

LANGUAGE STUDIES

II-III

Editor

MOSHE BAR-ASHER

Jerusalem, 1987

*Distributed by the Magnes Press
The Hebrew University, Jerusalem*

©

ISSN 0334-6110

Academon — The Hebrew University Students' Printing and Publishing House

Printed in Israel
at Ahva Co-op. Press Ltd., Jerusalem

*This collection of articles
is dedicated to Abba Bendavid
on the occasion of his seventy-fifth birthday*

Contents

Preface	ט
Abba Bendavid	יג
Esther Goldenberg, Bibliography of Abba Bendavid	3-7

Biblical Hebrew, Rabbinic Hebrew, Aramaic

Itzhak Avishur, Lexical Notes on Biblical Hebrew in the Light of Other Semitic Languages	11-21
Shraga Abramson, Some Aspects of Talmudic Hebrew	23-50
Moshe Azar, On וְכֵן in the Mishnah	51-65
Yoel Elitzur, The Stem Qittul in the Mishnaic Hebrew According to Cod. Kaufmann	67-93
Joshua Blau, Remarks on the Emergence of <i>Segol</i> in Biblical Hebrew	95-97
Ze'ev Ben-Ḥayyim, Notes on Grammar and Lexicography	99-109
Moshe Bar-Asher, Two Grammatical Phenomena in Palestinian Syriac	111-126
Yoḥanan Breuer, On the Hebrew Dialect of the Amoraim in the Babylonian Talmud	127-153
Avi Hurvitz, The Biblical Roots of a Talmudic Term: The Early History of the Concept צְדָקָה [=charity, alms]	155-160
David Talshir, The Autonomic Status of Late Biblical Hebrew	161-172
Chaim E. Cohen, וְשֵׁי Which Means חייב	173-175
Mordechay Mishor, וְלִצְאָתָּהּ and the Like	177-197
Steven Fassberg, Miscellanea in Western Aramaic	199-206
Shamma Friedman, -oy for -ay as First Person Singular Pronominal Suffix for Plural Nouns in Galilean Aramaic	207-215
Talma Zurawel, The <i>Sheva</i> in Maimonides' Commentary to the Mishna (Autograph)	217-223
Gad B. Sarfatti, The use of the Syntagm וְנִמְצָא עוֹשֶׂה in Mishnaic Hebrew to Express Before-Future and After-Past Time	225-243

Simcha Kogut, On the Meaning and Syntactical Status of תִּתֵּן in Biblical Hebrew	245–258
Elisha Qimron, Diphthongs and Glides in the Dead Sea Scrolls	259–278
Shimon Sharvit, Verbs Containing Infinitive as their only Complement in Mishnaic Hebrew	279–296

Pointing, Accents and Masora

Ilan Eldar, Masoretic Grammar and the Treatise <i>Diqduqé Hatte'amim</i>	299–313
Nehemia Allony, Israel Yeivin, New Sources for the Philology of Eretz-Israel	315–337
Israel Ben-David, The Accents <i>Shalshleth, S'gol'tha</i> and <i>Zaqef</i>	339–353
Aron Dotan, The Relative Chronology of the Accentuation System	355–365
Ephraim Hazan, Hebrew Letters, Vowels and Accents as Poetical Similes	367–375
Yosef Offer, Two Issues in the Masora	377–386

Modern Hebrew

Rina Ben-Shahar, Language in Ya'akov Shabtai's Novels <i>Past Continuous</i> and <i>Past Perfect</i> (Synopsis)	389–397
Lewis Glinert, The Lexicographical Methodology of Avraham Even-Shoshan: Normativism and Descriptivism	399–409
Rivka Halevi, Restricted Collocation of Nouns and Adjectives in Contemporary Hebrew	411–422
Asher Laufer, Descriptions of the Emphatic Sounds in Hebrew and in Arabic	423–438
Braha Fishler, On Agnon's "Avraham Leibush and his Sons"	439–451
Menaḥem Zvi Kaddari, אִיזָה/אִיזוֹ in the Language of Sh. J. Agnon	453–458
Ora (Rodrigue) Schwarzwald, Language Peculiarities and Normativism in the Writings of Oded Burla	459–472
Gershon Shaked, A Lost Option: The Creation of Slang and the Literary Stylistic Tradition	473–489

Biblical Hebrew, Rabbinic Hebrew, Aramaic

Ytzhak Avishur

Lexical Notes on Biblical Hebrew in the Light of Other Semitic Languages

This paper seeks to explain the following words occurring in the Latter Prophets in the light of comparative Semitic lexicology: (1) רקד, Is 13:21, cf. Judaeo-Arabic “rest, lie down”; (2) מלח, Is 51:6, Je 38:11, cf. Akkadian “rags”; (3) סבבו, Je 4:5, cf. Ugaritic; (4) כרם, שדה, Mi 1:6, cf. Akkadian (שדה = mountain, כרם = tell, ruin).

Shraga Abramson

Some Aspects of Talmudic Hebrew

This paper belongs to a larger study of post-Biblical Hebrew (for earlier parts see *ירושלים תשכ"ה*, *ירושלים תשמ"א*, *בלשון קודמים*, *ירושלים תשכ"ה* and *מחקרים בלשון א, ירושלים תשמ"א*). The author discusses teaching methods of the Rabbis and tries to show that in the Talmudic period both the Tannaim and Amoraim incorporated in their Hebrew verses or parts of verses from their teachers and colleagues. This fact leads to a better understanding of the formulations of certain Rabbis.

Moshe Azar

On וְכֵן in the Mishnah

וְכֵן is a distinguishing conjunction of the Halakhic style of the Mishnah. The conjunction element of וְ plus the anaphoric element of כֵּן give together a function word used by the editor of the Mishnah in order to achieve purposes which cannot be achieved with the same clearness by any other conjunction. It serves to connect rules (Halakhot) having a complete or partial equality concerning their verdicts, usually in the form: case₁ + verdict₁ + וְכֵן + case₂ + verdict₂ — usually in the syntactical form of hypothetical clause + consequence clause, or topic + comment. When verdict₂ is identical with verdict₁ it can be dropped. The idiosyncrasy of וְכֵן is weakened when occurring in the middle of a sentence (it can be sometimes replaced by the simple conjunction וְ), but it still may preserve an element connected to the idea of comparison, characteristic to וְכֵן: the element of novelty in comparison with what has been said previously. This is the reason why וְכֵן occurs generally at the end of a compound phrase (this and this... וְכֵן this).

