

ENCYCLOPEDIA OF HEBREW LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

Volume 3
P-Z

General Editor
Geoffrey Khan

Associate Editors
Shmuel Bolokzy
Steven E. Fassberg
Gary A. Rendsburg
Aaron D. Rubin
Ora R. Schwarzwald
Tamar Zewi



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON
2013

© 2013 Koninklijke Brill NV ISBN 978-90-04-17642-3

Table of Contents

VOLUME ONE

Introduction	vii
List of Contributors	ix
Transcription Tables	xiii
Articles A-F	I

VOLUME TWO

Transcription Tables	vii
Articles G-O	I

VOLUME THREE

Transcription Tables	vii
Articles P-Z	I

VOLUME FOUR

Transcription Tables	vii
Index	I

$C_1C_2VC_3C_2VC_3$, explaining the absence of the pattern * $\{[C_1C_2VC_3]C_1VC_3\}$, where the copied material (C_1VC_3) is not contiguous.

5. CONCLUSION

Hebrew reduplicated words, which conform to the structural restrictions imposed by the language's verbal and nominal configuration, have one or two pairs of identical consonants. The position of the identical consonants is restricted to the right periphery of the word, allowing the base stem to be aligned with the left edge. Words with identical consonants that do not obey the constraints on reduplication are not reduplicated, though they might have been reduplicated in earlier stages of the language. Speakers may resist words with identical consonants that do not obey the constraints on reduplication. This is evident by the word שפופרת *šfoferet* 'tube', which speakers often produce (and also spell) as שפורפרת *šforferet*. Interestingly, a search in the Bar-Ilan *Responsa Project* database (2010) reveals that the wrong form in the current stage of the language (i.e., *šforferet*) is documented (though rarely) in texts from the 11th century on, and might have originally been correct, if שפופרת *šfoferet* 'tube' is historically a reduplicated form of שופר *šofar* 'ram's horn' (i.e., *šofar* > *šforferet* > *šfoferet*). A similar historical development is found in Chaha (Banksira 2000), where $C_1VC_1VC_2$ forms are derived from $C_1VC_2C_1VC_2$ via deletion of a non-final coda consonant.

REFERENCES

- Banksira, Degif Petros. 2000. *Sound mutations: The morphophonology of Chaha*. Philadelphia / Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bat-El, Outi. 2002. "Semitic verb structure within a universal perspective". *Language processing and acquisition in languages of Semitic, root-based, morphology*, ed. by Joseph Shimron, 29–59. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 2006. "Consonant copying and consonant identity: The segmental and prosodic structure of Hebrew reduplication". *Linguistic Inquiry* 37:179–210.
- Berent, Iris and Joseph Shimron. 1997. "The representation of Hebrew words: Evidence from the Obligatory Contour Principle". *Cognition* 64:39–72.
- Gafos, Diamandis. 1998. "Eliminating long-distance consonantal spreading". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16:223–278.
- Schwarzwald (Rodrigue), Ora. 2004. "Some notes on consonant reduplication in Hebrew" (in Hebrew). *Morashtenu Studies* 2–3:251–265.
- Tobin, Yishai. 2001. "Trying to 'make sense' out of phonological reduplication in Hebrew", *Proceedings of LP'2000*, ed. by Bohumil Palek and Osamu Fujimura, 227–260. Prague: Karolinum.
- Ussishkin, Adam. 1999. "The inadequacy of the consonantal root: Modern Hebrew denominal verbs and output-output correspondence". *Phonology* 16:401–442.
- . 2000. "The emergence of fixed prosody". PhD dissertation, University of California Santa Clara.

