Biblical Hebrew and Liturgy

Joshua Blau

The Morphology of Nouns Terminating in Paragogic (Directional) –āh

According to the assumption of a general penultimate stress and the (later) shift of stress from a penultimate, short, open syllable to the ultima (with reduction of the short syllable), one would expect nouns terminating in paragogic –āh to have forms like מִזְרָ֫חָה in pause, מִזְרָחָ֫ה in context. By re-interpretation because of external similarity, original pausal forms (like מִזְרָ֫חָה) were connected with the absolute (such as מִזְרָח), and original contextual forms (such as מִזְרָחָ֫ה, which, by the way, is the only relic of contextual forms of this type) with the construct and influenced by them. Thus, absolute forms like מִדְבָּ֫רָה (influenced by גַּ֫תָה, מִדְבָּר), חָרְשָׁה (influenced by חֹ֫רֶשׁ), פֶּ֫תְחָה (influenced by פֶּ֫תַח), חָרְשָׁה (influenced by חֹ֫רֶשׁ), פֶּ֫תְחָה (influenced by גַּ֫ת) came into being alongside construct forms like מִדְבָּ֫רָה (influenced by מִדְבַּר). This re-interpretation is chronologically quite late, since forms such as גַּ֫תָה and מִדְבָּ֫רָה with short vowels in open penult syllables were only possible quite late, presumably under Aramaic influence.

Ze'ev Ben-Ḥayyim

Comments on the Use of the Term "Proto-Samaritan"

In this paper the author reviews the use of the term "proto-Samaritan". Following a brief survey of the literature on the nature of the Samaritan Pentateuch and its relation to the Tiberian text, the author examines in detail the recent use of the appellation "proto-

Samaritan" by D. N. Freedman and K. A. Mathews (*The Paleo-Hebrew Leviticus Scroll*) in describing the orthography of certain Dead Sea scrolls. The present paper criticizes this use of "proto-Samaritan", and shows that, in the light of the history of the Hebrew language, it is misleading.

Michael P. Weitzman

Biblical Elements in Jewish Prayer

Biblical material enters the Jewish prayer book in three forms: complete units (mainly Psalms), strings of biblical verses, and free compositions in biblical language.

While the book of Psalms contains both praises and laments, psalms of praise alone feature in Jewish prayer. Psalms of lament or entreaty were excluded because of their often bitter tone. The rabbinic idea that one must praise God even in adversity has bibical precedents and reflects courtly speech. An Israelite appealing to the king began not with complaint but with the cry: "Save!"

Calls upon God to "save" occur frequently in lament psalms. Strings of such verses provide the closest acceptable substitute for the psalms of lament, and occur in many prayers (e.g. *U-va lě-Ṣiyyon*). Other functions of verse strings are less frequent.

The free compositions dwell likewise not on men's suffering but on the salvation and other gifts of God. The language of public prayer is biblical in vocabulary and accidence, though influenced by the Aramaic kaddish. The main non-biblical feature is the heaping-up of synonyms, far beyond the scale of biblical parallelism.

Of the three forms, free composition offers the greatest flexibility of expression. It is also the oldest form, if the destruction of the second Temple is taken as the starting point. Complete psalms and verse strings in public prayer are first attested in the Tractate Sopherim.

Jewish suffering in the Middle Ages renewed interest in the lament psalms, on which some *piyyuṭim* were modelled. The main themes of Jewish prayer, however, had already been fixed: the praise and salvation of God.

Gad B. Sarfatti

The Inscriptions of the Biblical Period and Mishnaic Hebrew

1 The aim of this paper is to look for linguistic features – colloquial or archaic – common to the ancient inscriptions and to M[ishnaic] H[ebrew], but absent from B[iblical] H[ebrew] or very rare.

1. Two words in Arad 24 are spelled with *beth* instead of *pe*. This shift is extremely rare in BH but not uncommon in MH. Perhaps the difference between the voiced and voiceless sounds was clearly felt in the Biblical period, and became blurred later on: the scribal errors of the Arad ostracon could be forerunners of the late pronunciation.

2. The Proto-Semitic ending *-at* of the third person singular feminine perfect is found a few times in BH while it is usual in MH for verbs *tertia yod*. In the Siloam Tunnel inscription we have such an anding in היִת.

3.1. The second person singular masculine suffix is susually *-kā* in BH, spelled ךָ- with qamaṣ. In MH the usual suffix is *-āk*. The epigraphic material supplies us with nearly fifty examples of the ending ךְ-. Since final vowels are always written in epigraphic Hebrew, the inscriptions prove that the form *-āk* of the suffix is ancient Hebrew, and is not derived from Aramaic.

3.2.   The second person singular masculine perfect is found in the inscriptions nine times, five times with the ending תה– and four times ת–. In MH the usual spelling is תה–. The long ending of the inscriptions conforms to MH, and the short ending proves that the Biblical spelling is also an old tradition.

4.1.   On two seals ascribed to the 7th cent. B.C.E. we read שׂר העיר = 'the city governor', written with the definite article as in BH, whereas on four pots from the southern border of Judaea dating from an earlier time are incised the letters לשׂרער (presumably = לשׂר עיר) without an article, as in the parallel Mishnaic expression חבר עיר = 'the city Sage' (or: 'the city council'). The inscriptions on the pots omit the article, following in this case a kind of isogloss which links Phoenician to MH.

4.2.   In five of the Lachish ostraca we find the expression עבדך כלב, where the determined substantive עבדך is followed by a non-determined noun in apposition, כלב. In exactly the parallel expression we read in 2 Ki 8:13 עבדך הכלב, with the apposition regularly determined. Perhaps in the Lachish sherds we have a colloquial form, sometimes found in MH, such as עירובי ראשון, הכלב רע, הכהנים גדולים.

5.   On one of the Arad sherds we read אינגו יכולים = [אי]נגו יכלם, as part of the sentence 'The King of Judaea must know that we cannot send...'. This is standard MH, the same meaning being expressed in BH by לא נוכל.

6.   On the Yavneh-Yam sherd we read: קוצר היה עבדך = 'your servant was harvesting'. The composite tense formed by the participle and the verb היה, though found in the Bible, is mainly a feature of MH.

7.   In two of the Arad sherds (16–17) we find the preposition ל after the verb שלח. This is rare in the Bible, which normally uses in such a context the preposition אל, but is standard in MH.

8. BH commonly uses איש as an indefinite pronoun, 'anyone', 'someone', whereas MH (and Phoenician) use אדם. The sentence from the Siloam Tomb inscription ארור אדם אשר יפתח את זה = 'Cursed be he that opens this', and the words of Lachish 4 אין שם אדם = 'There is nobody there' conform to MH use.

9. עוד is used in Hebrew as an adverb or a conjunction. In MH it is sometimes used as a substantive: it can be the subject of the sentence, and has a dual form עדווייך. The substantival use of עוד is found also in some of the Arad ostraca.