There are no bases for the claim that וְכֵן is used to indicate contradiction between two rules. Whenever it seems that there is a contradiction there is also some kind of similarity between the two rules, and this similarity is the justification for the use of וְכֵן. Neither are there bases for the claim that וְכֵן usually suggests that what is written after it (and sometimes before it) is a supplement which was originally written in the margin of the page and was introduced by mistake into the text. Linguistic considerations support the view that וְכֵן is a living part of the Halakhic style and is used intentionally in order to emphasize the similarity between the rules or the novelty of some detail or to achieve brevity in the formulation of the law.

Yoel Elitzur

The Stem *Qittul* in the Mishnaic Hebrew According to Cod. Kaufmann

This work is a chapter in Tannaitic-Hebrew grammar. קטול is a nominal stem which is related to the verbal paradigm. Segal found קטול to be an

integral and staple part of the verbal paradigm. In his opinion, it is, in fact, the verbal noun of the *Pi'el* instead of the Biblical infinitival form קָטַל. Segal also insisted that in some instances קָטוּל is not a verbal noun itself, but rather a noun derived from the predicate, and thus appears also in the feminine and sometimes in the plural form (when it is found in the plural, it is usually dealing with legal terminology). E.Y. Kutscher noted, as against Segal, that קָטוּל sometimes serves as a verbal *noun* in the *Qal*, but his findings are inconclusive.

Y.N. Epstein pointed out that sometimes קָטוּל is a passive participle of the *Qal*. (According to Kutscher, the source of this form is קָטוּל and according to Z. Ben-Ḥayyim it is a variant of קָטוּל.)

In the present study, an attempt was made to compile all the words from the stem קָטוּל as they appear in the entire Mishnah (according to the Kaufmann manuscript—which is considered to be an authentic representation of Tannaitic Hebrew).

Firstly, it has been found that some words which appear in other editions as קָטוּל (but in manuscripts in a different class) appear in Ms. Kaufmann as קָטוּל, and on the other hand some קִטוּל nouns in Ms. Kaufmann are vocalized differently elsewhere. In some cases there is an internal difference of opinion in the manuscript between the scribe and the vocalizer.

The material which was gathered contains 72 verbal nouns directly from the *Pi'el* form, and 37 verbal derivatives of the *Pi'el*, but there also include seven forms that belong to *Nitpa'al*, another 16 which belong to *Qal*, and two to *Hif'il*. Seven forms bear no relation to a verb.

All these forms were discussed and were compared to other manuscripts, sources, and to other opinions of research.

Of the forms studied, particular emphasis was placed on the following words: לִימוּדִים, פִּיקוּדִים, קִירוּיָה, חֲתוּם, מָאוּן, אִיבּוּל, בְּיִרְוּיָן, צִיבּוּרִים, וְיִבּוּרִית, פֶּרֶשֶׁת-הַצִּיבּוּר / הַעִיבּוּר

Joshua Blau

Remarks on the Emergence of *Segol* in Biblical Hebrew

It is suggested that in Biblical Hebrew, alongside a system of six vowel qualities containing, in addition to the “basic” vowels *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*, also

qameṣ (ā) (the Babylonian vocalization and the Samaritan system), another system of six vowel qualities existed containing (long) *segol* as the sixth vowel (the system reflected by Origines's transcriptions, perhaps also in the Septuagint). This *segol*, it seems, arose directly from *ayu/i, iyu/i*, because the Tiberian vocalization system cannot directly be derived from the ordinary Sephardic vowel system.

Ze'ev Ben-Hayyim

Notes on Grammar and Lexicography

A. As is well known, the rule governing determination in Hebrew by means of the article, from the biblical times until to-day, can be stated as follows: When a substantive is defined by the article an attribute belonging to it also requires the article, e.g. המאור הגדול. In the Bible's language there are exceptions to this rule in which the article is attached to the attribute alone like יום הששי. No satisfactory explanation of this phenomenon has been given. However, the high frequency of the exceptions in post-biblical literature calls for a reinterpretation of this phenomenon in post-biblical Hebrew. The writer suggests that these exceptions should be treated separately from the determination rule and incorporated into the framework of relative noun-clauses in which the retrospective pronoun is omitted. To strengthen this thesis he adduces corroborating facts from Aramaic dialects and Arabic.

B. The root רטש in both meanings: (a) to smite, to dash in pieces; (b) to cast away, to reject — is original in Hebrew, and as it occurs also in Jewish-Aramaic only, with the same meanings, it seems to be a Hebrew loan in Aramaic. According to the writer's opinion it is a secondary root in which two different roots merged: (a) לטש, (b) נטש — through the well attested shifts *lʿ* and *nʿ* to *rʿ*. Thus החרטש in Sirach 8:8, "to occupy himself, to learn", is in fact semantically connected with the first meaning above. (c) דמאי, a Mishnaic term defining "fruits about which there is a suspicion as to the tithes therefrom being properly taken" (Jastrow I, p. 312), means originally "similarity" of which a secondary meaning "doubt" developed. The same semantic development occurs in the root *šbh* in Arabic, comp. *ištibah* "similarity, dubiousness". In the Hebrew of the Middle Ages דמיון is found in both meanings.

Moshe Bar-Asher

Two Grammatical Phenomena in Palestinian Syriac

The modern investigation of Palestinian Syriac (=PS) has revealed how different the actual grammar of this dialect is from the description presented in F. Schulthess's *Grammatik* (1924). Many grammatical features which were overlooked by Schulthess have been described recently by the author (see *Palestinian Syriac Studies, Source-Texts, Traditions and Grammatical Problems*, Jerusalem 1977).