OUTI BAT-EL
(Tel-Aviv University)

Reflexive

1. DEFINITIONS AND SCOPE

A reflexive verb denotes a verb or construction where the subject and the object refer to the same entity or set of entities. These two roles are often referred to as 'agent' and 'patient', but unlike in prototypical agent-patient relationships a reflexive verb does not necessarily involve a change of state (\rightarrow Agent; Patient), and thus manifests an intermediate degree of transitivity. A reflexive pronoun, likewise, typically denotes a referent that is identical to that of the Actor (the subject noun phrase), but generally has the syntactic function of an object. A reflexive verb, like a passive verb, can only be used to refer to a situation in which there is an agent, while a verb in the middle-voice is unmarked with respect to the presence of an agent, and thus may often be used in Hebrew to refer to the same situation as the passive or reflexive. There are, however, also reflexive-patient-subject constructions, i.e., constructions in which a transitive verb has a patient as its subject and a reflexive pronoun as its object, e.g., זו השקעה שמצדיקה את עצמה *zo hašq'a še-mašdiqa 'et 'ašmah* 'It is an investment that justifies itself'.

Reflexivization of the sort found in Semitic languages, as opposed to that found in Romance languages, is generally viewed as clause-bound and sensitive to the semantics of the verb. As opposed to the situation in Romance languages, it can be the input to nominalization, e.g., תיהיה התרחצות בים *tihye hitraḥašut ba-yam* 'There will be bathing.REF in the sea'. In generative studies (Reinhart and Siloni 2005; Siloni 2008), there is a view that takes reflexivization

of the Semitic type to be a ‘lexical’ operation, and Romance reflexivization to be a ‘syntactic’ operation. Another view (Doron 2003; Doron and Rappaport 2009) treats reflexivization in both types of languages as a lexical process for verb construction that involves the semantic identification of the external argument (i.e., the subject argument) with an internal argument (i.e., the object argument) of the verb. In this process the middle-voice morpheme introduces the external argument, and combines with the root via the operation of argument identification. The middle-voice morpheme is realized as the infix *-t-* in Hebrew, and as *se* in French.

Hebrew speakers use two main strategies for encoding reflexivity: (1) the morphological strategy—by using special verb templates (patterns) and zero complement (→ Binyanim); (2) the syntactic strategy—by using a periphrastic construction comprised of a transitive verb and a reflexive pronoun as direct object or indirect object suffixed with a (reflexive) possessive pronoun agreeing in person and number with the subject of the verb.

2. REFLEXIVE VERB TEMPLATES

The templates for expressing reflexivity in Biblical and Modern Hebrew, are *nif'al* (frequent in Biblical Hebrew) and *hitpa'el* (more common in Modern Hebrew). However, it should be noted that *nif'al* denotes primarily the middle, and this is basically true also regarding *hitpa'el* (Glinert 1989; Siloni 2008; Bolozky 2010), though, regarding *hitpa'el*, there are some scholars who assume that the reflexive-reciprocal meaning is its core meaning (e.g., GKC 1910; Waltke and O'Connor 1990). The term ‘middle’ generally refers to inchoative verbs, i.e., verbs that refer to a situation in which a participant undergoes a change of state, but the verb itself does not specify whether this change occurs as a result of an internal process or as a result of an action taken by some other participant, e.g., דני התעורר *Dani hit'orer* ‘Dani woke up’; העציץ *ha-ʿašiš nišbar* ‘The pot broke’. In Biblical and Modern Hebrew, *nif'al* and *hitpa'el* generally encode the meanings of middle-inchoative, reflexive, and reciprocal. As a reflexive, *nif'al* is often used in Biblical Hebrew in addition to a reflexive pronoun, e.g., וְנִשְׁמַרְתֶּם מְאֹד וְנִפְשַׁתֶּיכֶם *wa-nišmartem mə'ōd la-nəpšōtēkem*

