it more
closely approximates the prototypical transitive event schema. Bekins rightly argues for a semantic significance of syntactic alternations with BH reciprocal verbs. He says, "Reciprocal verbs may also allow the realization of the second argument as a direct object, inviting a stronger association with the transitive prototype. This syntactic construction portrays the participants as agent and patient without any implication of reciprocity."

In the examples above (243) a-f, some of the uses clearly depict a rape (2 Sam 13:14; Gen 34:2; and possibly 1 Sam 2:22). In these cases the motivation for using the transitive construction is clear as the Agent-rapist is exerting himself forcefully upon the Patient-victim. The motivation for the other uses is not as clear. In legal texts like Num 5:13, 19, and Lev 15:18, 24 the sexual encounter is clearly consensual; the use of the transitive construction therefore may simply reflect certain legal perspectives regarding the locus of responsibility. This, however, is admittedly speculative. In sum, the Obj [Companion] construction does not denote violent, nonconsensual, or illicit sexual relations. Rather, it profiles the action in such a way — specifically unidirectional and closer to the prototypical transitive scenario — that motivates its usage in such contexts. Other conceptual realities that motivate its usage are more elusive. Given their infrequent occurrence, the transitive אֹט-marked Obj [Companion] constructions should be considered as marked, secondary norms.

Pattern 4: [Type of Sleep] [Lier] שָׁכַב «

2 Sam 4:5 presents an unconventional transitive construction.

(245) 2 Sam 4:5

And he (Ish-Bosheth) was taking his noon-day sleep.

552. Bekins, _Transitivity and Object Marking_, 184. Along with other verbs, Bekins cites Qal שָׁכַב in this regard.
The Obj נָשָׁב (literally, "rest of noontime") is marked by the Obj Prep should be regarded as a DO, and more specifically, as a CO in a COC. The CO, in this case, is an Eventive Object, that is, an Obj which profiles the process expressed by the verb as unfolding throughout time as a reified (complete, atemporal) whole.\textsuperscript{553} This would be akin to English smile a smile or yawn a yawn in which the Obj for both refers not to the resultative smile or yawn, but to the event considered as a more or less static whole.

Pattern 5: [Location] [Lier] נָשָׁב «

GKC cites Ps 57:5 as an instance of Qal נָשָׁב in the transitive construction.\textsuperscript{554} Ps 57:5 is one of three occurrences in which Qal נָשָׁב collocates with a non-ה-marked nominal.\textsuperscript{555}

(246) a. Ps 57:5 נָשָׁב אֲשֶׁר לְחָבֵד אֶל-יָהּ

My soul is in the midst of lions,

it is with devouring animals that I lie down.

b. Ruth 3:8 נָשָׁב אֲשֶׁר לְחָבֵד אֶל-יָהּ

And here [at his feet] a woman was lying down.

In contrast to the Obj Prep marked constructions, the few usages of Qal נָשָׁב in the non-ה-marked constructions never (at least explicitly) denotes a sexual encounter.\textsuperscript{556} Rather, the nominal complements specify a place or [Location] at which or with which one "lies down."\textsuperscript{557}

---

\textsuperscript{553} Höche, 	extit{Cognate Object Constructions}, 79-80.

\textsuperscript{554} GKC §117bb, 370. As I suggested above, I believe GKC mis-categorized Qal נָשָׁב as a verb of dwelling. It is really a posture verb which, unlike Qal ישָׁב, never went through a semantic bleaching to mean simply, "to exist, reside" in [Location].

\textsuperscript{555} I am omitting 2 Sam 11:9: נָשָׁב אֲשֶׁר לְחָבֵד אֶל-יָהּ ("But Uriah laid down at the gate of the king's palace").

As I argued above (see 5.1) jAtRÚp£ may, at times, be used as a preposition which is how I am taking it here.

\textsuperscript{556} There are some who argue that the use of Qal נָשָׁב in Ruth 3 has sexual overtones.

