

ON THE ASPECTUAL OPPOSITION OF PASSIVES
IN MODERN HEBREW*

Tsuguya Sasaki

1 INTRODUCTION

The present study is concerned with the alleged aspectual opposition of two passive verbal patterns (binyanim) in Modern Hebrew, i.e., PAUL and NIF'AL,¹ as exemplified in (1), and its correlation with what I call 'inherent aspects' (cf. section 2.2).

- (1) a. hamixtav kativ(PAUL)
 ART-letter written
 'The letter is written'
- b. hamixtav nixtav(NIF'AL)
 ART-letter be.written(PRS)
 'The letter is written'

Previous studies on aspect in Modern Hebrew are not only restricted in number but far from being exhaustive, which is in a marked contrast with the state of the art in Biblical Hebrew. In this respect the above-mentioned issue is no exception. As will be shown in section 3.3 below, the problem is that those studies dealing with the opposition of PAUL and NIF'AL are contented with the description of prototypical examples and are attempting a formulation, which, it seems, does not apply to all cases.

This study is a modest attempt to fill this lacuna. In chapter 2 below the terminology to be employed hereafter is explained briefly so that the subsequent discussions will not be

circular. In chapter 3 general characteristics of the Modern Hebrew verbal system (verbal patterns, tense-aspect, and passive, among others) are elucidated; a brief mention is also made of the previous studies concerning the difference between PAUL and NIF'AL. In chapter 4, which is the main body of this study, I consider the aspects which PAUL and NIF'AL represent in 'events', 'telic processes', 'atelic processes', and 'states' (cf. section 2.2) respectively, and implicational relations in the present and past tenses. Chapter 5 is a summary of the preceding chapters.

2 THEORETICAL PREREQUISITES

2.1 THREE LEVELS OF NP REPRESENTATION

In accordance with Andrews (1985), Dik (1981), Geniušienė (1987), Givón (1984), etc., it is assumed in this paper that noun phrases have three levels of representation: morphological marking, syntactic functions, and semantic functions. In the following paragraphs each will be discussed in turn.

By 'morphological marking' I am referring to three categories: inflectional endings (e.g., nominative, accusative, ergative, absolutive, etc.), morphologically autonomous elements, and adpositions (i.e., prepositions and postpositions). Only the latter two are found in Modern Hebrew: accusative marker (ACC) et, and prepositions such as le-, be-, min, al, etc. (cf. Rosén 1966: 62-65).

What I call 'syntactic functions' (also called 'grammatical relations', etc.) are language-dependent categories comprised of 'subject', 'object', etc. They are defined according to

morphological and syntactic properties in a specific language. As far as Modern Hebrew is concerned, three syntactic functions are postulated: subject (S), object (O), and oblique (OBL). They can be defined on the basis of their morphological properties as shown below.

(2)

	morphological marking	verb agreement
S	Ø	+
O	Ø ~ ACC ²	-
OBL	prepositions	-

Now let us focus our attention on 'semantic functions' (also called 'thematic roles', 'case roles', etc.). Although a number of studies have been made thus far about language-independent semantic functions, none of them seem to be wholly coherent and decisive. The following is but a tentative definition of five (obligatory) ones which are relevant to this study.

- (3) a. agent (AG): a participant who initiates something (intentionally)
- b. stimulus (ST):³ a participant that stimulates someone's feelings or perception
- c. recipient (RE): a participant who receives something
- d. experiencer (EX): a participant who feels or perceives something
- e. patient (PA):⁴ a participant that is in a certain state or undergoes a change of state

Consider the following examples.

- (4) a. bišnat 1881 ala ben-yhuda_{S, AG} le-yisrael
in-year 1881 immigrate(PST) Ben-Yehuda to-Israel
'In 1881 Ben-Yehuda immigrated into Israel'

- b. hu_S pa niftar lifney hašlamat hamilon
 he pass.away(PST) before completion ART-dictionary
 'He passed away before the completion of the
 dictionary'
- c. lifney mea šana hoci zamenhof_S ag et
 before hundred year publish(PST) Zamenhof ACC
 hasefer_O pa harišon basafa haxadaša
 ART-book ART-first in.ART-language ART-new
 'A hundred years ago Zamenhof published the first book
 in the new language'
- d. hu_S ag natan lanu_Obl re matana_O pa niflaa
 he give(PST) to-us present wonderful
 'He gave us a wonderful present'
- e. kulanu_S ex yod'im et šneyhem_O st hetev
 all-us know(PRS) ACC two-them well
 'All of us know both of them well'

2.2 VALENCY, TRANSITIVITY, DIATHESIS, AND ASPECT

Linguists are not consistent in their use of valency, transitivity, diathesis, and aspect. It is often the case that one term is employed to denote several concepts, and on the contrary, one concept is expressed by different terms. It is necessary, therefore, that I make explicit what I mean by these categories.

The term 'valency' is used here in its narrowest sense, i.e., to denote the number of participants with obligatory semantic functions that a predicate can take. Predicates can be classified according to their valency as follows.

- (5) a. avalent: a predicate with the valency of 0

- b. univalent: a predicate with the valency of 1
- c. bivalent: a predicate with the valency of 2
- d. trivalent: a predicate with the valency of 3

For the term 'transitivity' I retain the traditional meaning. In other words, it is employed to denote a pure syntactic category of predicates. On the basis of transitivity, predicates can be classified into the following three divisions.

- (6)
- a. intransitive: a predicate with no object
 - b. monotransitive: a predicate with one object
 - c. ditransitive: a predicate with two objects

Care must be taken not to confuse transitivity with valency; they are not identical. Monotransitive verbs, for example, are not always bivalent, and vice versa.

Also confusing is the term 'diathesis'. In general, 'voice' and 'diathesis' are used interchangeably among linguists of the Western tradition. In this study, however, they are kept apart as suggested by Xolodovič (1970). According to his definition, diathesis is "a pattern of correspondences between units at the syntactic level and units at the semantic level"; on the other hand, voice is "a regular marking in the verb of the correspondences between units at the syntactic level and units at the semantic level," i.e., "a diathesis grammatically marked in the verb" (Xolodovič 1970: 13).