The material that we have collected is scanty, and not all of it lends itself to an unambiguous interpretation. We should anyhow like to state three points.

1. The inscriptions reveal vernacular forms that are developed in MH (par. 1, 3.1, 4.2, 5, 6, 7, 9);

2. We find in the inscriptions old linguistic features, some of them found in Phoenician, which are revived in MH (par. 2, 4.1, 8);

3. The inscriptions testify to the existence of equivalent forms, perhaps belonging to different dialects, which are employed in some of the later layers of Hebrew (par. 3.2).

Menaḥem Z. Kaddari

ראה בּ– As an Expression of Empathy in Biblical Hebrew

1. N(oun) P(hrase)2 = [−human]

ויך באנשי בית שמש כי ראו בארון ה' (ש"א ו', יט) – "[The Lord] struck at the men of Bet-shemesh because they rejoiced when they saw the Ark of the Lord" (1 Samuel 6:19).

ונראה בשמחתכם והם יבשו (יש' סו, ה) – "...so that we may share your joy. But theirs will be the shame" (Isaiah 66:5).

כי אמרה אל־אראה במות הילד (בר׳ כא, טז) – "For she thought, 'Let me not look on as the child dies'" (Genesis 21:16).

הרגני נא הרג... ואל־אראה ברעתי (במ׳ יא, טו) – "Kill me rather, I beg You, and let me see no more of my wretchedness!" (Numbers 11:15).

2. NP 2 (or a part of it) = [+human]

a. and NP 1 = [+divine]

כי אמרה כי־ראה ה׳ בעניי כי עתה יאהבני אישי (בר׳ כט, לב) – "For she declared, 'it means: 'The Lord has seen my affliction; for now my husband will love me'" (Genesis 29:32).

ויצא אל־אחיו וירא בסבלתם וירא איש מצרי... ויך את־המצרי... (שמ׳ ב, יא–יב) – "He went out to his kinsfolk and shared their suffering [in their labors]. He saw an Egyptian... and he struck down the Egyptian..." (Exodus 2:11–12).

b. and NP 1 = [–divine]

ה׳ לי בעזרי ואני אראה בשנאי (תה׳ קיח, ז) – "With the Lord on my side as my helper, I will see the downfall of my foes" (Psalms 118:7).

ברבות רשעים ירבה־פשע וצדיקים במפלתם יראו (מש׳ כט, טז) – "When the wicked increase, offenses increase, but the righteous will see their downfall" (Proverbs 29:16).

Mishnaic Hebrew and Aramaic

Shraga Abramson

On the Form of the Letter ח
According to the Halakha

The Hebrew script has developed like other scripts freely, without any special rules how to write it.

The Talmud speaks of being careful of the proper shaping of the letter ח which can be confused, e.g., ה, ת etc. But as far as the ח is concerned, the Talmud says (מנחות כט, ע"ב): אמר רב אשי חזינא להו לספרי דלקני דבי רב דמחטרי להו לגגו דחית וכו'. The explanation of מחטרי according to Rashi is that we put a small stroke on the left side of the ח derived from חוטר.

According to R. Tam, מחטרי is derived from חטרתא, a camel's hump, e.g., we put a sign similar to the camel's hump on the middle of the upper part of the ח. The early commentators of the Talmud and the Halakha subscribe to one of these opinions.

The present author shows that there is a third opinion, that of R. Hananel, who explains מחטרי as R. Tam does, but thinks of the double hump of certain camels. Therefore, the ח has two humps from both sides of the ח, a form which can be found in early manuscripts (in פשר נחום the ח is written in accordance with R. Hananel's opinion).

The same is true for the early printed editions of Rabbinic literature, which show both forms of the ח.

The author also corrects some errors in texts of the ראשונים.

Moshe Azar

The Adverbial Negators אין and לא in Mishnaic Hebrew

The aim of the paper is to describe in a comprehensive and synchronic manner the usage of the two principal adverbial negators אין and לא in the Mishnaic text.

The severe grammatical constraint imposed upon the usage of אין is explained first. It cannot appear without being followed by subject + nominal predicate, as resulting from its historical development: it served first to negate the existence of the referent denoted by the subject, and, at a second stage, began to negate a subject + its nominal predicate. Contamination of two structures explains the lack of subject after אין.

לא is shown to be the 'general' negator, which is used to negate not only verbal phrase clauses, but also different kinds of nominal clauses and phrases. Special attention has been given to the frequent phenomenon of 'repeated' negation.

Yoel Eliztur

Meeting-points between Reality and Language in Tannaitic Hebrew and the Question of the Ancienty of the Tosefta

In research carried out by the author concerning subjects of day-to-day life in Mishnaic and Talmudic literature, the Tosefta was found time and again to be unique among all other Tannaitic sources in its idioms and ways of expression, as follows:

(1) באר instead of בור. In all Rabbinic sources, the distinction between באר and בור is well preserved; the former always means 'well' while the latter means 'cistern'. In the Tosefta, according to all its witnesses, we find frequently באר in both functions. (2) דות. In Mishnaic manuscripts, a pit (used as storage) built with stones is called חדות, but in the Tosefta, as in the Babylonian Talmud, the form of the word is דות. The origin of this form is apparently Akkadian. (3) **A mixture of בור ודות** with בור שיח ומערה. In the Mishnah בור ודות are always storage pits while בור שיח ומערה are names for different types of water cisterns. The Tosefta mixes all of them into one complex: לא את הבאר ולא את השיח ולא שבתוכו המערות את ולא הדותיות את ולא היציעין את. (4) דות without בור. In the Mishnah and Baraythoth of the Bab. Talmud בור ודות are a regular pair, while in the Jerusalem Talmud חרות <//דות> always stands alone. One finds דות 5 times in the Tosefta and 4 times באר ודות. (5) דות in the wall. Contrary to all other Rabbinic sources, the Tosefta has a built דות in the house wall besides the dug one. (6) ממל – the lower stone. In the oil-press, מֶמֶל (from מל״ל, cf. the Talmudic identification – "ממל מפרכתא" Bava Bathra 67b) is the upper stone which crushes the olives laid down upon the "ים" (the big monolith upon which the ממל revolves). Only the Tosefta speaks about olives which are placed "לתוך הממל" [In addition, the Tosefta mentions in the process of the oil-press "ומהלך בהן שתי וערב", a term which seems to be influenced by the wine-press process].

Beside the data displayed above, one could collect other linguistic and idiomatic items in which the Tosefta is unique among Tannaitic sources, such as:

(1) אונקלוס with the Bab. Talmud, contrary to עקילס of the Jer. Talmud; the name in the Tosefta has no connection with any Bible translation. (2) Pl. suffix ־ין as a rule, with the exception of מודים, as in the Bab. Talmud, different from other sources. (3) הגרמה in the rules of ritual slaughtering, the term is found only in the Bab. Talmud and the Tosefta. (4) אבולים = 'gates', probably means gatehouse; this word which is found once in the Tosefta is well known in Babylonian Aramaic (from Akkadian). (5) בית הקברות in the Tosefta and the Bab.