\textsuperscript{557} Meek argues that the substantives מַעְבָּרֹת (Ketib מִפְּתָחִים, Ruth 3:14) and מִפְּתָחִים (1 Sam 19:16), though often classified as loci accusativus, actually have their locative notion supplied by the mem prefix. He sees the same phenomenon at work with מַעְבָּרֹת ("the place of entering," Prov 8:3) and מַעְבָּרֹת ("the place of the Arnon," Isa 16:2). He suggests that "to add the preposition b is accordingly quite unnecessary and would be
suggest taking the non-ןָּשָׁר-marked Objs of Qal رسول as foregrounding or increasing the salience of
the [Location] at which one "lies down." In distinction from the conventional Prep -ב [Location]
construction, the Obj [Location] construction moves the [Location] from the general setting in
which the action transpires to a more prominent participant or circumstance of the action. This
emphatic function of the Obj [Location] construction is expressed by the English cleft
construction in the translation of Ps 57:5 above.558

7.3 ריב
7.3.1 Qal ריב

The event denoted by the BH verb Qal ריב has elicited a tremendous amount of literature
treating its legal, social, and theological significance.559 The glosses offered by HALOT capture
the important point that Qal ריב may be used to refer either to a general, non-legal dispute ("to
get into a brawl, quarrel," ) or a legal, judicial dispute ("carry on, contest a lawsuit").560

558. The emphatic function of the Obj [Location] construction is discussed at length under verbs of dwelling (see
5.3.2.1 pattern 5 above).

559. The centrality of the רִיב as a theological phenomenon and a pattern for prophetic discourse is attributed to
Hermann Gunkel in his introduction to H. Schmidt, Die Grossen Propheten, SAT 2/2 (1923). For a dated
though still useful treatment of רִיב as a cultural and theological phenomenon in ancient Israel, see B. Gemser,
"The Rib- or Controversy-Pattern in Hebrew Mentality," in Wisdom in Israel and in the Ancient Near East ed.
by M. Noth and D. Winton Thomas (VTSupp 3; Leiden: Brill, 1969), 120-37. See also M. de Roche, "Yahweh's
רִיב Against Israel: A reassessment of the So-Called 'Prophetic Lawsuit' in the Preexilic Prophets," JBL 102

560. HALOT, 1224.
Pattern 1: [Disputer] ריב «

Qal ריב in an intransitive construction has two distinct but related senses. With a plural Subj Qal ריב may express reciprocal action.

(247) Exod 21:18

When men quarrel and a man strikes his neighbor with a stone or with his fists

Only occurring once in the HB, the reciprocal use of Qal ריב is not a common construction; however, the principles involved accord with cross-linguistic evidence of the behavior of reciprocals that its use in Exod 21:18 should not be considered an exploitation or even a secondary usage.561 Alternations expressing Subj pl reciprocal and Subj sg/pl transitive are common as in English meet:

(248) a. The women met every Saturday. (reciprocal)

b. Jane met Rhonda every Saturday. (transitive)

Typically when Qal ריב occurs in an intransitive construction its Subj identifies only one party in a dispute. It refers either to the general action of "quarreling" (non-legal) or "prosecuting/accusing" (legal).562 The following are representative:

(249) a. Isa 57:16

For I will not dispute forever,
and will not always be angry.

b. Hos 4:4

Let no man dispute, let no man protest.

561. To be sure, in contrast to English BH has a morphological marker or construction (i.e. Hithpael) typically associated with reciprocal action. However, BH root ריב never occurs in the Hithpael stem. The reciprocal meaning of Qal ריב is lexicalized in certain constructions (i.e. plural Subjs).

562. It is not clear the Subj must be singular for this sense. A group identified as a plural or collective entity might conceivably be described as "conducting a legal dispute" without the [Defendant] overtly expressed. This is one possible reading of the second ריב in Hos 2:4: y$1tVvlá àaø àayl_y Ík …wbyšir cMRkV;mlaVb …wbyør ("plead with your mother, plead; for she is not my wife.")}, though it seems more likely that this is a context dependent Obj Del.
c. Prov 25:8 

Do not go quickly to dispute.

Clearly, in these intransitive constructions a second party is implied as conceptually there must be one about whom or to whom the [Disputer] raises a complaint.

Pattern 2: [Opponent] Prep [Disputer] ריב «

Qal ריב collocates with a variety of Preps which govern the participant role [Opponent].

