Introduction
Grammatical Type: vb niphal.
Occurrences: Total 15x OT, 2x Sir, 5x Qum, 0x inscr.

Sir (numbering of Beentjes 1997): 31.6 (MS B, retroversion from Syr that is lacking in Greek; see Text Doubtful B.3); 46.8 (emended; see Text Doubtful A.1).
Qum: CD 4.18; 16.6; 1QH 15.17; 1QpMic 8; 4QpPs 2.9.

Text doubtful:
A.1 At Sir 46.8 the text reads נזכלו, apparently the niphal oflical (cf. Sir 42.21b), which might mean ‘were set aside’ (cf. DCH I, 363). It is clear, however, from the sense that we should have here the niphal oflical, as indicated by the LXX reading the passive of διασῴζω. The confusion betweenlical and niphal may be implied in the LXX to Jr 7.10, although there it is uncertain (see Versions A.4).

B.1 At Ezk 14.14 the piel יְנַצְלוּ נַפְשָׁם is translated in the LXX as a passive (and without a direct object). The LXX and salvi erunt in MS S of OL imply a niphal (Cooke 1936:156), but the LXX should perhaps not be followed (cf. its passive rendering of the hiphil in verse 16). There are similar differences between the MT and the LXX in the case of the piel ofמְלַט (Am 2.15b; Ps 33.17) and so this may be part of a wider ‘corrective’ by the LXX. The Vg, Pesh and Tg of Ezk 14.14 all render as the MT with a direct object.
B.2 Although on literary grounds one may wish to consider the occurrence in Mc 4.10 as part of an addition (so BHS), it should remain as part of our semantic evidence for the MT.
B.3 Sir 31.6c-d seems to be an addition in the Syr, which has been retroverted into Hebrew by MS B (Skehan & Di Lella 1987:380–81). The preceding Hebrew לא מצאו ‘they did not find (a way)’ in Sir 31.6c is explicable as a misreading of the Syr l’škhw ‘they were unable’.

Qere/Ketiv: none.

1. Root and Comparative Material
A.1 [See הָנַל hiphil]

2. Formal Characteristics
A.1 [See הָנַל hiphil]
A.2 If the reading נימול at CD 16.6 should be niphal, then we have a Mishnaic form of the niphal containing ŏ instead of ā (Segal 1927:79).

3. Syntagmatics
A.1 The subject of niphal niph may be the nouns נֶפֶשׁ ‘life’ (Gn 32.31), נָבֵד ‘servant’ (Dt 23.16), גֶבֶר ‘sons of Israel’ (Am 3.12), גֵבֵר ‘the mighty’ (Ps 33.16),
and the pronouns אַתָּה ‘you’ (2Kg 19.11; Is 37.11), הֵמָּה ‘they’ (Ezk 14.16) and הם ‘they’ (Ezk 14.18).

A.2 Following הֵמָּה niph the indirect object is indicated by the preposition ב + pronoun ‘great strength’ (Ps 33.16).

A.3 נִלְצָה niph is followed by the preposition ב + suf 2p m s (Dt 23.16).

A.4 Motion away from something may be expressed after נִלְצָה niph by מִן ‘from’ + the nouns פְנֵי מֶלֶךְ אַשּׁוּר ‘before the King of Assyria’ (Is 20.6), כַּף־רָׁע ‘evil arm’ (Hb 2.9), יָׁד ‘hand’ (Pr 6.5 [LXX implies יַצְיָד or יַצִּיַּד]), יַד יָּקֻש ‘hand of the fowler’ (Pr 6.5), and רָׁשׁוֹנָה ‘those that hate me’ + preposition עִם + noun אֲדֹּן ‘master’ (Dt 23.16).

A.5 The inf cstr of נִלְצָה niph is found in apposition to עֶזְרָה ‘help’ (Is 20.6).

B.1 At Am 3.12 נִלְצָה niph is followed by the preposition ב + פְאַת מִטָׁה ‘the corner of a couch’ and דְמֶשֶׂק עָרֶש ‘part of a bed’. Various interpretations and emendations have been suggested by scholars to explain the preposition, and a range of proposals have been laid out by Harper (1905:80–82). The most likely explanation is that proposed by Andersen & Freedman (1989:408–409), among others, who suggest that the pieces of furniture resemble the parts of the ‘rescued’ animal, indicating that only a few miserable pieces will be rescued. The ב then either expresses accompaniment or is a beth essentiae (so Rabinowitz 1961:228–31). Mays (1969:66–67), Rudolph (1971:164–65) and Wolff (1969:234), however, take the ב as dependent on but בישבים. It is clear that the ב is not an instrumental as it is in A.2 above.