It may safely be said that this approach surpasses the treatment of 'voice' by Barber (1975). Geniušienė (1987: 52-58) is an elaboration of the 'two-level diathesis' by Xolodovič to the effect that the 'three-level diathesis' must be postulated by adding one more level of representation called 'referent structure' to syntactic and semantic levels of representation (i.e., syntactic and semantic functions). I adopt here the

two-level diathesis, which is sufficient for the present purposes. In other respects, however, Geniušienė (ibid.) is followed *mutatis mutandis*. Though less elaborate, Comrie (1985b) is also a stimulating treatise which essentially tries the same approach as does Geniušienė, and complements it with some aspects which are not dealt with by the latter such as 'causatives'.

Those diatheses which are characterized by a shift in correspondences between syntactic and semantic functions vis-à-vis 'basic diatheses'⁵ are called 'derived diatheses'. The latter, in turn, are divided into the following two categories: 'causative diatheses' and 'recessive diatheses'. The former are characterized by valency-increase, while the latter, which comprise the so-called 'passives', 'anticausatives', 'reflexives', 'reciprocals', etc., by valency-decrease. To summarize, diatheses are classified as shown in (7) below.

- (7)
- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| └ basic diatheses | |
| └ derived diatheses └ | └ causative diatheses |
| | └ recessive diatheses |

This concept is utilized in explaining the so-called verbal patterns (binyanim) of Modern Hebrew in section 3.1.

More chaotic is the term 'aspect'. It cannot necessarily be said that representative works on aspect such as Comrie (1976), Dahl (1985), etc. are clear-cut and cover all those topics which are at issue under the rubric of aspect in the scholarly journals and monographs. Though the author does not draw a conclusion herself, Yamada (1984) is an excellent survey which gives us useful information on the state of the art in aspectology.

On the basis of Yamada (ibid.), Dik (forthcoming), etc., I classify aspects as follows: 'inherent aspects', 'presentational aspects', 'phasal aspects', 'quantificational aspects', and

'qualificational aspects'.⁶

(8) inherent aspects: traditionally discussed in the forms of the classification of verbs, predicates, situations, etc.; cf. Chung & Timberlake (1985: 213-218), Comrie (1976: 41-51), Dahl (1981), Dik (1981: 32-36), Kalocsay & Waringhien (1985: 143-148), Kenny (1963: 171-186), Lyons (1977: 485-486), Mourelatos (1981), Vendler (1957), Yamada (1984: 73-107, 115-122), etc.

- a. dynamic vs. stative: this opposition is clear intuitively, and is almost unanimously accepted among linguists
- b. punctual vs. durative: the absence vs. presence of the quality of lasting in time
- c. telic vs. atelic: the implication vs. non-implication of the terminal point

Combining these three oppositions, the following four categories, which I call 'event', 'telic process', 'atelic process', and 'state', are conceivable.⁷

(9)

dynamic	punctual	telic	event	
			telic process	
	durative	atelic	atelic process	
stative			state	

(10) presentational aspects: cf. Bybee (1985: 141-146), Chung & Timberlake (1985: 218-220), Comrie (1976: 16-40), Dahl (1985: 69-84), Dik (forthcoming), Yamada (1984: 55-56, 110-115), etc.

- a. perfective: "indicates the view of a situation as a single whole, without distinction of the various

separate phases that make up that situation" (Comrie 1976: 16)

- b. imperfective: "pays essential attention to the internal structure of the situation" (Comrie *ibid.*)

(11) phasal aspects: indicate "what is the case at some reference point on the temporal axis in relation to the occurrence of some SoA [= state of affairs = situation]" (Dik *forthcoming*); cf. also Comrie (1976: 52-56, 64-65), Comrie (1981), Dahl (1985: 129-141), Yamada (1984: 57-58, 123-133), etc.

- a. perfect (resultative): describes "a state that is the result of an earlier situation by giving expression to the earlier situation" (Comrie 1981: 66)

- b. prospective: describes "a state [...] related to some subsequent situation, such that the seeds of this situation are already present in the earlier state, by giving expression to the subsequent situation" (Comrie *ibid.*)

etc.

(12) quantificational aspects: refer to "different quantifications over a set of occurrences of some SoA" (Dik *ibid.*); cf. also Bybee (1985: 150-151), Chung & Timberlake (1985: 220-222), Comrie (1976: 26-32, 42-44), Comrie (1985b: 343-344), Dahl (1985: 95-102), Yamada (1984: 134-144), etc.

- a. habitual: refers to a situation that takes place habitually
- b. iterative: refers to a situation that is repeated
- c. semelfactive: refers to a situation that takes place once and once only

etc.

(13) qualificational aspects: cf. Comrie (1985b: 344-345),
Yamada (1984: 144-145), etc.

a. intensive

b. diminutive

etc.

3 VERBAL SYSTEM OF MODERN HEBREW

Generally speaking, Hebrew verbs are composed of three consonantal 'radicals'; the combination of the three radicals makes up a 'root'. Various semantic modifications are assumed by root modifications (such as internal vowel change and affixation), which can be divided into the following two sets: 'conjugations' (ntiyot) and 'verbal patterns' (binyanim).

(14)

	PAST	PRESENT	FUTURE
PAAL	FaMaL	FoMeL	yiFMo/aL
PAUL	---	FaMuL	---
NIF'AL	niFMaL	niFMaL	yiFaMeL
PIEL	FiMeL	meFaMeL	yeFaMeL
PUAL	FuMaL	meFuMaL	yeFuMaL
HITPAEL	hitFaMeL	mitFaMeL	yitFaMeL
HIF'IL	hiFMiL	maFMiL	yaFMiL
HUF'AL	huFMaL/ hoFMaL	muFMaL/ moFMaL	yuFMaL/ yoFMaL

In the above table, where F, M, and L stand for the first, second, and third radicals respectively, the conjugations refer to the horizontal rows, while the vertical ones represent the

seven verbal patterns called PAAL, NIF'AL, PIEL, PUAL, HITPAEL, HIF'IL, and HUF'AL; PAUL is also included here for the sake of convenience, though not treated as such in a number of grammars. The first set of root modifications denotes person, gender, number, and tense.⁸ The latter assumes the functions of altering valency, transitivity, diathesis, and aspect. Let us examine them in more detail in the sections which follow.

3.1 VERBAL PATTERNS (BINYANIM)

As was mentioned above, change in valency, transitivity, diathesis, and aspect is indicated morphologically by the change of verbal patterns. Unlike conjugations, in which there is a regular correspondence between forms and functions, the functions each verbal pattern assumes are not always predictable, though not completely anomalous. As Berman (1978) puts it, there are three possible views on the treatment of verbal patterns.