Talmud parallels the original קברות/בין הקברות in Mishnaic manuscripts. The origin of בית הקברות could be understood in the light of Bab. Aramaic. (6) One may point out a line of events in which the Tosefta seems to use Amoraic Hebrew instead of Tannaitic Hebrew: יותר מן ,חלק ב- ,בכדי ,שנה/שנו ,ואע"פ ,ומה ,אלמלי לא ,אסור לו.

The present investigation is relevant to the process of oral transmission of the Tosefta in the Yeshivoth of the Geonim, as discussed by E. S. Rosenthal and S. Lieberman. The oral transmission could have influenced the language of the Baraythoth of the Tosefta, as it did in the baraythoth of the Bab. Talmud some centuries before.

Moshe Bar-Asher

The Conjugations of Tannaitic Hebrew
(A Morphological Study)

1. This paper examines the conjugations of Tannaitic Hebrew as reflected in the Tannaitic documents that have been investigated to date. In our opinion, there are 14 conjugations, six of which are regular.

Regular Conjugations:

      pā‘al (qal) – nip̱‘al

      pi“ēl   – nitpa“al

      hip̱‘īl   – hup̱‘al

Irregular Conjugations:

      pu“al

      nup̱‘al, nippᵉ“al

      pē‘ēl (pā‘ēl) – nitpā‘al

      pō‘ēl   – nitpō‘al

      nittap̱‘al

2. The six regular conjugations may be divided into three pairs, of which one form expresses the active voice and the other the passive voice. Nip̱‘al and nitpa“al also preserve the reflexive voice.

3. There are eight participial forms belonging to the regular conjugations:

pō‘ēl – pā‘ūl – nip‘ăl
mᵉpa“ēl – mᵉpu“ăl – miṯpa“ēl
map‘īl – mup‘ăl

The past and future of the pā‘al (qal) internal passive already disappeared in Biblical Hebrew; the pā‘al (qal) internal passive participle, however, remained (פָּעוּל pā‘ūl), and expressed the stative perfect. The same is true in the derived conjugation D of Tannaitic Hebrew, where the past and future forms of the pu“al internal passive of pi“ēl disappeared (see below §4), but the participle survived as a living feature of the language.

4. The group of irregular conjugations includes eight different conjugational types. Pu“al (past and future forms) is on its way out of the language; many of the examples are due to corruption by copyists, e.g., זוּקְקָה "it was linked" (Nega‘im 4:5). The vocalizer of MS Kaufmann erroneously pointed zuqqāqā(h) for zōqᵉqāh "it links it" (זוֹקְקָה), the latter being attested in other manuscripts. Occasionally some pu“al forms are in reality "disguised" pi“ēl forms that have undergone phonetic changes. For example, in נֻמֵּיתִי "I spoke" (Yeḇamoṯ 16:7, nimmēṯī > nummēṯī; the shift of /i/ > /u/ is a result of the assimilation of /i/ to the consonant /m/. Unlike the forms of the past and future, the pu“al participle, on the other hand, is preserved (see above §3).

5. Nittap‘al is a conjugation that has been borrowed into Hebrew from the Aramaic ’ittap‘al. The initial nun, a clear marker of the passive voice, was prefixed in the process of borrowing into Mishnaic Hebrew. Only one example has turned up in Tannaitic literature, the I-y verb nittōsap̄, e.g., נִתּוֹסְפוּ "they were added" (‘Eruḇin 7:7). Apparently there are a few examples in Amoraic Hebrew that also belong to I-y verbs: nittōḵaḥ (נִתּוֹכַח) "it was disputed", nittōqad̲ (נִתּוֹקַד) "it was kindled". It seems that the conjugation penetrated Hebrew from Aramaic at the end

of the period when Hebrew was still a spoken language, and for this reason it did not take root.

6.   Nup̲‘al and nipp^e‘al are variants of nip̲‘al.   The former arose apparently in I-n verbs in order to distinguish between forms such as niṭṭalti (נְטַלְתִּי) "I took" (pi‘‘ēl) and niṭṭalti (נִטַּלְתִּי) "I was taken" (nip̲‘al). The /u/ vowel was transferred to nip̲‘al in order to mark the passive (cf. the /u/ in hup̲‘al). From I-n verbs this form spread to other classes of weak verbs – II-w (in verbs similar to I-n): נוֹעַר nu‘‘ar "he was awakened" for נֵעוֹר nē‘ōr (which is more regular); I-y: נוּלַּד nullad̲ "he was born"; and also the strong verb נוחלק nuḥlaq "he was opposed".

7. Nipp^e‘al is attested primarily in II-w verbs. An original form such as נָד̲וֹן nād̲ōn "it was discussed" was replaced by נִדּוֹן niddōn on analogy with the future yiddōn. This conjugation can also be found in I-n and geminate verbs that are inflected like II-w, such as נִצּוֹל niṣṣōl "he was saved" (alongside niṣṣāl), נִמּוֹק nimmōq "it rotted" (a variant of nāmāq). Only one example of nipp^e‘al has been discovered in the strong verb; one reads in the tradition of MS Parma B (de-Rossi 497): נִיטְּמֵאתִי niṭṭ^emēti "I became defiled" (Ṭeharot̲ 5:9 [2x]), נִיטְּמֵאתָה niṭṭ^emēt̲ā "she became difiled" (ibid. [2x]).

8. There is disagreement as to the origin of the irregular conjugations pē‘ēl (pā‘ēl) and nitp̲ā‘al. It has been argued that they are remants of the old conjugations fā‘ala and tafā‘ala (which are preserved in Arabic), where the shift of ā > ō did not take place (S. Morag; he first considered them Aramaic forms). Yet, it has also been argued that these conjugations are variants of pi‘‘ēl and nitpa‘‘al, in which quantitative metathesis has occurred: the gemination of the second radical preceded by a short vowel was replaced by a simplified consonant (non-geminated) preceded by a long vowel (Z. Ben-Ḥayyim). Without entering into the diachronic argument over these forms, we relate them synchronically to pi‘‘ēl and nitpa‘‘al. It should be stressed that there are alternations between the pairs within the traditions

themselves, e.g., נִיתְאָכְלוּ "they were consumed" (Tamid 2:1 [MS Kaufmann]) and נִיתְאַכְּלוּ (idem 2:5). Moreover, the past tense forms pē'ēl, pī'ēl (and not pā'ēl) should be noted, e.g., רֵיקֵן rēqēn "he emptied": רֵיקְנוּ ('Oqaṣin 1:5), כִּיפֵּר kīpēr "he atoned" (MS Vatican 66 to Sipra, passim). These forms are similar in their structure to the forms בֵּרֵךְ bērēx "he blessed", תֵּאֵר tē'ēr "he described", and נִחַם niḥam "he comforted", and are closer in structure to pi"ēl than to pā'ēl. We also mention מְאוֹכָלוֹת me'ōxālōt "consumed" (Tamid 5:5 [MS Kaufmann]) which is identical in form to מְבוֹרָכוֹת mebōrāxot "blessed", the pu"al participle. Some of the forms in these conjugations are certainly not early, but rather later derivations from substantives, e.g., רֵיקֵן "he emptied" from רֵיקָם/רֵיקָן "empty", and נִשְׁתַּפָּה ("became sane") from שָׁפוּי "sane".

