

English Abstracts

The Elliptical Sentence in the Mishna – Syntactical Conditions

The elliptical sentence is defined as a sentence from which a major constituent has been deleted (the subject, the predicate, the object, the adjunct), and the deleted constituent is lexically recoverable from another sentence (or clause), and the sentence is not a transformation of a conjunction-reduction.

Five types of elliptical sentence have been discovered in the Mishna:

1. the elliptical (second) parallel clause, which is divided into two subtypes: (a) the ellipsis is based on leaving at least one non-identical parallel constituent in the elliptical clause; (b) the ellipsis is based on adding a constituent to the elliptical clause, which is parallel to a potential constituent in the intact clause.
2. the ellipsis is in a "repair" sentence: a sentence from which all the constituents have been deleted, except one which is parallel to a non-identical constituent in one of the clauses of the previous sentence, or one which is an addition-constituent, with no parallel in the previous sentence.
3. the ellipsis in the answer to a general question.
4. the ellipsis in the apodosis which is recoverable from the consequence clause and vice versa.
5. the structural ellipsis, which does not need any neighbouring text in order to enable recoverability.

Gabriel Birnbaum

A Phonological and Morphological Description of Geniza Fragments T-S E1 43 – Mishna Shabbat 9–17

The study consists of a detailed description of the phonology and morphology of Geniza fragment T-S E1 43. It is the longest continuous fragment of the tractate Shabbat (comprising chapters 9–17), and one of the longest existing Geniza fragments of the Mishna.

The text has been compared to the “basic” manuscripts of the Mishna on the one hand, and to the printed text on the other hand.

The traditions of the copyist and that of the vocalizer have been separately examined.

Both of these traditions reveal authentic linguistic features, which can be traced back to the Tannaitic era. The copyist’s tradition reflects the Palestinian tradition of Mishnaic Hebrew (as distinct from the Babylonian one). The vocalizer’s tradition reflects the western subdivision of the aforementioned Palestinian tradition. Some isolated eastern features have, however, been found in it.

Of special interest are those linguistic features unknown to us from the “basic” texts, which have been found in the present manuscript; e.g. $\text{דְּיָפִי} - \text{דָּךְ}$ (as against דְּפִי); זַחְרוּרִית (=crimson, as against זַחְרוּרִית); הַמּוֹשֵׁט , מוֹשֵׁטִין (as against הַמּוֹשֵׁט , מוֹשֵׁטִין).

After many additional Geniza fragments are described in a similar way, the interrelations among the different fragments will be clarified, as well as their relation to the “basic” texts. This will shed more light on the different traditions of Mishnaic Hebrew.

Moreover, the study of one of the oldest and most authentic traditions of Mishnaic Hebrew enables us to have a better knowledge of the form this language took when it was spoken.

Moshe Bar-Asher

Contextual Forms and Pausal Forms in Mishnaic Hebrew According to MS Parma B

MS Parma B (Codex de Rossi 497) of the Mishna is pointed with vowel signs and a well-organized system of accents. The disjunctive accents (duces) are the *tipha*, *zaqeph*, *gereš*, *mahpakh*, double *merkha* (at the end of an interrogative clause), and the *šalsēlet* (at the end of an exclamatory clause); the main pause is marked in the middle of a mishna by an *athnah*. There is no accent sign on the final word of a mishna, with the following dot sufficing. All words that do not occur in pause are marked by a *maqeph* joining them to the following word.

We examine in this article the distribution of the contextual forms (e.g., אָמַר, אָכְלוּ) and the pausal forms (e.g., אָמַרְ, אָכְלוּ). In describing the distributional rules of the two sets of forms, one must distinguish between two main groups: (a) contextual forms whose second root letter is pointed with shewa as against pausal forms with a full vowel (e.g., אָמַרְ vs. אָמְרָה); (b) contextual forms whose second root letter is pointed with a vowel as opposed to pausal forms with a different vowel.