- (15) a. Total regularity: "This approach takes the view that the consonantal root is the lexical "prime" in a language such as Hebrew, the various morphological patterns associated with it (i.e., the binyan for the verbal system) being no more than obligatory additives which are connected to the roots in regular and predictable ways." (Berman *ibid.*: 87)
- b. Total anomaly: "According to this view, the "word" is the lexical prime in Hebrew for verbs as well as for nouns and other categories [...]. That is, the lexical entry should be composed of the root together with a given binyan pattern for verbs - for neither the root nor the binyan alone can be taken to have independent

value." (Berman *ibid.*: 91)

- C. Lexical redundancy: "[...] the view taken here is intermediary between the two more extreme positions outlined above, and it attempts to take account of two interrelated sets of variables simultaneously: (i) the syntactic processes manifested by the binyan system in general - such as transitivity, causativeness, inchoativeness, reciprocity, etc. - and (ii) the specific properties of each binyan in itself." (Berman *ibid.*: 95)

I adhere to the third alternative on the basis of the author's argument for it (cf. Berman *ibid.*: 95-100). It is also assumed that PUAL and HUF'AL are marked vis-à-vis PIEL and HIF'IL respectively, which, together with PAUL, NIF'AL, and HITPAEL, are marked vis-à-vis PAAL. The major functions which each verbal pattern assumes are illustrated below, though not exhaustively, with the terminology explained in chapter 2; cf. Ariel (1973), Ben-Asher (1973), Berman (1978), Berman (1979), Berman (1980), Cole (1976), Junger (1985), Junger (1987), Téné (1968), Téné (1969), etc.

(16) PAAL

a. basic diatheses

Δ1

AG
S

Δ2

PA
S

Δ3

EX
S

Δ4

AG	PA
S	OBL

Δ5

EX	ST
S	OBL

Δ6

AG	PA
S	O

Δ7

EX	ST
S	O

Δ8

AG	PA	RE
S	O	OBL

(17) PAUL

a. basic diatheses

Δ2

Δ3

b. recessive diatheses

Δ6a-('passive') <- Δ6 (PAAL)

AG	PA
Ø	S

AG	PA
S	O

Δ7a-('passive')

<- Δ7 (PAAL)

EX	ST
Ø	S

EX	ST
S	O

(18) NIF'AL

a. basic diatheses

Δ1

Δ2

Δ3

Δ4

Δ5

b. no change of valency / change of aspect

Δ1[dynamic] <- Δ1[stative] (PAAL)

Δ2[dynamic] <- Δ2[stative] (PAAL)

Δ3[dynamic] <- Δ3[stative] (PAAL)

c. recessive diatheses

Δ6a- <- Δ6 (PAAL)

Δ7a- <- Δ7 (PAAL)

Δ6b-('anticausative') <- Δ6 (PAAL)

-	PA
-	S

AG	PA
S	O

Δ7b-('anticausative') <- Δ7 (PAAL)

-	ST
-	S

EX	ST
S	O

Δ6c-('reflexive') <- Δ6 (PAAL)

AG	PA
S	

AG	PA
S	O

Δ7c-('reflexive') <- Δ7 (PAAL)

EX	ST
S	

EX	ST
S	O

Δ6d-('reciprocal') <- Δ6 (PAAL)

AG ₁ /PA ₂	AG ₂ /PA ₁
S	

AG	PA
S	O

Δ7d-('reciprocal') <- Δ7 (PAAL)

EX ₁ /ST ₂	EX ₂ /ST ₁
S	

EX	ST
S	O

(19) PIEL

a. basic diatheses

Δ4

Δ5

Δ6

Δ7

Δ8

b. no change of valency / change of aspect

Δ6[intensive] <- Δ6 (PAAL)

c. causative diatheses

Δ2+

<- Δ2 (PAAL)

AG	PA _i
S	O

PA _i
S

Δ3+

ST	EX _i
S	O

<- Δ3 (PAAL)

EX _i
S

Δ5a+

ST _j	EX _i
S	O

<- Δ5 (PAAL)

EX _i	ST _j
O	S

Δ5b+

AG	EX _i	ST _j
S	O	OBL

<- Δ5 (PAAL)

EX _i	ST _j
S	OBL

Δ7a+

ST _j	EX _i
S	O

<- Δ7 (PAAL)

EX _i	ST _j
S	O

Δ7b+

AG	EX _i	ST _j
S	O	O

<- Δ7 (PAAL)

EX _i	ST _j
S	O

Δ7c+

AG	EX _i	ST _j
S	OBL	O

<- Δ7 (PAAL)

EX _i	ST _j
S	O

(20) PUAL

a. recessive diatheses

Δ6a-

<- Δ6/Δ1+/Δ2+ (PIEL)

Δ7a-

<- Δ7/Δ3+/Δ7a+ (PIEL)

(21) HITPAEL

a. basic diatheses

Δ1

Δ2

Δ3

Δ4

Δ5

b. recessive diatheses

Δ6a-

<- Δ6/Δ1+/Δ2+ (PIEL)

Δ7a-

<- Δ7/Δ3+/Δ7a+ (PIEL)

Δ6b-

<- Δ6/Δ1+/Δ2+ (PIEL)

Δ7b-

<- Δ7/Δ3+/Δ7a+ (PIEL)

Δ6c-

<- Δ6/Δ1+/Δ2+ (PIEL)

Δ7c-

<- Δ7/Δ3+/Δ7a+ (PIEL)

Δ6d-

<- Δ6/Δ1+/Δ2+ (PIEL)

Δ7d-

<- Δ7/Δ3+/Δ7a+ (PIEL)

(22) HIF'IL

a. basic diatheses

Δ4

Δ5

Δ6

Δ7

Δ8

b. causative diatheses

Δ1+

<- Δ1 (PAAL)

AG	PA _i
S	O

AG _i
S

Δ2+

<- Δ2 (PAAL)

Δ3+

<- Δ3 (PAAL)

Δ4+

<- Δ4 (PAAL)

AG	RE _i	PA _i
S	O	OBL

AG _i	PA _i
S	OBL

Δ5a+

<- Δ5 (PAAL)

Δ5b+

<- Δ5 (PAAL)

Δ6+

<- Δ6 (PAAL)

AG	RE _i	PA _i
S	O	O

AG _i	PA _i
O	O

Δ7a+

<- Δ7 (PAAL)

Δ7b+

<- Δ7 (PAAL)

Δ7c+

<- Δ7 (PAAL)

(23) HUF'AL

a. recessive diatheses

Δ6a-

<- Δ6/Δ1+/Δ2+ (HIF'IL)

Δ7a-

<- Δ7/Δ3+/Δ7a+ (HIF'IL)

3.2 TENSE AND ASPECT

In Modern Hebrew three tense forms are morphologically distinguished: PRESENT, PAST, and FUTURE. They roughly correspond to what Comrie (1985a) calls 'relative present', 'relative past', and 'relative future' respectively. What is meant by relative tense is that "the referent point for location of a situation is some point in time given by the context, not necessarily the present moment" (Comrie *ibid.*: 56); to put it another way, "the present moment is, unless barred by context, always available as a reference point for relative tenses" (Comrie *ibid.*: 58).