‘And you shall take good heed to yourselves’ (Deut. 4.15). In Modern Hebrew, where *nif'al* is rarely used as reflexive, it is sometimes accompanied by a reflexive adverbial expression, e.g., אדם בתוך עצמו נסגר *'adam betox ʿašmo nisgar* ‘A man shuts himself inside (lit. inside himself)’ (modern Israeli song by Shalom Chanoh). In Mishnaic Hebrew, probably under the influence of Aramaic, *nif'al* and *hitpa'el* replaced the classical passive templates. *Hitpa'el* as a reflexive is used only in some rare cases. Hence, in Mishnaic Hebrew, as opposed to Biblical Hebrew, the reflexive is encoded almost exclusively in a periphrastic construction with the inflected noun עצם *'ešem* (lit. ‘bone’), which conventionalized as the reflexive pronoun, e.g., וְהִתְקַדְּשֶׁתֶּם *wa-hitqaddištem* ‘And sanctify yourselves’ (Lev. 20.7) versus קדש עצמך *qaddes ʿašmekā* ‘Sanctify yourself!’ (Mishna, Yebamoth 20a). Likewise in reciprocal constructions (→ Reciprocals). While Biblical Hebrew often employs *nif'al* (rarely *Hitpa'el*) in conjunction with יחדו *yahdāw* ‘together’, e.g., נִוְעְצוּ יַחְדָּו *nōʿəšū yahdāw* ‘consulted together’ (Ps. 71.10), Mishnaic Hebrew employs a periphrastic construction with a conventionalized bipartite reciprocal marker, e.g., נטלו עצה זה מזה *natlu ʿeša ze miz-ze* ‘They took advice from each other/consulted each other’ (Wayyiqra Rabba 20.8). In rare cases, transitive verbs, which normally refer to a situation involving two participants, occur in Biblical Hebrew with only one participant. The other participant is understood from the context to be the same entity, e.g., וַיִּקַּם דָּוִד מֵהָאָרֶץ וַיִּרְחֹץ וַיִּשְׂדֵךְ *way-yāqām dāwid mē-hā-ʾāreš way-yirḥaš way-yāšek* ‘David got up from the ground and washed (himself) and lubricated (himself)’ (2 Sam. 12.20).

Generally, *nif'al* and *hitpa'el* are mutually exclusive, that is, only one template can be chosen in a given context for denoting middle-reflexive or inchoative. In many cases, the choice between them has to do with morpho-phonemic constraints, e.g., הדליק *hidliq* ‘light (fire), turn on’ as opposed to middle-reflexive גדלק *nidlaq* (*היטדלק *hitdaleq*—the assimilation of the phonemes /t/ and /d/ blocks the formation of the middle-reflexive). But it may also be a result of semantic differentiation, e.g., נאבק *ne'evaq* ‘struggle’ versus התאבק *hit'abeq* ‘wrestle’; נקשר *niqšar* ‘become

(emotionally) attached to someone' versus התקשר *hitqašer* 'call someone by phone'. Nevertheless, there are some cases where *nif'al* and *hitpa'el* overlap, e.g., ... אֶת־קִלְדָּי שִׁמְעֵתִי בַגָּן ... וְאֶחָבָא 'et-qōlkā šāma'tī bag-gān... wā-'ēhābē 'I heard the sound of you in the garden... and I hid myself' (Gen. 3.10) versus וַיִּתְחַבֵּא הָאָדָם וְאִשְׁתּוֹ מִפְּנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵימִי מִיַּפְּנֵי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵימִי *way-yithabbē hā-'ādām wā-'išto mip-panē YHWH 'ēlōhīm* 'The man and his wife hid from LORD God' (Gen. 3.8). In very few cases, however, *hitpa'el* and *qal* in middle-reflexive meaning are interchangeable or show only a slight semantic difference between them, e.g., גבר *gavar* versus התגבר *hitgaber* 'overpower, overcome'; בוש *bōš* (Biblical Hebrew) versus התבושש/התבייש *hitbōšēš* (Biblical Hebrew)/*hitbayeš* (Modern Hebrew) 'feel ashamed'.