Group A: *shewa* vs. vowel

There is a regular distributional relationship in this category: when the form occurs in a syntactic context the contextual form is attested (e.g., יִפְעֵלוּ, יִפְעֵלוּ, יִפְעֵלוּ, יִפְעֵלוּ), but when the form occurs in a syntactic pause (marked by a disjunctive accent – imperatores and duces), the pausal forms are always found (יִפְעֵלוּ or יִפְעֵלוּ, יִפְעֵלוּ or יִפְעֵלוּ, יִפְעֵלוּ or יִפְעֵלוּ). There are few exceptions to this rule. Occasionally one finds יִפְעֵלוּ in a syntactic context or יִפְעֵלוּ in a syntactic pause. A close examination of these exceptions reveals that the accentuation-punctuation in the manuscript does not correspond to the syntactic accentuation-punctuation demanded; where יִפְעֵלוּ has a disjunctive accent, there should be a conjunctive accent, and similarly, where יִפְעֵלוּ

has a conjunctive accent, there should be a disjunctive accent. These exceptions are sometimes the result of rhythm or attraction to nearby forms. Cf., e.g., (וְנִסְתָּהּ וְנִסְתָּהּ אוּפְסָתָהּ וְנִסְתָּהּ (נגעים ד, ז). Although only two of the verbs have a disjunctive accent (וְנִסְתָּהּ וְנִסְתָּהּ), all four are pausal forms. It appears in this instance that both attraction and rhythm were at work in transforming all the forms into pausal forms.

One regularly finds a form with a vowel in both context and pause in three categories: (1) the inflection of the *Huphal* conjugation (הוֹזְכְּרוּ (הוֹזְכְּלוּ); (2) the noun class פְּלִי - פְּלִי (דְּפִי); (3) part of the noun class פְּלִי - פְּלִי (e.g., גְּמִי). The pausal form is dominant in all syntactic environments in these categories.

Group B: vowel vs. vowel

1. *pathah* vs. *games*: Words with *pathah* in the contextual form and a *games* in the pausal form (e.g., שְׁחַט, שְׁחָט) behave in a regular fashion: the form with *pathah* (שְׁחַט, שְׁחָט or שְׁחֹט) occurs in a syntactic context or a secondary pause whereas the form with *games* (שְׁחָט; שְׁחֹט) is found in a primary pause. One must, however, point out that a surprising phenomenon is found at the end of a mishna – in only a third of the examples is a *games* marked, as against two-thirds of the examples in which *pathah* continues to be pointed.

The following general picture emerges:

synt. context	second. pause	primary pause (<i>athnah</i>)	primary pause (end of mishna)
שְׁחַט־	שְׁחָט	שְׁחֹט	שְׁחָט / שְׁחֹט
יִין־	יִין	יִין	יִין / יִין

Very infrequently one finds a word pointed with *pathah* in all the environments, e.g., אַחַת, אַחַת, אַחַת, אַחַת.

2. *pathah* vs. *šere*: in context one finds mainly *pathah*: יִירַע־, אִירַע־; in secondary pause or primary pause one finds on the whole *šere*: לִטְפִיחַ, יִמְרַח, but also *pathah*: יִקְצַע.

3. *seghol* vs. *games*: In this category (e.g., שְׁמֹן, שְׁמֹרֶת) the contextual form is dominant in all environments: שְׁמֹן, שְׁמֹן, שְׁמֹן־.

Summary

In general, the grammatical rules which apply to MS Parma B are – a contextual form in the environment of a syntactic context, and a pausal form in the environment of a syntactic pause. These findings correspond, to a large extent, to what is known from several other manuscripts of Rabbinic literature that have been examined (e.g., MS Parma A = Codex de Rossi 138). Notwithstanding, the similarity of MS Parma B to the Biblical Tiberian tradition is astonishing. Even though there are slight variations testifying to a mixing of different traditions in MS Parma B, these are not sufficient to change our conclusion.