As far as basic diatheses are concerned, aspects such as

perfective, imperfective, perfect, prospective, etc. are indicated neither synthetically nor analytically. Hence the semantic range each tense form covers is much wider than in those languages which are possessed of more elaborate aspectual distinctions, e.g., English. Let us consider the following examples (cf. Rosén 1966: 31, 71, 79).

(24) a. hašemeš zoraxat

ART-sun shine(PRS)

'The sun shines/The sun is shining'

b. ani ba maxar

I come(PRS) tomorrow

'I am coming tomorrow'

c. ani gar birušalayim ze . eser šanim

I live(PRS) in-Jerusalem this ten year(PL)

'I have been living in Jerusalem for ten years'

(25) a. kolumbus gila et amerika

Columbus discover(PST) ACC America

'Columbus discovered America'

b. hiskamnu

agree(1.PL.PST)

'We have agreed'

c. tilfannu lemoše, ki xikinu

telephone(1.PL.PST) to-Moses, for wait(1.PL.PST)

zman rav

time much

'We rang Moses up, for we had been waiting a long time'

(26) a. axake ad maxar

wait(1.SG.FTR) until tomorrow

'I will wait until tomorrow'

b. nedaber im hamore

talk(1.PL.FTR) with ART-teacher

'Let's talk with the teacher'

The habitual aspect alone is expressed analytically, i.e., by means of haya⁹ 'to be' + PRESENT. This is, however, confined to the past tense. haya is also used as a copula in the past and future tenses. Here are some examples.

(27) a. hu haya omer tamid ...

he be(PST) say(PRS) always ...

'He always used to say .../He would always say ...'

b. yosef talmid

Joseph student

'Joseph is a student'

c. yosef haya talmid

Joseph be(PST) student

'Joseph was a student'

d. yosef yihye talmid

Joseph be(FTR) student

'Joseph will be a student'

3.3 PASSIVE AND OTHER RECESSIVE DIATHESES

It is not so easy to give a definition of 'passive' in a language such as Hebrew, where there are no formal means to demarcate it from the so-called 'anticausative', 'reflexive', and 'reciprocal' as shown in (16)-(23). It is inevitable to have recourse to the meaning. My tentative definition is that the diatheses characterized by Δ6a- or Δ7a- are passives. The division between passive, anticausative, reflexive, and reciprocal is, however, minute and not so clear-cut as it may seem at first. There are a number of cases in which it is possible to interpret both as

passives and as, e.g., anticausatives. Hence, in dealing with the issue in the following chapter, I was obliged to restrict myself to a small number of examples which are for all intents and purposes passives.

Furthermore, a brief look at (16)-(23) will show that they pose one more problem: are there any differences recognizable between the two passive verbal patterns of PAAL and PIEL respectively, i.e., between PAUL and NIF'AL on the one hand, and between PUAL and HITPAEL on the other; and if there are any, what do the oppositions stand for? There have not been many researchers who have engaged themselves in the treatment of this issue. To the best of my knowledge, there are no more than six studies which are worth mentioning, though not necessarily satisfactory in every single point: Rosén (1955: 239-249), Rosén (1956: 139-143), Rosén (1966: 126, 142), Rosén (1977: 179-183), Berman (1978: 165-168), and Kutscher (1982: 259).

Rosén's contributions to the study of Modern Hebrew in general cannot be emphasized too much. The same holds true of the topic at hand. As far as I know, he was the first to point out the aspectual oppositions of the above-mentioned pairs implicitly in Rosén (1955: 239-240) and explicitly in Rosén (1956: 139-143). This phenomenon is again mentioned briefly in Rosén (1966: 126, 142). Rosén (1977: 179-183) is a summary and elaboration of his preceding studies on this issue; incidentally, this book is filled with insightful descriptions of Modern Hebrew. The following is a summary of his claims in chronological order.

(28) Rosén (1955: 239-240)

a.

FaMuL	NIF'AL
"hešlem p'ula"	"asu p'ula"

meFuMaL "hešlem p'ula"	PUAL/HITPAEL "asu p'ula"
---------------------------	-----------------------------

(29) Rosén (1956: 139-143)

a.

	PUAL	HITPAEL
PST	FuMaL (infectivum[?sic])	hitFaMeL (infectivum)
	haya meFuMaL (perfectum)	
PRS	meFuMaL (perfectum)	mitFaMeL (infectivum)
FTR	yeFuMaL (infectivum)	yitFaMeL (infectivum)
	yihye meFuMaL (perfectum)	

(30) Rosén (1966: 126, 142)

a.

PAUL (perfect)

(31) Rosén (1977: 179-183)

a.

FaMuL (stative)	nifMaL (fientive)
meFuMaL (stative)	(mitFaMeL) (fientive)

b. hašaar sagur(PAUL)

ART-gate closed

'The gate is closed (= Das Tor ist geschlossen)'

c. hašaar nisgar(NIF'AL)

ART-gate be.closed(PRS)

'The gate is closed (= Das Tor wird geschlossen)

d. hakesef mešulam(PUAL)

ART-money be.paid(PRS)

'The money is paid'

e. hakesef mištalem(HITPAEL)

ART-money be.paid(PRS)

'The money is (being) paid'

Berman (1978: 165-168) also treats this issue as part of the overall treatment of the Modern Hebrew tense-aspect system. On the whole, her interpretation coincides with that of Rosén except that PAUL is regarded as expressing the perfective aspect. Her claim can be summarized as follows.

(32) a.