The verbal paradigm of reflexives is restricted in Hebrew, or, put differently, the process that generates reflexive verbs is not productive. The reflexive paradigm of *hitpa'el* is generally limited to bodily activities, especially grooming verbs (for arbitrary reasons some of them are excluded) that usually have a transitive counterpart, most commonly in *p'el*, but also in *qal* and *bif'il*, e.g., (רחץ *raḥaš* >) התרחץ *hitraḥeš* 'wash himself', (גילח *gileax* >) התגלח *hitgaleax* 'shave himself'. But it also includes inherent reflexives with no transitive counterpart, e.g., התוודה *hitvada* 'confess' השתחוה *hištaḥava* 'bow (himself) down, prostrate oneself'. There are also reflexives with a negative connotation of pretence, which are denominative verbs, e.g., התחכם *hitḥakem* 'pretend to be wise (make himself overwise)'. *Hitpa'el* also includes some other verbs, most of them new creations of Modern Hebrew, e.g., הצטדק *hištaḏeq* 'justify oneself', התמקד *hitmaqed* 'focus on'. In some cases, there is a semantic differentiation between encoding in the transitive construction and encoding in *hitpa'el*, e.g., מכר עצמו *maxar 'ašmo* 'sold himself' versus התמכר *hitmaker* 'become addicted'.

A reflexive verb in *hitpa'el* does not necessarily refer to a situation in which the Actor brought some change in its own condition, status, or location. There are also reflexive *hitpa'el* in which the Actor does not bring about a change in itself, e.g., אֶל־יִתְהַלֵּל חֲגֹר כַּמְּפַתָּח, *al-yithallēl ḥōgēr ki-mḥattēah* 'One who girds on (his armor) should not praise himself like one who puts it off' (1 Kgs 20.11).

In Biblical Hebrew, in few rare cases, *hitpa'el* is used to convey the 'benefactive-reflexive' meaning, namely it refers to a situation in which the Actor acts in his or her own interest or for his or her own benefit, e.g., וְהִתְחַנְּנוּ אֵלַי, *wa-hithannū 'ēlekā bab-bayit haz-ze* 'And they implore you for favor for themselves in this house' (1 Kgs 8.33). A more common construction used for this function throughout all diachronic layers of Hebrew is one with an active verb and a dative-benefactive preposition ל- *l-* ('to', 'for') with a pronominal suffix referring to the Actor, e.g., in Biblical Hebrew וַיַּעַשׂ לוֹ אֶהוּד הַחֶרֶב, *way-ya'as lō 'ēhud ḥereb* 'And Ehud made a sword for himself' (Judg. 3.16), and similarly in Modern Hebrew, e.g., קניתי לי, *qaniti li simla* 'I bought myself a dress'.

In Late Biblical Hebrew, *hitpa'el* also has the semantic force of a passive (probably a result of Aramaic influence or even Greek; see Bendavid 1967-1971:I, 144; II:485-486, *inter alia*), e.g., הִיא תִּתְהַלָּל, *hī tithallāl* 'She shall be praised' (Prov. 31.30); וַיִּשְׁתַּכְּחוּ בְעָרִי, *we-yištakkəḥū bā-'ir 'āšer kēn-'āšū* 'And those who have acted so are forgotten in the city' (Eccl. 8.10). In 'higher' registers of Modern Hebrew the form of *hitpa'el* is often preferred in the passive meaning instead of the regular *hitpa'el*, e.g., הכתובת התגלתה/נתגלתה, *ha-ktovet hitgalta/nitgalta be-miqre* 'The inscription was discovered by chance'.

In Modern Hebrew, *hitpa'el* and *nif'al* never take the direct object marker את *'et*, while in Biblical Hebrew in some cases (frequently with inalienable objects, and when referring to belongings such as clothes, jewelry, and land) *hitpa'el* may take the direct object marked by את *'et* (albeit, never with *nif'al*), e.g., וַיִּתְפַּרְקוּ... אֶת־, *et-nizmē haz-zāhāb* (Exod. 32.3) 'And they broke off themselves... the golden rings'; וַיִּתְפַּשֵּׁט יְהוֹנָתָן אֶת־הַמְּעִיל אֲשֶׁר, *way-yitpaššēṭ yəhōnātān 'et-ham-mē'il 'āšer 'ālāw* 'And Jonathan stripped himself of the robe that was on him' (1 Sam. 18.4).