In this paper we describe two additional unknown phenomena:

a. The form *Eppe'el* and *Eppa'al* — with the assimilation of the t of *Eipe'el* and *Eipa'al* to the following consonant. Although the conservative orthography rarely reveals this phenomenon, the few deviating spellings demonstrate that such an assimilation took place, e.g., אכחב, אגזי, אנסי, אנשי אקר, אכחב, אגזי, אנסי, אכחב, אגזי, אנשי אקר. A form such as אעבד (< אהעבד) shows that this assimilation occurred when the guttural was still pronounced.

b. In addition to the forms *Pa'el* and *Eipa'al* (> *Eppa'al*) with geminated second radical, it seems likely that the parallel forms *Pā'el* and *Epā'al* (with a long vowel between the first and second radicals, no gemination) existed in PS. Spellings such as אשחחף, אשחחף, presumably, *šātef* and *eštātaf*. This conclusion is supported not only by the pointing of t with a dot, but also by existence of such forms in Samaritan Aramaic and Samaritan Hebrew, as well as Rabbinic Hebrew.

Yohanan Breuer

On the Hebrew Dialect of the Amoraim in the Babylonian Talmud

Research in Mishnaic Hebrew has still not made a detailed analysis of the Hebrew dialect used in the Babylonian Talmud. This article describes sixteen linguistic phenomena that appear in the dialect of the Amoraim within the Babylonian Talmud. Most are new and unique to this Hebrew

dialect. Some already appear in the dialect of the Tannaim, though rarely, whereas within the dialect of the Amoraim these terms are used fairly frequently.

In addition to describing these phenomena, the following two major problems are discussed:

1. In the case where these linguistic phenomena appear, albeit rarely, within the dialect of the Tannaim, we must entertain the possibility that these words are not authentic linguistic tools of the Tannaim. It is more plausible to assume that they were inserted within the dialect of the Tannaim by the various scribes and copiers of the texts who were greatly influenced by the dialect of the Amoraim. In many cases it is not easy to present a decisive conclusion, however, it is important to note the problem.

2. The dialect of the Amoraim was different from that of the Tannaim in that it was not a spoken language. When the dialect of the Amoraim was compared to that of the Tannaim, it was thought that the dialect of the Amoraim underwent subtle change only due to the influence of Biblical language (which was well known and treated with status and respect), or due to the influence of the Aramaic language, which was the spoken language of the times. Certain aspects of the Aramaic influence have been presented in the article: however, there are instances where there is no need or it is simply not possible to discover any Aramaic influence. Thus it is possible to conclude that there was, indeed, a certain inner development that took place within the dialect of the Amoraim. This conclusion forces us to consider two possibilities. Either the dialect of the Amoraim was a living language used in speech (if only to a small degree); or that even in a dialect that is not used for the purposes of speech there still remains the possibility that such a dialect can undergo a natural and inner development.

Avi Hurvitz

The Biblical Roots of a Talmudic Term: The Early History of the Concept חַסְדִּים [= charity, alms]

The present study is an attempt to trace the possible Hebrew forerunners of the post-biblical term חַסְדִּים = "charity, alms" in the Old Testament. To this

end, the biblical roots חנן and צדק are examined. Our study indicates that in a few passages these roots are indeed employed with the specific connotation of the later concept of צדקה. All the Hebrew occurrences of this usage, however, are found exclusively in Proverbs and Psalms (a similar usage of חנן and צדק occurs in Biblical Aramaic in Dan. 4:24, as already noted by F. Rosenthal).

The particular meaning under consideration here is obvious from the contexts in which חנן and צדק are attested. As for חנן, we note that within the framework of Biblical Hebrew, it occurs only in Proverbs and the Psalter with אביונים / דלים / עניים / יתומים, indicating financial or material support for the poor and needy (and not simply "mercy" or "compassion" in general). Similarly, the nouns צדיק and צדקה, etymologically related to the Talmudic צדקה = "charity, alms", are employed along with אוצר / הון / עשר / פיזור (ממון וכו') — again, combinations whose distribution within the Hebrew Bible is confined to Proverbs and Psalms. The remarkable resemblance between this sense of חנן and צדק cannot be explained away as mere coincidence. Rather, it seems to represent a stage in a linguistic process which eventuated in the concrete meaning of צדקה = "charity, alms" prevailing in Rabbinic writings.

It is not yet clear what are the broader implications of the close agreement between the Proverbs-Psalms passages on the one hand, and Rabbinic literature on the other. One possibility is that this similarity stems from a common *historical background* of all these texts. In other words, we should assume that the biblical texts in question belong to the late Biblical period. Another course would be to ascribe the analogous linguistic development of חנן and צדק to the *literary genre* of the biblical texts discussed. That is, they are similar to the talmudic texts because, according to the accepted view, the above mentioned Proverbs-Psalms passages belong to Wisdom literature, which — particularly on social-moral issues — has much in common with the *Weltanschauung* of the Rabbis.

Be that as it may, one fact can definitely be established: the decisive turning-point in the history of the Hebrew root צדק, which ultimately resulted in the Talmudic concept of צדקה, is not to be found in the Book of Isaiah (as has been suggested). Rather, the linguistic evidence adduced above indicates that the critical phase in the semantic development of the root צדק is reflected in the Hebrew Bible in the Books of Proverbs and Psalms.

David Talshir

The Autonomic Status of Late Biblical Hebrew

Most scholars are of the opinion that Late Biblical Hebrew is a mixture of Classical Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew, while its original share is meagre and accidental.

A study of the exclusive linguistic elements of Late Biblical Hebrew, that is those elements which are absent both in Classical Biblical Hebrew and in Mishnaic Hebrew, has shown that the originality of this stratum from a linguistic point of view is actually extensive: two-thirds of the elements which characterize Late Biblical Hebrew as against Classical Biblical Hebrew are absent in Mishnaic Hebrew as well; in other words, most new linguistic elements of Late Biblical Hebrew were replaced in Mishnaic Hebrew. Consequently, it is a mistake to evaluate Late Biblical Hebrew as Mishnaic Hebrew disguised as Biblical Hebrew.

To illustrate the vitality of Late Biblical Hebrew, function-words were chosen, which are “of fixed, and usually small, membership”. The investigation revealed sixteen cases in which different *mots de structure* are used in Classical Biblical Hebrew, late Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew for one and the same function. This essential change testifies to the independent role that Late Biblical Hebrew played in the development of the Hebrew language.