	PAUL	NIF'AL
PST	haya FaMuL (statal/perfective passive)	niFMaL (kinetic/true passive)
PRS	FaMuL (statal/perfective passive)	niFMaL (kinetic/true passive)
FTR	yihye FaMuL (statal/perfective passive)	yiFaMeL (kinetic/true passive)

	PUAL
PST	FuMaL (kinetic/true passive)
	haya meFuMaL (statal/perfective passive)
PRS	meFuMaL (kinetic/true passive) or (statal/perfective passive)
FTR	yeFuMaL (kinetic/true passive)
	yihye meFuMaL (statal/perfective passive)

b. kol hamkomot tfusim(PAUL)

all ART-seat(PL) taken

'All the seats are taken'

c. kol hamkomot nitpasim(NIF'AL)

all ART-seat(PL) be.taken(PRS)

'All the seats are (=get) taken'

d. hatauyot mesumanot(PUAL)

ART-error(PL) be.marked(PRS)

'The errors are marked'

As is the case with a number of linguists, especially Semitists, Berman seems to have fallen into the fallacy of confusing perfective with perfect.¹⁰ According to her, 'perfective' focuses on "the state to which the verb refers" (Berman *ibid.*: 168). It will be evident to everyone that what she calls 'perfective' refers to what is generally understood as perfect (resultative) among linguists (cf. section 2.2).

Lastly, let us focus our attention on Kutscher (1982: 259). In essence, what he maintains is in agreement with Rosén and Berman, though the terminology employed is different. Let us consider the following.

(33) a.

	PAUL	NIF'AL
PST	haya FaMuL (stative passive)	niFMaL (action passive)
PRS	FaMuL (stative passive)	niFMaL (action passive)
FTR	yihye FaMuL (stative passive)	yiFaMeL (action passive)

	PUAL	HITPAEL
PST	FuMaL (action passive)	hitFaMeL (action passive)
	haya meFuMaL (stative passive)	

PRS	meFuMaL (stative passive)	mitFaMeL (action passive)
FTR	yeFuMeL (action passive)	yitFaMeL (action passive)
	yihye meFuMaL (stative passive)	

- b. habayit sagur(PAUL)
ART-house closed
'The house is closed'
- c. habayit nisgar(NIF'AL)
ART-house be.closed(PRS)
'The house is (being) closed'
- d. hainyan mesudar(PUAL)
ART-matter be.fixed(PRS)
'The matter is fixed'
- e. hainyan mistader(HITPAEL)
ART-matter be.fixed(PRS)
'The matter is (being) fixed'

As (28)-(33) show, these studies have one deficiency in common: they assume tacitly (or at least on the basis of a tiny portion of the material) that one and the same rule applies to all cases regardless of the inherent aspectual characters which the predicates have. My claim is that this is untenable: there must be some variations in the (presentational or phasal) aspect which each verbal pattern represents according to its inherent aspectual character.

The following chapter is concerned with this problem. However, it is confined to the opposition of PAUL and NIF'AL in the present and past tenses. The opposition of PUAL and HITPAEL will be left over till later on as a desideratum, for it may well

be surmised with reason that PUAL is to HITPAEL what PAUL is to NIF'AL. The future tense is likewise excluded from the present discussion, as it is closely related to mood, and to describe it meticulously is beyond the scope of this study.

4 THE CORRELATION OF PASSIVE AND ASPECT

As was mentioned in section 2.2, three pairs of oppositions are conceivable in terms of the inherent aspectual characters of predicates: dynamic vs. stative, punctual vs. durative, and telic vs. atelic. Their combination, in turn, makes four types of categories: event [dynamic / punctual / telic], telic process [dynamic / durative / telic], atelic process [dynamic / durative / atelic], and state [stative / durative / atelic]. It is apparent that stative and punctual, stative and telic, and punctual and atelic are incompatible with each other respectively.

As regards bivalent monotransitive predicates, which have passive counterparts in Modern Hebrew, the following examples illustrate passives of events, telic processes, atelic processes, and states respectively.

(34) events

- a. gamar et haavoda⁹
'to finish the work'
- b. ganav et hataxšitim
'to steal the ornaments'
- c. hafx et hašulxan
'to turn the table over'

(35) telic processes

- a. katav et hamixtav
'to write the letter'
- b. bana et habayit
'to build the house'
- c. arax et hamsiba
'to prepare the party'

(36) atelic processes

- a. daxaf et haagala
'to push the cart'
- b. mašax et haagala
'to pull the cart'
- c. daraš et haoved
'to require the worker'

(37) states

- a. ahav et habaxura
'to love the girl'
- b. zaxar et hašem
'to remember the name'
- c. kalal et hanos'im
'to include the topics'

Events, telic processes, and atelic processes are distinguishable in terms of the co-occurring time-adverbials: the former two are compatible with be- 'in' (e.g., bešaa 'in an hour') but not with bemešex 'for' (e.g., bemešex šaa 'for an hour'); on the contrary, the opposite is the case with atelic processes. Consider the following examples.

- (38) a. gamarti et haavoda bešaa
finish(1.SG.PST) ACC ART-work in-hour
'I finished the work in an hour'
- b. *gamarti et haavoda bemešex šaa

*'I finished the work for an hour'

- (39) a. katavti et hamixtav bešaa
 write(1.SG.PST) ACC ART-letter in-hour

'I wrote the letter in an hour'

- b. *katavti et hamixtav bemešex šaa

*'I wrote the letter for an hour'

- (40) a. *daxafti et haagala bešaa
 push(1.SG.PST) ACC ART-cart in-hour

*'I pushed the cart in an hour'

- b. daxafti et haagala bemešex šaa

'I pushed the cart for an hour'

Furthermore, a little reflection upon the above examples will easily lead us to recognize the difference between (38.a) and (39.a), as Vendler (1957: 147) points out. It is quite natural to interpret that the writing of the letter continued during the period indicated by that time-adverbial in the latter. As regards the former, however, it makes all the difference in its interpretation. Obviously, it is not implied that the finishing of the work continued during that period; rather, some other activities required one hour to lead to a culmination, i.e., the finishing of the work.

In the sections which follow, I will consider the correlation between events, telic processes, atelic processes, and states on the one hand, and the aspectual values PAUL and NIF'AL denote in the present and past tenses on the other.

4.1 PASSIVES OF TELIC PROCESSES

At the outset, before commencing the analysis, it seems worthwhile to reaffirm what is meant by 'perfective',

'imperfective', 'perfect', and 'prospective' in this study so that unnecessary misunderstandings may not arise (cf. section 2.2). 'Perfect' is reserved here for a phasal aspect which focuses a state resulting from some activity; accordingly it corresponds to the so-called 'perfect of result' (Comrie 1976: 56-58, Dahl 1985: 133-136). In addition, it cannot be emphasized too much that perfective and perfect should be strictly kept apart. They are quite distinct in nature, though there are some overlaps between them.

