English Abstracts

Barak Dan

The *Dativus Ethicus* in Biblical Hebrew and Early Translations

The role of the *dativus ethicus* in Biblical Hebrew (e.g., לְךָ in לְךָ-לְךָ) and in later phases of the language has always been difficult to define. In some cases, the occurrences themselves are disputed and depend on the understanding of the text. The first aim of this article is, therefore, to present a list of the certain occurrences of the *dativus ethicus* in the Hebrew Bible so that they may be examined further. The major challenge is differentiating this dative from the many instances of the *dativus commodi*. The second objective is to see how other sources, mainly the ancient translations of the Hebrew Bible, understood the Hebrew *dativus ethicus*. In those cases where one is able to learn something from the translation, it appears the phenomenon was understood in different ways. Special attention is also given to examples of the *dativus ethicus* in Aramaic, where unexpected examples are found in the Genesis Apocryphon scroll from Qumran.

Shimon Garty

Different Layers in the Tiberian System of Accents

This paper tries to isolate two distinct levels in the accentuation system, more precisely, the system of disjunctive accents. I seek to show that the disjunctive accents consist of two main layers. The more ancient level is reflected by the highest level of the disjunctives, namely the *qesarim*. The second layer includes the lesser disjunctives (*məlaxim, mišnim, šəlišim*). The first part of the paper deals with a verse from the Song of Deborah (Judges 5) where the unexpected positioning of the *ʾetnahta* reveals a unique pronunciation based on a defective text (without final *matres lectionis*).

In the second part of the paper it is argued that the exegesis of the *qesarim* contradicts the exegesis of the other disjunctives. Moreover, it seems that the exegesis of the *qesarim* is older. A possible source (from *Genesis Rabba*) for this distinction between the *qesarim* and the other disjunctives is discussed.

Emmanuel Mastéy

The Terms יושב and יישוב in Mishnaic Hebrew

The substantival noun יושב "settlement" (pronounced *yóšeb* or *yošéb*) is rarely found in superior manuscripts of Tannaitic and Amoraic works composed in Eretz Israel, and never (as an independent usage) in Babylonian works. Even in the former, however, copyists often eliminated the term by replacing it with its common counterpart יישוב, believed to be the semantic equivalent of יושב. In this study I wish to examine the precise dialectic setting and semantic contours of the term יושב as compared to יישוב. It seems that יושב is a Palestinian term whose only meaning is "settlement," while the contemporaneous term יישוב was reserved for the verbal noun "settling, populating." In Babylon, however, יישוב alone was employed in both senses.

Ohad Abudarham

A Unique 3rd Masculine Singular Suffix in Yemenite Targumic Manuscripts of the Five Scrolls

In the present research I discuss a unique 3rd m.s. pronoun suffixed to plural nouns, which appears almost exclusively in Yemenite targumic manuscripts of the Five Scrolls. In contrast to the majority of Aramaic dialects, including the Yemenite tradition to Targum Onqelos and Targum Jonathan to the Prophets, where the regular Aramaic suffix–*ohi*/–*oy* (e.g., רגלוֹהי = 'his legs') is attested, in Yemenite targumic manuscripts of the Scrolls we find an unexpected suffix: -וֹיֵ(e.g.,יְדוֹי = *yədawwe* 'his hands'). The study clearly shows that this is not a mere scribal error since fifty-nine instances of it were identified: it is distributed over all of the Scrolls in at least ten different manuscripts.

The explanation proposed combines phonetic factors found in the Yemenite and other traditions (diphthongization) as well as analogical factors occurring in other Aramaic dialects (partial analogy to the 3rd m.s. suffix on singular nouns).

Hananel Mirksy

The School of Menahem Ben Saruq: Linguistic Studies

Scholars disagree as to Rashi's view of the weak verbs. Did Rashi see the
root of verbs פ״ו, פ״נ, ע״ו, ל״י as triliteral? Did he understand the missing
consonant as part of the root? In this essay I examine Rashi's commentary
and try to reveal his view, based on the interpretation of his use of the term
יסוד נופל ('falling root letter'), which in the Maḥberet of Menahem ben
Saruk represents a category of letters.

Moshe Kahan

Innovations in the *Sharsherot Kesef* Dictionary
by Joseph ibn Kaspi

Two important and original linguistic works were found among Joseph Ibn
Kaspi's writings (1280- ca. 1332).The first is entitled *Retuqqot ha-Kesef*,
and discusses logical laws that are expressed in the Hebrew language.
Retuqqot ha-Kesef remained unpublished, and only one manuscript of the
work is known to exist today – Ms Rome Angelica Or 60. The manuscript
includes 108 handwritten pages. The second is entitled *Sharsherot Kesef*.
It is an extensive dictionary, which analyzes roots of Hebrew words in
alphabetical order. Parts of the dictionary were found in four manuscripts:
(a) Ms Rome Angelica Or 60; (b) a photograph of the manuscript in the
British Library; (c) Ms Paris, Paris National Library, Heb 1244 (this
manuscript includes the entire dictionary); (d) Ms Sassoon 922. A critical
edition of *Sharsherot Kesef* has not been published to date.