9. There may be one example of pō'ēl: סוֹעֲרַתּוּ sō'[a]rattū "she scattered it by storm" (Kil'ayim 5:7 [MS Parma A (de-Rossi 138)]). The passive nitpō'al, on the other hand, is attested in a few passages: נִתְיוֹאַשׁ nityō'aš "he despaired", נִתְרוֹקְנָה nitrōqena(h) "it was emptied" (Nedarim 10:2 in all witnesses), נִתְקוֹצָה nitqōṣā(h) "it was cleared of thorns" (Šebi'it 4:2 in old printed editions and in the reading tradition of North Africa). The last verb – nitqōṣā(h) – looks as if it has been influenced by the noun קוֹץ qōṣ "thorn". The other two verbs apparently are nitpā'al forms in which ā > ō, perhaps because of the back consonants 'alep (נִתְיוֹאַשׁ) and the qōp (נִתְרוֹקְנָה).

10. Thus, the eight irregular conjugations include pu"al, which is in the process of disappearing, and nittap'al, which is in the process of appearing, as well as six other conjugations: nup'al and nippe'al, which are variants of the regular nip'al; pē'ēl and nitpā'al; and pō'ēl and nitpō'al, which are least synchronic variations of pi"el and nitpa"al (pō 'ēl, it if exists as a conjugation, is not a phonetic variant of pi"ēl).

11. There is a series of five secondary forms in the derived conjugations D and D+ of Mishnaic Hebrew:

1. piʻēl – nitpaʻal
2. pilpel – nitpalpal (such as פִּרְנֵס "provide", תִּרְגֵּם "translate",
and all quadriliterals)
3. pōlēl – nitpōlal
4. pēʻēl – nitpāʻal
5. (pōʻēl) – nitpōʻal

The first two pairs are used regularly, the last three are used rarely (pōlēl and nitpōlal occur in Mishnaic Hebrew primarily in Biblical verbs such as מְקוֹנְנוֹת "they lament" [Mo'ed Qaṭan 3:9]).

12. שַׁפְעֵל šapʻēl (which penetrated from Akkadian via Aramaic) and נִשְׁתַּפְעַל ništapʻal forms should be viewed in Mishnaic Hebrew as quadriliterals (like gilgēl "he rolled", nitgalgal "it was rolled") beginning with šin rather than as special conjugations. So too מְהַלְקְטִין "they scatter food" (Šabbat 24:3), which would appear to belong to the Aramaic conjugation הַפְעֵל (hapʻel), but in Mishnaic Hebrew is in reality a quadriliteral verb from the root h.l.q.t.

Nitpiʻʻal is attested in the Yemenite tradition, e.g., נִצְטַעֵר "he felt pain", which is a variant of נִתְפַּעַל. It occurs in the spoken language in verbs that come from Mishnaic Hebrew and not in texts of Mishnaic Hebrew itself.

Natan Braverman

An Examination of the Nature of the Vienna and Erfurt Manuscripts of the Tosefta

This paper supports the findings of H. Natan who, after studying the linguistic tradition of MS Erfurt to the Tosefta, concluded that certain linguistic phenomena of the Tosefta that differ from those found in MS Kaufmann to the Mishnah were, nonetheless, original and authentic. The paper adduces this support by way of an analysis of the

correlations between these two manuscripts of the Tosefta with respect to the incidence and distribution of certain interchangeable language structures.

The occurrence in the Tosefta of original dual structured expressions strengthens the conclusions of M. Bar-Asher and H. Natan that a variety of dialects and language forms existed during the Tannaitic period.

More generally, the parallel appearance of these phenomena and of other rare phenomena may also testify to the faithful transmission of MSS Vienna and Erfurt.

These correlations notwithstanding, there are differences between these two manuscripts with respect to both language and textual variants. According to S. Lieberman, these differences may by explained as reflecting differing traditions of the transmission of the Tosefta.

In contrast to the list of correlations, which speaks for the faithful transmission of these two manuscripts, the paper also collects evidence of various sorts of emendations that occur in both manuscripts – emendations on the basis of the Babylonian Talmud, emendations of commentary and translation, emendations involving the replacement of incomprehensible words with similarly sounding words that can be understood, as well as additions introduced as stylistic improvements.

Yoḥanan Breuer

"Palestinian" Forms in the Babylonian Talmud

The studies of Rabbinic Hebrew carried out over the last generation have in the main focused closely upon manuscripts of Tannaitic literature. A most significant finding of this research is that many forms found in the printed literature are late forms. Alternate forms

were used in the Rabbinic Hebrew period, forms that now have been uncovered in Tannaitic literary manuscripts.

The manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud have not as yet been adequately studied. Consequently, the forms appearing in the printed versions of the Talmud are often assumed to reflect the original Babylonian forms. Hence the impression is gained that the forms in the manuscripts of Tannaitic literature represent "Palestinian" forms, while those in the printed Talmud versions are the "Babylonian" forms.

This paper adduces a number of forms known only from Tannaitic manuscripts, with the aim of demonstrating that they serve in the Babylonian Talmud as well, as may be seen from Talmudic manuscripts. The following are the forms considered in the paper: (1) proclitic של; (2) plurals of nouns ending in ־ות; (3) תלמיד חכמים; (4) the plural form תרנוגלין.

The discussion indicates that these forms are not specifically "Palestinian", for from the very onset they appeared in the Babylonian Talmud as well. They are "original" forms, unlike those in the printed versions which are "late".

Even where different manuscripts of Tannaitic literature reveal dissimilar traditions, there exist parallel dissimilar traditions in the various Talmudic manuscripts as well. The following examples are relevant: קוטלן / קטלן; אוזמל / אזמל.

Eljakim Wajsberg

The Orthography of the Names Rabba and Rava: Rav Hai's and Rivalling Rules

In a well known responsum Rav Hai Gaon records orthography rules for the names of the Amoraim Rabba and Rava: Rabba = רבה, Rava = רבא. The present article deals with the difference between these spelling rules as stated by Rav Hai and their implementation in Talmudic manuscripts.

Orthography rules presuppose written texts, but the orally transmitted Talmudic texts were put into writing presumably no earlier than the 8th century and it is conceivable that different spelling rules emerged during the transition to written texts.

Indeed in both Yemenite manuscripts of Tractate Pesachim, MS Enelow 271 and MS Columbia X–893 T–14a, another orthographic system is discernible: most occurrences of Rabba are written רבא. In order to exclude the possibility that those occurrences are random mistakes, I take advantage of the fact that these manuscripts can be shown to have a common ancestor. My basic assumption is that readings shared by both manuscripts represent this common ancestor. It turns out that in this reconstructed text all the occurrences of the name Rabba were written רבא, contrary to Rav Hai's rule.