Chaim E. Cohen

חייב Which Means רשאי

In Mishna Arakhin 8:9, the word רשאי occurs with the meaning חייב (the Kaufmann Ms. actually has חייב, but other reliable Mss. have רשאי), and it has been explained there in that manner by the commentaries (Rashi, Tosafot and others). This meaning of רשאי was known to some of the lexicographers (but most of them ignored it), and the late Prof. Lieberman also mentioned it. The source of this meaning is that of the root “רשי” in Aramaic (from the Akkadian).

In several additional places where the word רשאי appears in the Babylonian Talmud, and where most commentators explained it according to the usual meaning (i.e. allowed), the Tosafists gave it the meaning that it has in Arakhin, i.e. "obligated" (V. Kiddushin 33a, Hullin 54b, Ta'anith 13b).

Mordechay Mishor

לצאת תצא and the Like

In the Hebrew language of the Amoraitic sources, the infinitive and the verbal noun are used to emphasize the verb (like the "infinitive absolute" in Biblical Hebrew).

The infinitive and the verbal noun are exploited to express some syntactical subtleties analogous to Goldenberg's "types" (*IOS I* [1971], pp. 36–85).

The infinitive is used in extraposition, i.e. as a formal subject: לצאת תצא. The verbal noun is used in "focusing", i.e. as a formal predicate: קל הקלו (in the Pal. Talmud), קל הוא שהקלו (in the Bab. Talmud).

It is not quite clear whether the verbal noun is also used simply to strengthen the idea of the verb, with no syntactical function in itself.

The rarity of evidence for these types of "tautological infinitive" in Western Aramaic sources (save in one single expression מסבור סבר), suggests that the phenomenon did not arise in Hebrew merely as a "calque" from Aramaic, but rather as an internal development.

Steven Fassberg

Miscellanea in Western Aramaic

Four features found in Western Aramaic sources are discussed: (1) the forms of the definite article on plural nouns in Ma'lula -ō, -ōy, -ōya, and their possible origin in the pronominal system (suffixes on masculine

plural nouns); (2) אבֹּה “his father”, אחוּה “his brother”, חמֹה “his father-in-law” in Galilean Aramaic as against אבֹּי, אחוּי, חמוּי, the former arising, perhaps, from a misanalysis of the latter as *ʿabu + i* (“my father”), *ʿahu + i* (“my brother”), *ḥamu + i* (“my father-in-law”); (3) the form רבֹּן “Master”, which appears to have gone over to the qattūl class in Palestine (cf. Babylonian רבֹּן) because of attraction to the divine epithets חנוּן “gracious” and רחום “merciful”; (4) ריש “head” but ראשין “heads” in the Palestinian Targum fragments from the Cairo Genizah, the plural clearly a Hebraism.

Shamma Friedman

-oy for -ay as First Person Singular Pronominal Suffix for Plural Nuons in Galilean Aramaic

In a study published in 1981, the author dealt with the sound-shift final *ay* > *oy* in Mishnaic Hebrew and Galilean Aramaic (as well as in Babylonian Aramaic). Examples were provided for Hebrew nouns derived from participle sing, III-y, and Aramaic plural participles III-y (מורדי > מורדיי; add גבוי > גבויי). At that time, an example for the first person pronominal suffix was presented, which is of interest in that it removes the contrast with the third person suffix, and in that it does not appear in the standard morphologies or paradigms.

It is herein demonstrated that this form is frequent and widespread in the extant testimonies of Galilean Aramaic, e.g. אַנָּא מִן יוֹמֵי = “I never” is common, and the suffix should be listed as an alloform in the descriptive morphology of Galilean Aramaic, together with the corresponding phenomenon in the Palestinian-type Targums (recently discussed by Z. Ben-Hayyim and others).

This form had been taken by some as a rhetorical use of the third person for the first. E. Y. Kutcher generally rejected -oy spellings in verbs, etc. as corruptions, in connection with his attempt to determine the single correct historical forms for Galilean Aramaic, such as in his work on plural participles III-y. The author suggests a methodological correction here in which early popular non-standardized linguistic phenomena not be rejected as corrupt, but listed as authentic alloforms.

Talma Zurawel

The *Sheva* in Maimonides' Commentary to the Mishna (Autograph)

The study of the *sheva* in Maimonides' autograph (= MA) shows some ways of pointing which are different from the traditional ways. This article presents two features of MA concerning the *sheva*.

1. Pointing *sheva* instead of *pataḥ* before a strong *dagesh*. This feature leads us to the conclusion that, in the tradition of the vocalizer of the text, *pataḥ* before a *dagesh* was pronounced as a very short vowel.

2. Interchange of *sheva* and other vowel signs. From the study of this phenomenon we learn that MA reflects a reading tradition in which the *sheva* was pronounced as *pataḥ*.

Gad B. Sarfatti

The use of the Syntagm נמצא עושה in Mishnaic Hebrew to Express Before-Future and After-Past Time

The inflection of the verb in Mishnaic Hebrew (=MH) is extremely poor: there are only two tense-forms (*qatal*, *yiqtol*), an imperative (*qetol*, an infinitive (*liqtol*), and a participle (*qotel* — to which we can add its passive form *qatul*). But MH manages by various expedients to express all the nuances of time (and mood) that the speaker and the writer may require. This paper deals with the syntagm formed by נמצא (nif'al, perfect) and the active participle of non-neuter verbs (i.e. the syntagm of the type נמצא עושה) used as a compound tense with a general character of perfect, particularly to express the before-future and after-past (according to Otto Jespersen's terminology).

In MH נמצא is polysemic, and passes gradually from its pregnant meaning "to be found" to an entirely non-lexical use as auxiliary verb. Such is the case in the following sentence (Rosh ha-Shana 1:6): שלח לו רבן גמליאל (= Rabban Gamliel) את מעכב אתה את הרבים נמצאת מכשולן לעתיד לבוא

despatched him (to Rabbi Aqiva): if you restrain the multitude you will have put a stumbling block in their way for the future). Here נמצאת מכשולן describes an action which is in the future time in relation to the actual message of Rabban Gamliel and in the past time in relation to the day when the New-Moon witnesses will no more come to Jerusalem on Shabbat because Rabbi Aqiva had stopped them on previous occasions. The syntagm נמצא עושה in similar contexts of futurity is found 15 times in the Mishna and 55 times in the other Tannaitic compilations that have been examined, and it can always be suitably rendered into English by the future perfect tense.