4. Versions

a. LXX: ἀπέχομαι (?Jr 7.10); διασῴζω (Sir 46.8); ἔκπαυμα (Am 3.12; Hb 2.9); ῥόδομα (2Kg 19.11; Mc 4.10; Ps 69[68].15); σῴζω (Gn 32.31; Is 20.6; Ezk 14.16, 18; Ps 33[32].16; Pr 6.3, 5); προστίθημι (Dt 23.16);

Omitted: Is 37.11.

Minor Greek Versions [MRN]:

b. Peshitta: ‘rq (Dt 23.16);

ps’ (Gn 32.31; 2Kg 19.11; Is 20.6; 37.11; Jr 7.10; Ezk 14.16, 18; Am 3.12; Mc 4.10; Hb 2.9; Ps 33.16; 69.15; Pr 6.3, 5);

c. Targum: הָוָא (Ps 69.15; Pr 6.3, 5);

ב[ו][ר] ‘ש (Gn 32.31; Dt 23.16; 2Kg 19.11; Is 20.6; 37.11; Jr 7.10; Ezk 14.16, 18; Am 3.12; Mc 4.10; Hb 2.9; Ps 33.16);

d. Vulgate: confugio (Dt 23.16[15]);

eruo (Am 3.12; Pr 6.5); liberari possum (2Kg 19.11; Is 37.11); liberari se puto (Hb 2.9);

libero (Is 20.6; Jr 7.10; Ezk 14.16, 18; Mc 4.10; Ps 33[32].16; 69[68].15; Pr 6.3);

salvus factus est (Gn 32.31[30]);
A.1 In the LXX הָנִּל niph appears to be rendered predominantly by σωζω, a translation that is infrequent with other forms of הָנִּל, perhaps indicating an emphasis on the safety in the niphal. The preferences, however, of libero, pš’ and הָנִּל in the Vg, Pesh and Tg are consistent with the translations of other forms of הָנִּל.

A.2 The translation of הָנִּל niphal by προστίθημι at Dt 23.16 is slightly peculiar, but the Heb יִנָׁצֵל+אֵל is also awkward. Lust (Lexicon:405) renders it as ‘to attach oneself to sb’. Wevers glosses as ‘has added himself (to you)’ and explains “i.e. has fled (to you)” and, therefore, sees it as a possible rendering of the Hebrew (1995:371). προστίθημι is not included in the list of equivalents by Muraoka (Index:99), arising from its omission by HR.

A.3 The LXX at Is 37.11 omits any equivalent for הָנִּל niphal, probably because the hiphil appears as the first word of the next verse.

A.4 Muraoka, on the basis of the translation ἀπέχομαι, suggests that the translator at Jr 7.10 has misread the Hebrew verb as הָנִּל ‘to withdraw’ (Index:99). It might, however, be a possible translation of הָנִּל.

A.5 The Targum and Peshitta are generally consistent in their translations and choose renderings that are the most frequent for lexemes in the field of ‘salvation’.

5. Lexical/Semantic Field(s)
A.1 [See הָנִּל hiphil]
A.2 הָנִּל niphal is used in the same context as מַלְט niphal (Is 20.6), and seems in that verse to be the equivalent of עֶזְרָה ‘help’. It is found in parallelism with ישע niph (Ps 33.16; Sir 31.6).

6. Exegesis
A.1 The niphal of הָנִּל may either have a passive meaning ‘to be saved’ or a reflexive ‘to save oneself’ (BDB:664; HAL:677), although in some instances it is ambiguous.

A.2 The passive meaning at Gn 32.31 denotes the saving of Jacob’s life. In similar fashion at Ps 33.16 it appears to denote safety in battle, and at Is 20.6 escape from battle. There is, however, in Isaiah the further connotation that the means of ‘escape’ will be ‘deliverance’ by God. Likewise, at Ps 69.15, although the verb refers to the escape from enemies, it is in a plea to God and implies a more general deliverance.

A.3 The passive also denotes a more general deliverance, as that from Babylon brought about by God (Mc 4.10). At Jr 7.10 it may be passive in meaning (as BDB:664; HAL:677), or possibly reflexive, and denotes the security felt by Israel.

A.4 Although Hb 2.9 could be passive (BDB:664) it seems more likely that it is reflexive (HAL:677) in sense, denoting making oneself safe from harm.

A.5 The meaning is clearly reflexive ‘to tear oneself away, deliver oneself’ in Dt 23.16; Pr 6.3, 5; Ezek 14.16, 18. BDB:664 also includes 2Kg 19.11; Is 37.11 as reflexive, but HAL (677) is probably correct to treat them as passive.

B.1 BDB:664 suggests the sense ‘be torn out or away’ for Am 3.12, but it would be the only example of this passive meaning and ‘be delivered’ is much more appropriate to the context.

7. Conclusion
A.1 The niphal of הָנִּל may have either a passive meaning ‘to be saved’ or a reflexive ‘to save oneself’.
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