3. REFLEXIVE PRONOUNS

Encoding the reflexive by a simple pronominal suffix is not common in Hebrew, though, in some cases it can be found in Mishnaic Hebrew, e.g., גוללו אצלו, *golelo 'ešlo* 'He rolls it up to himself' (Mishna, Erubin 10.3); האשה מתקדשת

בה *ha-ʿiša mitqaddešet bah* ‘A woman can be betrothed by herself’ (Mishna, Qiddushin 2.1). In some rare cases, the compound preposition מאל *mi(e)* ‘from/of’ + ’el ‘to’ suffixed with the possessive pronoun is used, e.g., העולה מאליו *ha-ʿole meʿelaw* ‘that springs up of itself’ (Mishnah, Orla 1.2). In Modern Hebrew this prepositional compound is used only in the expression מובן מאליו *muvaṅ meʿelav* ‘self-evident’.

The conventionalized Hebrew reflexive pronouns are a type of ‘autophoric nouns’ (Lehmann 1995:43), i.e., ordinary nouns with free non-reflexive uses centering around the person, as a whole or in part, which became grammaticalized to comprise the ‘self’.

All the grammaticalized reflexive pronouns in Hebrew evolved from body parts, e.g., נפש *nefeš* ‘throat, soul’, עצם *ʿešem* ‘bone’ (cf. late Aramaic גרם *gerem* ‘bone’) and גוף *guf* ‘body’. נפש *nefeš* ‘soul’ is used almost exclusively in Biblical Hebrew, e.g., בַּעֲשׂוֹר לְחֹדֶשׁ נַפְשֵׁיכֶם *be-ʿāšōr la-ḥōdeš taʿannū ʿet-napšōtēkem* ‘On the tenth of the month you shall humble yourselves’ (Lev. 16.29). In Mishnaic Hebrew, *nefeš* is used infrequently. In Modern Hebrew, it co-occurs as a pronominal form preceded by the dative-ל *le-* marker in an adverbial function denoting ‘alone’, e.g., עזוב אותו לנפשו *ʿazov ʿoto le-nafšo* ‘leave him alone (lit. to himself)’.

The body part which grammaticalized as a reflexive marker in Mishnaic Hebrew, and which is commonly used in Modern Hebrew, is עצם *ʿešem* ‘bone’. In Biblical Hebrew, עצם *ʿešem* ‘bone’ is occasionally found in construct state (not as an inflected noun) as determiner of abstract nouns and not human beings in the sense of ‘the very, the self-same’, e.g., בַּעֲצָם הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה בָּא נֹחַ *bə-ʿešem hay-yōm haz-ze bā nōaḥ* ‘On that very day Noah entered’ (Gen. 7.13). In this sense it also co-occurs in Modern Hebrew, e.g., עד עצם היום הזה לא קיבלתי תשובה *ʿad ʿešem ha-yom ha-ze lo qibalti tšuva* ‘Until that very day I got no answer’.

גוף *guf* ‘body’ is used as a reflexive pronoun almost exclusively in Aramaic. In Hebrew it is used only as an intensifier, e.g., גופה של מנחה *gufah šel minḥa* (Safra 25b) ‘The sacrifice itself’; or in adverbial position in the sense of ‘separately’ or ‘independently’, e.g., in Modern Hebrew כדאי לדון בכל מקרה לגופו *keday ladun be-xol miqre le-gufo* ‘It is better to discuss each case on its own’.