This paper describes the two abovementioned works, and examines the
principles discussed therein. The objective of the study is to demonstrate that
Kaspi's dictionary, *Sharsherot Kesef*, differs in essence from all previous
Hebrew dictionaries, including Jonah ibn Janah's *Sefer ha-Shorashim* and
David Kimhi's *Sefer ha-Shorashim*. The distinction stems from the fact
that the dictionary is based on Kaspi's rules of logic, which he discusses
in *Retuqqot ha-Kesef*. Moreover, Kaspi prefers to waive grammatical and
linguistic principles when they clash with rules of logic.

Natlai Akun

Shewa After a Long Tiberian Vowel in the Hebrew of Moroccan Jews from Tafilalt, Marrakech, and Meknès

In the Sephardic reading pronunciations of the *shewa* after a long vowel the realization depends on the type of text (biblical vs. Mishnaic) read by the informant. In Morocco on the other hand, the pronunciation of this *shewa* varies according to the background of the informant. Two different tendencies are attested: in the first the *shewa* is quiescent in the reading of the Bible and the Mishna, whereas in the second the s*hewa* is mobile.

The results of our research reinforce the view according to which the first pronunciation directly continues the Tiberian tradition of *metheg* marking a secondary accent and quiescent *shewa*. The second pronunciation goes back to the Sephardic tradition of the Middle Ages introduced by the Qimḥis where *metheg* indicates an open syllable and a following mobile *shewa*. At a earlier period in Morocco there was only one tradition in which the *shewa* was quiescent. The mobile pronunciation is later and the result of Spanish influence in Morocco. It should be added that the penultimately-stressed forms attested in the reading traditions of Moroccan rabbis are the result of an internal phonetic development.

Yehudit Henshke

Peripheral Hebrew: Between Error and Loan

This article examines the spoken Hebrew of speakers from the geographical and social periphery of Israel. The language of these speakers is usually taken as a corrupted and low register of Hebrew, but a careful investigation of its features reveals that this sociolect is influenced considerably by Judeo-Arabic, which was spoken by the first generation of immigrants to Israel. It should be noted that the penetration of the Judeo-Arabic substratum is recognizable in all linguistic fields.

The article deals with lexical, morphological, semantic, syntactic, and phraseological phenomena that show up in the book of Sara Shilo, *No*

Gnomes Will Appear (שום גמדים לא יבואו; Tel Aviv 1995). The book, which relates the story of a Moroccan family from a small town in the north of Israel, was written largely in a substandard level, which well reflects the discussed social sociolect.

Amikam Gurevitz

The Raven and Its Hebrew Wings: A Linguistic and Literary Analysis of Ten Hebrew Translations of the Poem "The Raven" by Edgar Allan Poe

The poem "The Raven" by Edgar Allan Poe has been translated into Hebrew ten times by nine different translators beginning with Z. Jabotinsky in 1914 and then again in 1923, followed by H. D. Nussbaum (1925), Yaakov Orland (1947), Ido Bin-Gorion (1957), Yehoshua Kochav (1983), Shmuel Friedman (1984), David Ben-Or (1992), Uri Sela (1993), and Hanna Nir (1993). In this article the different translations are compared and contrasted with the original and with each other in the light of meter, rhyme, Hebrew stress and pronunciation, lexicon, puns, poetic license, and literary motifs.

Rikki Bliboim

Re-examining Negative Particles: The Semantic-Pragmatic-Syntactic Interface

This article reconsiders the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic status of three prefixes of negation in Modern Hebrew: *'i, ḥoser,* and *bilti.* Although these prefixes have been examined in the past (e.g., Tzivoni 2003), changes in their behavior call for their re-examination.

One of the questions raised is whether the distinction between *'i* and *ḥoser* regarding the expression of total or partial negation is still valid. I suggest that the clear distinction asserted in the past by several grammarians is no longer in effect. Moreover, I have found that *'i* can be used even in cases where a definitive antonym exists: *'i emet* 'un-truth' is used even though

there is a clear antonym - *sheker* 'lie'. Many factors account for this process, including sublimation, reduction, and irony. Sometimes these two types of negation are differentiated semantically. This can take place through use of the different prefixes: *'i havana* 'mistake, misunderstanding' vs. *ḥoser havana* 'a lack of understanding'. In other cases, the use of different prefixes is dictated by the verb's polysemy and structure: *'i hakara bezxuyot* 'lack of recognition of rights' vs. *ḥoser hakara* 'unconsciousness'.

Also reexamined here is *bilti*, an additional particle of negation. *Bilti* is mainly joined to derived adjectives that do not possess lexical antonyms. This distinction, however, is no longer so clear-cut. Thus, for example, we find the use of *bilti naki* 'unclean', even though there is a definitive antonym *meluxlax* 'dirty'. What usually give rise to these forms are pragmatic factors and the polysemy of the adjective. Also, we find *bilti* appearing more and more with double negation: *lo bilti savir* 'not unreasonable'. Occasionally an intensifier joins *bilti* to compensate for the weakening of *bilti*'s force of negation– *bilti za'ir be'alil* 'clearly not tiny'. Although *bilti* tends to join the positive pole of the scale, this example shows that it can also join the negative pole, though less frequently. My earlier claim that *bilti* does not negate natural adjectives (hot-cold, big-small, etc.) is still valid and exceptions to this rule occur usually for pragmatic reasons.