On the other hand, if the context is in the past, then נמצא עושה generally expresses the after-past time (and it can be rendered in English by “was to” followed by the infinitive or by “would” with infinitive). This happens only once in the Mishna (Tamid 4:3) and 19 times in the other texts examined. Such is the case, e.g., in the following sentence (Tosefta Sukka 2:6): משל למלך בשר ודם שבנה פלטרין ושכללה והתקין בה את הסעודה ואחר כך הכניס את האורחין, כעס עליהן, אמר לשמש ונטל את הנר מלפניהן, ונמצאו כולן יושבין בחשיכה (=... he got angry with them, and ordered the servant to take away the lamp, and all would be sitting in the darkness.) It is clear that all sat in the darkness *after* the servant took away the lamp: נמצאו יושבים expresses the after-past time.

In sum: the syntagma נמצא עושה is a perfect (and as such it presents a result), and expresses a time which contains an element of past and an element of future.

Simcha Kogut

On the Meaning and Syntactical Status of הִנֵּה in Biblical Hebrew

The frequent occurrence of הִנֵּה in the Bible did not prevent its near extinction in post-biblical Hebrew. In modern Hebrew הִנֵּה came, once again, to be used widely, albeit neither to the same extent nor always in the same way as in the Bible. Scholars of biblical Hebrew have had difficulty in reconstructing *hinnēh*'s original function and have assigned it many

different meanings. In this article we have examined a small number of the ideas that have been suggested and have concluded that none of the scholars has arrived at a monolithic picture of the use of הִנֵּה in biblical Hebrew, nor has anyone succeeded in clarifying its syntactical status.

In this article we have compared the syntactical status of הִנֵּה in biblical Hebrew with its status in modern Hebrew and have noted that in biblical, as opposed to modern Hebrew, הִנֵּה cannot be regarded as predicative in many of its occurrences, especially when it precedes a verbal sentence, such as וַיֹּאמֶר: הִנֵּה חֵלֹם חֲלַמְתִּי (Judg 7:13) or a complete nominal sentence, such as אַךְ הִנֵּה אֲשַׁחַךְ הִיא (Gen 26:9). In our opinion, הִנֵּה serves to introduce a sentence or clause and is not to be regarded as part of them. In the event that a single constituent follows הִנֵּה — such as הִנֵּה! אֱלֹהֵינוּ! (1 Kg 18:8, 11) — this constituent is to be understood as a one-member sentence. In modern Hebrew, הִנֵּה has taken on the semantic component of place that was part of the statement of existence conveyed by the one-member sentence to which הִנֵּה was joined. As a result, הִנֵּה is considered to have the status of an adverbial predicate. In this article we have also described the process by which הִנֵּה has come to serve as a copula in modern Hebrew.

In the Bible, most instances of הִנֵּה(ן) occur following a verb of seeing. We have observed a number of “formulas” that occur repeatedly: one long formula — וַיֵּשֶׁב עֵינָיו וַיִּרְא וְהִנֵּה... (see, e.g., Gen 24:63) — and several stages of its shortening — וַיֵּשֶׁב עֵינָיו וַיִּרְא... (see, e.g., Exod 14:10); וַיִּרְא וְהִנֵּה... (see, e.g., Gen 29:2); ...וְהִנֵּה(ן). When the verb of seeing is complemented by a single constituent, its meaning is “to look at”, “to see”, and הִנֵּה cannot precede the complement: we find וַיִּרְא אֶת בְּנֵימִין אַחִיו (Gen 43:29), but not וַיִּרְא וְהִנֵּה בְנֵימִין אַחִיו*. On the other hand, when this verb is complemented by a content clause, its meaning is likely to be “to perceive (that)...”, and הִנֵּה(ן) can then precede the clause — וַיִּרְא וְהִנֵּה גַמְלִים בָּאִים — וְהִנֵּה(ן), as in וַיִּרְא וְהִנֵּה, invites an object content clause as its complement, it must be regarded as having the syntactical status of a sentence, namely a one-member sentence. In addition, we have pointed to the fact that the subject of the verb of seeing that was absorbed by הִנֵּה(ן) is not always one of the characters in the narrative. There are sometimes cases in which הִנֵּה(ן) absorbs the imperative! רְאֵה! and its subject is directed at the reader. We have also discussed the status of הִנֵּה(ן) as a marker of the boundary of the content clause that it introduces.

Elisha Qimron

Diphthongs and Glides in the Dead Sea Scrolls

In early Hebrew and Aramaic texts, there are many spelling irregularities involving the letters *alef*, *yod*, and *waw*. These letters could be interchanged, added or dropped. Thus, the singular passive participle of ל"י verb is spelt in different ways: עשוים, עשויים, עשוום, and תלואים (תלאים); the singular form of this category is spelt עשווי and עשו; ראווי and לוים; the word "Levites" is spelt לוים, לויים, לוויים and לוויים; the word מצוות is spelt מצוות, מצואות, מצאות and מצאח; the word באו "they came" is also spelt באווי and בו. Examining the data from the Dead Sea Scrolls and other early Hebrew and Aramaic sources, the writer concludes that these variants are merely orthographical devices to represent a special phonological sequence which occurs in words such as those mentioned above. The weak consonants *alef*, *yod* and *waw*, being not pronounced as consonants in these words, were dropped or became a vowel. Thus 'asuyim became 'asu-im; 'asuy became 'asu or 'asu-i; leviyim became levi-im; mišwot became mis-ot; ba'u became ba-u. In those cases where two different vowels meet (after the dropping of the consonant) a glide may have developed between these vowels (e.g. 'asu-im pronounced 'asu'im). In those cases where these vowels were identical, the two vowels may have merged into a very long vowel (e.g. levi-im pronounced levīm). The above spelling variants are, then, different devices to represent these new forms. Since the Hebrew consonantal script is hardly suitable to represent sequence of vowels, these forms were frequently misinterpreted.

Such spelling irregularities occur also in places where an original *he* was dropped, e.g. the word תהו "emptiness" is also spelt תהווי and תוה. It was apparently pronounced *tõ* or *to"u*.

Shimon Sharvit

Verbs Containing Infinitive as their only Complement in Mishnaic Hebrew

This article deals with two-place-verbs in which an infinitive stands in the second place: NP + VP + Infinitive. This syntactic construction includes

only those sentences in which the agents of the two verbs are identical. What are the relations between the two elements of the two-verb-predicate?