(250) a. Jer 22:9

Why do you dispute with me?

b. Gen 31:36

And Jacob became angry and quarreled with Laban.

c. Num 20:3

And the people disputed with Moses.

Each Prep [Opponent] construction expresses the general sense of "to quarrel with" or "to conduct a lawsuit against." However, establishing the specific sense of the different prepositional constructions is difficult given the paucity of occurrences. HALOT, for examples makes the suggestion that Qal ריב + Prep ל means, "to lodge a complaint with, complain to."563

If I understand the suggestion correctly, HALOT proposes that sense of the Prep ל construction is that a [Disputer] complains to a party who is not the [Opponent] in the dispute. This is an attractive suggestion, but only works with three of the four occurrences of Qal ריב Prep ל [Opponent]. The party "complained to" in Job 33:13 is also the party "complained about," that is, the [Opponent].

563.HALOT, 1224.

It is unclear if the [Opponent] ever appears as the syntactic DO. The reason for the ambiguity resides in the homophony of the Obj Prep and Com Prep את־. That it is used with the Com Prep is evident from the suffixed forms, as, for example, in Isa 50:8:564

(251) Isa 50:8

 cặpיריהו אתית יסחך ים

Who will dispute with me? Let us stand up together.

Whether it may be used as an Obj Prep is uncertain as there are no suffixed forms of the Obj Prep. There is no reason, however, why the את־ marked Objs should not all be regarded as Com Preps governing the participant [Opponent].

Pattern 4: [Disputation] [Disputer] ריב «

Qal ריב does appear in a transitive construction when its Obj profiles the participant role [Disputation]. This may be seen in the following:

(252) a. Mic 7:9

כםיהו עליתם רפיה רזפת

Until the time when he will plead my case.

b. Ps 74:22

כםיהו עליתם רפיה רזפת

Arise, O God, plead your case.

c. 1 Sam 25:39

כםיהו עליתם רפיה רזפת

Blessed by the Lord who pleaded the case of my reproach at the hand of Nabal.

d. Lam 3:58

כםיהו עליתם רפיה רזפת

O Lord, you have pleaded my case.

In the examples above, the Obj [Disputation] construction is clearly a CO. It may possibly be regarded as a conceptual reification of the entirety of the action denoted by the verb Qal ריב. However, this does not seem to fit as a ריב appears to be something one has prior to the actual conducting of the "dispute." In 1 Sam 25:39, for instance, David had a "case of reproach" prior to YHWH's "prosecuting" it. According to Höche's taxonomy of COCs, the transitive construction of Qal ריב is best analyzed as an instance of an inherent landmark Obj. That is, the CO ריב is an Inherent (or affected) Landmark as opposed to a Product or Effected Landmark. Conceptually, the ריב existed prior to the "dispute," and is not brought into existence on account of it.

Höche proposes that the essential quality of COCs is their "combination of two different profiles of the same conceptual base — one related to the verbal and one related to the nominal constituent." He says, "The parts on which the profile can be shifted stand in various relationships to the base: They can originate as the verbal event's trajector (paint - painter, host - host), its landmark (internal object) (choose - choice, feed - food)... As in all of these relations verb and noun share semantic structure." The CO selects the participant [Disputation] from the frame and profiles it as the Ground or Landmark in the Obj position.

On two occasions, Qal ריב takes a DO which profiles neither an [Opponent] participant nor a CO participant. Both are found in Isaiah:

(253) a. Isa 1:17

_iffו יִלְוָ֣א וְרִיבוּדְם אֶלֹהָ֔יִךְ; 17

Render judgment for the fatherless, and plead the cause of the widow.

565 Höche, Cognate Object Constructions, 89.
566 Höche, Cognate Object Constructions, 84.
567 Höche, Cognate Object Constructions, 84.
b. Isa 51:22

וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה וּבְיָדְךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל

And your God will *plead the cause* of his people.

I propose that the DO in Isa 1:17 and 51:22 trades on the COC by way of metonymy. These verses exhibit a creative exploitation of the conventional transitive construction in which the [Disputer], in the sense of the "one who has a רִיב," is substituted for the [Disputation] typically expressed as the DO רִיב. The basis is the metonymic relationship between the person and their dispute. "To plead the widow," means to plead the "case" or "disputation" that belongs to the widow. Like the COCs, these transitive uses are never marked by the Obj Prep which may reflect the lack of distinguishability between the participants and is an indication of low transitivity.