Now let us focus our attention on passives of telic processes. Consider some examples arranged in the order of PAUL (PRESENT), NIF'AL (PRESENT), PAUL (PAST), and NIF'AL (PAST).

- (41) a. hamixtav katuv(PAUL)
 ART-letter written
 'The letter is written (= has been written)'
- b. habayit banuy(PAUL)
 ART-house built
 'The house is built (= has been built)'
- c. hamsiba aruxa(PAUL)
 ART-party prepared
 'The party is prepared (= has been prepared)'
- (42) a. hamixtav nixtav(NIF'AL)
 ART-letter be.written(PRS)
 'The letter is written (= is being written)'
- b. habayit nivne(NIF'AL)
 ART-house be.built(PRS)
 'The house is built (= is being built)'
- c. hamsiba neerexet(NIF'AL)
 ART-party be.prepared(PRS)
 'The party is prepared (= is being prepared)'

- (43) a. hamixtav haya katu(PAUL)
 ART-letter be(PST) written
 'The letter was written (= had been written)'
- b. habayit haya banuy(PAUL)
 ART-house be(PST) built
 'The house was built (= had been built)'
- c. hamsiba hayta aruxa(PAUL)
 ART-party be(PST) prepared
 'The party was prepared (= had been prepared)'
- (44) a. hamixtav nixtav(NIF'AL)
 ART-letter be.written(PST)
 'The letter was written'
- b. habayit nivna(NIF'AL)
 ART-house be.built(PST)
 'The house was built'
- c. hamsiba neerxa(NIF'AL)
 ART-party be.prepared(PST)
 'The party was prepared'

In the above examples, (41.a)-(41.c) are used to refer to a present state resulting from the writing of the letter, the building of the house, and the preparing of the party respectively; in other words, PAUL (PRESENT) denotes (present) perfect. In contrast, (42.a)-(42.c) are used in the context where the implied terminal point is as yet reached, which means that NIF'AL (PRESENT) denotes (present) imperfective.

PAUL (PAST) is simply a past counterpart of PAUL (PRESENT), i.e., (past) perfect. However, this is not the case with NIF'AL. Change from NIF'AL (PRESENT) to NIF'AL (PAST) is not a mere change of tense, but it involves aspect as well: NIF'AL (PAST) indicates that the implied terminal point beyond which the

writing of the letter, etc. cannot go on was actually reached, and not that the writing of the letter was ongoing, i.e., it indicates (past) perfective. As a corollary, NIF'AL (PAST) implies PAUL (PRESENT), while NIF'AL (PRESENT) never implies PAUL (PRESENT).

4.2 PASSIVES OF EVENTS

With passives of events the situation is the same as in the telic processes treated above except for NIF'AL (PRESENT). First let us examine some examples.

(45) a. haavoda gmura(PAUL)

ART-work finished

'The work is finished (= has been finished)'

b. hataxšitim gnuvim(PAUL)

ART-ornament(PL) stolen

'The ornaments are stolen (= have been stolen)'

c. hašulxan hafux(PAUL)

ART-table turned.over

'The table is turned over (= has been turned over)'

(46) a. haavoda nigmeret(NIF'AL)

ART-work be.finished(PRS)

'The work is finished (= is about to be finished)'

b. hataxšitim nignavim(NIF'AL)

ART-ornament(PL) be.stolen(PRS)

'The ornaments are stolen (= are about to be stolen)'

c. hašulxan nehpx(NIF'AL)

ART-table be.turn.ed.over(PRS)

'The table is turned over (= is about to be turned over)'

- (47) a. haavoda hayta gmura(PAUL)
 ART-work be(PST) finished
 'The work was finished (= had been finished)'
- b. hataxšitim hayu gnuvim(PAUL)
 ART-ornament(PL) be(PST) stolen
 'The ornaments were stolen (= had been stolen)'
- c. hašulxan haya hafux(PAUL)
 ART-table be(PST) turned.over
 'The table was turned over (= had been turned over)'
- (48) a. haavoda nigmra(NIF'AL)
 ART-work be.finished(PST)
 'The work was finished'
- b. hataxšitim nignvu(NIF'AL)
 ART-ornament(PL) be.stolen(PST)
 'The ornaments were stolen'
- c. hašulxan nehpx(NIF'AL)
 ART-table be.turned.over(PST)
 'The table was turned over'

As is the case with telic processes, PAUL (PRESENT), PAUL (PAST), and NIF'AL (PAST) denote (present) perfect, (past) perfect, and (past) perfective respectively, and NIF'AL (PAST) implies PAUL (PRESENT). However, when it comes to NIF'AL (PRESENT), it is not (present) imperfective but (present) prospective that is indicated. There is every reason for imperfective to be incompatible with events. As Comrie (1976: 24) puts it, imperfective is characterized by "explicit reference to the internal temporal structure of a situation, viewing a situation from within," therefore it presupposes the inherent durative character on the part of the predicates. Apparently, events lack internal complexity perceptually. It follows that

imperfective and events are essentially incompatible with each other.

4.3 PASSIVES OF ATELIC PROCESSES

Passives of atelic processes are different from those of telic processes in many ways. The essential difference between the two is that in the former the semantic opposition between PAUL and NIF'AL is in many cases neutralized in terms of denotation, if not connotationally. Consider the following examples.