The deviations in the orthography of רבא in both manuscripts reveal their distinctive characteristics; in MS Columbia the deviations can be proven to be random errors, while in MS Enelow we find a strong correlation between the orthography רבה and the Amora Rabba, i.e., MS Enelow underwent a (limited) linguistic redaction in order to bring its readings into conformity with Rav Hai's rule.

Similar to the disagreement between the orthography rules of Rav Hai and the linguistic features in the Yemenite manuscripts are contradictions between interpretations and halachic decisions of Rav Hai and those that can be drawn from the versions of Tractate Pesachim in the Yemenite manuscripts. A similar exclusive use of רבאis found in the Yemenite MS Oxf. 2677 to Tractate Sukka, in spite of the fact that it differs slightly in style from the Yemenite manuscript to Tractate Pesachim.

It should be noted that many proper names in MS Sukka are spelled with final ה in conformity with the so called orthography of Erez-Israel, e.g., חייה, עקיבה; this refutes the possibility that the spelling רבא with א is an adaption by scribes to the supposed Babylonian spelling.

Louis Ḥiron

The Use of עתיד and סוף in the
Language of the Palestinian Amoraim

This paper deals with the use of the words עתיד and סוף in the language of the Palestinian Amoraim, as reflected in Midrash Song of Songs Rabbah (SSR), in comparison with their use in the language of the Tannaim.

<div align="center">עתיד</div>

First we must distinguish between the Mishnah and other Tannaitic works. In the Mishnah we find the structure עתיד + infinitive (עתיד לפעול) only 31 times, while in the rest of Tannaitic literature it appears 271 times (for example, 93 times in the Tosefta).

Although all the occurrences are in non-factitive sentences, their semantic values, as Mishor has stated, are: (1) declaration of hidden events; (2) expression of certainty; (3) expression of purpose; (4) indicative future (in some cases a syntactic pattern is required and in others it is not).

This structure obtains in SSR 37 times with similar values: certain future nine times, fulfilled future four times, expression of purpose six times, indicative future 18 times.

The structure עתיד + Imperfect (עתיד שיפעל) is not found in the Mishnah; it appears only six times in the works of the Tannaim, and twice in SSR.

The structure עתיד + participle (עתיד פועל) is very unusual in the language of the Tannaim (only once), but more common among the works of the Amoraim. In SSR there are two examples of this structure.

In sum, a comparison of the use of עתיד in SSR and in the works of the Tannaim (with the exception of the Mishnah) shows quite a similar picture, both in relation to frequency and to semantics.

The word סוף is used in two different ways: (1) in a construct chain with a noun or a pronominal suffix; and (2) serving as adverb whether with a preposition or without it

We limited our study to the first use, in which the construct chain with סוף serves as a subject in a nominal clause whose predicate is an infinitive or a phrase with –שׁ. We find: (1) סוף + noun or suffix + infinitive (סוף פלוני לפעול) twice in SSR; (2) סוף + noun or suffix + –שׁ + participle (סוף פלוני שׁ(הוא) פועל) twice in SSR; a third possibility, סוף + noun or suffix + participle (סוף פלוני פועל), is not attested in SSR.

We conclude that the use of both עתיד and סוף in the language of SSR (perhaps also in the language of the Palestinian Amoraim in general) does not differ from their use in the language of the Tannaim.

David Talshir

The Significance of Different Orthography
in Personal Names

The data seem to suggest a contradiction between the development of the theophoric names of the type יהוחנן, on the one hand, and the name יהושע, originally of the same type, on the other.

In the period of the Second Commonwealth a tendency evolved to restore the aspiration of the prefix in the theophoric names of the יוחנן type, under the influence of יַהְוֶה*: –יו was pronounced, or at least intended to be pronounced, –יהו. This process even affected names which were not originally prefixed with –יהו, e.g., יוסף.

The name יְהוֹשֻׁעַ, however, did not take part in this process because of individual changes: dissimilation in the first syllable resulted in a new form, which excluded it from the circle of theophoric names: (יְהוֹשֻׁעַ> יוֹשֻׁוּעַ > יֵשׁוּעַ. The form יֵשׁוּעַ spread all over Palestine. Nevertheless,

towards the end of the Tannaitic period, especially in the Galilee, a non-linguistic factor, namely, the ban of Jesus' name intervened: יֵשׁוּעַ disappeared, and יְהוֹשֻׁעַ (pronounced יְיֹשׁוּעַ) was restored.

Significantly, the orthography of the theophoric names in question in Tannaitic literature differs in the epigraphic material of the same period: in contrast to the Mishnaic pair יוֹחָנָן־יְהוֹשֻׁעַ stands the epigraphic יְהוֹחָנָן־יֵשׁוּעַ; it may indicate that the best manuscripts of the Mishna do not always give an accurate picture of the language of the Tannaim, but rather that of the Amoraim.

Shelomo Morag

On Some Lines of Similarity between Samaritan Hebrew and the Yemenite Tradition of Post-Biblical Hebrew

The paper deals with several lines of similarity between Samaritan Hebrew and the Yemenite tradition of post-Biblical Hebrew; the main part of the study is devoted to an analysis of the evidence we have for the *pāʿēl* and *nitpāʿēl* verbal stems in various traditions of Hebrew, primarily in the aforementioned two.

The appearance of these stems in the Yemenite tradition of post-Biblical Hebrew (henceforth: YT) was previously discussed by the writer in a paper published in *Tarbiẕ* vol. XXVI (1956/57), pp. 349–356 (an addendum to this paper appeared *ibid.*, vol. XXVII [1957/58], p. 556). In that paper a distinction was established between two categories into which forms of the *pāʿēl* and *nitpāʿēl* stems must be classified: (a) forms derived from *med. w/y* and *med. gem.* roots, e.g., *měṣāyēn* "(he) makes prominent, adorns", *měgāvēv* "(he) heaps"; (b) forms belonging to the strong verb, e.g., *měḥāṭěfīn* "(they) snatch". The first category will be henceforth denoted as *pāʿēl (a)* and the second as *pāʿēl (b)*. To the *pāʿēl*

(a) category also belong roots having *m* as their second radical and *n* as their third, e.g., *mězāmĕnīm* "(they) say grace (after a meal)".

In the paper appearing in this volume an attempt has been made to present an updated picture of the use of the two categories of *pāʕel* and *nitpāʕel* in YT, SH (=Samaritan Hebrew) and other traditions of Hebrew. A full inventory of the roots used in these stems is given, and the relative frequencies of their occurrence in the various traditions are presented.

The additional material that has accrued from the work at the Hebrew University Language Traditions Project shows that in YT (and in the Hebrew words integrated in the Judeo-Yemenite dialects) both *pāʕel (a)* and *pāʕel (b)* are definitely more frequent than had been previously assumed; this may indicate that the tradition here reflects a layer of Hebrew in which the stem was very much alive.