Syntactically, the first is the main component of the predicate and the second is its obligatory complement. But semantically, the infinitive is the main component of the predicate and the first verb only adds some special meaning to it. Most of those verbs are of incomplete predication, at least when they are used in this structure, and scholars even intend to call them: auxiliaries.

We can classify the finite verbs into three main categories:

1. Adverbial verbs — an alternative way for using a regular adverb.
2. Aspectual verbs: — they express the beginning, the continuing, the repeating or the finishing of an action.
3. Modal verbs:
 - a. verbs of ability and possibility.
 - b. verbs of need and obligation.
 - c. verbs of will and intention.

The deep structure — (NP + Verb) + (NP + Verb) — can be transformed into two surface structures: 1. Verbs + infinitive; 2. verb + sentence.

Actually we find that sometimes the first structure is transformed into a participle or even into a finite verb. In total we find six variants of the basic construction:

1. Finite verb + infinitive.
2. Finite verb + finite verb.
3. Finite verb + participle.
4. Finite verb + “to be” + participle.
5. Finite verb + infinitive + infinitive.
6. Finite verb + sentence (*šē-yif'al*).

The third part of the article includes a lexicon of all verbs found in the Tannaitic sources. It contains citations for all variants of the constructions.

Pointing, Accents and Masora

Ilan Eldar

Masoretic Grammar and the Treatise *Diqduqé Haṭṭé'amim*

The late Prof. Nehemia Allony set out to examine and re-evaluate the treatise *Diqduqé Haṭṭé'amim*, studying both its greatly different editions, namely S. Baer and H.L. Strack's (1879) as against Aron Dotan's (1967). He did that in a programmatic article published several years ago ("the Tiberian Linguistic School and Masoretic Grammar" [Hebrew], *Beth Mikra* 61 [1975], pp. 231–265).

Having examined some manuscripts and looked into the treatise, Allony reaches two major conclusions constituting new findings with regard to the masoretic-grammatical material included in Baer and Strack's edition in particular and masoretic grammar in general:

(1) This material is not anonymous, and therefore all the chapters of the treatise may each be recognized and identified by either authors or sources.

(2) This material is not ancient; therefore masoretic-grammatical literature is not to be assumed to precede linguistic literature but, on the contrary, is to be regarded as drawing heavily on it.

The first part of the present article constitutes a critique of Allony's method of investigation and analysis, refuting his arguments and proofs and rejecting his above-mentioned conclusions. The present writer believes the masoretic-grammatical material included in Baer and Strack's edition of *Diqduqé Haṭṭé'amim* should be dated to the period when the grammatical study of Hebrew flourished; almost all of it is anonymous, and it precedes the linguistic literature.

Allony criticizes Dotan's edition of *Diqduqé Haṭṭē^camim*, claiming it does not contain the original Tiberian version of this treatise, as it is to be found, according to Allony, in relatively old eastern manuscripts. He claims it contains the Spanish version of the treatise, which is an abridged, revised and later version.

The present writer offers the reasons for his rejection of Allony's claim. There is but a single version of *Diqduqé Haṭṭē^camim*, which is neither Tiberian nor Spanish. This version is presented in Dotan's edition and is derived from those manuscripts chosen by Dotan as representing the treatise. The eastern manuscripts mentioned by Allony do not include the treatise called *Diqduqé Haṭṭē^camim* at all. It could be proved that they originate from a certain ancient treatise comprising several masoretic-grammatical chapters; it may be assumed that they reflect several revisions of this ancient treatise done during the process of its being copied. The particular work *Diqduqé Haṭṭē^camim* is, in fact, one such revision made in the early 10th century A.D. by °Aharon Ben Asher, the famous Tiberian Masorete.

Nehemia Allony, Israel Yeivin

New Sources for the Philology of Eretz-Israel

The authors publish a Geniza fragment (MS. New York, J.T.S., Adler 2556, 5–6), dealing with masoretic subjects. The fragment is written in Arabic; it is here translated with comments. The author apparently lived in Eretz-Israel in the middle or second half of the 10th century.

Fol. 6 contains phonetic subjects: the end of a discussion on the double pronunciation of *resh*; a detailed discussion on the letters *b g d k p t* following *Phwy*. The author mentions the fact that only the four letters *Phwy* have the quality of being sometimes mute and sometimes pronounced (P never at the end of word).

Fol. 5 contains 7 rules of accentuation for the three books Ps., Prov. and Job, dealing mainly with the conjunctive accents *Deḥi*, *Revia*, *Legarme* and *Šinnor*. The character of these rules is close to that of

“*Diqduqe Ha-te^camim*”, more detailed than the latter but less rigorous and precise. The name of Ben-Naftali is mentioned twice in connection with the rules, but they do not always correspond to what we know of the system of Ben-Naftali.

Israel Ben-David

The Accents *Shalshleth*, *S’gol’tha* and *Zaqef*

The Massorettes and later scholars up to our time are of the opinion, that *S’gol’tha* is the representative of *Zaqef* and that *Shalshleth* is equally so. But a systematic survey leads us to other conclusions.

In the seven verses with *Shalshleth* in the 21 Books we see: (a) syntactically the disjunctive power of *Shalshleth* exceeds that of *Ett’nach’tha*; (b) all words with the accent *Shalshleth* which may appear in pausal form (five out of seven) have indeed pausal vocalization. Therefore *Shalshleth* is to be placed in the first group of the pausal accents, just after Silluq and before *Ett’nach’tha*.

S’gol’tha always turns half-vowels (*Sh’wa* and *Chatef*) into stressed full-vowels and shows pausal vocalization at certain other circumstances, while (first) *Zaqef* does so only partly.

Therefore we may grade our three accents according to their disjunctive power: (1) *Shalshleth*, (2) *S’gol’tha*, (3) (first) *Zaqef*.

Aron Dotan

The Relative Chronology of the Accentuation System

In previous studies the author questioned the generally accepted view that Hebrew vocalization and accentuation make one monolithic system which came into being at one and the same time. He tried to establish that biblical accent signs preceded vocalization signs.

To follow up this study, the question of the homogeneity of the accentuation system is here examined.