- (49) a. haagala dxufa(PAUL)
ART-cart pushed
'The cart is pushed'
- b. haagala mšuxa(PAUL)
ART-cart pulled
'The cart is pulled'
- c. haoved daruš(PAUL)
ART-worker required
'The worker is required'
- (50) a. haagala nidxefet(NIF'AL)
ART-cart be.pushed(PRS)
'The cart is pushed'
- b. haagala nimšexet(NIF'AL)
ART-cart be.pulled(PRS)
'The cart is pulled'
- c. haoved nidraš(NIF'AL)
ART-worker be.required(PRS)
'The worker is required'
- (51) a. haagala hayta dxufa(PAUL)
ART-cart be(PST) pushed

'The cart was pushed'

b. haagala hayta mšuxa(PAUL)

ART-cart be(PST) pulled

'The cart was pulled'

c. haoved haya daruš(PAUL)

ART-worker be(PST) required

'The worker was required'

(52) a. haagala nidxfa(NIF'AL)

ART-cart be.pushed(PST)

'The cart was pushed'

b. haagala nimšxa(NIF'AL)

ART-cart be.pulled(PST)

'The cart was pulled'

c. haoved nidraš(NIF'AL)

ART-worker be.required(PST)

'The worker was required'

The aspectual ranges covered by PAUL (PRESENT) and NIF'AL (PRESENT) on the one hand, and by PAUL (PAST) and NIF'AL (PAST) on the other are the same, i.e., imperfective.¹¹ There is, however, some difference between PAUL and NIF'AL in other respects, as far as daraš et haoved 'to require the worker', for instance, is concerned.¹² It is natural that PAUL and NIF'AL (came to) be differentiated somehow, for it is redundant that a language has two forms with exactly the same meaning.

4.4 PASSIVES OF STATES

The last concern in this chapter is passives of states. I have not noticed to date any difference whatever between states and atelic processes in terms of the aspectual values PAUL and NIF'AL

represent, as the following examples show.

- (53) a. habaxura ahuva(PAUL)
ART-girl loved
'The girl is loved'
- b. hašem zaxur(PAUL)
ART-name remembered
'The name is remembered'
- c. hanos'im klulim(PAUL)
ART-topic(PL) included
'The topics are included'
- (54) a. habaxura neehevvet(NIF'AL)
ART-girl be.loved(PRS)
'The girl is loved'
- b. hašem nizkar(NIF'AL)
ART-name be.remembered(PRS)
'The name is remembered'
- c. hanos'im nixlalim(NIF'AL)
ART-topic(PL) be.included(PRS)
'The topics are included'
- (55) a. habaxura hayta ahuva(PAUL)
ART-girl be(PST) loved
'The girl was loved'
- b. hašem haya zaxur(PAUL)
ART-name be(PST) remembered
'The name was remembered'
- c. hanos'im hayu klulim(PAUL)
ART-topic(PL) be(PST) included
'The topics were included'
- (56) a. habaxura neehava(NIF'AL)
ART-girl be.loved(PST)

'The girl was loved'

- b. hašem nizkar(NIF'AL)
ART-name be.remembered(PST)

'The name was remembered'

- c. hanos'im nikllu(NIF'AL)
ART-topic(PL) be.included(PST)

'The topics were included'

All the above examples indicate imperfective aspect.¹¹ As is the case with atelic processes, the opposition of PAUL and NIF'AL is neutralized. It is surmised that the same tendency toward non-aspectual semantic differentiation is stronger here. Furthermore, it seems that the more frequently the verb is used, the more likely it is that PAUL and NIF'AL are differentiated semantically (but not in terms of aspect). This holds true of such common verbs as xašav 'to think' (xašuv (PAUL) 'important' vs. nexšav (NIF'AL) 'to be thought') and raa 'to see' (rauy (PAUL) 'suitable' vs. nir'a (NIF'AL) 'to be seen, seem').

5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In this paper, I have attempted to elucidate the aspectual opposition of two passive verbal patterns, i.e., PAUL and NIF'AL, in the present and past tenses. It has been shown that the aspects they represent are not always the same, pace Rosén, Berman, and Kutscher, but depend on the inherent aspectual characters of the predicates as summarized below.

(57) events

	PAUL	NIF'AL
PRS	perfect	prospective
PST	perfect	perfective

(58) telic processes

	PAUL	NIF'AL
PRS	perfect	imperfective
PST	perfect	perfective

(59) atelic processes

	PAUL	NIF'AL
PRS	imperfective	imperfective
PST	imperfective	imperfective

(60) states

	PAUL	NIF'AL
PRS	imperfective	imperfective
PST	imperfective	imperfective

It has also been pointed out that there are implicational relations between PAUL (PRESENT) and NIF'AL (PRESENT) / NIF'AL (PAST) as follows.

(61) events / telic processes

NIF'AL (PAST) ---> PAUL (PRESENT)

NIF'AL (PRESENT) -/-> PAUL (PRESENT)

(62) atelic processes / states

NIF'AL (PAST) -/-> PAUL (PRESENT)

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE GLOSSES

AM	ACCUSATIVE MARKER	PRS	PRESENT
ART	ARTICLE	PST	PAST
F	FEMININE	SG	SINGULAR
FTR	FUTURE	1	FIRST PERSON
M	MASCULINE	2	SECOND PERSON
PL	PLURAL	3	THIRD PERSON

NOTES

- * My sincere thanks are due to Avi Ashkenazi, Dafna Berlfein, Shai Friedman, and Sandra Peretz (in alphabetical order), who served as informants. This study was greatly inspired by the treatment of -ata/-ita (imperfective and perfect passive participles of Esperanto respectively) by Kalocsay & Waringhien (1985: 143-148).
- 1 In order to avoid unnecessary confusions, I employed capitals to indicate language-specific forms (e.g., PRESENT); on the other hand, terms which are not in capitals stand for language-independent functions (e.g., imperfective).
- 2 As a rule, definite noun phrases are marked with ACC.
- 3 This term, employed in Talmy (1985), is not so widely used as the other semantic functions listed here.
- 4 Some scholars (e.g., Andrews 1985) postulate a separate semantic function called 'theme', for a participant that is

in a certain state.

5 Originally, Geniušienė employs the term 'base diatheses'.

6 'Presentational aspects' and 'quantificational aspects' correspond to what Dik (forthcoming) calls 'presentation' and 'quantification' respectively.