4. SUBJECT CO-REFERENTIAL DATIVE PRONOUN

In Contemporary Hebrew, in ‘marked’ environments the dative-ל *le-* ‘to, for’ (→ Dative: Modern Hebrew), is commonly used as a co-referential subject pronoun expressing the speaker’s stance or emotional attitude towards the described situation, e.g., והיא קמה ועזבה יום אחד אותה ואת שני הילדים [...] פשוט ברח לה *ve-hi qama ve-ʿazva yom ʿexad ʿoto ve-et šne hayeladim [...] pašut barxa lah* ‘And one day she (just) left him and her two children [...] (~fancy that!) just ran away (lit. run away to-her/herself)’ (Oz 2002:195). When used with inanimate subject-entities, this construction often yields a meaning of an uncontrolled or haphazard situation. The subject-entity is conceptualized as a living being, and is given a kind of individual identity of an autonomous entity capable of acting on its own, e.g., מעבר לשולחן השתפלה *meʿever la-šulḥan hištapla lah* *ha-keres ha-mefuneqet* lit. ‘beyond the table the spoiled belly hung down.REF (*hitpaʿel*) to-her (to herself)’ (Yehoshua 1994:197). In this discourse (pragmatic) function, the dative pronoun co-referential with the subject is not interchangeable with the conventionalized reflexive pronoun עצם *ʿešem* ‘self’. Furthermore, it can co-occur even together with a reflexive verb in *hitpaʿel*, as shown in the above example.

The subject co-referential dative pronoun (instead of the canonical reflexive pronoun) is used in Modern Hebrew, especially in colloquial speech, when referring to an affected possessor, e.g., קרעתי לי את המכנסיים *qaraʿti li ʿet ha-mixnasayim* ‘I tore my (lit. to-me/myself) trousers (~ what a shame, I did it to myself)’.

5. REFLEXIVE PRONOUNS AS INTENSIFIERS

Reflexive pronouns may be used as intensifiers (‘emphatic reflexives’ Quirk et al. 1985; Kemmer 1995, *inter alia*). Hebrew, as opposed to most European languages, makes no formal differentiation between intensifiers and reflexive pronouns. Like reflexive pronouns intensifiers inflect and exhibit agreement with their subject. Typically, their meaning is ‘X and nobody else’, but they may also be paraphrased as ‘even/also X personally’. Examples from Mishnaic and Modern Hebrew include:

גיטה *mebr'a'et gittah* 'The woman herself brings her divorce document' (Mishna, Gittin 2.7); השר *ha-sar 'aşmo xatam 'al ha-mismax* 'The minister himself (personally) signed the document'; המורה עצמו לא ידע את *ha-more 'aşmo lo yada' 'et ha-tšuva* 'The teacher himself (even/also he personally) did not know the answer'. In contemporary Hebrew the complex form *כשלעצמו* *kše-le- 'aşmo* (lit. when-to-himself), as opposed to its simple counterpart *עצמו* *'aşmo* 'himself', selects a non-agentive subject as its focus, e.g., הסיפור *ha-sipur kše-le- 'aşmo me'anyen* 'The story itself (by itself) is interesting'.

In their adverbial use intensifiers are preceded by a preposition, most commonly *ב-* *be-*, e.g., *בעצמי* *be- 'aşmi* (lit. by myself) 'alone, without help'. Such intensifiers typically select agent subjects, though they may sometimes also select instrumental objects as their subject.

6. LOGOPHORIC REFLEXIVES

The so-called 'logophoric reflexives' (Reinhart and Reuland 1993, *inter alia*) are discourse-triggered morphemes which appear in positions that are not argument positions of a syntactic predicate. Like intensifier reflexives they are encoded in the same form as 'true' reflexive pronouns. They are typically used to present the situation from the perspective of the 'logophoric' referent, e.g., האספן הודיע שלא רק *ha-asfan hodia' še-lo raq ha-tmuna šel ha-saxqanit 'ela gam ha-tmuna šel 'aşmo li-mxira* 'The collector announced that not only the picture of the actress, but also the picture of himself is on sale'.