Since some of the accentuation rules are dependent on the phonological structure of the words involved, the choice of accents is at times conditioned by the count and weight of vowels and syllables. The *shewa* is an important factor in Hebrew word structure, and it is possible to estimate its phonetic value in various positions within the word, whether or not it was considered, as far as the accents were concerned, the equivalent of a vowel.

An examination is made in this article which shows that the phonetic value of the *shewa* was not the same in all accent contexts. The variations were due to the historically-changing pronunciation practice of the *shewa*. Hence a historical stratification of the accents was possible.

The results show very clearly three historically distinct layers of accents:

a. The disjunctive accents — the oldest stage, where initial *shewa* was zero, while medial *shewa* in certain conditions was considered a vowel. This stage is the only one with a parallel in the other two accentuation systems, the Babylonian and the Palestinian.

b. The conjunctive accents — the second stage, where initial *shewa* was considered a vowel while medial *shewa* was zero, in full accordance with the Tiberian pronunciation rules of the *shewa*.

c. The secondary conjunctive accents, marking the secondary tone within words — the third stage. Here medial *shewa* in certain conditions is once again considered a vowel.

Finally an attempt is made to explain the historical development of the various stages in the realization of the *shewa*.

Ephraim Hazan

Hebrew Letters, Vowels and Accents as Poetical Similes

The forms and the names of the Hebrew letters, the marks of the vocalization and the accent signs always gave scope to the imagination of poets and writers. They used such forms as poetical similes, as for example in the poem of R. Shmuel Hanagid:

Moon like a *Yod* (י) written in
golden ink upon the robes of night
or as in Gabirol's Poem:

Moon like a half of *Samech* behind a cloud
formed like *Mem*

There are also examples of similes of animals which look like forms of the Hebrew letters.

The Masora could also be a poetical simile. Gabirol said that he was higher than his opponents as the nun in the name *Menashe* (Jud 18:30), which according to the Masora is written higher than the other letters: מנישה. Apart from their use in written texts, the most frequent use of the Hebrew letters, vowels and accents is in puns and in the ambiguity of their names and the general meaning that one could see in them e.g. the vowel *pataḥ* carries the meaning "open" and *qamets* bears the meaning "to close a hand."

Yehuda Alharizi used this meaning to describe a miser. The article introduces many examples of the use of such double meanings of the Hebrew marks (letters, vowels, accents). Finally a complete poem (of R. Frazi Shawwat of Tunisia) is introduced. This poem uses all the names of the accents in their general meanings in relation to a specific theme: the exile and the redemption of Israel.

Yosef Offer

Two Issues in the Masora

Two problematic issues, in which there are many varying opinions and discussion, are discussed here.

The first issue is the stress of syllable in the word ויֵאמֵר in the book of Job. According to many Mss. and printed editions this word should be pronounced in some verses (e.g. Job 3:2) ויֵאמֵר (*Mil'el*, with *Pataḥ* under the *Mem*), a form that is grammatically abnormal. Other Mss. punctuate ויֵאמֶר, according to the rules. This phenomenon is explained as a mistake, which is due to the special way of description of the Masora rubrics.

The second issue is the word הלה in Deut. 32:6. The writing of this word is grammatically abnormal: Some Masoretes write the letter ה as a

separate word; others write הל as a separate word. The letter ה is written in some sources as a large letter. The reading of the word is opposed to the rules of prefix letters. It is read 'הלה instead of 'לה. All these phenomena are explained as a result of two different textual traditions, and an attempt is made to describe all these historical developments of the Masoretic and Halakhic Literature.

Modern Hebrew

Rina Ben-Shahar

Language in Ya'akov Shabtai's Novels *Past Continuous* and *Past Perfect* (Synopsis)

Shabtai's language in the novels *Past Continuous* and *Past Perfect* considerably deviates from the predominant linguistic and stylistic norms of contemporary Israeli Hebrew prose. Shabtai deviates from norms mainly on the syntactic level where he has almost made up a syntax of his own. The sentences of Shabtai's text are so closely linked up and interconnected, as sometimes to become paradoxical or even unintelligible. This special syntax is a technical means of expressing the associative nature of these two novels. In both, events and figures pertaining to different times and places are added up and intermixed. "Major" dramatic or pathetic events and "minor" everyday actions are equally dealt with.

One of the predominant types of conjunction used in Shabtai's novels is syntactical subordination through relative clauses. Shabtai uses relative clauses flexibly and variedly, often deviating from modern written Hebrew norms. Many passages are made up of a long line of hierarchically intertwined relative clauses.

A predominant deviation from standard style is the use made of sequential "pseudo" relative clauses, namely relative clauses reporting sequential acts and new facts instead of reporting background details describing the noun or defining it, thus helping to identify it, as required by written Hebrew norms. Such clauses are usually interlocked with standard relative clauses, often joined by the conjunctive "and", "pretending" to join two equatable clauses. The combination of these two types of relative clause, namely the standard relative clause often reporting past

events prior to the main action, and the “pseudo” sequential relative clause reporting new events, serves Shabtai’s mixing technique. In his novels Shabtai mixes different times, actions and thoughts, important and trivial matters. This technique is also supported by a syntactical coordination, mainly employing the conjunction “and” endowed by Shabtai with greater freedom than usual in written Hebrew. Through the conjunction “and” Shabtai often creates a sharp shift from one topic to another, juxtaposing seemingly irreconcilable matters.

Lewis Glinert

The Lexicographical Methodology of Avraham Even-Shoshan: Normativism and Descriptivism

Avraham Even-Shoshan’s Hebrew dictionaries reflect a partial and only a semi-systematic normativism. The substandard finds almost no expression, while the colloquial standard of contemporary Hebrew is partly and apparently arbitrarily represented. Where the colloquial standard deviates grammatically from the prescriptive, be it phonologically, morphologically or categorically, it too is excluded. Literary or poetic usage is entered without indication of its limited use. As for archaic usages, which could justifiably be deemed part of the contemporary language for their passive use, they are actually considered the preferred forms where they denote natural realia. However, Even-Shoshan’s dictionaries do not give a fully exhaustive coverage of Biblical or Mishnaic words or their classical meanings, and thus cannot be considered to reflect the passive linguistic world of the contemporary public in the fullest sense of the word. Even-Shoshan’s grammatical concerns coincide with those prevalent in Israeli normative circles, and bear comparison with the projected methods of Goshen-Gottstein’s scientific synchronic lexicon, and possibly with general lexicographical practices. But whatever the normative tendency of Even-Shoshan’s lexicons, they represent a significant shift towards the descriptive in Modern Hebrew lexicography.