Michael Weitzman

Usage and Avoidance of the Term "העם הנבחר"

The election of Israel seems at first glance central concept in Judaism. Yet the root *bhr* is hardly ever used about Israel in Tannaitic and Amoraic literature. Furthermore, in biblical passages where *bhr* clearly refers to Israel, an alternative meaning is often proposed in the Midrashim; Onkelos too rejects the sense "choose", with its implied exclusivity, and writes instead (preserving an ancient meaning of *bhr*) that God "delighted" (*'itre'e*) in Israel. (The translator of the Peshitta Psalter, in contrast with contemporary rabbinic sources, invents new references to his community's election.) The rabbis apparently dropped the biblical terminology of election in reaction to the emergence of sectarian communities that each proclaimed itself the elect. In the third century CE, however, the restoration of election terminology begins with R. Humnuna's revival of the blessing "Who chose us from all the nations". Thereafter, the increasing frequency of *bhr* in relation

to Israel can be traced in the Midrashim (where Israel's election is generally justified rather than simply asserted), Targumim and liturgy. This growing emphasis on the election of Israel signifies not arrogance but a defence against the ascendancy of the Church, whose claim to have displaced the Jews as the elect could no longer be countered through mere silence.

Luis Giron

A Preliminary Description of the Language of Canticles Rabba: Sample Edition

According to the *Sefer Hamegorot*, the *Midrash Rabbah* on Canticles (CR) was composed about 600 C.E. The description of the literary language of this time in Palestine was undertaken by Prof. Y. Kutscher; one of his students, M. Sokolof, studied the language of *Genesis Rabbah* (GR) according to Vat. Ms. Ebr. 30.

In a preliminary comparison of the two midrashim, we see that the main lines and major trends characterizing GR against the language of the Tannaim are not present at all, or only very slightly, in the language of CR: there is no construct infinitive without *lamed* or with pronominal suffix acting as the subject of the infinitive; there is no first person plural employed as singular, neither in the independent personal pronouns nor in the imperfect; there is no participle acting as perfect; there is no proof at all of the usage of the ending *-t* for the third person feminine perfect of strong verbs, and we find the *ketib* לֹא־מָר only once or twice against hundreds of לוֹמַר.

On the other hand, all but one of the orthographic phenomena characterizing Tannaitic Hebrew are present in the language of CR, the one missing being the change of final *mem* to final *nun* in words like אָדָם or שְׁלוֹם. After further research we may have to change some of the

statements concerning the date when or the place where this midrash was composed.

For this paper we use basically the text of CR according to Vat. Ms. Ebr. 76 and the *variae lectiones* of the mss.: Munich 50, 2, Oxford Seld. sup. 102, Cambridge add. 1504, and most of the fragments from the Cairo geniza. As a reference point we also introduce the readings of the Vilna edition. At the end of the paper we show a practical example from the edition of CR we are now preparing.

Israel Yeivin

Interchange of Roots in the Language of the Mishna and Piyyut

There are two classes of such interchanges: (1) conversion of a weak root into another weak root; (2) conversion of a weak root into a strong root, which generally means insertion of a third, strong root letter into a root which originally consisted of two strong letters only. The author records all the occurrences of changes of both classes, listing them according to their verbal conjugations and the alphabetical order of the converted letters. We find 2.5 times more conversions in Piyyut than in Mishnaic Hebrew. Among these conversions, those of the first class are 2 times more frequent in the Piyyut than in the Mishna, while changes of the second class are more than 3 times more frequent in Piyyut than in the Mishna. The reason for this difference may be that changes of the first class are more often caused by linguistic factors, while those of the second class are sometimes caused by non-linguistic ones (mainly the influence of Biblical verses). Since the language of the Mishna was closer to the spoken language than to that of the Piyyut, changes of the first class are more frequent in it.

Chaim E. Cohen

Compound Nouns With the Possessive Pronoun in Tannaitic Hebrew

This article deals with the distribution of the possessive pronoun in Tannaitic Hebrew when it occurs with set phrases. As is known, Mishnaic Hebrew developed an independent possessive pronoun: **שֶׁל־**. It is shown here that the use of this independent pronoun is limited mainly to those phrases that are technical terms, e.g.: **עשירית האיפה** שלהן (Tos. Ḥagigah 2, 9), otherwise, the suffixed forms are used, e.g.: **בעל חובו** (Peah 8, 8).

This rule is very well exemplified by the phrase **בית־אב**, which we find in all three possibilities: (1) when it is not a standing phrase at all but just a free compound of two nouns e.g.: **הלכה רגל הראשון לעשות בבית־** אביה (p'saḥim 8, 1); (2) when it is a standing phrase (in the meaning of 'a family'), like: **ואומרין לפניה דברים שאינה כדאי לשומען היא וכל משפחת** בית־אביה (Soṭah 1, 4); – in these two cases the suffixed form is used, (3) but when this very phrase is a halachic term (in the meaning of a priest's division in the Temple), it occurs only with the independent pronoun, e.g.: **כל שמכיר את משמרתו ואת בית־אב שלו** (Tos. Ta'anith 2, 2).