7.4 Conclusions

The above analysis of three BH verbs which exhibit the transitivity alternation demonstrates the applicability of both the theory and methods of CG in elucidating the syntax-semantics interface of alternating constructions. A close study of verbal alternations that takes into account conventionality (and unconventionality) based on corpus analysis reveals a subtle and (sometimes) a not-so-subtle semantic nuance that is critical for translation and interpretation. Two central features of the transitivity alternation are participant roles and event structure. Shifts in the profiled participants and/or the syntactic encoding of the event structure correspond to shifts in meaning that often follow well-known linguistic construal operations. The major construal operations exhibited in the BH transitivity alternations outlined above are: Metonymic Object Change, Emphasis, Cognate Object Constructions, Indefinite Object Deletion, as well as various shifts in event schemas via Preps (e.g. reciprocal to prototypically transitive constructions).
Chapter 8: Conclusion

The aim of this dissertation has been to apply the insights and methods developed in the field of Cognitive Linguistics to a very specific linguistic phenomenon in biblical Hebrew, namely the transitivity alternation. Simply put, the transitivity alternation is the ability of some BH verbs to appear in both one argument and two (or more) argument grammatical constructions. We have also taken up the distinct yet related phenomenon in which these same verbs allow different participant roles to be profiled in a one- or two-argument construction.

The problems for translation and interpretation presented by the BH transitivity alternation have long been recognized. The earliest versions of the Bible exhibit an awareness of at least some of the difficulties presented by alternating verbs and the earliest Hebrew grammarians of the medieval period discussed the phenomenon with a fairly high degree of linguistic sophistication. In fact, their union of syntax and semantics as well as their understanding of verb classes anticipated some of the theoretical insights of modern linguistics and especially Cognitive Grammar.

The theoretical and methodological approach adopted in this study is the relatively recent linguistic theory known as Cognitive Linguistics. Among the many sub-disciplines that make up the broad field of Cognitive Linguistics, I especially employed the insights of Cognitive Grammar as propounded by Langacker and Talmy, and Construction Grammar, particularly the version developed by Goldberg. At the heart of the theory of CG is the conviction that, "meaning is conceptualization." When CGs speak about linguistic meaning they are not referring to something that exists in the "outside" or "objective" world, but rather to an individual's conceptualization. Therefore, a given "real world" situation may be expressed in an almost infinite number of ways, and the way a speaker chooses to express a given situation is
motivated by aspects of the situation (e.g. certain elements make better Figures than others) as well as the goals of the speaker.

Furthermore, CG operates on the principle of form-meaning pairing. A change in syntactic expression is understood to correspond to a change in "meaning." "Meaning" in CG includes both semantic and pragmatic aspects. Syntax, in CG, is not separate from semantics. Rather, syntax reflects basic cognitive functions like judgment, focus, attention, perspective, constitution, orientation, to name a few. These cognitive functions motivate syntactic expression and syntax can therefore be analyzed with reference to cognition, what CG often calls construal operations.

At the heart of the study is the issue of transitivity. Transitivity according to the traditional view is a purely syntactic phenomenon related to valency, that is, whether or not a DO is present. Cognitive Grammar breaks with the generativist tradition in asserting that transitivity is fundamentally a conceptual phenomenon and it is scalar in nature. It is conceptual in that it describes a relationship between two entities not in the "real world" but as they are conceived in a speaker's mind and construed in his or her utterance. Transitivity is scalar in that the properties involved exist on a continuum. The result is that expressions can be more or less transitive as the clausal constituents (verbs and nouns) approximate the transitivity prototype, specifically a discrete Agent acting on a discrete Patient in such a way that the Patient undergoes a change of state.

The transitive prototype is not the only factor governing perceptions of transitivity. There is also the transitive schema which at its most schematic or general level features two participants in a symmetrical Figure/Ground relationship. The schema is expressed by every member of the category (in this case the transitive construction), the prototype only by some members. Both prototypes and schemas need to feature in the analysis of BH transitivity
alternations. A two-argument construction can be far from the transitive prototype (as, for example, with Qal נַעֲשָׂה) and yet nevertheless be schematically transitive as it involves, at minimum, the orientation of a Figure relative to a Ground.