In SH all occurrences of the stems belong to the *pāʕel (a)* category. As the full inventory of the forms of this stem (based on Z. Ben-Ḥayyim's *The Literary and Oral Tradition of Hebrew and Aramaic Amongst the Samaritans*, vol. IV), which is given in the paper shows, its use is most frequent in this tradition. Ben-Ḥayyim considers the *pāʕel* stem in SH to be a variant of the *piʕel*; he regards the long ā of the *pāʕel* to be a substitute for gemination. But no other verbal or nominal categories of SH regularly exhibit such phenomena of substitution.

There is, therefore, no proof for seeing in *pāʕel* a variant of *piʕel*. The writer's conclusion is that SH *pāʕel* forms, as well as *pāʕel (a)* forms of YT, are distinct from *piʕel* forms; the former belong to the Semitic stem whose characteristic feature is an ā following the first radical (Arabic *fāʕala*).

Other points of similarity between Samaritan Hebrew and the Yemenite tradition are briefly dealt with:

(a) *y* in final position followed by the vowel i: SH *guwwi* "a nation" (=גוי) – YT *noyi* "beauty" (נוי). In SH this phonological feature is evidenced in a number of words while *noyi* is the only word in which the feature is attested in YT.

(b) *qityā* nominal pattern, e.g., *libyā* "lion" in SH – *biryā* (בִּרְיָה; "a creature, person") in YT.

(c) the pronunciation of mobile *shewa* preceding ע, ח, ה, א in agreement with the quality of the vowel of these consonants (e.g., in וְחוּט the *shewa* is realized as u). Also, the pronunciation of a *shewa* preceding y (e.g., in בְּיוֹם) as the vowel i. The occurrence of these features, which are known to be typical of the Tiberian tradition, in SH, definitely bears evidence to its antiquity. Both SH and YT (as well as, in an independent way, Tiberian Hebrew) have apparently here preserved an old Hebrew phonological trait.

(d) *qĕtāl* nominal pattern. The occurrence of this pattern is most common in both SH and YT, usually as the counterpart of the segolate pattern in other traditions of Hebrew (e.g., צְבָע "colour" in YT *versus* צֶבַע in other traditions). It appears that here also a comparatively old independent feature of some dialects – which is not necessarily due to the influence of Aramaic – is to be observed.

The writer has in this paper used a methodology which compares dialectal traits across traditions, evaluationg these traits typologically and examining their frequency of occurrence. This methodology appears to yield conclusions of some relevance as to the nature of older layers of Hebrew.

Mordechay Mishor

Unpronounced *'alef* in an Etymologically Incorrect Position

The juxtaposition of both historical and phonetical spelling led sometimes to the interpolation of an unpronounced *'alef* in a word in an etymologically incorrect position. Some examples of the phenomenon are given in this article.

Shlomo Naeh

Between Grammar and Lexicography

The article deals with three cases that demonstrate the priority of lexicographical treatment, which is part of the hermeneutic process, to the grammatical analysis. The latter, if not based on a rigid lexicographical ground, may lead to a false grammatical conclusion.

1) The common explanation for the word "נוהגין" in Mishna Shabbat 12:4,5 (as it appears in MSS. Kaufmann and Parma) takes it as a "nuf'al" form (a variation of the regular "nif'al"), derived from the root ה.ג.ה. This explanation led, in addition to serious exegetical difficulties in the Mishna, to the very doubtful conclusion that the "nuf'al" form is not unique to פ"נ verbs. Here it is suggested, supported with evidence from parallel literature as well as from the text of the Mishna itself, that the word in question is an active participle of "qal", derived from the root נ.ה.ג, which may bear the meaning "to join".

2) The verb "מרד" in the phrases "עין שמרדה" (b. 'Avoda Zara 28b) and "שחין מחיה וקדח המורדין" (m. Nega'im 6:8, etc., and parallels) are traditionally explained as derived from מ.ר.ד, while the variation "מורדין" for "מורדין" (which appears infrequently in certain manuscripts. and consistently in MS Vat. 66 of the Sifra) has been viewed as a participle form of "hif'il" from the root ר.ו.ר. These explanations are difficult, both textually and grammatically. I prefer to consider this verb as built on the root מ.ר.ר, which is also found in the Biblical phrases "כמר מדלי" (Isaiah 40,15) and "מרר בבכי". In the examples mentioned above "מרדה" and "מורדין" are scribal errors.

3) The third section deals with one aspect of the alternation of the nasal sounds in final position: the possibility of such an alternation after the vowel "o" (elsewhere I have shown that this alternation depends on the vowel which precedes the nasal consonant). The expression "לשם יחיד/רבים" (Sifra: Ṣav, chapter 14; Emor, parasha 4) has been understood by all scholars as a result of a sound shift, or

neutralization of the final nasals in "לשון יחיד/רבים" (the same has been claimed for "לטעון טעון" [Sifra, baraita of the "thirteen measures"], as if it is a variation of "לטעום טעום"). But textual analysis based on the most reliable manuscripts may prove that such an explanation is impossible, and the text has to be read as it is written. Thus, "לשם יחיד/רבים" means "in the category of singular/plural".

Steven E. Fassberg

The Adverbials מיד and על יד על יד
in Rabbinic Hebrew

This study examines the use and origin of the Rabbinic Hebrew adverbials מיד "immediately" and על יד על יד "gradually". מיד is usually positioned towards the end of the sentence in halakhic passages but at the beginning of the sentence in aggadic portions; על יד על יד almost always occurs at the end of the sentence. מיד ("from the hand" > "directly" > "immediately") is paralleled by the Akkadian adverbials attested at Mari that are based on qāt "hand": qātam ana qātim, qātamqāti, qātaqāti ("hand to hand" > "immediately"), and ina qātimma ("in the hand/from the hand" > "immediately"). Examples of מיד in Jewish Aramaic contexts are borrowed from Hebrew. על יד על יד ("next to the hand" > "not immediately" > "gradually") is also attested in Rabbibic manuscripts without reduplicaion: על יד.

Shamma Friedman

Studies in Talmudic Lexicography [4] – *azda*

Lexical forms with the realization /azda/ or the like appear in
Elephantine Aramaic, Biblical Aramaic, and the Aramaic of the
Babylonian Talmud. Even though our main concern is with Babylonian
Talmudic Aramaic, we will begin our study with the two earlier
varieties of Aramaic, especially since they reveal the tendency of
scholarship in one field to introduce material of questionable relevancy
from other fields when difficult problems exist.

Thus, biblical *azda* was usually explained in terms of the talmudic,
both in traditional and scholarly literature, until it was accepted as
being of Persian origin, largely through investigation of the
Elephantine forms. However, Bible scholars still kept an eye on the
talmudic word, expressing preference for variant *talmudic* readings, and
even suggesting that the talmudic spelling *azda* was created from the
biblical word, and that only *'zl* (="go") is authentic in the Bavli!
Conversely, talmudic lexicographers became convinced that the biblical
(Persian) *azda* also exists in the Talmud!