Rivka Halevi

Restricted Collocations of Nouns and Adjectives in Contemporary Hebrew

The paper deals with restricted collocations (RCs) of nouns and adjectives in which the semantic (as opposed to syntactic) head of the collocation is an adjective and the class of lexical items that collocate with the adjective is comprised of nouns.

RCs are phraseological units. In these constructions the head is polysemous and the selection of the subsense is determined by the verbal context. The restrictions that govern this type of collocation are in no way connected with the referential meaning of the lexical items involved, but rather determined by habitual and arbitrary ways of using the language. For example, the restrictions on *משאלות ורודות* * as opposed to *חלומות ורודים* are a matter of habitual linguistic usage, whereas the restrictions on *פרה חומה* * as opposed to *פרה ירוקה* derive from the referential meaning of the lexical items.

Transformational linguists have constructed a theory to deal only with well-formed sentences and have tended to ignore phraseological units. Such an approach is in our opinion misguided because of the important role played by these units in the process of linguistic creativity.

This paper has two aims:

1. To demonstrate that RCs constitute a class governed by its own rules, We present a number of semantic and syntactic characteristics of RCs composed of nouns and adjectives that prove that the structuring of RCs is different from that of free constructions. The semantic restrictions discussed include: a restriction on the number of items that belong to the same paradigm, a restriction on the substitution of synonyms for the head, a restriction on the substitution of scatters for the head and a restriction on antonymy. The syntactic restrictions discussed include: a restriction on transformation from an attributive adjective to a predicative adjective, a restriction on nominalization, a restriction on free formation of comparative and superlative and a restriction on affixation. We also illustrate unsystematic relations between definiteness and indefiniteness and between singular and plural.

2. To suggest a method of presenting in the lexicon the particular semantic and syntactic characteristics of RC in Modern Hebrew.

Asher Laufer

Descriptions of the Emphatic Sounds in Hebrew and in Arabic

A survey of the literature on the emphatics shows a diversity of opinions concerning their articulation. Most scholars do not support their theories with substantial evidence.

Our study is based on 300 minutes of recordings from 9 Hebrew and Arabic Speakers. The subjects were recorded on videotapes while a fiberoptic scope was positioned in their upper pharynx. A simultaneous acoustic signal was also recorded. Our data were supplemented by a cineradiographic film of three Arabic speakers.

Our results clearly show that all the emphatic sounds share the same type of secondary articulation: pharyngealization. The narrowest constriction is made between the tip of the epiglottis, which tilts *backward*, and the pharyngeal walls. We can also see, that the lower part of the root of the tongue is retracted to a lesser degree.

Our data show that all the emphatic and pharyngeal sounds are made with qualitatively the same pharyngeal constriction. The differences are due to the fact that for pharyngeals the constriction is the primary one, and therefore it is most constricted, while the pharyngeal constriction during the emphatics is a secondary one, and therefore the degree of constriction is less extreme and more variable.

The same sort of pharyngealization is seen with all the emphatics, and therefore we shall use the same sign [~] for all of them, including the / \tilde{k} /.

We found that when pharyngeals and pharyngealized sounds are realized, the Hebrew and the Arabic speakers produce them essentially in the same way.

Braha Fischler

On Agnon's "Avraham Leibush and his Sons"

Several years ago two versions of the story "Avraham Leibush and his sons" were published side by side. One was first published in 1905 in

“Hamizpe”, and the other was printed from a manuscript dated 1959 — a gap of over fifty years.

On comparing the two versions an essential change is found in Agnon’s *linguistic and stylistic approach*. No more direct progression to the central point, but a frame aiming at an idea; no more simple construction ruled by sequence of events, but multibranching linguistic connections between distant units, like repetition, regression, gradation and anaphora; no more single stratum layers, but a combination of the visible and hidden planes — using symmetrical structures, generalizing phrases and idiomatics; no more a plain narrator, but a sophisticated one, who in his “involvement” and “sympathy” opens to criticism the hero and the society in which he lives.

In short, Agnon’s style turns the simple anecdote into a complicated story that criticizes the materialistic and utilitarian way of thinking, and at the same time indicates a way out from these ailments.

Menaḥem Zvi Kaddari

אִיזָה / אִיזוֹ in the Language of Sh. J. Agnon

The adjectival interrogative particles of delimitation אִיזָה (sg. m) / אִיזוֹ (sg. f), originating in M(ishnaic) H(ebrew), are documented 296 times in the 1953 (“The Eight Volume”) edition of Sh. J. Agnon’s works. However, closer analysis of these occurrences in Agnon’s language reveals significant deviations, both in their syntax and meaning, from the MH usage. In syntax, the basic rule of gender — number agreement between אִיזוֹ / אִיזָה and their respective head NPs has been frequently disregarded, e.g. ואִיזוֹ חֵבֵר (אלוֹ וְאֵלֶּיךָ, p. 159); אִיזוֹ בְּגָדִים (אלוֹ וְאֵלֶּיךָ, p. 183); אִיזָה עֲנוּיִל שְׂמֹנִיִל (אלוֹ וְאֵלֶּיךָ, p. 91). In their grammatical meaning, the particles function both as interrogatives (“which one?”, and “what kind of?” too) and as indefinite delimitators-quantifiers (“some”).

New rules can be detected in Agnon’s use of אִיזוֹ / אִיזָה (possibly in some cases Agnon’s intention in pronunciation of the second form had been אִיזוֹ): אִיזָה regularly preserves its gender — number agreement, while “אִיזוֹ (אִיזָה)” is open to new connections (mostly to NP in pl.). Both אִיזָה and אִיזוֹ have undergone a shift to the indefinite delimitation-quantification.

“legitimate” literary style. To date, Hebrew Literature has not yet come to terms with the options and opportunities of a spoken revived language. If there were any achievements they were only partial and we cannot say that this has become a major stylistic factor in modern Hebrew narrative fiction.