The main conclusion of this study is that the BH verbs which undergo the transitivity alternation evoke scenarios which deviate, usually to a significant degree, from the prototypical transitive scenario. Very few of the verbs considered in this study regularly appear in highly transitive constructions ("highly transitive" defined by being close to the prototypical transitive scenario). The construal operations that were most useful in explaining the conceptual motivation for the various transitivity alternations were: Metonymic Object Change, Indefinite Object Deletion, Cognate Object Constructions, the Substance-Source alternation, and the ability of grammatical constructions to contribute participant roles not conventionally profiled by the verb (e.g. ditransitive constructions).

Certain verb qualities were determined to motivate transitivity alternations. For example, the semantic reflexivity of Verbs of Dressing and Undressing allows for either the [Dresser] or the [Dress] to be construed as the endpoint or measuring argument of the verbal action. In the Qal stems, the [Dresser] is also the [Dressee] and the change-of-state of the [Dresser] participant is the conventional goal of the act of "dressing." BH dress verbs exhibit the ability to construe either the [Dresser] or the [Dress] as the goal or endpoint of the action by means of the intransitive or transitive construction respectively. The semantic reflexivity of BH Verbs of Dressing also contributes to peculiar grammatical patterns in passive expressions. The passive construction, it was argued, is not an operation (or transformation) performed on a more basic syntactic structure. Rather, the passive construction has semantic import in its own right and in combination with a reflexive verb exhibits certain semantic features, notably the backgrounding
of the notion of AGENCY. Or, conversely, the passive construction foregrounds the patientive status of the Subj who "is dressed" or "is girded."

The rare appearance of Verbs of Dwelling in transitive constructions was explained primarily with reference to cognitive salience. The common but vague notion of "emphasis" was defined with reference to the cognitive function of focus or salience. The human mind has the ability to make a background element of an event or scene more prominent. If expressed at all, the Setting in BH is conventionally expressed by means of an oblique construction. The encoding of the Setting as a syntactic DO increases its prominence and makes it a more significant "participant" or "circumstance" in the expression. Its importance, it was argued, is often understood with reference to poetic or narratival exigencies.

The largest group of verbs, Verbs of Fullness and Want were divided into four types according to profiled participants and the event structure conventionally expressed by the verb. The four types represent different conceptualizations of force dynamics: Type 1 verbs express simple containment, Type 2 change-of-state, Type 3 Effected Obj, and Type 4 Affected Obj. The types were also situated relative to the prototypical transitive scenario. Type 1 (represented by Qal מלא and Qal שבע) are the furthest from the prototype and the most schematic, and Type 4 (represented by Qal זרע) the closest to the prototype and the least schematic. Types 2 and 3 fell somewhere between these two poles.

Finally, the theory and methods applied to BH verb classes was applied to a selection of miscellaneous BH verbs not manifestly associated with a verb class which exhibits the transitivity alternation. Since not every BH verb which exhibits the transitivity alternation could possibly be analyzed in a study of this scope, this chapter was intended to lay the groundwork for future research as the various tools and methods which proved fruitful for the larger data sets of the BH verb classes were applied to the smaller data sets exhibited by the miscellaneous verbs.
In part, this project has been experimental in the sense that it attempts to apply modern linguistic theory and methods to a dead language. The fact that BH is no longer anyone's mother tongue presents an added layer of difficulty to an already difficult endeavor. Neither native speakers nor, as is often done in linguistic analysis, personal intuition of acceptability were able to be consulted in determining what is grammatical, ungrammatical, or borderline. The Hebrew Bible has served as the almost exclusive source of data and judgments have had to be rendered on the evidence found therein. This necessarily lends a degree of tentativeness to the conclusions offered throughout. Nevertheless, the data found in the available corpus has, in many instances, shed light on the conceptualizations involved in linguistic expression and has allowed for the principled explanation for the BH transitivity alternations as well as insight into subtle semantic nuances of alternations which are often regarded as synonymous.


________________. "Alternating Constructions with Biblical Hebrew שָׁרַץ 'to swarm.'" (forthcoming).