Takamitsu Muraoka

The Nominal Clause in Late Biblical Hebrew and Mishnaic Hebrew

This research attempts to identify patterns of the nominal clause to be found in Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH) and Mishnaic Hebrew (MH), and to compare the results in respect of each layer. The corpus chosen for

the purpose of the research comprises Ezra and Nehemiah (excluding the so-called Nehemiah memoirs) for the former, and the Temple Scroll from Qumran, the tractates Berakhot and Shabbat according to the Kaufman manuscript, segments of Mekhilta de R. Ishmael, and Sifre Deuteronomy for the latter.

The criteria used for the purpose of classifying nominal clauses include (a) the number of core constituents, which has relevance to the question of the so-called "copula"; (b) the word-class of the constituents, which can be substantive, adjective, pronoun – demonstrative or pronominal – and prepositional phrase, and non-substantivised participle; (c) their relative sequence, and (d) the definiteness or otherwise of some categories of the core constituents.

An attempt was also made to address the question of semantic relationship between the two major core constituents, i.e. whether it is that of description or identification, both terms understood in a way different from their conventional understanding and likewise to see whether there can be established some correlation between these semantic categories and various nominal clause patterns.

Some points of general interest are: (1) the need to deal adequately with special "registers" such as lists, measurements, formulaic sayings; (2) a gradual increase over the years in the use of the participle in nominal clauses; (3) the possible need to recognise the existence on one-member nominal clauses; (4) the near-total absence of the circumstantial clause in MH; (5) the adherence, *c o n t r a* Bendavid, of the 2nd person pers. pronouns to the general rule governing the use of the pronouns in the other persons; (6) the non-admissibility of D. Cohen's thesis regarding the existential/locational clause with a prepositional phrase; (7) the virtual non-existence of pure "copulaic" use of the demonstrative pronoun *אֵלֶּהּ*, *אֵינֶה* etc.; (8) some interesting and subtle differences, apart from (2), between LBH and BH; and (9) the affinity between the language of the Temple Scroll and Classical BH.

Mordechay Mishor

Talmudic Hebrew in the Light of Epigraphy

The language of the epigraphic sources of the Talmudic period is not identical with the literary sources attributed to this time. We may assume that the literary sources represent but one of the varieties of Hebrew which were actually in use.

MS. Oxford d.69, a Hebrew letter from Palestine written in the 6th (or perhaps the 5th) century C.E., i.e., towards the end of the Amoraic period, testifies to the use of the Hebrew language in Palestine outside the rabbinical academies.

In the present article some of the particularities of this letter are pointed out: the use of the title רב (not רבי) before a proper name, the adverb קודם not followed by ל-, the spelling כאן (not כן), the exclusive use of the independent accusative pronoun, the occurrence of כולום (instead of כלום), the demonstrative pronoun זה with a definite article, and some rare uses of prepositions. Most of these features are also attested in the literary sources, but they have commonly been considered either alien to the Palestinian "type" or late developments, inserted in mediaeval manuscripts by careless copyists.

Shlomo Naeh

Notes to Tannaitic Hebrew Based on Codex Vat. 66 of the Sifra

Since Sifra is the most coherent and crystalized representative of Tannaitic literature, and since it has an outstanding witness as Codex Vat. 66, a systematic research of its language will undoubtedly increase our understanding of Tannaitic Hebrew in general.

Nine minor topics were selected from an overall research, in order to illustrate this statement; and although each one stands autonomously, one may gather from them some general conclusions.

The impact of non-grammatical forces, such as poetics and pragmatics, on the written language is exemplified in several notes: the use of Biblical words for aesthetical or literary needs (אשר; זאת-אומרת), and the powerful influence of analogy on word-derivation (איזה; מעוט; יסיכה).

The study of pause (הפסק) according to the vocalization in Cod. Vat. 66 reveals stress as the decisive phonological factor: words are vocalized as pausal forms only if a change in stress is involved.