Even after rejecting the Persian derivation for any and all talmudic
occurrences of *azda*, we are still left with the troubling question of its
form. Always considered in relationship to *'zl* ("go"), *azda* was in any
case listed as a separate verb, or as an alternate form of the verb *'zl* by
many lexicographers. However, it must be pointed out that *'zd* does not
function as a complete verb. Furthermore, the occurrences of *d* in these
forms is phonetically conditioned, occurring only when the preceding
consonant (*z*) is vowelless and *d* itself is followed by a vowel; namely, it
replaces *'zl* only when the latter contains the cluster *zl* + vowel.

This analysis is supported by other Aramaic dialects that also alter
'zl under such conditions: Syriac *azlin* > *azin*, *azlat* > *azat*; Yemenite
Talmud manuscripts *azla* > *ala*! Clearly, elision within the cluster *'zl*
occurs in these dialects. In standard Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic,
the simplification of this cluster does not lead to the complete

assimilation of one consonant to another, but terminates with the substitution of a consonant phonetically intermediate in the *zl* gap, namely *d*.

The occurrences of *'zd* in the Bavli are thus examples of orthography that reflects a popular pronunciation, in contrast to the classical, historical orthography *'zl*.

The actual distribution of *'zd* must be viewed in terms of the semantic range of *'zl*: (1) the simple meaning, "to go", (2) a specific sub-form meaning "to perish", "to be destroyed", "to be lost", (3) the *terminus technicus* לטעמיה ...אזדא; אזדו לטעמייהו. In (1) the popular spelling is virtually absent in the extant corpus of manuscripts and printed editions, having been replaced by the classical orthography, in that *'zd* > *'zl* was obvious to all copyists. In (2) *'zd* and *'zl* are closer to being free variants; *'zd* is retained (or even introduced) in that copyists often considered it a separate verb or form, due to its semantic departure from the plain *'zl* = "go". Category (3), a *terminus technicus*, is one step further in this continuum, with its relationship to *'zl* least obvious. Here the popular orthography is retained (and probably enhanced) even after the standardization of Bavli orthography corrected most popular forms to historical spellings.

We have succeeded in finding one occurrence of *'zl* in the third category, a usage previously considered non existent: Bava Meṣi'a 118b, Cod. Flor.: ואזלו לטעמיהו!

David Rosenthal

Additional Entries to the Talmudic Lexicon (II): נוג, רומח (Ta'anit 22b)

On occasion manuscripts of the Babylonian Talmud, primarily fragments from the Genizah, enrich the Talmudic lexicon with words that are previously unattested. This article deals with one such

example, נוג, which appears in the Yemenite manuscript to the Tractate Ta'anit. The textual tradition of the manuscripts is divided on this point into the western-Ashkenzi branch, which reads the Hebrew רומח, and the eastern branch, in which the entire sentence is missing.

With a slight emendation (*zayin* for *waw*), one receives the Persian נזג "spear". This word entered both Aramaic (ניזכא) and Arabic (ניזך) with a *kaph*. In Babylonian Talmudic Aramaic as reflected in the Yemenite manuscript to Ta'anit (and also in the version of the Geonim), however, the word has a *gimel*, and this would appear to document the time of its penetration into the text of the Talmud.

Medieval Linguistics, Masora and Vocalizations

Ilan Eldar

The Beginnings of Hebrew Lexicography
in the Orient

The present study investigates Hebrew Lexicography in the Orient in the tenth and eleventh centuries. It presents a survey of the interrelationship between Karaite and Rabbinite theories of lexicography and pays special attention to the difference between complete dictionaries and glossaries.

The pre-dictionary phase is represented by glossaries to the Bible, Gaonic commentaries to words in the Mishna and Talmud and by collections of hapax-legomena.

The intermediary phase includes the *Agron* of Rav Sa'adia Gaon and other anonymous dictionaries.

Finally, the *Jāmi' al-Alfaz* and the anagrammatical dictionaries of Rav Hai Gaon and of Abū (a)l-Faraj Harūn should be considered comprehensive exegetical dictionaries of Biblical Hebrew.

Israel Ben-David

The Disjunctive Power of the Disjunctive Accents in the Bible

Is there a proven way to measure the disjunctive power of the accents? Syntax is an important factor in establishing contextual and pausal forms, yet it is inadequate for measuring and comparing contextual and pausal forms.

Conventionally the disjunctive accents are divided into four grades: Grade I ("Emperors"), Grade II ("Kings"), Grade III ("Reges"), Grade IV ("Duces").

At the end of a verse and at the end of the first half of a verse, i.e., among Grade I accents, there are almost exclusively pausal forms. On the other hand, at the beginning of a verse and at the beginning of the second half of a verse there are mostly conjunctive accents and, with few exceptions, contextual forms. Between the Grade I disjunctive accents and the conjunctive accents there are the minor disjunctive accents, Grades II-IV. Most of these accents have contextual forms. By counting and comparing contextual and disjunctive forms of the three minor disjunctive accents, we may ascertain the power of each disjunctive accent in producing contextual and pausal forms.

The result of this survey refutes some conventional assumptions. Our study shows, for example, that the disjunctive power of the Grade III disjunctive accent Rebia' is 2.5 times greater than the disjunctive power of the Grade II disjunctive accent Tifḥa.

All scholars have grouped the substitute accents together with the main accents. There is, however, a remarkable difference between the disjunctive power of the substitute accents and of the main accents: The rate of contextual forms / pausal forms with Zaqef qaṭon is 73.9% :25.2% (and additional 0.9% intermediate forms), and with Zaqef gadol the rate is 94%:5.6% (and additional 0.4% intermediate forms).

Mordekhai Breuer

The Division of Songs in the Bible

The Aleppo Codex, the Cairo Codex to the Prophets, the Sassoon Codex 507, and MS לֵמ divide Shirat Ha'azinu and Shirat David into lines and each line into two parts, according to the logical division of the song and its verses. There are some exceptions, however, in MS לֵמ, which solve a problem that was not solved by the other MSS. The order of the song demands that each verse begin at the beginning of the line and end at the end of the line; however, when a verse has to be divided into three or five parts, it must end at the middle of the line. Consequently, the following verses begin and end at the middle of the line. MS לֵמ prevented this by putting the two parts of one of these verses in the same line as the last part of the preceding verse. This line includes, therefore, three parts of verses which cannot be logically divided into two parts. The division of such lines is fixed by clear rules: in some cases they are diveded into two parts which have a similar number of letters; in others they are divided after the end of one of the three parts which are included in the line.

Sometimes the division of the line does not fit the division of the accents. In these cases we have disagreement between the scribe and the accents regarding the explanation or the logical division of the verse. A very intersting example of two possibilities of dividing a verse of a song is in Lam. 1:1.