7. IDIOMATIC EXPRESSIONS AND CONSTRUCTIONAL IDIOMS CONTAINING REFLEXIVE PRONOUNS

Reflexive pronouns often co-occur in idiomatic expressions and constructional idioms. For example in Modern Hebrew: *זה סיפור שהת- בפני עצמו* *(ze sipur še-hitpateax le-maxaze) bifne 'aşmo* '(This is a story which developed into a play) on its own (lit. in-the-face-of itself); *בשם עצמי* *(ani medaber raq) be-šem 'aşmi* '(I am speaking only) for myself (lit. in-the-name-of myself)'; *בחלום*

(ba-xalom ha-xolem meqayem dialog) beno le-ven 'aşmo '(In the dream the dreamer is conducting a dialogue) with himself (lit. between-him and between-himself)'. In Mishnaic Hebrew, this expression means 'privately', e.g., *וכשהוא מתפלל לבין עצמו* *u-kše-hu mitpallel beno le-ben 'aşmo* 'And when he prays privately' (Mishna, Bikkurim 1.4). In Mishnaic Hebrew *'ešem* as a reflexive pronoun frequently collocates with *כל* *kol* 'all' conveying the meaning 'he/she/it as a whole', e.g., *כל עצמו אינו כותב אלא* *kol 'aşmo 'eno koteb 'ella...* 'Altogether he writes none other than' (Mishna, Sota 2.3). In Modern Hebrew, the binominal *בכבודו ובעצמו* *bi-xvodo u-ve- 'aşmo* 'he himself (lit. he in his honor and he in himself)' is used emphatically to refer to honorable persons (in colloquial speech often in a sarcastic meaning of 'the big boss'). In contemporary Hebrew the Mishnaic expression *איבד עצמו לדעת* *'ibbed 'aşmo la-da'at* 'commit suicide (lit. lost himself to-consciousness)' (versus its Modern Hebrew counterpart in *hitpa'el* התאבד *hit'abed*) leads to a rise of context-expansions of the construction where the negative connotation still prevails, e.g., *השקפת העולם האמריקאית מובילה לבדידות, לני- כור ולחברה ש(מפריטה עצמה לדעת* *hašqafat ha- 'olam ha- 'amerika'it movila li-vididut, lenikur u-le-xevra še-)mafriṭa 'aşmah la-da'at* (Haaretz 30.5.03) '(The American outlook leads to loneliness, alienation and to a society that) privatizing itself to death (lit. to consciousness)'.

PRIMARY SOURCES

- Oz, Amos. 2002. *A story on love and darkness* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem: Keter.
Yehoshua, Abraham B. 1994. *The return from India* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv: Am Oved.

REFERENCES

- Bendavid, Abba. 1967–1971. *Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew* (in Hebrew). 2 vols. Tel-Aviv: Dvir.
Bolzky, Shmuel. 2010. "Nitpa'el and hitpa'el in Israeli Hebrew" (in Hebrew). *Rabbinic Hebrew and its interfaces*, ed. by Ephraim Hazan and Zohar Livnat, 277–289. Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan Press.
Doron, Edit. 2003. "Agency and voice: The semantics of the Semitic templates". *Natural Language Semantics* 11:1–67.
—. 2008. "The contribution of the template to verb meaning" (in Hebrew). *Modern linguistics of Hebrew*, ed. by Galia Hataav, 57–88. Jerusalem: Magnes.