7 In the following some representative classifications are contrasted, the level of analysis being ignored.

this study	event	telic process	atelic process	state
Vendler (1957)	achievement	accomplishment	activity	state
Kenny (1963)	performance		activity	state
Lyons (1977)	event	process		state
Kalocsay & Waringhien (1985)	verboj de rezulto sen daŭro	verboj de daŭro kaj rezulto	verboj de daŭro sen rezulto	

8 For the sake of convenience, conjugations according to person, number, and gender are omitted from the table.

9 I have followed the method of using 3.M.SG.PST as the citation form of the verb.

10 For the distinction of perfective and perfect, see Comrie (1976: 62-64) and Dahl (1985: 138-141).

11 Here NIF'AL (PAST) does not imply PAUL (PRESENT) as in events and telic processes.

12 (49.c) implies that the worker itself is required, while (50.c) implies that the worker is required to do something.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, A. 1985. The Major Functions of the Noun Phrase. In: T. Shopen (ed.). Language Typology and Syntactic Description 1. 62-154. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ariel, S. 1973. The Functions of the Binyanim in Modern Hebrew. Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies 5/4. 17-23.
- Barber, E. J. W. 1975. Voice - Beyond the Passive. Berkeley Linguistics Society 1. 16-24.
- Ben-Asher, M. 1972. binyaney hapoal - inyan ledikduk o lemilon. hauniversita 17/2. 31-34.
- Ben-Asher, M. 1973. binyan nif'al vehitpatxuto. In: M. Ben-Asher. iyunim betaxbir haivrit haxadaša. 11-20. Tel-Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad.
- Berman, R. A. 1978. Modern Hebrew Structure. Tel-Aviv: University Publishing Projects.
- Berman, R. A. 1979. Form and Function: Passives, Middles, and Impersonals in Modern Hebrew. Berkeley Linguistics Society 5. 1-27.
- Berman, R. A. 1980. Child Language as Evidence for Grammatical Description: Preschoolers' Construal of Transitivity in the Verb System of Hebrew. Linguistics 18. 677-701.
- Bybee, J. L. 1985. Morphology: A Study of the Relation between Meaning and Form. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chung, S. & A. Timberlake. 1985. Tense, Aspect, and Mood. In: T. Shopen (ed.). Language Typology and Syntactic Description 3. 202-258. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cole, P. 1976. A Causative Construction in Modern Hebrew: Theoretical Implications. In: P. Cole (ed.). Studies in Modern Hebrew Syntax and Semantics. 99-128. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Comrie, B. 1976. Aspect. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Comrie, B. 1981. Aspect and Voice: Some Reflections on Perfect and Passive. In: P. J. Tedeschi & A. Zaenen (eds.). Syntax and Semantics 14. 65-78. New York: Academic Press.
- Comrie, B. 1985a. Tense. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Comrie, B. 1985b. Causative Verb Formation and Other Verb-Deriving Morphology. In: T. Shopen (ed.). Language Typology and Syntactic Description 3. 309-348. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dahl, Ö. 1981. On the Definition of the Telic-Atelic (Bounded-Nonbounded) Distinction. In: P. J. Tedeschi & A. Zaenen (eds.). Syntax and Semantics 14. 79-90. New York: Academic Press.

- Dahl, Ö. 1985. Tense-Aspect Systems. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Dik, S. C. 1981³. Functional Grammar. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Dik, S. C. forthcoming. Theory of Functional Grammar.
- Even-Shoshan, A. 1987. hamilon hexadaš 1-8. Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer.
- Geniušienė, E. 1987. The Typology of Reflexives. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Givón, T. 1984. Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Junger, J. 1985. Morphological Causatives in Modern Hebrew. In: A. M. Bolkestein et al. (eds.). Predicates and Terms in Functional Grammar. 235-257. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Junger, J. 1987. Agentless Passives in Modern Hebrew. Acta Linguistica Hafniensia 20. 55-79.
- Kalocsay, K. & G. Waringhien. 1985⁶. Plena analiza gramatiko de Esperanto. Rotterdam: Universala Esperanto-Asocio.
- Keenan, E. L. 1985. Passive in the World's Languages. In: T. Shopen (ed.). Language Typology and Syntactic Description 1. 243-281. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kenny, A. 1963. Action, Emotion and Will. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Kutscher, E. Y. 1982. A History of the Hebrew Language. Jerusalem: Magnes Press.
- Lyons, J. 1977. Semantics 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mourelatos, A. P. D. 1981. Events, Processes, and States. In: P. J. Tedeschi & A. Zaenen (eds.). Syntax and Semantics 14. 191-212. New York: Academic Press.
- Ornan, U. 1971. binyanim, uvsisim, ntiyot ugzerot. hauniversita 16/2. 15-17.
- Ornan, U. 1980. od al horaot habinyanim. Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies 6/4. 1-9.
- Rosén, H. B. 1955. haivrit šelanu. Tel-Aviv: Am Oved.
- Rosén, H. B. 1956. mefual baivrit hayisr'elit. lšonenu 20. 139-148.
- Rosén, H. B. 1966². A Textbook of Israeli Hebrew. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rosén, H. B. 1977. Contemporary Hebrew. The Hague: Mouton.
- Sasaki, T. 1987. On Morphological Causatives in Biblical Hebrew. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Kyoto University.

- Shiratsuki, N. 1986. A Study of the Resultative Forms in Basque. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Kyoto University. [In Japanese].
- Siewierska, A. 1984. The Passive: A Comparative Linguistic Analysis. London: Croom Helm.
- Talmy, L. 1985. Lexicalization Patterns: Semantic Structure in Lexical Forms. In: T. Shopen (ed.). Language Typology and Syntactic Description 3. 57-149. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Téné, D. 1968. L'hébreu contemporain. In: A. Martinet (ed.). Le langage. 975-1002. Paris: Gallimard.
- Téné, D. 1969. L'articulation du signifié de monème en hébreu contemporain. Word 25. 289-320.
- Vendler, Z. 1957. Verbs and Times. Philosophical Review 66. 143-160.
- Xolodovič, A. A. 1970. Zalog. Kategorija zaloga (Materialy konferencii). 2-26.
- Yamada, S. 1984. On Aspect. Tokyo: Sanshusha. [In Japanese].

RESUMO

PRI LA ASPEKTA OPOZICIO DE PASIVOJ EN LA MODERNA HEBREA

La nuna esploro provas analizi la supozan aspekta opozicion de du pasivaj formoj en la moderna hebrea, kiuj estas nomataj PAUL kaj NIF'AL kutime, limigante al la prezenco kaj la preterito. Oni klarigas kontraŭ la ĝisnunaj studoj, ke la aspektaĵ valoroj esprimataj de PAUL kaj NIF'AL ne ĉiam estas samaj, sed varias laŭ la propraj aspektaĵ karakteroj de la predikatoj. Nome, evidentiĝas koneksa korelativo inter la jenaj du aferoj: unue, ĉu PAUL kaj NIF'AL indikas perfektivan, imperfektivan, perfektan aŭ prediktan aspektojn; due, ĉu la predikatoj implicas limo-punkton kaj/aŭ la daŭrecon. Krome, oni rimarkas kelkajn implicajn rilatojn inter PAUL kaj NIF'AL.

(佐々木嗣也, 博士後期課程)