Another topic deals with an interesting orthographic phenomenon: Cod. Vat. 66 is the only traditional witness for the ex-Messoretic orthography עזואל, which is found here in Tannaitic context, while in Biblical citations the expected form עזאול is used.

Other treatments in the article are lexical: a study of the idiom הוד שער and its relation to similar idioms: חוט השערה, שיערה, חוט; an everyday term: תבנית הזהב, probably means "blond hair"; and the form קווט as an expanded participle from קו"ט, the Aramaic doublet from Hebrew קו"צ, in a Midrashic commentary to Lev. 20, 23: כאדם - באוקץ במ - שהוא קווט במזוננו.

Talma Zurawel

The קָטַל/קָטַל/קָטַל Patterns in Maimonides' Autograph to the Mishna

This article discusses the two-syllable מלעיל nouns appearing in *The Autograph of Maimonides* - Commentary to the Mishna. The material is presented descriptively. Other sources of Mishnaic Hebrew are alluded to only where there is a matter of particular interest. There is a group

of nouns which appear in *The Autograph of Maimonides* as קָטַל, while in other sources they appear in the קָטַל pattern. The קָטַל inflection corresponds to that of פִּאֲרַמָּה ב, which is also among the representatives of the Eastern type of Mishnaic Hebrew.

Menahem Zevi Kaddari

Syntax of *Harbe* in Mishnaic Hebrew

Attributive *harbe*: in Tannaitic Hebrew *harbe* is post-positd to its nominal head, e.g. *melakhot harbe* (Sabbat 7, 2). Even in cases of reversed word-order in the printed texts, in the major manuscripts the head *harbe* sequence is found (e.g. *harbe reshuyot*, the Kaufmann ms.: *reshuyot harbe*, Sanhedrin 4, 5). In Amoraic Hebrew (of the Babylonian Talmud), the prenuclear position predominates, possibly due to the influence of Babylonian Aramaic (e.g. *harbe me'erot*, like *tuva nehore* in Aramaic, b. Berakhot 52b). The grammatical categories of the head noun of *harbe* are as follows: its gender varies (masc., fem.); its number is pl., if it is a count noun, sg., if non-count noun.

Adverbial *harbe*: (1) *harbe mi-* functions as gradation adverbial (comparative), e.g. *harbe mishelosh me'ot pesahim* (Tosefta Pesahim 4, 1) – “more than...” (2) There is no definite evidence of *harbe* as intensifier in Mishnaic Hebrew (neither in the language of the Tanna'im nor of the Amora'im).

On the other hand, substantivised *harbe* functions as predicate, or subject or object. Its function as existential quantifier is also considered.

Nouns with Double Formation in the Plural in Tannaitic Hebrew

This article is a study of the distribution of seventy-nine nouns, the plural of which is found in Tannaitic texts in double forms: $-\bar{o}t/\bar{im}$. These are divided into two groups:

- (a) 63 nouns, in their singular form ending with the morpheme $-\emptyset$
- (b) 16 nouns ending with $-t/-\bar{a}$.

In general, it may be noted that in most occurrences there is no free distribution. Some of the main categories are as follows:

1. Mishnaic Hebrew prefers בְּכֹרִי in the construct form, e.g. $\text{בְּכֹרֹת, בכורות; שְׁטָרִי, שטרות; אֵילָנוֹת, אילנות}$. In several nouns this occurs only when the two nouns are derived from the same root, e.g. $\text{פִּירֵי פִירוֹת, קוּלֵי קוּלוֹת}$.
2. The two forms are used for semantic differentiation, e.g. $\text{לוֹחוֹת} = \text{Tables of the Decalogue, but לוֹחוּיִם} = \text{boards; תְּהִלִּים} = \text{Psalms, but תְּהִילוֹת} = \text{praises}$.
3. The two forms are in complementary distribution according to their state:

	a	b	c	d
absolute state	בְּכֹרֹת	שְׁטָרוֹת	מְרָאוֹת	שְׁנַיִם
construct state	בְּכֹרִי	שְׁטָרִי	מְרָאוֹת	שְׁנֵי
with pronominal suffix	בְּכֹרֵי	שְׁטָרוֹת	מְרָאֵי	שְׁנוֹת