- Doron, Edit and Malka Rappaport-Hovav. 2007. "Towards a uniform theory of valence-changing operations". *Proceedings of IATL 23*, Hebrew University of Jerusalem.
- . 2009. "A unified approach to reflexivization in Semitic and Romance". *Brill's Annual of Afroasiatic Languages and Linguistics* 1:75–105.
- Faltz, Leonard M. 1985. *Reflexivization: A study in universal syntax*. New York: Garland.
- GKC 1910 = Kautzsch, Emil (ed.). 1910. *Gesenius' Hebrew grammar*. Trans. by A. E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Glinert, Lewis. 1989. *The grammar of Modern Hebrew*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Halevy, Rivka. 2004. "Šoteq lo ha'adon' (silent to him the master): The function of the construction 'verb + l + co-agent pronoun' in contemporary Hebrew" (in Hebrew). *Lěšonenu* 65:113–142.
- . 2007. "The subject co-referential l- pronoun in Hebrew". *Studies in Semitic and general linguistics in honor of Gideon Goldenberg*, ed. by Tali Bar and Eran Cohen, 299–321. Münster: Ugarit Verlag.
- Jouïon, Paul and Takamitsu Muraoka. 2006. *A grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Revised English edition. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Kemmer, Suzanne. 1995. "Emphatic and reflexive -self: Expectations, viewpoint, and subjectivity". *Subjectivity and subjectivisation*, ed. by Dieter Stein and Susan Wright, 55–82. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995 [1982]. *Thoughts on grammaticalization*, 2nd ed. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of English language*. London: Longman.
- Reinhart, Tanya and Eric Reuland. 2003. "Reflexivity". *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:657–720.
- Reinhart, Tania and Tal Siloni. 2005. "The lexicon-syntax parameter: Reflexivization and other arity operations". *Linguistic Inquiry* 36:389–436.
- Segal, Moshe H. 1927. *A grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Siloni, Tal. 2008. "On the hitpa'el template" (in Hebrew). *Theoretical Hebrew linguistics*, ed. by Galia, Hatav, 111–138. Jerusalem: Magnes.
- Waltke, Bruce K. and Michael O'Connor. 1990. *An introduction to Biblical Hebrew syntax*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- internal changes of the lexical base, to another type of marking, in which inflection is effected through linear means with no change in the lexical base. Sometimes the two processes are combined, i.e., there is both an internal change and linear inflection in the form of a suffix (e.g., ספר *sefer* 'book', ספרים *sfar-im* 'books').
- In English, most nouns are inflected by adding the suffix *-s/-es*, e.g., *boot-boots*, *box-boxes* whereas other types of nouns require an internal vocalic change (*umlaut*), as in the case of *foot-feet*. Following the German linguistic tradition, some linguists refer to the former (the regular) as 'weak morphology' and the latter (the irregular) as 'strong morphology' (Rosén 1977:130–144). Others refer to the regular trilateral forms as 'strong' (GKC; Schwarzwald 1984a; Jouïon and Muraoka 2006). Thus there is some confusion of terminology in the field (→ Inflection; Defective Verbs).
- The forms that Modern Hebrew inherited from the Tiberian tradition were based on phonological realities that are no longer current in contemporary Hebrew: (1) vowel reduction of the vowel *ā* in open syllables following stress changes (Bolzky 1980; 1998; Ravid 2001); (2) spirantization of the בגדכפ"ת *bgdkpt* stops after vowels (Weinberg 1966:301–296; Ben-Horin and Bolzky 1972; Bolzky 1980:3–16; Ephratt 1981; Schwarzwald 1981a:41–53; Ravid 1998; Shatil 2003b; Henkin 2006); (3) insertion of a vowel as a means of preventing clusters (anaptyctic vowels), e.g., *divre* > דברי *divre* (→ Consonant Cluster: Modern Hebrew). In addition, Biblical Hebrew made distinctions of consonant length (→ Gemination). In contemporary Hebrew, all these alternations are morphophonemic rather than phonological (Schwarzwald 1981b; 1984b; Ben-Shahar 2001).
- As a result of the loss of these features, many of the paradigms that exhibit them in Tiberian Hebrew have come to be treated as irregular and have undergone a broad range of leveling or 'regularization' in non-standard Hebrew (Rosén 1977:143). For instance, the normative inflection of a nominal base like דבר *davar* 'word, thing' is דבר *davar* (absolute), דבר- *dvar* (construct), דברים *dvar-im* (pl), דברי- *divre* (pl construct). Although this inflection has been maintained in Modern Hebrew, other nouns with the same pattern (*-a-a-*) are inflected by most speakers thus: פגז *pagaz* (absolute) 'cannon shell', פגז *pagaz* (s construct), פגזים *pagaz-im*

RIVKA HALEVY

(The Hebrew University, Jerusalem)

Regularization of Paradigm

1. INTRODUCTION: TERMINOLOGY AND SCOPE

The term 'regularization of paradigms' refers to a morphological shift from one type of marking, in which inflection is effected through