Amos Dodi

The Contribution of Catalonian Maḥzorim Towards the Understanding of the Phonetics in Catalonia from the 13th to the 15th Centuries

This article describes the vocalization of eight Catalonian maḥzorim based on manuscripts from the 13th to the 15th centuries. From the study of these sources one can learn that there are only a few examples of deviations from Tiberian tradition in the case of *bgdkpt*. On the other hand, there are more occurrences of vowel deviations from Tiberian vocalization, such as: (1) Qameṣ – pataḥ. In most of the examined manuscripts we found interchanges between the afore-mentioned vowels; (2) Ṣere – segol. In most sources the punctuation of unstressed syllables follows the biblical Tiberian tradition. Deviations take place in other kinds of syllables. Interchanges between these vowels occur mostly in a final, open syllable. However, the changes between ṣere and ḥiriq, shewa mobile and ṣere / segol, qibbuṣ / shuruq and qameṣ "ḥatuf", ḥolem and qameṣ "ḥatuf" are rare. Qameṣ in a closed, unstressed syllable whose historical vowel was a short u appears frequently in most manuscripts. In contrast, there are rarely any examples of pataḥ in place of Tiberian qameṣ in a closed, unstressed syllable.

The conclusion inferred is that there was an equal pronunciation of qameṣ and pataḥ on the one hand, and of ṣere and segol on the other. Similar features are also found in some manuscripts with Palestinian pointing. However, the absence of fluctuation between ḥolem and shuruq, and also between ṣere and ḥiriq, hint that the vocalizers probably distinguished between these pairs of vowels.

Geoffrey Khan

The Pronunciation of the Minor *Ga'ya* as Reflected in Karaite Bible Manuscripts in Arabic Transcription

In medieval Karaite manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible in Arabic transcription a vowel in a closed syllable that is marked by minor *ga'ya* in the accurate Tiberian codices is sometimes represented by a *mater lectionis* and sometimes not. Many of the Karaite manuscripts in Arabic transcription are marked with Hebrew vocalisation and accents. In such manuscripts a vowel with minor *ga'ya* in the accurate Tiberian codices is generally marked with the *ga'ya* sign irrespective of whether it is represented in the transcription by a *mater lectionis* or not.

The consistency of representing a vowel with minor *ga'ya* by a *mater lectionis* is greater in some manuscripts than in others. In most manuscripts the distribution of the *matres lectionis* representing vowels with minor *ga'ya* is conditioned by the quality of the vowel. Many manuscripts represent the vowel only when it low (*patah, qames*) but not when it is high (*hireq, šureq*).

The transcriptions in the Karaite manuscripts do not all exhibit the same orthography. The manuscripts vary in the extent to which they use *matres lectionis* to mark long vowels. One may classify them in a scale according to the consistency of the general usage of *matres lectionis*. Manuscripts at the top of this scale, which exhibit the most abundant usage of *matre lectionis*, represent a vowel with minor *ga'ya* by a *mater lectionis* irrespective of its quality. Manuscripts that omit a *mater lectionis* in the transcription of a high vowel with minor *ga'ya* exhibit a less abundant general use of *matres lectionis*.

The variations in the consistency in the general usage of *matres lectionis* reflects increasing degrees of explicit graphical representation of long vowels. The scribes of some of the manuscripts omitted to

Such rules are discovered by surveying the semantic relation and structural affinities of semantically related metaphors. I claim that metaphorical utterances in which the vehicle belongs to the semantic field of liquids are governed by rules that hold in this original field. The relationship between solids and liquids shapes through the metaphorical use the domains of human emotions and of human activity. One may "sink in despair", "bask in happiness", and "be drowned in pity" (in English, in Hebrew, and in many other languages), but one cannot "be swept away by shock" or "be drowned in enthusisiasm".

Several rules account for these licences and prohibitions. The most important one is the principle that states that deep beneath the metaphorical covers exist affinity and lack of contradiction: vehicles that express higher degrees of activity tend to juxtapose with tenors that are more distant and less intimate, and therefore match with the struggling activity of "swimming". Lack of motion (in liquids) is suitable for describing some emotional states such as shock or deep thinking. It is argued that although metaphors display a certain semantic distance between elements taken from remote semantic fields (such as the physics of liquids and solids versus human feelings and behavior as in the metaphor "a house soaked with culture"), nevertheless, another level of rules and affinities is evoked and renders the metaphor acceptable. Novel poetic metaphors obey the same kind of rules. But while everyday metaphors fit into a structured framework, poetic metaphors show a kind of solitude and uniqueness which add to their poetic power. Too small a deviation from the framework yields a bad metaphor: it is deviant enough not to be understood but expected enough to loose its potential ingenuity and beauty.

Adina Abadi

The Use of Biblical and Other Sources in
Hakhnasat Kalla by S. Y. Agnon

The paper examines quotations from the Bible, Talmud, Midrash, and other sources in the novel "Hakhnasat Kalla" by S. Y. Agnon. It examines the extensive use of quotations with exact references in a work which is not scientific but rather literary, and discusses some of the literary functions of these quotations.

A major part of the paper is devoted to passages in which Agnon introduced various changes. Five categories of changes are described: (a) introduction of a verse, etc.   into an unsuitable context, (b) decomposition of an idiom into its components, (c) expansion, (d) substitution, (e) concatenation. The semantic effect and the literary functions of the changes are discussed.

The conclusion is drawn that the material from the sources serves as a deep level of the novel, from which the full meaning of the novel is deciphered. The two kinds of quotation – literal as against deviant – serve the two facets of the novel: the legendary and the comic. Nevertheless, there is not complete overlapping between them. The extensive use of quotations invests the novel with the character of a midrash, and raises the question of its genre, which is on the border between fiction and midrash.

Brakha Fischler

"Recycling" of Word Combinations in
Modern Hebrew

This article deals with a phenomenon associated with the domain of "Living Literary Language". It contrasts two sets of linguistic data and attempts to define the relation between them: on the one hand, fixed collocations in contemporary Hebrew, and on the other hand, related but slightly different word combinations taken from classic literary sources (the Bible, the Talmud, Rashi's commentary, etc.).

The relation between these two sets is based, among other things, on data from documented intermediate stages. This article presents the documentation (mainly from the 19th and 20th centuries), and with the aid of this material we will sketch the process of evolution from the original word combination to the contemporary collocation.

Two sets of word combinations have been examined in the computerized database of the Historical Dictionary Project of the Academy of the Hebrew Language (with additional data from the Bar-Ilan University database of present-day Hebrew Literature).

The first set comprises construct phrases whose second element was originally the word "Eretz" (ארץ), but which in the course of time was changed into the synonym "Adama" (אדמה), e.g., חלקת אדמה, רעידת אדמה, כברת אדמה, etc.

The second set deals with adverbs of place whose original structure was that of a repetition (such as כאן וכאן, מפה ומפה, etc.), but today are known as pairs of antonyms: פה ושם, מפה לשם, etc.